

**The Chairperson:** — I'd like to have the conversation directed to the chair, and we'll begin. I have five items on the agenda for this morning and what we'll do is we'll deal with the item that was raised by Ms. Haverstock first. She is not here. However Mr. Cosman, the Law Clerk, has a meeting at 10 o'clock and so we'll do that first then anyway and she can read the verbatim regarding the tabling of documents and when they should be tabled.

I guess, Mr. Cosman, we'll let you go first and describe your perceptions of the process. And you just go right ahead.

We are dealing, first of all, Ms. Haverstock, with the item you raised yesterday, and that dealing with tabling of documents. And there are some pieces of information that Mr. Cosman is going to provide for us and then we'll open it up for discussion.

**Mr. Cosman:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not totally cognizant of what the problem was with respect to tabling of documents, but . . .

**The Chairperson:** — I'll review it for you and then we can go from there. The question was raised: why can't documents be tabled in the House without the legislature sitting, and be tabled at a certain period of time after the minister gets them, and then provided to the Clerk and then given to the members of the Assembly.

**Mr. Cosman:** — Well presently there is no law in force that enables that to take place. We presently do not have in force, for example, section 35 of the new Crown Corporations Act, 1993, which would enable a document to be tabled with the Clerk of the Assembly if the House was not then in session. But this section is not yet in force; in fact this Act is not yet in force.

So our fall-back is simply The Tabling of Documents Act, 1991, and that Act does not enable the deposit of documents that are required to be tabled with the Clerk if the House is not in session. There's nothing in the legislation that addresses that kind of method, if you will, of tabling a document.

So at present there's no legislative structure in place to allow departments or Crown corporations to actually deposit with the Clerk and comply with The Tabling of Documents Act. This would require an amendment to The Tabling of Documents Act and possibly amendments to the various Acts that require ministers of departments to table their documents.

**The Chairperson:** — I have a question then. In your mind, does The Tabling of Documents Act set the outside limits of the requirements of tabling of documents, or does it infer that the requirement is within the first 15 days of a sitting of the Assembly?

**Mr. Cosman:** — I'll just read the provision of The Tabling of Documents Act, 1991, section 4(l):

Subject to subsection (2), a presentor (and that usually is a reference to the minister) shall lay the document before the Assembly within 15 sitting days after the day on which the presentor received the document.

The problem there is a reference to 15 sitting days. That's a reference to the House actually sitting. If the House is not sitting, those 15 sitting days are not ticking away on the clock, so to speak, and so there's nothing addressing any other method. If the House is not sitting, time is not running, there's no other way through statutory structure of complying with the legal requirements to table documents with the Clerk and so on. Those provisions just do not exist at the present time.

Again for Crown corporations, in the new Act, the 1993 Crown Corporations Act, that will be possible. But that has not yet been proclaimed.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had indicated yesterday that there is an existing precedent in that *Public Accounts* are tabled with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly whenever the Assembly is not sitting. And that's in The Financial Administration Act, section 65(4), and had suggested that a simple amendment to section 4 of The Tabling of Documents Act would in fact allow annual reports to be tabled in the same manner as *Public Accounts*. Does that sound reasonable?

**Mr. Cosman:** — Yes. That would take an amendment to The Tabling of Documents Act.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Right.

**The Chairperson:** — Any further discussion?

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Mr. Chair, Mr. Cosman, what would happen if a department or a minister chose to release the annual report of an organization for which he's responsible or she is responsible for? Would that minister be breaking a law? What would happen if a minister chose to make available an annual report that perhaps is available today, but obviously the House is not in session. Would that minister . . . and then when the House is in session, within 15 days of it beginning, to table the annual report in the House to signal and comply with that legislation. Would that be a problem?

**Mr. Cosman:** — There's no law as such, no statute law as such that would prevent that from happening. There are a couple of things that might be worthwhile considering. One would be the theory of what you might call contempt of parliament, and that is making a document public to the public generally or to others than the members of the Assembly first, might be considered a contempt or a breach of a member's privilege. But that's not a statute law as such.

