

1:02 p.m.

Tuesday, November 26, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll declare the meeting officially open and welcome Patrick Ledgerwood, Chief Electoral Officer for the province.

Pat, as you know, the process today is to review the 1992-93 estimates in some detail. Members of the committee will ask questions for information or make comment. We won't be making any decisions today on the actual budget figures, but we do want to ensure we have a better understanding. We want to relate to the question of travel and hosting as enunciated by the Premier in his statement earlier and just generally get ourselves in a position so that when we do come back early in the new calendar year, we can deal with the budget in a straightforward way.

I now turn it over to you, if you have any opening comments you'd like to make to us, and then we'll get right into it.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that you received the '92-93 budget estimates back last summer and the revision to the Administration element earlier this week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I'm quite prepared to go into as much detail as necessary and answer any questions that the members may have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

Well, let's first of all deal with Manpower. I might mention that we appreciate the format in which you've given us the information, by going back to the 1990-91 actual, both the budget and forecast for '91-92, and the estimate for '92-93. When we do come back early in the new year, we'd also like an indication of the breakdown of the employees and the various categories: managerial, full-time, unionized, opted out, and so on.

Why don't we start with Manpower and look at manpower requirements?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. I think we should appreciate that the budget is designed to meet my responsibilities under current legislation. As the chairman has pointed out, a new format on the Administration side. Remember that the administration is to run the office; it's for staff salaries and benefits and also office supplies.

You have been given the detail for '92-93. Mr. Chairman, I have the detail, if you want it, regarding the positions. We have eight permanent positions. I'm an officer of the Legislature appointed under the Election Act. There is a requirement under the Election Act for a deputy. I have two directors, two managers: a director of election operations, and a director of registration, which is basically the election finances and contributions disclosure area. We have three clerical staff and a storeman. So we have four managers and four nonmanagers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Any questions on the employee side under the Wages and Salaries columns? Alan.

MR. HYLAND: You had a change this year. Your assistant retired or something?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes, my deputy retired early this summer, and I have a new deputy in place now. He's a well-qualified individual in that he was director of election operations prior to going out to Vegreville to take over Lakeland College there. We stole him from Lakeland. He was the director of both the Vegreville campus and the Wainwright campus. He has a lot of election experience and will be a definite asset to the office. We had some excellent candidates apply for the position of deputy, and he won the competition head and shoulders above the rest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions on Manpower under the Administration element? We have the same breakdown for employee/employer contributions and the increases by UIC and workers' compensation. What other increases are there, Pat?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. The Employer Contributions, Mr. Chairman, is the public service pension plan, and we have included the information that the Provincial Treasurer put out in July as to proposed new rates. We have accepted those rates, so for the nonmanagement side we've computed that at 6.5 percent; on the management pension plan, at 9.5 percent. We also have the dental plan in there, the LTDI benefits, and then we've grouped the others as other employee benefits, and that's where the UIC would come in. It's at 5.7 percent of our Manpower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Anyone else? Yes, Derek.

MR. FOX: I'm just wondering, Pat. Then your '92-93 estimate, \$457,000, is down from your 1991-92 budget, from the approved budget last year. Is the staff complement changing what you budgeted for this year and next year?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, the staff complement is the same. The new deputy came in at a lower salary than the former deputy. He's on probation for one year, and at the end of that probationary period then he will, under normal conditions, receive a salary increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Anyone else?

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if I'm working with the right document. What was in the book is the newest?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. There should be a cover memo from Patrick Ledgerwood to myself dated November 21, '91, with the Administration element. The Administration element was updated. We will deal with the Election and the Enumeration elements which are in the book.

MRS. GAGNON: Sorry. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else under Manpower?
All right. We're ready to move on, then, to Supplies and Services.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: As you can see, the Supplies and Services are basically in line with what we actually spent during fiscal year '90-91 and what we budgeted for and forecast for fiscal year '91-92.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you give us an idea under Travel Expenses, under the current forecast of \$14,565? Can you tell us ...

MR. NELSON: That was my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; let the record show that's Stan's question.

Can you tell us what you will be covering during the current fiscal year?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. It's code 512A under Travel Expenses. We have myself and the director of registration going to Fredericton for our annual meeting of Chief Electoral Officers. We have the operating expenses for my vehicle and travel expenses. If you'd like, I have a complete breakdown as to the actual dollar amounts, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not sure we need that today. I do appreciate that you do have it as part of your supplementary material.

I'll turn it over to Stan in just a second.

