

[Deputy Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[3:53 p.m.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attendance. Dr. Elliott sends his regrets from his sick bed. [Inaudible] agenda was supposed to be.

If you'll forgive me, we have just a few things to go over. First I would like to receive a motion with respect to the minutes as circulated. Purdy and Notley — adoption of the minutes as circulated. All those in favor please signify. Carried unanimously. Thank you.

With respect to business arising from the minutes, we had Mr. Purdy and Dr. Elliott going to Toronto with the Auditor General. In both cases that failed to materialize because of the sitting of the House and Bob Elliott being sick at the time.

Very briefly with respect to having gone myself to the conference on ethics which was held last week in Montgomery, Alabama, I only arrived back in Calgary at midnight last night, so I haven't had a chance to do a summary. But I will be doing a brief outline of the conference. One of the reasons we are sending people from the committee to these conferences is to see whether or not we feel the conferences are worth while. I agree that this one is, so we might send a committee member each year. The next one is in Seattle next December.

The Chief Electoral Officer and I were together from the Tuesday through to the Friday morning. I'll supply an analysis of the conference. I made copious notes, and I'll do it for you in point form. They had lawyers from the federal Justice Department down there with respect to voting rights in the south. There are about 10 to 12 states which are under federal jurisdiction, and they can't make any changes whatsoever on any level of government with respect to polling stations and all the rest of that. That's a very contentious issue in the south, of course.

In addition they had overseas voting rights, which really didn't apply to us, although it does apply to at least three of our agents general — in Hong Kong, California, and London — who raised the issue of why they can't vote in provincial elections. Canada's Chief Electoral Officer was there, talking about various foreign jurisdictions, and that was fairly useful. There was a fair representation from Ontario and Quebec, and I brought back another feast of documents from that conference as well.

There was also a very interesting section with respect to campaign financing and declaration of donors, plus the impact of the media, and that was very useful. With respect to United States elections in particular, the cost has just gone absolutely out of sight. So that was another kind of area as well.

I realize that's not much of a review to give you at this time. As I say, the notes are here and will be duly processed. I'll get them to you in due course.

Of course another thing which is very interesting to us, although it's foreign to us, is that whole matter of how lobbies function not only in Washington but with respect to all their state governments. I found that was very useful information. Because we in Canada follow the Americans so much, I think we are going to have to look at who is a lobbyist and who isn't, and how they really function. I'm sure that's going to happen more at the federal level before it happens provincially. Nevertheless it's an area that we need to bear in mind.

The major difference, of course, between the United States and Canada is the fact that we have enumerations and they don't. I think there's perhaps one state which goes door to door and runs an enumeration. It takes a while to get your head in gear to realize that if you want to vote down there, you have to register. There's not going to be somebody coming to your door, whether it's municipally, provincially, or federally, to make sure that everybody in your household is enumerated so they can just go marching down to the polling booth and cast their vote. I think that makes for a very, very different approach to elections. I haven't quite thought through all the ramifications

even with respect to Calgary Egmont, let alone the province of Alberta. I'll get the notes summarized and have that circulated to all the committee members.

I see from the follow-up report — does everyone have one of these? Did the chairman get the terms of reference with respect to the baby Taschuk commission?

MRS. EMPSON: He didn't say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have no idea on that, and it's not in the few notes that were sent to me. Wait a minute. No, that one wasn't carried. October 14 — did we not follow up with those items, Louise?

MRS. EMPSON: You did handle Toronto and attendance at the Montgomery, Alabama one, but attendance at the June conference and others that are coming up still needs to be discussed, probably around March or April.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we're going to discuss those at a meeting in January or February. So what that item 2 from October 14 means is Toronto and Montgomery. Then there are some more conferences coming up next summer, one in Prince Edward Island with the Auditor General, I think it was, and also the matter of the International Ombudsman Conference in Sweden and Helsinki. So we'll have to deal with those early in the new year.

Item number 3: discussion concerning the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. I'm afraid we'll have to hold that one over until the next meeting as well. I see here — which set of minutes did we approve earlier today, November 2 or November 18?

MRS. EMPSON: I have two names. I have Mr. Purdy and Mr. Notley. Did you each approve one?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I only called for the vote once, so I now call for the vote on the November 18 minutes as circulated. All those in favor? Thank you.

MRS. EMPSON: Who was the mover of this motion?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Notley did the first one and Mr. Purdy did the second. Then they both changed about with respect to seconding.

MR. PURDY: We don't need seconders anyway, because we follow the rules of the House.