The other thing might be some kind of cabinet or executive confidentiality. It may well be that for one reason or another Executive Council may not want

documents to be released in advance of the legislative requirements.

**Mr. Streliaff:** — Okay, Mr. Cosman, what would happen if the minister, to answer your first concern, released the annual reports first to all MLAs and then once that was clearly done, that then he advised his organization that they then can release it in a more public way?

And also what would happen if the minister ensured that before that . . . before the release occurred that it was done through an order in council or that it had the review and sanction of their cabinet colleagues.

**Mr. Cosman:** — In a way you're asking me to predict, you know, future response to something like that by perhaps a member of the Assembly who still might feel in some way that the protocol of tabling in the Assembly has been a breach of their privileges.

In other words, even though each and every member received a copy, I can't predict that a member wouldn't rise in his or her place when the House is called back into session and say, notwithstanding that I have received this document unofficially and have a copy here in my hands, parliamentary protocol in this case and the legislation requires that it have been tabled in the Assembly first before released to the public.

I don't know if an argument like that would succeed but I can't predict that somebody wouldn't raise it still. Although in a world where you would have as much consensus as possible in this, I think it highly unlikely that someone would raise it or raise it successfully.

I think the best answer to this is, is that it be addressed directly by legislation in The Tabling of Documents Act. However, I don't think a law would be breached as such if it were disseminated in the way that you described.

**Mr. Cline:** — Well I think what has to be remembered here is that our law in a common law system is not just what the statutes say. It's unwritten law which includes the procedures of the parliament in the Legislative Assembly because we live in a British common law system.

And that means that . . . I mean, The Tabling of Documents Act, to my mind, implies the documents are going to be tabled in the legislature. That's what it says. And if a minister in our parliamentary system doesn't adhere to what that says, I think the minister is not complying with that Act and certainly not complying with the common law.

I don't have any disagreement that the law should be changed but I think what we ought not to get into here is the suggestion that because something isn't in a statute, that it doesn't say you can't do something; that there isn't the unwritten rule that you can't do it. And our legal system depends upon people obeying not just the letter of statute law but obeying the common law as well.

But, and I looked at this last night and I did see that in the new Crown Corporations Act, the legislature has addressed this by having an exception to The Tabling of Documents Act in the case of Crown corporations. That, I guess, has not been proclaimed yet because the regulations are not prepared, although I think the government anticipates that it will be proclaimed fairly shortly.

So that takes care of that problem. And in fact . . . I mean, the good news is that the legislature has rectified the problem in so far as Crown corporations go so that it ought not . . . you ought not to get into this situation again.

Now with respect to organizations that have to table reports — The Crown Corporations Act doesn't apply to — I think Ms. Haverstock is right. We should recommend to the Assembly that the appropriate legislative change be made to effect that change across the board.

I don't know if we should suggest that any particular provision be changed because I think that's for the legal drafters to decide. But to suggest that the government has done something improper here is the opposite of what has occurred. The government has complied with the law as is. And to suggest that, you know, the government can just cavalierly disregard the laws and traditions of the legislature, I don't think is correct, and I have to take issue with that.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — The auditor was on the radio earlier this week, and you were pretty much making this same public comment as you're making now, that with respect to a number of reports, that . . . notwithstanding the law, that the government could somehow or should somehow ignore that. And I'm wondering if you had a legal opinion to back that up or on what basis you would make that comment.

**Mr. Streliaff:** — Mr. Chair, members, I was asked by a reporter about the . . . The reporter mentioned a number of reports and asked whether it was a good idea to make them public in a more timely way. And I said that I thought it was a good idea to make annual reports available as soon as they are available because the usefulness of information declines, or something like that, as time goes on.