When we do get into the final element, because of the interest in finding ways to reduce travel and hosting, we'll be looking at it in close detail.

Stan.

MR. NELSON: Well, I was going to make a similar comment, Mr. Chairman. The traveling to Fredericton and other traveling expenses with staff and what have you: considering the restraint program that's presently involved, and I appreciate that the one that's involved right now is suggesting 25 percent for the balance of this fiscal year, but considering that that may pursue into the new year, what would you impact if we took 25 percent off your travel expenses here for the next year? As one, that would possibly mean the director of registration not attending that conference with you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The last time he attended a conference was in 1982. I think once every 10 years is not out of line for a manager to meet with his colleagues from the other 10 jurisdictions.

MR. NELSON: Well, that may be the case, but at the same time we have a fiscal responsibility to the taxpayers. We have to endeavour in any way possible to encourage all of us to be more fiscally restrained. That may mean that something like that may have to be discussed a little more thoroughly with yourself.

1:12

MR. LEDGERWOOD: If that's the recommendation of the committee, then we'll certainly live with it. I know that one of the problems we have with discretionary travel is that most of our money is spent visiting returning officers. I think we appreciate that these are political appointees. Some of them are very, very strong: excellent individuals. Others are not quite as strong. I think we have a moral obligation that if we're going to run an effective enumeration or an effective election, we must have these individuals trained to the highest level they can achieve. So a lot of our travel is liaison visits by my staff to those individual returning officers. I can assure that we do it by the most economical means. We would not fly from here to Calgary, for example, to see a couple of returning officers in Calgary. My staff would drive. They would visit returning officers going down,

they would also visit as many returning officers as they could in Calgary, and they would likely come back a different way and visit other returning officers.

We've been trying to be as efficient as we can. We certainly are familiar with austerity. I think you may remember that I came from the federal government and have gone through similar cuts before. You can rest assured that we'll give you full co-operation.

MR. NELSON: I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions on travel? Moving on then, Advertising: nil.

Freight and Postage and so on. Pat, Freight and Postage is the same as you had budgeted for last year but slightly above the forecast. Postage will be up, I understand, at the first of the year. Do we know what it will be up to?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I don't know. We've factored that in. As you know, we provide data to anybody who calls. If you want a copy of the 1989 General Election Report, we will mail it to you. So this is generally in response to queries from the public. With the new boundaries commission and their activities, we may find that particularly the first part of the next fiscal year we will be mailing out a lot of data to individuals who will be preparing briefs for the public hearings that will follow the release of the interim report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why would that be charged back to your budget?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Because if they want election information ... For example, we anticipate that a lot of people will want to know what the boundaries were before, so they will be asking for maps.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; I fully appreciate if they're asking for current boundaries, but if they're asking for the proposals, I would think that would go through the commission, of which you're a part, of course, because that still doesn't become law until it's dealt with by the Assembly.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the commission has made preparations to mail up to 5,000 copies of the interim report. That will be charged back to the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It's when people want to compare the commission's proposals in the interim report vis-a-vis the current boundaries that we'll be sending out our maps.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. NELSON: Five thousand people.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I think the select special committee printed 5,000 copies, and I don't believe there are any left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Rentals.

MR. FOX: Could I just ask on that, Mr. Chairman? It's unrelated to this specific budget, but would the boundaries commission

include the current electoral map of Alberta with their report to give people something to compare and contrast it to?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, that's not the plan.

MR. SIGURDSON: Can you make that recommendation, or has that recommendation been made?

MRS. GAGNON: It might save some money in the long run.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I think the select special committee pointed out at the very first of their report that there would be significant changes to most electoral divisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That doesn't answer the question, though, Pat. Obviously, for a lay person looking at the proposed new boundaries, they would want something to judge that on. Therefore, the current boundaries would be applicable. If it's not there, all the more reason they'll either be calling your office or our offices. Why wouldn't you automatically have the current boundaries in the report so they've got the two side by side?

MR. NELSON: It would sure save a lot of money.

MR. FOX: It wouldn't be the kind of detailed map that a person would be able to base a submission on if they want to appear before the hearings. Just in terms of comparing the proposed map of Alberta to the current map of Alberta, I think it might be useful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I take it as a consensus as to a suggestion back?

MR. FOX: Yeah, it's the boundaries commission's decision.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Certainly I can pass it to the committee. The report is ready to go to the printer. We don't want to delay it. It's 350 pages now. If you want to put in 83 more maps ...

