

[Chairman: Dr. Elliott]

[2:08 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, do we have the agenda before us? Item 1, June 6, 1985, Committee: Discussion of the International Ombudsman Institute, as a result of Mr. Sawyer's letter re his recent trip to Australia.

MRS. EMPSON: This item was tabled at last week's meeting. You might want to discuss it at another meeting. I believe Mr. Hiebert was the one who tabled it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have this letter from Mr. Sawyer. We each have a copy, but you have additional copies for us. The question right now, gentlemen, is: do we wish to open that at this particular meeting or let it carry through on the agenda for later? I would rather we let it ride through to a later meeting, if that's all right. Does anybody feel any urgency on this? David, are you in a position to comment on that at this time?

DR. CARTER: Having glanced at this letter, that's a simple enough matter to clear up today and get done with. Are we going to have the budget people in first, get rid of them, and then do our business, in case other members show up? What kind of time line are you and others under, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a good question. I have no time constraints on me today. My airplane doesn't leave till 8 o'clock this evening, so I will not be the factor. We'll have to determine the other things we have to do here. Looking at this agenda in front of us, there are six items. If there's anything we want to look at today, we can. If we agree to, it's all right from the standpoint of the Chair, but we are here today to talk to the Chief Electoral Officer with respect to his budget. We can make that our priority item today.

DR. CARTER: Anybody else?

MR. PURDY: Four o'clock for me.

MR. THOMPSON: Me too.

DR. CARTER: I don't see us taking terribly long with the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we deal with him first, and then we'll get into the items on there?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

[Messrs. Ledgerwood and Sage entered the meeting room]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the only difference in this room between now and when you left is that we have now called the meeting to order and Bill Purdy arrived. Otherwise everything is the same, and you've met everybody. I'm making an assumption that everybody has met everybody, Pat.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Bill is Bill's MLA.

MR. PURDY: I didn't realize that.

MR. SAGE: I live in Spruce Grove.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are here to talk about your budget. We're going to let you guide us through whatever approach you wish to use in discussing it.

First of all, though, let's say, welcome, it's good to have you. I think this must be pretty close to the first meeting that you have come to see us in your present capacity. We've had a few fun things associated with your installation and everything else, and now we're down to the nitty-gritty of the career.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here. I hope I'm here many times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. We'll let you carry on.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It's a very simple budget and is designed to meet the requirements of current legislation. It's very similar to previous budgets that you've had a look at and approved. There is still a major expenditure for an enumeration in 1986, in that if there's not a general election between now and September 1986, we will conduct an enumeration September 15 to 30. It also meets the Provincial Treasurer's requirements of zero growth.

Basically, three areas. Administration is really the running of our office, paying of personnel, and purchasing supplies, materials, and equipment. The other is the election, a very small amount in that it's basically there to provide training for the returning officers and their election clerks. The enumeration is the big item, and I think you're aware that it's about 85 percent labour-intensive. Basically, the major amount is the fees. The other items in there are supplies, printing, transportation, and advertising.

If you look on the cover sheet, you'll see that Administration is \$369,085, down slightly from '85-86. The election costs are the same, and the enumeration costs the same.

If you want to go to section A, which is Administration, you'll find that we're down in Manpower, and that's basically because of staff changes. The new deputy is not receiving the remuneration the old one was. There has been an increase of up to .75 percent in benefits, and of course it includes the 3.3 percent annual increment. The Chief Electoral Officer position is the same wage as previously, and I think it's a couple of years since there was an increase in that. So it's slightly down on the Manpower costs.

Supplies and Services is basically the same, except for Rental of Equipment and Property. We've determined that it's cheaper to buy our xerox than it is to rent it, so we're going to purchase our xerox. You see that our expenses are down in Supplies and Services but up an equivalent amount in Fixed Assets at the bottom. Our total expenditures are within \$2,000 of last year's.

Would you like to go through the whole thing, Doctor, or would you like to stop at each of the three sections?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you're doing fine. We aren't known as a shy group; if anybody has a question, they'll likely jump in quite quickly.

MR. MILLER: Pat, in regard to the enumeration that's now being carried out, is that on the basis of the old electoral boundaries or the new ones?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: On the basis of the new, the 83 electoral boundaries that will come into being with the writ of the next election.

MR. MILLER: The second question is -- you talk about another enumeration next year. I thought we did it every two years.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The enumeration is done every year except -- the exceptions are the year after a general election, so no enumeration in 1983; also, the Chief Electoral Officer has the option of conducting an enumeration or not during a period when the Electoral Boundaries Commission is sitting, so it was determined not to do an enumeration in '84. This is our first enumeration since 1982.

MR. MILLER: In other words, if I hear you correctly, the year after an election, you don't have it.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No.

MR. PURDY: It's in legislation, Bud.