MRS. EMPSON: That's why I'm going to have both names here: one for each.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Blain, perhaps you'd like to help us with the next item we have. It's an account for \$10,000 from Sax Zimmel Stewart & Co. chartered accountants for professional services rendered: the audit of the accounts and preparation of statement of revenue and expenditure for the year ended March 31, '83; interim audited accounts and related systems review for the year ended March 31, '83; attendance at meetings to review financial statements and draft memoranda and recommendations — all with respect to the Auditor General. The note Dr. Elliott had from Neil Henkleman was this: attached please find the account of Sax Zimmel Stewart for the 1983 audit of this office. Payment of this account is, I believe, usually arranged by the Clerk of the House.

MR. BLAIN: It's chargeable to this committee. A resolution for payment is required.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would one of the members please be good enough to make the motion that the audit fee of \$10,000 be paid?.

MR. PURDY: A question on that, Mr. Chairman. What was the audit fee last year?

MR. BLAIN: I can't tell you to the dollar, but it was about the same. There's no substantial increase, if any.

MR. PURDY: We aren't seeing any significant increase here.

MR. BLAIN: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For purposes of the minutes, would you find out what the figure is and then have Louise include it?

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further questions? All those in favor, please signify. Carried unanimously.

With regard to the other documents which you have — the Sax Zimmel Stewart auditor's statement, plus the office of the Auditor General budget analysis, which is about 10 or 12 sheets of paper held together with a paper clip, dated February 23, '83 — it is my understanding that that's with us for information but looking forward to us having a meeting with the Auditor General early in the new year to discuss his budget for '84-85. Having been thrust into this role with about three minutes' notice, does anyone disagree with that?

MR. NOTLEY: No, I think that would be basically correct, would it not, Doug?

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As a committee we have not yet seen the 1984-85 budget for any of the officers. Is that correct?

MR. BLAIN: That's right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When are they supposed to be in, so things can be got together for the spring sitting? Almost immediately?

MR. BLAIN: They should certainly be in, I would say, by the end of this month.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Notley and Mr. Blain, have we then as a committee, or has the previous committee, been dealing with these estimates about six or nine months too late?

MR. BLAIN: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, would you refresh my mind as to the time line that goes on here?

MR. BLAIN: The Treasurer sends out the budget instructions in the latter part of July or the early part of August. He customarily sets a date for September, but that applies to government departments. There's considerable leeway in the time of submission. For the last several years in the Legislative Assembly, of course, we haven't adhered to that

because we don't go to the priorities committee. At the present time, the legislation estimates are in the final stages. The Members' Services Committee is meeting on Monday to wrap them up. They usually go down to Treasury to be incorporated in the estimate books by mid-January.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But again with all three officers, we as this committee weren't dealing with it until after we were struck, so we were dealing with them in June in the past year.

MR. BLAIN: No, we couldn't have been. The estimates you have before you were in the House in the spring . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, so what we were dealing with was just simply salaries.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. NOTLEY: Normally we have dealt with the estimates in January, have we not, Doug?

MR. BLAIN: In January, yes.

MR. NOTLEY: My recollection is that the only time the committee ever met would be to . . .

MR. BLAIN: That's right, yes, in January.

MRS. EMPSON: However, if I may, we didn't deal with the budgets until session started this spring.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. That was because we couldn't, because the committee hadn't been struck until the Legislature had commenced. So there were no committees.

MR. BLAIN: That's right, yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you all. I feel better that alzheimer's disease hasn't caught up to me as quickly as I thought. Okay. That still means that we as a committee should be meeting in early January to deal with the budgets of all three of these folks. We'll come back to that in a moment, because we're going to have to set a date.

Before we do that, there's a letter here for the chairman to sign. I think I should read it, because I'm not so certain that — perhaps it's pro forma that the chairman can go ahead and sign it, but I don't recollect this having come to the committee in the time that we were on it from '79. It's from the Ombudsman to Bob Elliott re salary contingency vote, office of the Ombudsman.

Attached is an Application for Transfer of Funds in the amount of \$38,000.00. This application is a request for a transfer from the Salaries Contingency Vote to the Manpower Control Group in the budget of this office. The application has been completed in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. Your signature on this form would be appreciated.

I am attaching photocopies of documents to support this application and provide you with all information available.

The first document is a copy of . . . code which lists the personnel in the Edmonton and Calgary offices. This is the

personnel in the Edmonton and Calgary offices. This is the latest list available and amendments have been made where necessary. Monthly salaries have been manually included.

Then it goes on to the moneys.