MR. FOX: No, I was just talking about one map of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat you're not listening. The suggestion was that there be a map of Alberta showing the constituency boundaries as they now exist vis-à-vis what is proposed. It is a suggestion.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. It's a fine suggestion, but it's more than a map of Alberta in that remember we have Edmonton and Calgary as multis; we have Red Deer as a multi.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We have Lethbridge as a multi. So it's not just a map.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But as you and Tom and I know so well because we all served on the former committee, going back to the statement you just quoted from that was in the first line of our report, the negative changes are in the rural areas, not in the urban areas in terms of boundaries. So it's gone to you as a suggestion. Let's just leave it at that.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I'll certainly take the suggestion, and if we can put in the maps, we will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Rentals.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Rentals. We have a fax machine, we have a postage meter, and we have a photocopier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?
Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Would it not be easier to purchase a fax, or do you think you have to update it too often to make that economical?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: One of the problems, of course, with the equipment we have: the state of the art is changing very quickly, and we've found that it's better to lease. Normally we have about a three-year lease. Even if they upgrade and come out with a new model, they will let us break that lease and give us the new equipment. So we've found, particularly in this rapid change in technology, that it's actually better to lease and keep state-of-the-art equipment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Anyone else?
Telephone and Communications.

Then we move on. Repair and Maintenance: there's quite an increase there, Pat.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, I don't think it's a change from our '91-92.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless there's a typo in mine. Is that eight or three?

MR. NELSON: It's a three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a three. All right. Pardon me. It appeared to be an eight. So going from three to eight, it seemed like a significant increase.

MR. HYLAND: Where's your specs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. Give them to me. Contract Services.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The main item in this particular code 512K is for legal fees and anybody that we hire on a temporary basis through an employment agency. Also, we have some administrative forms in that particular Contract Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Jack.

MR. ADY: I guess I just would like Pat to give us a little information that would account for the 35 percent increase in two years in that category from 1990 to 1992.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The last time I got into this particular area, I ended up in a little difficulty when we couldn't classify what a lawyer was. I used the term "lawyer" as defined in the Interpretation Act. You may remember that Mr. Clegg provided legal services to us at no cost. We now have a contract with another lawyer. I'd like to leave it at that.

1:22

MR. ADY: Okay. I think I understand what's happened there now. I don't want to go through that again either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Data Processing. Is Data Processing all right?

Hosting. I mentioned in my earlier comments, Pat, that travel and hosting are two areas we're going to take another look at to see if there are savings that can be made, so I'll just ask you to identify that for our next discussion.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. Are we looking at 25 percent across the board?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not coming down on any figure at this stage of the game, just asking that a closer look be given to those matters.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Fine, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Materials and Supplies. Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: If I might, why is that estimate so low as compared to the actual '90-91? Are you getting fewer publications? What's happening there? Do you need less because it's not an election year?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. As we go through the budget, you'll find we would be using materials and supplies in both the Enumeration element and the Election element, so these materials and supplies are on the administrative side of the house. You'll find significant costs in materials and supplies in the other two elements we have in that I anticipate there will be changes to the Election Act at the spring sitting which, of course, will cause changes to our forms, guides, brochures, training aids, returning officers' handbooks, et cetera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else under the Administration element?

Just before we move into both the Election and the Enumeration elements, while it's important we have a thorough discussion on both elements today, I would hope that by the time we have our final meeting, we will know the intention of the government, through the Attorney General, on changes to respective legislation. As members of the committee are aware, the Chief Electoral Officer has requested changes to legislation which would seriously impact upon supplies and materials he would need to order, and of course that would be reflected in the budget.

Members will also be aware that the committee has officially requested through the Attorney General that legislation be amended so the enumeration plan for September of 1992 be postponed and called within the first six months of 1993 and at the discretion of the Chief Electoral Officer. I anticipate we'll have a clearer response from the Attorney General between now and our next meeting so we'll know whether or not that's true, because obviously if the two pieces of legislation are not to be amended, that has an impact on the Chief Electoral Officer and his operations. It means that enumeration must take place in September even if it's on the old boundaries, and then we're looking at the dollar figures contained herein. I merely state that to put the discussion in the context that we should have a thorough discussion today but fully understand we are still awaiting direction from the Attorney General as to the government's intent.

Pat, back to you, then, on the Election element.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: You can see that the Election element is very straightforward. What we're doing here is basically getting the materials and supplies necessary to conduct an election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat, is the \$2,000 in the 1991-92 forecast used by the returning officers or by your staff visiting returning officers? What is it used for?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It's basically my staff going out to visit the returning officers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; that's what I thought.