In my conversations with many of the government organizations, they would like to be able to release their reports as soon as possible because they use them for many purposes. And they have a story to tell and that they're most anxious to get that story out. And I said that I thought that was a very good idea and that it should . . . the annual reports should be made available as soon as possible. And I still advocate that very strongly.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Yes, so do I. I mean, that's not the issue. The question that you somehow suggested that even though the law, as has been explained by Mr. Cosman and Mr. Cline, stipulates that at this point that these documents should be tabled in the

legislature, you were somehow holding forth with the opinion that the government could somehow ignore that anyway. And I just wonder what legal opinion you had to base that opinion on.

**Mr. Strelloff:** — Mr. Chair, members, in my conversation I did say something to the effect of that I thought it was more of a convention that . . . and a no-later-than requirement that annual reports be tabled in the Assembly within 15 days of the next sitting of the House, if it wasn't in session; that that was more of a convention and that I didn't know of any specific legal requirement that would prevent or that would, well, prevent an annual report to be released prior to or outside the sitting of the House as long as when the House was sitting that the minister responsible did table the annual report within the specific tabling limit.

Now I didn't ask for . . . I didn't seek a specific legal opinion on that. I knew that in the past the Public Accounts had been issued prior to the 15 days whether it was 10 or 15 days rule. And I thought, well that seemed to make sense. It was a good decision that everyone concurred with. But I didn't seek a specific legal opinion, and I was just holding the view that the practice now is more of a convention and that it is to ensure that annual reports are tabled no later than . . . The Legislative Law Clerk now has expressed the opinion that it's more of a . . . there is more substance to that convention. And that's a very good argument.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Did you get the opinion of the Speaker on this?

**Mr. Strelloff:** — No, I didn't seek the opinion of the Speaker.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Because it deals with the question of parliamentary privilege. I just wondered whether you might have done that. Because you were saying that in a sense that that's kind of an irrelevant consideration. I just wondered whether that was based on some discussion with him.

**Mr. Strelloff:** — Mr. Van Mulligen, no, I did not seek his opinion. It was a spur of the moment question and it just seems like a reasonable course of action. And on reflection, I probably should have sought advice within the office and outside of the office before suggesting that as being a practice that doesn't require specific review, approval, sanction by the legislature.

**The Chairperson:** — The question, I guess, is where do we go from here? Is it protocol for this body to recommend that? Can I go beyond that and suggest that maybe the Law Clerk draft an amendment? Is it the opinion of the committee that we should do that? If it is, then we could proceed with that, but I'm not sure whether that is a part of our responsibility. I'd just like to seek the opinion of the committee as to what we do or what you want to have happen.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thanks, Mr. Chair. Well I would of course like to see that we have ready access to the information as soon as possible. I think that what we

should do is to ensure that all bases are covered, so that when people view this committee, as though we have ensured proper protocol has been followed. If in fact Mr. Van Mulligen is suggesting that there be some consultation with the Speaker's office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. Well, I would suggest a simple amendment to section 4 of The Tabling of Documents Act.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — And any other appropriate Acts.

**The Chairperson:** — This committee has to have more than just a suggestion. We have to have a motion.

**Mr. Cline:** — I'll move that:

We recommend to the Legislative Assembly that appropriate legislative changes be made to enable documents to be released when the legislature is not in session with respect to those organizations that The Crown Corporations Act does not apply to.

**The Chairperson:** — Do you want to put that down on paper there, and we'll deal with that?

**Mr. Kujawa:** — Before you put it down on paper, do you want enabling or requiring, because he did say enabling. Should it not be requiring? That's my question.

**Mr. Cline:** — I don't have any problem with that.

**Ms. Crofford:** — I wouldn't mind seeing it mentioned in there that it is distributed to MLAs first so you know the thing is out. Because otherwise, you know, it could be out for a while, and you don't know it is out.

**The Chairperson:** — Some of that process as it relates to how we have the tabling of documents in Crown corporations and in departments through the Assembly, the documents are tabled with the Clerk, the Speaker and the Clerk, and then they go to the offices of the members of the Assembly, and that's what the new rules are, I think, as it relates to how they're handled. I think your observations are good, but that's the way they should be probably followed.