The salaries for the Edmonton office in December differ from the remaining three months as the staff member on Maternity Leave is not drawing salary for that month. Two other staff members are in Temporary Promotion positions increasing their salaries for that month slightly . . .

Salaries for non-Permanent employees will amount to \$10,718.00. No monies were allotted for this code in the original budget. This position was established when one of the staff took Maternity Leave resulting in the necessity to establish a temporary position to cover off the six months Maternity Leave taken. This amount has been rounded to \$11,000.00.

Wages paid will exceed the amount budgeted by \$4,415.00 by December 31, 1983. An amount of \$7,000.00 is required to cover this deficit and provide some monies for any expenditure in this area to the end of the fiscal year . . .

In reviewing monies in the Supplies and Services Control Group, it is felt no moneys in this group are available for transfer to the Manpower Group. There is slightly better than one third of the monies budgeted remaining in this code group. Several major expenses occur early in 1984 which will deplete this amount rapidly. These include the printing of the Annual Report, Postage Meter replenishment, maintenance contract renewals, etc.

Part of it does seem to have been completed in accordance with instructions from the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. But Mr. Blain, have you had experience with this kind of thing before?

MR. BLAIN: Yes. I haven't seen that document. Perhaps that sort of document should come to the committee through me, so I can be in a position to answer your questions. The salary contingency vote, as you know, is provided so that if, after the estimates are adopted, a necessity arises for additional salary money due to a settlement in a particular group, for example, and the money isn't available because we're not allowed to budget for salaries in advance, then funds may be drawn from the salary contingency vote if they can't be found within the department's own resources. Frequently they can't be, or can only be partially found. But it is customarily there for salaries for permanent positions. With the committee's permission, I would like to examine this against the regulations before you sign it.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. I move that the matter of the signature be withheld until such time as you've had a chance to review it, and then the chairman be authorized to sign.

MR. BLAIN: If you wouldn't mind, I'll do it promptly. But I'm a little concerned about their references to temporary positions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All those in favor of the motion, please signify. Carried unanimously. All that goes together, and you see there's been a short time line on that. If it's really for '83-84, they have a few months before the end of the fiscal year anyway, and we'll have to meet again in January. But you can see that that just sort of arrived on Dr. Elliott's desk yesterday, or even today for that matter.

MR. BLAIN: Today, December 14.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think where we're at, committee members, is to determine a date when we might be able to get together again, sometime in the first two weeks of January.

MR. PURDY: I'm going away.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You're away?

MR. PURDY: I'm away till the 17th.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Grant, what about that second week of January? Are you around Edmonton then?

MR. NOTLEY: The only day I wouldn't be is around the 10th. But the 9th through the 13th would be probably okay, with the exception of the 10th. I have a commitment on the 10th.

MRS. EMPSON: The Senate Reform Committee will be travelling then.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought they weren't going until . . .

MRS. EMPSON: You're going to be tied up on the 9th and the 10th in an orientation meeting. Then they're leaving on the 11th to go to Victoria.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Possibly.

MRS. EMPSON: Possibly.

MR. NOTLEY: Which committee is that?

MRS. EMPSON: The Senate Reform.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When are they due back from that?

MRS. EMPSON: The 11th to the 13th, if everybody agrees to meet on those days. You yourself will be tied up on the 9th and the 10th.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How about the following week, on the 16th? The committee is open then?

MRS. EMPSON: So far.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, then that fits better with Bill.

MR. PURDY: I'm back on the morning of the 17th.

MR. NOTLEY: Would there be any major problem having in it that week of the 17th through to the 21st? The 16th — well, the 17th, because Bill gets back on the 17th.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bud, are you available that week?

MR. MILLER: I think the 17th would be okay. I haven't got my date book here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So if we did it on the afternoon of the 17th, it would be all right. You'd be back to work, and then come over in the afternoon?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's try for that as our general understanding, which might have to be changed by the chairman. We'll circulate it as soon as possible. Okay, the 17th. Mr. Purdy, what time could you be available, after your other commitment?

MR. PURDY: Oh, 3:30 or three o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're going to have to be dealing with . . .

MR. PURDY: Three budgets, so I think we'd better say one o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that acceptable?

HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now in that regard, Louise — or Doug, whoever is going to do it — would you contact the three officers and tell them we'd like to see their budget material as soon as possible before that date, so we have some time to have half a look at it before the meeting. That was the 17th?

Okay. Any other items of business?

MR. MILLER: I move that we adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Carried unanimously. Thank you, gentlemen.

[The meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.]