The \$22,750 would represent the cost of bringing in returning officers and doing your gear-up work.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes, training and preparation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The training sessions, yes. Any questions on that? It's pretty straightforward.

We jump, then, down to Contract Services, \$225,375.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: That's broken down into basically three elements: the training sessions for returning officers at just over \$10,000, the printing and resupply of election forms and other miscellaneous supplies for the Election Act at \$20,000, and printing new forms, guides, brochures, et cetera, for the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act at \$15,000. I anticipate there will be amendments to the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act as well in the spring sitting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the second Act I referred to that we'll find out ...

Okay. Any questions of Pat?

MRS. GAGNON: Yeah. Could I just clarify something, please. It's a little off the actual budget. The commission's report will be tabled at the end of June in the next sitting of the Legislature, right?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The plan currently is that the interim report will be tabled before the end of this calendar year. The commission will then hold public hearings in February. They're currently looking at holding 24 public hearings. They'll get feedback from the public on the initial proposals, make their changes, and they're required by legislation to table their final report before the end of June. It's anticipated that the commission will have completed its work well in advance of that time.

MRS. GAGNON: My question, then, is: why is it necessary to amend the Act, delaying the enumeration from the fall of '92 to '93? Why could the enumeration not take place in the fall of '92?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if I may interrupt, if you go back and check *Hansard*, Yolande, you'll see that we had the same discussion in the committee. If the commission brings its report in near the end of June - and they're mandated to bring in it no later than the end of June - I think you'll find in *Hansard* that the Chief Electoral Officer advised us, because we still have to pass the legislation as an Assembly, that that does not give him sufficient time to do an enumeration in September. One of the scenarios we looked at was moving the process ahead for final passage of the legislation from the end of September. That would have further compressed the six-month period. Again, we dealt with that issue at some length in our Electoral Boundaries

Committee and felt that because there's such a need for public input between the time the interim report is released and prior to the final report being prepared and presented, that would not be fair.

MRS. GAGNON: But my point is: let's say we're sitting at the end of June; you know, just pie in the sky. The report is tabled. It is passed by the Legislature before June 30 ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: In July.

MRS. GAGNON: ... or the early week of July. Is it impossible, then, to do the enumeration that fall, the fall of '92?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you'll find those answers in *Hansard*, but if you'd like to reiterate what you said earlier, Pat...

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The key in the enumeration process is the returning officer. The changes that will result from the changes in electoral divisions will mean that we will have at least 25 new returning officers. They must be selected and appointed by order in council. We then must train those returning officers. That will be a key, getting returning officers appointed. Also, the new electoral division maps must be divided into polling subdivisions, and this is normally done by the returning officers, who normally would have an excellent knowledge of their areas of responsibility. So the polling subdivision maps would be prepared by the returning officers after they were selected, after they were trained by us. The maps would then be forwarded to us. We would check them and pass them to mapping for preparation. The enumeration is done and a list of electors is prepared for a particular polling subdivision. So there is a time compression problem.

MRS. GAGNON: So in order to delay until after '92, then, this amendment has to be made to the Act as it exceeds the period as stated at the present time. Okay. I get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The spirit of our motion was to give the Chief Electoral Officer maximum flexibility as to when the enumeration would take place in the first six months of '93. If he could gear up and be ready to go in early January, he would do so. If he needed an extra 30, 45, or 60 days, he would have that flexibility. That was the spirit of it, but we're still waiting for a response from the government because they have to decide whether they're going to amend it or not. If they choose not to, then the Chief Electoral Officer has no alternative other than to go ahead with an enumeration based on current boundaries and current statistics.
1:32

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Gagnon may like to review the Election Act, those particular sections we discussed, I guess, last June, particularly sections 14, 15, and 16. May 1, '92, is a critical date in many areas.

MR. HYLAND: That's the second part of what I was going to say. The first part is related to if the report comes down in June and it's accepted, it's going to take some time to draft it too. If we thought we were going to be passing that Act in the spring session, if it came down near the end, we'd be looking at the end of July, probably before lawyers, being lawyers, would get through

with it. So I don't think it would be drafted as quickly as near the end of June.

The other thing is the importance of local returning officers drafting those polling subdivisions so they know what's happening. I know of a case in Redcliff where for a number of years, about three times, federal and provincial had the same polling divisions and everything was working well. A new returning officer came in. He didn't bother to come and look at the polling subdivisions. Even though it was only in Medicine Hat, he started drawing lines. Well, besides having a terrible time during enumeration, they had a terrible time during election day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You said a returning officer, Alan. Federal or provincial?