DR. CARTER: What's the last date?. You said for '86, September or something or other.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The enumeration is September 15 to 30, and the revision period is the second full week in October. I haven't looked at '86. This year the revision period is October 17, 18, and 19.

DR. CARTER: September 15 next year, unless there's a general election prior to that date.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We will conduct an enumeration.

DR. CARTER: Thank you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We're budgeted for it. We're basing this on the 83 electoral divisions. We require 7,000-plus enumerators. We'll have a good idea on the polling subdivisions. We're estimating as high as 4,400 polling subdivisions. We'll know that next week when we get together with the returning officers. We're going to have a wrap-up of the enumeration next week with our returning officers and do our initial training for the next general election.

MR. THOMPSON: Pat, you got hold of Jim Gunn and got that little discrepancy all cleared away?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: What Mr. Thompson is talking about is that some of our returning officers, particularly in the rural area, find it very inconvenient because of their age or their own particular disability to go out and collect the list of electors from the enumerators. Some of them have enumerators come to their residence. When they do that, some of them have said, "We're not going to pay for travelling that distance." When we designed the system, it was not for that case. It was for the case of an individual who was only coming a short distance to deliver the list of electors, but if the returning officer lives in one corner of the riding and the enumerator is in the other corner, then they have to pay them 22 cents a kilometre to deliver that list of electors. It's very simple. Many of them will take a trailer and go around and collect. Others want the enumerators to come to their residence.

We're budgeted for that in that we budget for two enumerators in each electoral division, in each subdivision. As you remember, in the rural, the returning officer has the option of using either one or two enumerators. In many cases, of course, they only use one, so there is actually extra money in there because we have to budget as if they all use two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

MR. PURDY: I have one other question, but it's more to do with the election. I don't know whether or not you want to hold it till that time. You have \$100,000 in there now, Pat.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes.

MR. PURDY: I sit on another committee which has now included in its '86-87 budget moneys showing an increase from 79 to 83 seats in the Legislature. Was direction given to you to hold it at \$100,000 or just put in a projection if an election were called for sometime in '86?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: If there's an election called, we do that by special warrant.

MR. PURDY: I realize that.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: This \$100,000 is basically to train election staff. The travel is about as much as the training fee. This will be the first

time we've trained election clerks, and you may recall that we have on our schedule of fees an amendment that permitted us to train election clerks. A returning officer gets \$125 a day for training sessions; the clerk gets \$90. They both receive exactly the same per diem and travel expenses.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, do the returning officers still get a retaining fee?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: They get \$75 a month, \$900 a year. This year the average returning officer will make about \$5,000. That's the average rural. The urban makes about \$700 more in that they get their \$900 honorarium, they get \$1,000 for conducting the enumeration, and they get \$200 for preparing their subdivision map. We train them at least two days; \$250 for that. They receive a \$250 fee for training their enumerators. Rather than rent office space, most of them use their houses. We pay them up to \$600 for two months' rental, and they receive 10 cents a name.

So the average rural, just under \$5,000; the average urban, about \$700 more. Under redistribution the average rural will be 13,496, based on the 1982 report, and the average urban will be about 21,155.

MR. PURDY: I must be close to urban instead of rural, because I have 20,000 and something.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: You've got 21,111, and that's the highest of any rural.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the result of the new enumeration, on the basis of the new constituency, or what are you talking about?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, Mr. Chairman, that's as a result of our estimate of voter population based on the 1982 election report. We will have the figures available from the 1985 enumeration early in November. The revision period ends the 19th. The returning officers will take a day or two to review their maps to make sure the polling divisions are proper, and then they will be sending that data to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. I thought St. Albert was the highest rural constituency under those dates you're talking about.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, St. Albert is now an urban riding. We're estimating the new electoral division of Westlock-Sturgeon at 18,155.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, did you have a question?

DR. CARTER: A question on page A3, comparing it to B1. Under code 840, Purchase of Reproduction Equipment, which you mentioned, there is \$2,200, and the other one is Purchase of Reproduction Equipment for \$3,500. What's that? What am I matching or not matching? Under Fixed Assets on page B1 . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Code 830 is the purchase of a television for my office. The rationale on that is that although we don't have to declare fixed assets under \$500 . . .

DR. CARTER: Sorry; 840.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. That \$2,200 relates to the \$2,200 we have on page A1, Reproduction Equipment. That's that Xerox photocopier we're going to get.

DR. CARTER: But on B1 at the bottom of the page, Fixed Assets, Reproduction Equipment . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We're going to get a new typewriter. Bill has explained it. The typewriter we purchased, also a Xerox, is in that \$3,500 you see under B1. The Xerox reproduction equipment, the model 1025, is actually \$5,500. So we've paid for the typewriter, and now we're going to pay for the reproduction equipment with the \$3,500 here and the \$2,200 there.