The observations that have been made here are that in The Crown Corporations Act that members of the Assembly be first addressed, and it is also that same way in The Financial Administration Act that deals with the tabling of the *Public Accounts*. So that's the protocol route that needs to be taken.

**Mr. Kraus:** — Mr. Chairman, a story from the recent past. It was in about '84, I think, that we decided in the best interests of everyone — or '83 or '84 — we would release the *Public Accounts* in between sessions just because they should be released. And it wasn't a very good experience.

I think it was a member of a party that doesn't exist any more took advantage of the situation and held an impromptu public accounts meeting in Moose Jaw with the media. I learned a lesson from that, and it was

that you should always follow the rules of the legislature. Now that we have a tabling of the *Public Accounts* in between sessions but as sanctioned by the legislature it works very well. But when you move away from those practices you can get yourself into difficulty.

And I think it was Mr. Cosman was saying, you just never know what's going to happen if you don't follow the rules. When everybody understands what's going to happen and it's sanctioned by the legislature, it works. But it certainly wasn't a very good experience from my perspective, and that's why I would recommend you change the law or don't table in between sessions.

**The Chairperson:** — It was more probably in '84-85.

**Mr. Kraus:** — Yes, somewhere in there.

**Mr. Strelieff:** — In December of '91, I thought the *Public Accounts* were released. Were they not released in December, the *Public Accounts*?

**Mr. Kraus:** — I believe the only time they . . . if they've ever been released in a December, it's been when the House is in session. I don't recall.

**A Member:** — In '91 it was.

**Mr. Kraus:** — The House was back in, wasn't it?

**A Member:** — That's right, it was.

**Mr. Cline:** — Okay, I've written this out. Maybe I'll read it and the committee members can, indicate whether it's appropriate.

**The Chairperson:** — Please read it.

**Mr. Cline:**

That the committee recommends to the legislature that appropriate legislative amendments be made to require reports to be released when the legislature is not in session in the same manner as pursuant to section 35 of The Crown Corporations Act where documents are required to be tabled.

**The Chairperson:** — Do you want to have that reread for clarity?

That the committee recommends to the legislature that appropriate legislative amendments be made to require reports to be released when the legislature is not in session in the same manner as pursuant to section 35 of The Crown Corporations Act where documents are required to be tabled.

Motion by Mr. Cline.

The Law Clerk has suggested that we put in: that appropriate legislative amendments be made to require documents to be released when the legislature . . .

Okay, The Crown Corporations Act under section 35 has both report and document.

**Mr. Cline:** — Okay. Well, I think we can incorporate that.

**The Chairperson:** — Okay. Does it say all reports and documents? No, it should be: made to require reports that have to be released when the legislature is not in .

Can we deal with this in the spirit of what section 35 deals with in The Crown Corporations Act, and that would make the matter a whole lot easier without having to grapple over the words of this. Okay?

All those in favour of the motion by Mr. Cline. That's carried. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Cosman. We will then go to another item. Mr. Strelieff wants to mention something about pension liabilities.

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Mr. Chair, members, yesterday or the day before we were discussing pension liabilities and who records them and who doesn't record them, and I was reaching back into my memory to advise you on who records them and I said that Manitoba records them. I'm pretty sure I said that. I haven't checked the verbatim yet. I went back to my office to check exactly what was going on and I went to Manitoba's financial statements and they do not record them; Manitoba does not record their pension liability. I think Mr. Kraus can agree with that. I don't think Mr. Kraus was at the meeting when I said that, and I just want to correct that.

**Mr. Kraus:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Strelieff, I must say though I did get a phone call and I did phone yesterday morning just to verify whether they had changed from their 1992 reporting practices. And they advised me no, they still do not report.