MR. HYLAND: A federal returning officer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: It was just so much simpler when everybody knew it, everybody was working together. There were no problems. I think it's important in towns; it's important in rural areas where you change the direction of flow. If Pat's people tried to do it - and they probably would be well qualified to do it - not knowing where people go, it could create a terrible problem in answering questions. It needs to be done locally.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ledgerwood, without giving any specifics away, of course - I don't think you could - can you tell us: are the legal descriptions of each constituency contained in the interim report that will be going out soon?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes. The detailed legal descriptions will be there. As a matter of fact, some of them are so detailed they're over two pages long.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes, I'm aware of that. So when there are amendments following the public hearings, depending on the degree of change in the boundary from the proposal to the final structure we end up with, the time could be relatively short getting a final legal description.

Can I ask how long it took to get the legal descriptions from mapping for the commission's work? How long did it take from the time you submitted a map to the time you got back the legal descriptions?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I can't give you a total time because we sent the maps over piecemeal. As we did an area, we sent them over.

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh, okay. I see. Thanks.

MR. FOX: I'm just wondering, while we're on the topic, Pat, what the procedure is for the tabling of the interim report. Where does it go from the printer? Who releases it? When does it become public?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The commission will give the report to the Speaker. Once the Speaker has released the report to MLAs, I think the following day the press corps will receive their copies.

It's a very standard procedure, much similar to the procedure the chairman follows when he's releasing my reports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. If the House is sitting, then it's taken to the Assembly. If the House is not sitting, then the process Pat has described is followed. Anything else?

We move on, then, to the Enumeration element. Manpower. Pat you've asked for an additional three-quarters of a full-time position. There was an increase in your staff component this fiscal year, was there not?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, there has not been an increase in staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last year at this time we did not approve a partial position?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Oh, what we do - it's a temporary position, X number of percentage of a man-year. We don't hire an individual for a percentage of a man-year. What we do is hire half a dozen individuals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was that temporary or permanent?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, as it happened, we didn't get the amendments and things that we'd forecast. We didn't order the supplies, so in fact we haven't had the temporary help. This three-quarters of a man-year is for the individuals who will assist our storeman in preparing the pallets that go out to returning officers with the enumeration materials.

MR. HYLAND: With this last year, then, that gives you a little more flexibility in that you would have one full part-time position to use as you see fit, with the quarter increase last year and now this one. Or have you dropped that quarter last year and we're only dealing with three-quarters?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, in the budget last year we had funding for an individual. If you look at the top, we had budgeted for \$17,750. We are not spending any of that money because we did not hire any temporary help. I think in many ways I'm more frugal than some of the people at this table.

MRS. GAGNON: Oh, but not Stan Nelson, I'm sure. Right, Stan?

MR. NELSON: That's right

MR. HYLAND: You didn't use that one, so it's three-quarters instead of a full one.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: What you have to do is look at '91-92 where we had part of a man-year and didn't use any. This year we're asking for three-quarters of a man-year in conjunction with preparing the enumeration materials.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else under Manpower? Yes, Derek.

MR. FOX: I'm just wondering: generally with the Enumeration element and the Election element, because these are unusual expenses that come every few years, we don't have anything to compare it to in '90-91 or '91-92. Can you give us some idea of the cost of conducting this sort of thing: materials, the rate paid

to the enumerators, the rate paid to the returning officers? Has there been much change since the last time we went?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, there's been no change to the schedule of fees paid to election officials. The only increase, of course, has been the inflation rate, and I think since the enumeration in 1988 we're looking at a 20-some percent increase in some areas, particularly the materials, but no increase in the cost for personnel.

MR. FOX: Would it be possible just for interest's sake - I mean, I understand it's been four years since we've done an enumeration, or three and a half years - to bring the figures from the last year we had an Election element and the last year we had an Enumeration element? Recognizing that there are differences based on the number of forms you have on hand relative to what you have to order and stuff, it would be interesting to compare the costs of conducting elections and enumerations over a period of time.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I prepare a very detailed cost analysis on any electoral event. In the 1988 enumeration report there's a complete breakdown of every penny that was spent on that. Similarly, at the back of the 1989 General Election Report there is a compendium of expenses. I'll be very pleased to send Louise sufficient copies that she can distribute to members.

1:42

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?
Stan.

MR. NELSON: Are you dealing with this in general or line by line?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we'd finished Manpower, and we're into Supplies and Services. Do you have a specific?