DR. CARTER: Okay. Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to carry on page by page through your report for whatever highlights you'd like to point out?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: This is just fine, as questions come up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as the questions don't get ahead of where we are on the page.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I would now like to go to B1, which is the Enumeration Element. As I mentioned, it's based on an estimated voter population of about 1.4 million and a maximum of 4,400 polls. The basic change in manpower is a result of that .75 percent contribution now. That changed that very little. It's reflected again in Professional, Technical, and Labour Services in Supplies and Services. You can see basically the same thing with our fixed assets.

The enumeration is exactly the same budget. About 26 of our 83 returning officers are new, and we'll have a much better idea of how they operate this time. Some of them operate very frugally. Unfortunately, they don't all do that, and we will sort of earmark the ones we think have been a bit wasteful. We will certainly bring to their attention that it's not fair to hire your daughter for \$10 an hour to do typing when it requires 100 hours for her to type a few forms and somebody else has done it at no cost. This is where you people get involved, because then the returning officer will go to the MLA and say: "I'm trying to train my daughter to be my replacement. She's going to be my election clerk. She's an excellent typist and she's certainly worth \$1,000."

MR. MILLER: Roughly calculating, it costs about \$2.50 to enumerate each person?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It will be very close to that. In 1982 it was \$2.20. We think it will be a bit more this time. Some of the problems we had in '82 — you remember, for example, Calgary McCall, where we ended up with over 40,000 in one electoral division. We think the redistribution should cut down some of our costs. What it will do is cut down in some areas and, of course, increase in others, but as we say, certainly somewhere between \$2.20 and \$2.50. We'll get a better idea once we find out how some of these new returning officers have operated.

MR. PURDY: Do you base it on two enumerators per polling station? I know Al Shenfield is using one.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: He may be using two in places like Spruce Grove and Stony Plain and some of the areas.

MR. PURDY: No, just one straight through. He

will be using 64 people instead of 128.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: You may find that somebody else used two in over half of theirs, with good reason. For example, in some of the [rural] ridings the roads aren't very good, the weather has not been very good, and the returning officer has felt that there should be two people in the car, particularly when they're going out in some of the really remote areas. Also, with three big dogs in a yard, they felt that there should be two enumerators and that one of them should be a male. I can't argue against that logic. As a matter of fact, we encourage it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Do you want to carry on?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. The Election Element on C1, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, is basically to train the returning officers and their election clerks. We'll be conducting training next week, two sessions in Edmonton and two in Calgary. We plan to conduct a series of two-day training sessions in February. This time we'll just have the returning officers; at the next training sessions we will have the election clerks and the returning officers. If it should happen that we have a fall election, we will arrange some training for the returning officers and election clerks. This is just the initial training to make them aware of their duties and responsibilities. We'll provide them with the information. Later on we'll go into a very detailed briefing, particularly for the 26 new ones.

That's basically it. The last few pages are basically the format that all departments have to put their budgets in to Treasury.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there's been a problem in Ottawa. Mr. Masse has been accused of wrongdoing, I believe, in the amount of money that was spent per elector. Pat, maybe you can give us some guidance. We have to submit an audited report every year from each constituency. This causes concern in some constituencies because some of the secretaries we have are volunteer people. They do a pretty good job in most instances, but in some cases I believe you would agree that they leave a little bit to be desired. I don't know the details of

what happened in Ottawa, but I wouldn't want something like that to happen here in Alberta with any party. Is it possible that we as MLAs are leaving our seats open to being challenged through some irregularity in reporting to your office? Bill probably knows a lot about this, too, from the Act. Would you comment as to whether there is a potential area where we might have a problem as MLAs?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Mr. Miller, I think the potential problem is that any time anybody violates the Act, they're leaving themselves open to litigation. The federal system has a limit on expenditures by individuals during the campaign. Our legislation is different in that you can spend as much as you want. Our limits in Alberta are controlled by how much people can contribute. We could run into problems, of course, if the individual didn't keep track of the contributions or if somebody contributed more than the allowable limit to that campaign and did not declare it.

MR. PURDY: The other concern there, Pat, is that I as a member can only put so much money into my campaign too. Who is ultimately responsible in the end for that bill if the contribution value doesn't come in to what was spent during the campaign? He's going to have to pay that, and the member is liable for that payment. He's then in conflict with the Act if it's over the \$5,000 or . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Up to \$30,000 in a campaign year. The limits are high. But our problem is not how much you spend; it's how much you collect, with limits on how much you collect.