**The Chairperson:** — Manitoba does not?

**Mr. Kraus:** — No, they do not. I mean they show it like we do. It's a footnote to the financial statements, but they do not book . . . in fact they said their impression wasn't dissimilar from ours. If you want to look at the province that's doing it in the absolute correct way right now, it's Alberta. There's a little bit of it here and there but no one is really living up to the intent of the spirit of that recommendation except for Alberta. That doesn't mean some others aren't doing a little of this and that, but I think . . . their impression was exactly the same as mine. But they do not book them as of now.

**The Chairperson:** — Well we want to thank you, sir, for bringing that to our attention. And then we will go on to the next item of business and that deals with the departments that are to be called forward with witnesses as it relates to the Provincial Auditor's report.

We on our side of the Assembly thought that we would like to have all of the items brought to the attention of the committee. However we would not require witnesses, at least at this point, of no. 20 which is Social Services, 23 which is legislation, 24 which is the Saskatchewan Auto Fund, and 25 which is Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation.

Those four were ones that we said that we probably would discuss as it relates to the auditor's report and we wouldn't call witnesses of, unless something inadvertently comes up, and then we can do that later on. But otherwise we would ask for the departments to bring forward their deputy and whoever they saw fit to provide information to the committee.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask you about chapter 22, the Investment Corporation of Saskatchewan, and whether you want to call them inasmuch as the . . . it's my understanding that the events that result in the recommendation that's before us has substantially changed. And that is that there is no longer a shareholders' monopoly, I understand, in that.

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Mr. Chair, members, I don't know of any changes.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — No? Okay, well that's something maybe you can check out and you can always decide subsequently whether you want to call the Investment Corporation. It is my understanding that the requirement that the public pension plans in fact do their investment work through the ICS (investment Corporation of Saskatchewan) has ended and that there's no requirement for . . .

**The Chairperson:** — Under the year under review they still wouldn't have had that requirement, even though it may be there today. I'm not sure whether it is there today.

**Mr. Kraus:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe that agreement, I think, expired on March 31, 1993. So now in fact pension plans have the choice where they go. And I happen to know the one plan has already invested money with several other agencies. I mean they're not . . . They just decided they didn't want to have all of their money here. So that has changed as of March.

**The Chairperson:** — Okay, March, 1993?

**Mr. Kraus:** — Yes.

**Mr. Wendel:** — Mr. Chairman, the reason Investment Corporation of Saskatchewan is in here is that it is a Crown agency under The Provincial Auditor Act. Whether or not pension plans can invest with other investment managers is not the issue. If the shares are still all owned by Crown agencies, it's still a Crown agency under our Act. The fact that you can have other agencies do your investment management or counselling wouldn't change that.

**Mr. Cline:** — I'd like to ask a question of the Provincial

Auditor. Do you plan to do a document which goes through your recommendations and outlines which of the departments or agencies have rectified the problems?

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Mr. Chairman, members, yes we do that, and would provide that in your preparation for this meeting when you're deciding on what issues are still outstanding through each of the departments and organizations.

**Mr. Cline:** — Do you know when that would be prepared approximately?

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Mr. Chair, members, we can do that when you wish us to do. We hadn't done that for this meeting because our understanding was that we would be dealing with 1 to 8.

**Mr. Cline:** — Right. Yes, okay. Here's my suggestion. We had these four departments that you've identified, Mr. Chairman. We had also thought that there probably was no purpose to be served by calling them. And there were some others as well.

But I would like to suggest that we plan on calling the ones other than the ones you've identified, subject to this: that perhaps yourself and myself and Ms. Haverstock could meet and review the comments of the Provincial Auditor with respect to his recommendations, and then we could possibly decide that some of the departments were not required to be called and take it from there. So that we would go on the assumption — unless Ms. Haverstock, you know, wishes to leave these four that you've mentioned in — we could go on the assumption that aside from those four the others might possibly be called, but we could review what the Provincial Auditor has to say, and then perhaps narrow it down somewhat prior to the time we meet and set an agenda of departments prior to the time we meet. So I wouldn't mind getting your comments and Ms. Haverstock's comments on whether that might be an appropriate procedure.