MR. NELSON: I have a general question first, I guess. Considering that we don't really know at this point in time what legislative changes may take place in the spring of '92 and thus we don't know whether there is a possibility of an enumeration based on the old boundaries in '92 or the new boundaries in early '93, would it be your intent to basically hold these amounts of money, if approved, in abeyance until such time as you had a clear direction by the Legislature? Or would you be proceeding in the early part of the new year or after the budget of April 1 to gear up for an enumeration based on the current legislation in the fall of '92, in September?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I would certainly look to the Legislature for direction. Now, we've talked about the scenarios where the commission puts in their report and what happens, and I don't think any of us is in a position to really anticipate. Certainly it is the intention of the commission to have the report available to be tabled in the Assembly long before the end of June. Whether or not the Legislature reacts to that is something that I have no control over.

MR. NELSON: What's "long before?"

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We're looking at as much as two months before the end of June.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Pat, I . . . I'll wait until Stan finishes.

MR. NELSON: Go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Possibly you can help us understand, because when we met with you in the Electoral Boundaries Committee, I recall we then looked at where we could compress the time lines, and we wound up compressing the time lines leading up to the interim report by I believe it was three months. If I'm not mistaken, you argued very strongly that we not compress the six-month time line because that's the time when the public have the opportunity to come back through the public hearing process with their input. Now, it may be that what you're suggesting is that in one scenario, through the 24 hearings you've spoken of, there aren't a lot of requests for changes and the commission can complete its work rather quickly. I guess another scenario is that there could be a lot of requests for changes which could, in fact, push you back to the full six months. I don't want to be putting words in your mouth. I'd like to hear from you as to what you're saying to us today.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I think that's an excellent assessment, Mr. Chairman. The public hearings will dictate the reaction of the commission as to the changes. We feel we've done a reasonable job of the boundaries. I don't want to get into too many details as to some of the problems that were encountered, but under one scenario we could have the final report ready in early May. Under another scenario we could have difficulty meeting the end of June. I think we've worked long enough together; I always like to look at the worst case scenario.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anyone else? I'm not sure that we need to go through this line by line, but may I suggest that if a member has a specific area they'd like to get more information or make a comment on, we go to that area.

Stan, did you have one?

MR. NELSON: Well, I don't really know how to deal with this at the moment until I have further information as to what it's proposed that the government might do legislatively.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why I made my opening comment, Stan, that we could deal with it today but with the understanding that once we have further direction from the Attorney General, we'll know in which direction we as a committee must go.

MR. NELSON: Then I'll just hold my comments until that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks.
Alan.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, to the Chief Electoral Officer: who sets the fees paid to enumerators, et cetera? Is that set by order in council, or is it set by you, or is it set by legislation?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It's set by legislation. There is a fees and expenses schedule that basically tells what the fees are for each and every item. For example, ROs receive a \$75 a month honorarium. If we're talking about the enumeration, they receive a basic fee of \$1,000 for conducting the enumeration. They receive \$125 for each training session that they attend. That may be one, two, or three, depending on their experience, particularly in the mapping area. They're paid a fee of \$200 to revise their map and put it into polling subdivisions. They're paid a flat fee of \$250 to train enumerators regardless of how many training sessions they hold. They're also paid a flat fee of 10 cents per

name for those names on the list of electors that the enumerators give them. They're also entitled to have an office. That office could be in their home, if necessary, and up to \$300 a month for that rental. They're also paid \$125 a day for the three days of revision to the list of electors, and then they're reimbursed for travel, telephone, those types of things. It's all delineated in this fee schedule.

MR. HYLAND: That office fee is just for enumeration, not for all the time between enumerations? It's just a short period?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, that's just for a maximum of two months. Although we permit them to have an office in their home during the enumeration, we discourage them from having their office in their residence during an election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: I'm just curious. Three hundred dollars a month for an office for a returning officer during an enumeration period: what kind of an office can you get in Calgary or Edmonton for that kind of money?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: If they rent a commercial office, then we will reimburse them for the actual expense.

MRS. GAGNON: Could I ask, please, Mr. Chairman: when was the last time that the fee schedule was reviewed? How long has it been on the books?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I don't know. I'd have to look it up. I can't remember whether it was 1982 or 1985.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat, you said it is in the legislation, not in the regulations?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I think it's in the regulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's in the regulations. All right.

Any other questions on the Enumeration element under Supplies and Services?

Fixed Assets: I think that goes without saying. Anything else on this element?