DR. CARTER: Pat, in the case that I as a donor give too much money to Bud's campaign, who is liable for the prosecution? Me for giving too much, him for accepting too much, or both of us?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I would think both. Your chief financial officer would also be involved in that if you have given X number of dollars and he has given you a receipt for only a portion of that, he would be the third member, particularly if you had intent. Of course, it's very hard to prove collusion. In many cases, the member may not even be aware. It may be

between the contributor and the member's chief financial officer. That's a hard hypothetical question, because you don't have the facts. If it did get into where we were laying charges, those facts would come out in the investigation. If the investigation warranted criminal charges, they would certainly be laid.

DR. CARTER: Do you have feedback on the Masse case and others? Is it true that there are other people being investigated as well? This is the first election they've had with the new election finances Act. Is that correct?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We haven't had any feedback from our colleagues in Ottawa. As a matter of fact, they're very close-mouthed about it. They have a different system than we have. The Chief Electoral Officer actually has three branches. He has an election operations branch, an election finances branch, and his third branch, which is the commissioner. The commissioner looks after this type of thing. The individuals file their statements with the financial branch, and if something is amiss in the statement, they pass it to the commissioner. It is my understanding that in most of these cases it was somebody who planted the seed and said there's something wrong in that area.

The only one we had was in 1982. We had a member running, and he filed his financial statement. We received an anonymous tip. We said, "We can't act on anonymous tips; we need information." We then received a letter from a lawyer indicating that he had a client who was prepared to give us information. I contacted the individual through the lawyer, and he gave me some names. I contacted those names by both telephone and written correspondence. They didn't answer my written correspondence. I contacted them by phone, and they said: "You must be kidding. We're not going to say anything." As a matter of fact, one fellow said he was not about to get a tomahawk in his back. So our investigation was dead when we couldn't get anybody — other than innuendo. They wouldn't commit themselves to paper.

DR. CARTER: In the federal case this is the first time around for their new election finances Act?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, they've had previous charges where people have violated the Act.

DR. CARTER: When did that Act come into force? February?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I don't know, but we have it in our little library and we can photocopy it. I know that in the last one, the individual who was coming to court unfortunately died of a heart attack a very short time before the court case. In the others, when they got into court, the judge just slapped their wrists and gave them minimum fines.

MR. MILLER: Getting back to what you mentioned about this anonymous phone call and the lawyer, wouldn't you be obligated to have that investigated by the RCMP?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, it was rather complicated. In the confidence of this room, it was . . .

MR. PURDY: Can we go off the record, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

[The recorder was turned off from 2:40 p.m. to 2:42 p.m.]

MR. MILLER: Can out-of-province contributions be accepted by a candidate?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It depends on whether the corporation that's making the donation is registered in Alberta.

MR. MILLER: Suppose it's an individual from outside of the province.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Again, depending on whether they're registered in Alberta, whether they're paying Alberta income tax.

DR. CARTER: What about if it is Bud's Aunt Fanny who lives in Winnipeg?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, we don't accept out-of-province contributions in that case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will have to be within your own personal \$30,000, Bud.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know why Bud is sitting here worrying . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Here we are. It's section 29 of the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act. Basically, it should come through the party and not to the individual.

DR. CARTER: So the individual in Winnipeg could send it to the party, and then they could redistribute it.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Would you like me to read into the record?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think your answer to that is satisfactory. Isn't it, Bud?

MR. MILLER: Further, as a supplementary, if I might, Mr. Chairman. What about my giving a personal contribution to Johnny Thompson?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: And getting an official receipt?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Fine. No trouble at all. Oh, are you out of province?

MR. MILLER: No, I'm in province. I'm not going run again, and I just want to give him about \$3.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Certainly.

MR. MILLER: And I want a receipt.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: As you know, if you give, I think, \$1,725, you'll also get a tax rebate of something like \$750.

MR. PURDY: You can make a contribution to yourself, too, and get the tax write-off.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes.

MR. MILLER: I didn't know that.

MR. PURDY: Oh, yes.

MR. MILLER: You have?

MR. PURDY: Sure. I've been writing a cheque

to the constituency and then getting a tax break on it. You can do that.

MR. MILLER: And you keep the money.

MR. PURDY: Oh, no. The money goes into the constituency, but I get a break on my income tax at the end of the year. If you make a \$100 contribution, you actually are only making a \$25 contribution because you get \$75 back.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Seventy-five back on the hundred, up to the maximum — I'd have to look this up, but I think it's \$1,725 and you get back \$750.

MR. MILLER: You said you made the contribution to yourself.

MR. PURDY: To the association, not to myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're right, Bud. That's what he said. He didn't even say, "I made it to my own election campaign fund." He didn't even say that.

MR. PURDY: I correct the statement, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How are we doing for questions, gentlemen?

MR. PURDY: After that one, no more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I still have one thing I feel unclear about. You said that normally an enumeration would be conducted every two years?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, every year except the second year after a general election.

MR. MILLER: The first year.