**The Chairperson:** — I don't have a problem dealing with the agenda either, but Mr. Boyd and myself went through these yesterday and we were of the opinion that we would like to ask questions of the department on the ones that I did not mention. And so that issue is, in my mind, established.

**Mr. Cline:** — Okay. Well I don't have any problem with that. I mean we can certainly have witnesses from all of these departments. The only thing I'm saying really is that it may still be that if you reviewed the comments of the Provincial Auditor in terms of what the departments had done, that perhaps you and Mr. Boyd might at least want to reconsider your position with respect to some of them.

But, I mean having said that, we have no objection to having witnesses from all of them. But I just thought that might be a useful procedure and it might, it might change your mind, Mr. Chairman. Because I know that you and Mr. Boyd are very open-minded people

and I'm sure that when you read what the Provincial Auditor has to say it may at least possibly change your mind.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — No, the comment I wanted to make is that there's nothing to prevent you either from calling departments that aren't even listed in the auditor's report. I mean if you want to call some department because of issues that are raised for you in the *Public Accounts*, then you should do so.

Having said that, if the auditor's report comes back and says, look all of the recommendations with respect to department X have been dealt with to my satisfaction, and you see no other reason to call them, then maybe you might say, well then there is no purpose in really calling that department. I mean you may still want to call them because of concerns you have in the *Public Accounts* but maybe you don't.

And you might say then that there is no point in calling those people in. One . . . No, I don't think we're calling Sask. Forests Products, for example. But if that one were resolved and you had no other questions, then what's the point of getting those people all the way down here.

**The Chairperson:** — Right, okay. I wonder though at us getting together with the Provincial Auditor on that basis, whether that isn't just as time consuming as having them come in and deliver the message and then . . .

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — You can do it over the phone, Harold, I mean.

**Mr. Cline:** — What I'm suggesting is that if in two or three weeks the Provincial Auditor had a status report with respect to his recommendations, and then that went to you and to me and to Ms. Haverstock and maybe all members of the committee — I guess it would — we might look at that and we might say, well, you know, there's no point in calling this particular department or agency, I mean, if the thing has been completely dealt with. Having said that, I mean, if any one of us wanted them to appear, that's fine too. But we might decide that it would not be an appropriate use of time.

**The Chairperson:** — Okay.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — I concur with both Mr. Cline and Mr. Van Mulligen that . . . I mean, what we're talking about here is not only expeditious use of our time but we're talking about taxpayers' dollars. So I would far prefer to be able to ensure that if we're going to make decisions about sitting and using our time well, that we do so with the guidance of an update from the Provincial Auditor and that we make some choices based on the information that's been put forward by the Provincial Auditor.

It would be quite different if we had to make the decision today and it was a fait accompli that we could never have people come forward again. But I think we have the continued option, so I would agree

with the approach you're suggesting.

**The Chairperson:** — Could I make a suggestion then that the timing of that meeting be at the same time that we have the meeting regarding the . . . or if we're going to have the meeting regarding the public . . . or the audit plan for the Department of Health in relation to the health boards.

**Mr. Cline:** — That's a very good idea. And then if we could ask the Provincial Auditor and his staff if possibly they could have their information to us say a week prior to that meeting and then we could review it. And by the time we get here, we'll have probably have some idea of where the issues really are.

**The Chairperson:** — Is that a possibility? Okay, sure. Okay, have we resolved that then?

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Will you be dealing with . . . I know that we're calling the Department of Health in to deal specifically with the question of health boards. But if they're in, could we also at that point then deal with the items that are in the auditor's report? I don't think that they're particularly cumbersome or would take up too much time — and the *Public Accounts* for that matter — as opposed to calling them back in a second time.

**The Chairperson:** — I think we're dealing with two different items, Mr. Van Mulligen. We're going to be talking to some of the administrative people in the Department of Health that deal with the administration of the health care boards and not necessarily the whole of the Department of Health.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — All right.