Okay. Thank you, Pat.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Mr. Chairman, do you have any idea when the next meeting will be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the new year.

MR. NELSON: February 3 and 4.

MR. ADY: We have some dates blocked out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have some dates blocked out for Ethics Commissioner. We'll deal with that later today.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The committee adjourned from 1:51 p.m. to 1:53 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll reconvene. Thank you very much, Don.

Item 7, Budget Estimates for the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices. Now, Louise has a new handout

MR. HYLAND: Does this replace every page, Louise?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: No. Actually, the first page is now the 1991-92 forecast. The other pages remain the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I was going to suggest as an opening comment: I met with Louise and asked her to do some number crunching for us. If we were to go down under Supplies and Services - for instance, Travel Expenses - and reduce the Travel Expenses in the 1991-92 estimate by 25 percent, that would reduce it by \$7,274.50, to bring us to a new total of \$21,824.

MR. SIGURDSON: You speak faster than I write, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A reduction of \$7,274.50, which would give us a new total in the 1992-93 estimate of \$21,824.

Similarly under Hosting, the last item under Supplies and Services, it's not a large item, \$700, and that's basically the coffee and juice when we have sandwiches at our meals. But if we were to reduce that figure by 25 percent, we'd be down to \$525 instead of \$700. One of the advantages of dealing with it in a global sense is that that gives the committee more flexibility, then, for the conferences. For instance, we've tentatively looked at three delegates for the Ombudsman's conference, okay? In all likelihood we're now down to one or two, but it does give the committee some flexibility to use in the other conferences and so on.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: Under Travel Expenses, 712A00, what was the actual for '91? Do we know yet?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: It's in the forecast column, Travel Expenses. We're anticipating an expenditure of \$21,166.

MRS. GAGNON: I know, but I'm asking: do we know what the actual was? For instance, I didn't go anywhere in '91.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The forecast takes that into account. Oh, you didn't go; Derek went to the conference in your place.

MRS. GAGNON: Right. So the costs are basically as forecasts; that's what I wanted to know. What's the actual as compared to the forecast?

MR. NELSON: That's the actual. The forecast is the actual.

MR. FOX: This is actual to date plus anticipated until the end of the fiscal year. That's what a forecast is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Stan, on the general.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, just a question. I'm just wondering if we could reduce those costs, achieve some of these goals, by using a Canadian airline to the United States or a U.S. airline to the United States and flying out of the U.S. to an international port, considering the large costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think one of the advantages in using a global figure is that it allows us to be more imaginative. For instance, some members have accumulated a great number of travel points. I wouldn't suggest going to an American carrier unless you're going to a conference in the States or someplace overseas that was served more directly, more conveniently than by one of our carriers. What we're trying to do, Stan, is to give more flexibility in the process.

MR. NELSON: Well, I'm just suggesting one creative way of doing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Can we go back then? Any other comments on the general before we go through it in the specifics? Okay. Let's go then to Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits, the first item.

Louise.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Allowances and Supplementary Benefits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. What did I say? I'm sorry; it's the first element under Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: This covers the fees for the members and spouses to attend the various conferences. There's an increase for the upcoming year because the various conferences have been raising their registration fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That figure could be brought down, again, if we sent fewer delegates to various conferences.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's correct. This is the worst case scenario.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, the worst case scenario at this time. Yes, Don.

MR. TANNAS: Could I ask a question? If two people want to go to a particular conference, and one person goes, if the second person wanted to go and was prepared to pay their own fees and their own way, would there be any objection to that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. The other thing to keep in mind is travel points, as I mentioned earlier. We've had members of the Assembly go to various functions using bonus points, so there's no cost.

MR. TANNAS: That's what I was getting at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a matter of being more imaginative.

All right. Anything else under the first element? Okay; moving on then, in Supplies and Services. We're now down to Travel Expenses. We've made a proposal that we reduce the travel expenses by 25 percent based on the 1991-92 estimates.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, this could be agreement in principle, because when we come back to our final round of budgetary discussions, we'll look at it. That's what's proposed.

Yes, Don.

MR. TANNAS: Is this 25 percent off the 91 percent? For instance, we've got one figure and then a minus 9 and then we went to 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; it's off the \$29,098.

MR. TANNAS: Okay, fair enough. It's not 9 percent plus 25 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; it's estimate to estimate.

Insurance and repair and maintenance are both zero. That relates to the chairman's vehicle, and there is no chairman's vehicle.