MR. PURDY: The Act reads that enumeration shall be held in the second year after a general election

MR. LEDGERWOOD: So no enumeration the first year. The Chief Electoral Officer has an option, when the Electoral Boundaries Commission is reviewing boundaries, of whether or not to conduct an enumeration. So if we don't have an election between now and September of '86, we'll have another

enumeration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the fall of '86.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The fall of '86. If we don't have an election before the fall of '87, we'll have another enumeration, in that the government elected for five years in November of 1982 is good until November of 1987.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To hold an enumeration each of those years at \$3,838,000 a year.

DR. CARTER: Plus another \$100,000 to train people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Plus another \$100,000 for training people in case of an election.

DR. CARTER: Four million less change.

[A portion of the meeting is not reported]

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We have a lot of interest in new parties. As you know, we have nine registered parties. We have received applications from three more individuals who want to register parties. We had four names that we were reserving, and I wrote them and indicated that if we didn't hear from them by October 1, we would put their requests into the dead file. None of them have come back, so there are four parties that died on the vine.

MR. THOMPSON: On that point, Mr. Chairman, what does it cost a party to become registered in Alberta? Is there any fee at all?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: There's no fee. The requirement is under the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act. The biggest problem is to get the endorsement of 4,308 electors. You wonder where that figure came from. That's .3 of 1 percent of the number of electors at the last general election. So they have to go out and conduct a petition. That's the biggest item. Once they form their executive, get a banking facility or account and a statement of assets and liabilities, register under the Societies — it's just a mechanical thing, really no registration fees per se.

MR. THOMPSON: The main restriction for these frivolous types of parties is going out and

collecting the names.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: In the case of the Heritage Party, they got their petition done in a matter of a couple of weeks. In the case of the COR Party, they completed their petition during the Edmonton Exhibition. They just set up a booth and anybody who went by signed. We validate the petition. We don't check all 4,300 names; what we do is a random selection. We number the pages and then number the... There are normally about 16 signatures on a page. Then we go through on a random selection and call those people. All the petitions we've had so far have been validated. It takes us up to two weeks to validate one.

MR. MILLER: How long is that list good for?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: This is one of the problems we're going to run into with the Green Party. They have been collecting signatures since 1982, and they do not have their list. I would apprise them of the fact that if we could not validate their signatures, then I would not approve the registration. So it would behoove them, if they've got a bunch of 1982 signatures on it, to replace it with 1985 signatures.

MR. MILLER: If I get the list today, is that good forever?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Once you're registered, you're registered, unless you fail to validate. We explain to them that if they fail to validate, they get the whole package back and we want a new package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? We've gone through the budget, and we've gone off into other areas of the office. Do you have any questions of us at this particular time?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. As I mentioned, I'm looking forward to working with the committee. I am as near as the phone, so if there are any problems, I hope I will be approached early, before they became major problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have a good coffeepot over there, and most of us have sampled it at one time or another. We look forward to coming back again before too long. If things

get really slack around here, we just might come over and say hello.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Our major project is getting the list of electors and the maps from the returning officers. Late this month we'll be running off the list of electors and the maps. We'll have them available for distribution before the end of December. The Act requires that we deliver to political parties by February 1 up to six copies of the list of electors and the maps with the polling subdivisions and the legal descriptions. We'll beat that date significantly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On one of our visits with Mr. Wark I remember he had the collapsible cardboard voting booth and other documents pertaining to the poll that came as a package which, if requested, he would make available to a school for part of the instruction process and so on. Is that offer still available? Do you have comments on that?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: That offer is always available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it by application only, if a student applies? You don't automatically send stuff out. You don't have a PR program of that type.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, we don't. From our experience the junior high school students are really not far enough advanced for us to go out and spend time with them. We have experimented when a social studies teacher has asked us to come out. Most of the periods are 80 minutes while their attention span for something as complicated as the electoral process is not sufficient.

High school students are different. I'm not sure if you're aware of the Forum for Young Albertans. We go over and spend time with them, and that is time well spent. I'm not sure it's worth while for the junior high school students, but we make the packages available. What we do is encourage the teachers to come in. We'll sit down with the teachers, give them the data, and have them pass it back to the students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do your returning officers in the districts spend time with teachers?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: On occasion they do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some of our schools in Alberta are quite a long way away from your office; that's what I'm referring to.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We don't mind. Particularly in the Grande Prairie area in the fall, I like to go out and speak to high school students or at the universities or anything of that type. We get involved in the citizenship briefings. We go and attend those briefings and explain the electoral process to those individuals. Also adult education: we attend NAIT, SAIT, and the community colleges. We don't mind doing that. The junior high is the only one I said we're not going to go to anymore.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. I was assuming I was getting close to the end of the questions with my questions. If that assumption is correct, we'll just say thank you very much. We look forward to seeing you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you very much. We look forward to having you visit us.