**Mr. Sonntag:** — just a suggestion here. I've not spoken to the vice-chair here yet about this but I know he'll be as understanding with me as he is with you. Just a thought. If we do in fact meet ever with any of the health boards . . . I believe it was the first day that you were talking about going out into some of the communities, maybe that would be . . . maybe at that time that would be a consideration. Rather than have one or two of the boards come here, maybe to consider . . .

**The Chairperson:** — In our discussion, and perhaps you weren't in at the time, the committee came to the opinion that to speak with the health boards at this point in time was probably premature — not immature; premature — and that we should be talking with the Provincial Auditor in relation to the administration in the Department of Health that is going to plan how they're going to audit the books of those health district boards. At a later date, that perhaps may be a part of the agenda.

**Mr. Sonntag:** — No, I was here for that discussion. I just note . . . All I'm suggesting is that if we do in fact meet with any of the health boards that we may want to consider going out to meet with them rather than have them come here.

**The Chairperson:** — Oh, I have no problem doing that. And we could maybe make that a matter of discussion at the meeting that we have later in November or December 1.

We've completed then the observations regarding the departments to be called forward. Okay. I don't hear any objection to the process here so I will assume then that the departments to be called forward will be dealt with with Mr. Cline and Ms. Haverstock and myself in relation to some of the discussion that the auditor is going to provide or information the auditor is going to provide for us at the meeting with the Department of Health. And that leads us then to the next question: what day would we consider as an appropriate date for the meeting with the Department of Health? And at the same time . . . No, we'll deal with that one first.

I don't have my calendar with me. However, some time after the Remembrance Day weekend is what I believe we should take into consideration. I personally can't be here before the 12th or 13th, but November 14.

**Mr. Cline:** — You can't be here before the 14th?

**The Chairperson:** — Well I could be. I could be here the 8th but not any other day.

**Mr. Cline:** — Okay. The 8th is no good for us. So that puts it after November 14.

**The Chairperson:** — Yes. The week of the 15th to the 19th, is that . . . somewhere in that week provide a serious problem?

**Mr. Sonntag:** — The 17th would be perfect.

**Mr. Cline:** — 15 and 16 are good. I think especially 16.

**A Member:** — The 17th?

**A Member:** — He said no on the 17th.

**Mr. Sonntag:** — Okay, how about 15?

**The Chairperson:** — If I don't hear any dissenters . . .

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Would this be one day only?

**The Chairperson:** — I am assuming it's one day. That's the assumption I made. I didn't think it would be taking more than one day.

We could think about it this way. If we dealt with it on a Monday, then we could get here Sunday evening, then we could start at 9 o'clock Monday morning. And then we would probably conclude sometime around 4 o'clock in the afternoon I would think.

**Mr. Cline:** — How do people feel about the 23rd as an alternative?

**Ms. Haverstock:** — I'm in Melfort that day. The 22nd, on the other hand, is real dandy.

**Mr. Kraus:** — Health would probably appreciate the time.

**Mr. Cline:** — Who?

**Mr. Kraus:** — You're talking about calling Health in, are you not?

**Mr. Cline:** — Oh yes.

**The Chairperson:** — Well do I hear general approval for the 22nd from the committee members? I get a general nodding of agreement. On Monday the 22nd, if we start at 9 o'clock in the morning, go to 12, and from 1 o'clock till we're . . . or 1:30 till we've concluded, is that . . . that's meeting the agreement with everyone? Okay, then that's what it will be. I will ask the Clerk to inform the Department of Health.

And I think, Mr. Kraus, if it's proper — I don't know whether it is protocol or not — would it be, in your mind, a good idea for you to call them and tell them kind of where we are at, how we want to deal with this? And to you, Wayne, if you want to work together with him as you've been doing that to this point.

**Mr. Kraus:** — I already took the liberty last evening of talking to them, trying to point out that it's a positive opportunity for them to present their case.