We'll have the enumeration report available in December, and you would normally table that. So we'll bring it down [inaudible].

DR. CARTER: Take care. Thanks for coming over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we off the record now?

[The recorder was turned off from 2:56 p.m. to 2:59 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, gentlemen. That was item 3 we just dealt with, the review of the Chief Electoral Officer's budget for '86-87.

DR. CARTER: A motion to approve the budget of the Chief Electoral Officer as presented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have a motion. Any discussion on the motion? Those in favour?

MR. PURDY: Just to make a comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. We have a question first.

MR. PURDY: The only reason I asked that question is that I sit on the Members' Services Committee. I guess there are various directions that go out or various managers use different techniques for coming up with their budgets, but Members' Services has included [83] members in their 1986-87 budget, for remuneration and all that. Next week when we meet I'm going to bring up just why the speculation is there in that committee when other committees aren't speculating on a general election. It should be 79 members.

MR. MILLER: Good point, Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John.

MR. THOMPSON: Not on this subject but on another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm confused on the motion. Is it item 2, Approval of the Auditor General's budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, item 3. He's just voted on the report we just heard. Any other comment on David's motion? Those in favour of the motion? That motion is carried unanimously.

Should we go to the top of the page gentlemen, item 1, and start over again here? Left over from June 6, 1985, Discussion of the International Ombudsman's Institute as a result of Mr. Sawyer's letter re his recent trip to Australia. Does anybody have a comment on that agenda item and what we should do with it at this time?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I think we should just hold that till we have the discussion with the Ombudsman about his budget estimates. Future travel will come up in the estimates. That's an appropriate time to discuss the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the kind of suggestion I wanted to hear. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The record will show that we'll put that back on the

agenda when we have the Ombudsman present.

Let's look at item 2 from our last meeting. We have Approval of the Auditor General's Budget for 1986-87. Do we have a motion for that? Bud Miller makes the motion that we approve that budget. Any questions or discussion on the motion?

DR. CARTER: My only question is, did we leave the impression with them that we would have them back again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't think so.

DR. CARTER: From my own personal point of view I don't see any need for having them back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think we left that impression. Louise says no.

MRS. EMPSON: During the meeting you said that in case you might want them back would they be available. He said yes, but you covered everything during the meeting.

DR. CARTER: Thank you. Question on the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Those in favour of the motion? That was carried unanimously.

Item 4, Discussion of Attendance at December Conferences. Louise has some comments to guide us on that.

MRS. EMPSON: This one was tabled at last week's meeting. It's the first week in December. There's the Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, December 1 to 3, in Montreal. The second one is in Chicago on December 3 to 6, Council on Government Ethics Laws.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did not identify committee membership to participate in either of those. We're going to be meeting again in a week to 10 days. Just for reminder purposes, can we distribute this sheet of paper to each of the members? It points out some recommendations.

MR. PURDY: I move that Miller and Carter attend the comprehensive auditing convention in Montreal December 1 to 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on

that recommendation?

MR. THOMPSON: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. Those in favour of the motion? That motion is carried. Thank you.

Does anybody have a suggestion for December 3 to 6, the Council on Government Ethics Laws?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Mr. Purdy and Mr. Hiebert go to the Chicago convention. Mr. Carter could go to both of them. I'd like to have Purdy, Hiebert, and Carter go to Chicago. That's my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Any further question on that? Those in favour of the motion? That motion is carried. Does that look after our December conference attendance, then?

I'm looking at item 5, discussion of correspondence from Mr. Sawyer regarding his annual leave payout. I believe that correspondence is in front of us.

DR. CARTER: I move that the payout of the eight days remaining for the period September 1, 1984, to August 1, 1985, indeed be paid out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have the motion. Any question?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, as the Ombudsman states here, it's somewhat unclear in his contract. Personally, I think the best thing to do would be to clear up the contract so that it's mentioned in there, wherever it is, that it's paid on an annual basis or something like that instead of having something like this come up every year.

DR. CARTER: I agree, and I'd be happy to second that motion even though we don't need a seconder, if that was the next motion. That clears up the ambiguity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's deal with the first motion David put forth, John. I'm going to ask for a second motion, because that word "unclear" in this letter is a bothersome thing. I think we should deal with the specific. Are there any other comments with respect to the

recommendation that we pay for the eight days in the time frame that is identified? Hearing no further comment, those in favour of the motion that we pay the eight days? That motion is carried.

I'm sorry. Did you have a question?

MR. MILLER: Yes. I was unclear. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. I have no problem with that because I was pushing you there. Before I count that ballot . . .

MR. MILLER: The unclear part of it was whether or not it's permissible budgetwise — whether or not it can be done from a budget point of view. It's an added expenditure as I see it.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, it's a matter of interpretation.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with David's motion, but I was wondering if we shouldn't have Mr. Thompson's motion today and David's next meeting and, in the meantime, see if it would be possible to get clarification for paragraphs 6(a) and (b). If we can do it, I'd be prepared to go with David's motion. If we have David's motion now and then we have a ruling that no, the accrued vacation had to be taken at the completion of his contract, we would in effect be putting the cart before the horse. I didn't say that very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but David understood exactly what you said, and he's now going to respond.

DR. CARTER: I'll withdraw my motion, with the unanimous consent of the House, bearing in mind the fact that if it has to wait to accumulate, it will be 'a mell of a hess' to have to try to compute. In the meantime, we can get hold of a lawyer and make certain we do indeed have the right to function. In that regard, maybe no motion is appropriate.

MR. PURDY: I think it's best to hold it until we get a legal interpretation on it. I know of other companies, even under a contractual thing, where you have to take your holidays at your accrued basis. He says it's unclear there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would our local counsel be able to assist us in this respect? Should we have him look at it now, or shall we have him respond to us?

MR. PURDY: He's going to respond to us. He's going to have to get the contract and look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He probably has it.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, from the last paragraph in this letter, if Brian is right, he says:

. . . my contract [provides] that I can be paid for any accrued vacation entitlement not taken.

Obviously, there's some clause in his contract that allows for that to happen. However, the point he's making:

It is unclear whether payment under these circumstances is to be made at the end of each year or only at the end of the contract.

If Brian is right, there's really nothing to interpret as far as this unpaid leave itself is concerned. It's just interpretation of when the leave is going to be paid, whether it's at the end of the five years or on an annual basis.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, as vice-chairman and previous chairman of that search committee, I would undertake to get good clarification before our next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that would be very good. Thank you, David. Are you satisfied that you have unanimous permission from this group to withdraw that motion? I read it that way. Thank you. That looks after that topic for now, and you'll report to us at our next meeting or in the near future, David? Thank you.

I'm at item 6, Discussion of New Meeting Date to Review the Ombudsman's Budget Estimates, since he will be unable to meet with the committee on October 8, 1985. Let us point out that on October 8 we are meeting — is it 10 o'clock in the morning? — with the visitors from British Columbia. So we have a meeting that morning.

DR. CARTER: Who else will be attending the meeting, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as I know, only the

people from B.C.

DR. CARTER: How many of them do we have, and is it an all-party group?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the equivalent of our group here. I don't have the final figure. Maybe Louise has it.

MRS. EMPSON: No, I don't. I spoke with Pam this morning. I believe she's a researcher for Mr. Parks. It's still very unclear how many are coming. But I confirmed 10 o'clock Tuesday morning in this meeting room with this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right here.

MR. MILLER: The 2 o'clock meeting is cancelled then?

MRS. EMPSON: That's right. I saved Mr. Sawyer for that day because of his tie-in with budget and many of these people. He's going to be in Calgary the 8th and 9th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So he will not be with the group at 10 o'clock.

MRS. EMPSON: No, he's going to meet them the previous day, on Monday, at 2 p.m. in his office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had a visit with Dr. Ivany, and I understood he would be meeting with them at a different time and would not be with them that morning when they're talking to us, on October 8.

MR. MILLER: Are you going to take them out to dinner?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. They have another person taking them to dinner. I don't know who that is. Is it you?

MRS. EMPSON: No, I don't think so.

MR. MILLER: I meant lunch. On the farms at 12 o'clock we call it eating dinner; at 6 o'clock it's supper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I knew what you were talking about.

MR. MILLER: Lunch is what you have between.

MR. PURDY: At 3:15.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And at 10 in the morning.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose there's anything we can do about that aspect, but I think there would have been some benefits if we had sat down with that group over lunch and maybe discussed some of our concerns on an informal basis and been able to communicate the way we do things, which is probably the best in the world, and give them a few pointers on how to come up to our standards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well said.

Just before I recognize you, Mr. Thompson, I am going to ask how far you want to go with this recommendation, Bud. Should we make contact again with Mr. Parks and firm up the suggestion that they meet with us at 10 o'clock and we'll go for lunch at 11:30 or something like that? Something tells me they have a lunch commitment now.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd like meet with them after Dr. Ivany meets with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will be checking with them and, through Louise's office, will find out exactly where they are and what they have. We'll extend the invitation for lunch, and if they're able to come to lunch with us, or to Bud Miller's dinner, we will pick the appropriate place and have something set up that will meet all the minimum standards.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if you had a meeting with Dr. Ivany and if you had anything to report to the committee on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had a telephone discussion with Dr. Ivany, and the only report I have with respect to this topic, which is the only thing we talked about, is that he was originally the contact person with this MLA from British Columbia who is the chairman of their committee. Ivany was the one who gave them my name; thus that letter came through. There was some confusion behind the letter, because the letter looked like he was accepting an invitation or had agreed to a commitment or an

appointment which we at this table knew nothing about. I think we have it all straightened away now.