**The Chairperson:** — Okay. We will do that on the 22nd then, November 22.

The other item that needs to be dealt with is a meeting in January to conclude the discussion as it relates to the auditor's report on items 8 and beyond, and whatever public accounts that need to be talked about, that members wish to talk about after . . . or as well.

Should we wait till November 22nd to make that decision or do it now. Fine. Give me a date. We have to remember this likely will take a week, and it likely . . . we'll have to, of course, work together with the departments about where they fit into this. So it'll take a great deal of coordination, I guess.

**Mr. Cline:** — Well I think either of the last two weeks in January would be good for us.

**The Chairperson:** — Either of the last two weeks in January.

**Mr. Sonntag:** — The 17th actually is okay for me.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — It's okay? Why don't we say the 17th then?

**The Chairperson:** — Does the week of the 17th to the 21st suit the majority? The 17th to the 21st. January 17 to 21, inclusive. We will work around it.

I just want to make a note, and I'll have . . . if there's any changes that occur . . . The Clerk's office has a great deal of difficulty doing it on the last weekend of

the month, so we want to move it back or further ahead, and I don't know how you'd do that with the calendar. But anyway, move it to the week of the 24th to the end of the month, then the Clerk's office has a great deal of difficulty because they're hosting a conference here and their staff are going to be used for that. So if there's changes then we may have to do it other ways then.

**Ms. Crofford:** — We should be letting the departments know almost immediately so that they can, you know, make their plans. Who knows? They might have holidays, too.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — I was actually wondering if we should formalize a meeting with Mr. Strelioff about . . .

**The Chairperson:** — Before November 22?

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Perhaps prior to would be the best way of being able to inform departments who are actually going to be involved in this, if there are some that would not have to . . .

**The Chairperson:** — I think that I would assume that there are going to be. The majority of them are going to be called anyway, except those four that I mentioned.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Can I just make a suggestion? And that is that you should let all the departments know, with the exception of the ones that you have identified, they're required to be here. And then pursuant to a report from the auditor, if you look at that and then say, well there is other departments that we would not want to call, then you can always let Eric and Lynda know. And if you all agree, we can drop that one.

**The Chairperson:** — That's normally the practice, Mr. Kraus.

**Mr. Kraus:** — I would just like to suggest that you do that because often what happens is they don't hear until pretty close to the meeting, and they are desperate to know whether they are going to appear. And even if they prepare and then don't go, I think it is better than finding out on January 4 they have to go. So if you could let them know now, they would appreciate it.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — On the other hand, this will keep them in a state of high anxiety for weeks and weeks though.

**The Chairperson:** — Well the practice is that as soon as the dates are identified, the department will be notified. The week will be identified. Departments will be notified. Then they will be again notified about the time in that week.

Well I believe that that deals with the items that I had on my agenda. Are there any other items that you want to raise that haven't been raised that need to be dealt with by this committee?

I would . . . second call. I don't see any interjection. I would then like to say thank you to the Clerk and his staff for their service here at the meeting. I would like to say to the comptroller that I appreciate your work here, and to your staff, to you, Mr. Auditor, and your staff. And then I want to say thank you to the members of the committee for their attention and for their attention to getting the work done. And I appreciate that, and I think we've moved a considerable distance, and I appreciate that. It has been easy for me to chair the meeting. And hopefully the interface by members will be similar to what we've had here. It has been great working with the committee.

With that, I need a motion to adjourn.

**Mr. Cline:** — I would like to say in response, Mr. Chairman, how great it is working with you.

**The Chairperson:** — I'm going to stop you right there. I have three sons, and I very often have told them this, that the pleasant atmosphere in our home — and it has been a pleasant atmosphere in our home — has been more to their credit than to mine, so I was just going to say that your work here has been to your credit more than to mine.

I need a motion to adjourn. Thank you, from Mr. Sonntag. The meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 10:05 a.m.