Dr. Ivany will be spending time with these people, but I think it's the day or evening before. Mr. Sawyer will also be spending some time with them; I'm not sure when it is. If they meet with us at 10 o'clock on the morning of Tuesday, October 8, they will be dashing back to British Columbia that afternoon on the first flight out, because they have an evening commitment in Victoria. That's the way I understood it.

Any other questions on that piece of business?

MR. THOMPSON: We come back down to when we meet with the Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. That's our next problem.

MR. THOMPSON: I have trouble understanding why we didn't know a little earlier that he couldn't come. It doesn't really matter, but basically the point is: when is it going to be convenient for the Ombudsman to meet with us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't have that answer today.

MR. THOMPSON: So obviously we can't set a meeting date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can set dates that are convenient to us as a committee and see if he can match them.

MR. PURDY: In this case, Mr. Chairman, who is the servant? Us or him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: David Carter is going to check the contract. I don't know what the commitment out of the city is that caused this change of plan. Maybe he had never even had an opportunity to confirm his participation in this. Maybe we made certain assumptions that were unfair to him, Bill. I don't know; I can't recall all the details. We were hoping he would be available to visit with us, and he obviously isn't.

MR. PURDY: It's his budget. If he wants it

passed on February 24 before it goes to printing, we can do it then too.

MR. THOMPSON: Bill, we're the ones that like to get them in early.

MR. PURDY: That's right.

MR. THOMPSON: It isn't a high-priority item.

MR. PURDY: We have to get it done. That's why we're meeting early.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to be in Edmonton on the afternoon of October 16; that's a Wednesday. I have a 3 o'clock appointment for a short while with a couple of ministers here. Other than that, I have an hour or two that day.

MR. PURDY: I'm okay in the afternoon that day too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you be available, Bill?

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're doing well. October 16 is a Wednesday, a 1 o'clock meeting. David?

DR. CARTER: Any morning time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I could make morning time by coming in on a 6 o'clock airplane. I don't do that for many people, David, but for you I would be happy to.

DR. CARTER: That's very nice of you. That's the only time it can be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill, how about you in the morning?

MR. PURDY: I'm flexible on that basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about you gentlemen in the morning?

MR. THOMPSON: I get the 6:30 plane too, and I understand your problem, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Every morning I take that plane, something happens the night before that keeps me up till about 1 o'clock and then I'm up at 4.

MR. THOMPSON: Ten o'clock on the 16th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's right.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

DR. CARTER: Can we adjourn long enough to determine whether he's available that day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. MILLER: That's a good idea, David.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we have a way of finding out . . .

DR. CARTER: Because if he isn't, we'll have to have another discussion with him, Mr. Chairman, you or me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Can you phone him now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a way of finding him right now?

MRS. EMPSON: I can phone and check with his secretary. She can at least check.

AN HON. MEMBER: There's a phone right here if you know the number.

MRS. EMPSON: Do you know the number, Dr. Carter?

DR. CARTER: Yes, 6566.

[The recorder was turned off from 3:20 to 3:23 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten o'clock, October 16, in the Carillon Room.

MRS. EMPSON: I'll check whether the room is available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Does this create a problem? Will there be no doubt about getting notices out to all the members?

MRS. EMPSON: No problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good.

DR. CARTER: One other item, Mr. Chairman. I think we should put on our agenda to remind ourselves about when we are supposed to make the salary adjustment for Mr. Rogers. I think I remember that we were going to do something in the wake of the August or June readjustment of salaries in the public service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. There were adjustments made. The question we at this table have is, what was the impact of those adjustments made in the civil service? What impact would that have on our officers? The one we were concerned about was our Auditor General, because there had been no salary adjustment there for the last two or possibly three years. I don't recall the details now. That was the question.

DR. CARTER: He had a minimal adjustment, but that was all. Could we ask the Chair to speak to the Treasurer about getting the necessary documentation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can certainly do exactly that. I don't know what that will result in, but you can certainly ask. The Chair has been asked to check with the Provincial Treasurer. I'll be happy to do that.

I'm changing the topic again now. Last meeting we talked about days when members had worked on one assignment or another during the summer and whether they were covered by expense claims. I've checked around. I'm assuming that they're all in now, and we've got them all covered. Thank you very much.

Any other business for this time? Hearing nothing, we'll see you at 10 o'clock on the morning of October 16.

AN HON. MEMBER: The 8th.

MR. PURDY: Oh, the 8th. Pardon me. I'd better double-check this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to be here at 10 o'clock on the 8th and at 10 o'clock on the 16th.

MR. MILLER: Got you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. I declare this meeting adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 3:25 p.m.]