Professional, Technical, and Labour Services. Now, this relates to the audit of our Auditor. Louise, let's just review briefly what we have from our auditors.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I contacted Mr. Mahon from Kingston Ross Pasnak and asked if he anticipated an increase in the fees, and he said about 3 percent. He gave me the figure of \$13,125. At that time, he mentioned that because of the new payroll on-line system that was being accepted throughout the government, it might cost more, and he was wanting to leave it open. I suggested that this not happen. Therefore, he gave me the figure of \$13,125 and received reassurance from the Auditor General that they'd be able to work with him if this happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's important for members to recall that during the current fiscal year the figure is \$12,500, which is identical to the previous year. But we had to wrestle him to get that figure. So the thing that we need to think about between now and our next meeting is: do we wish to accept the figure presented? Do we wish to counteroffer with our own figure? Do we wish to go to the open market?

Yes, Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Could somebody refresh my memory? I thought that the expenses for the audit were higher a few years ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the first year.

MR. SIGURDSON: And we expected a descending amount as they became more familiar with our system. Now, I realize that there's this hypothetical situation that there may be something new in the system, that they're ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I recommend, in anticipation of our next meeting, that Louise do two things: first of all, get the statistical data for us on the figures since 1986, which was our first year, Tom, for the auditing firm, and also have a representative of the firm here so that we can go in camera and discuss it in detail. Is that agreeable?

2:03

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Hosting. Again the proposal is that we reduce our hosting by 25 percent, moving that figure down to \$525. Anything else under Supplies and Services?

Okay. Moving on to Other Expenditures, we have Pay to Members of the Legislative Assembly. The figure is proposed to be reduced by 10.9 percent, from \$41,128 to \$36,640. Okay?

MRS. GAGNON: Could I ask how this would be achieved? Fewer meetings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's based on the number of meetings held and travel. Some members are not claiming travel expenses for meetings. They're in town for other business anyway.

MRS. GAGNON: I do that usually.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So do I, and others do. So it's a matter of the number of meetings, plus next year we don't anticipate as many meetings because we won't have ethics. Right now we're recruiting the Ethics Commissioner.

MR. ADY: There would be some additional reduction if fewer people attended conferences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's true, Jack.

So we'll do some fine-tuning on the budget proposal for our meeting in the new year. Okay? Anything else on the committee's budget?

Could we move on to a report by Derek and Louise on the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference in Montreal. Derek, would you like to lead off, please.

MR. FOX: Sure. Mr. Chairman, I'll report just briefly on my experience at the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference in Montreal. It started on Sunday, November 17, and carried on through Monday the 18th and Tuesday the 19th. Louise and I attended the conference with the Auditor General, Don Salmon, and there were, I think, three officials from his office there as well.

Just a brief description of the intent of the conference. The Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation exists, I think, to sort of expand the horizons of the audit community, to work very hard to develop sound methods to measure effectiveness and try and determine for clients, be they government departments, public utilities, hospitals, or whatever, whether or not money that has been spent is well spent and ways of measuring the effective delivery of service relative to the money allocated to programs.

It was a very impressive technical conference. I haven't seen anything quite like it. The audiovisual presentations that supplemented the speakers and panels were really quite impressive. I understand that with the translation services and audiovisual systems they used, they spent close to a hundred thousand dollars on the technical side of the convention. It was really quite dramatic, and I think everyone was quite impressed with it.

The calibre of speakers was excellent. We had a number of plenary sessions with speakers ranging from the CEO of the Bank of Commerce to the chief executive officer of the Ontario Development Corporation, David McKinnon. There was a very good presentation by the Deputy Minister of Family and Social Services, Stan Remple, from the province of Alberta, who is on the board of governors of the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation. As well, there was a representative from Alberta from the Department of Municipal Affairs, an audit control officer or something from the department.

The sessions were all focused on trying to explore techniques that have been used in some jurisdictions to measure effectiveness and consider their further application to departments of government. There are times when it can drag a little bit, some of the jargon and nuances in the discussion, especially if you're not an accountant or an auditor, but I did find it very worth while. I was somewhat surprised to realize I was the only politician there.

Other jurisdictions don't send elected representatives, yet the substance of the conference was dealing with how to better manage funds and measure the effectiveness of program delivery for basically public institutions.

The focus of this particular conference was Moving into the Mainstream: An Agenda for Action. They feel they have developed through the last decade or so a number of really worthwhile techniques to apply comprehensive auditing to government and agencies, and they feel it's becoming generally better understood and better accepted. They also introduced a private-sector component to it as well.

I'd be happy to answer any individual questions about the sessions. I think it's a very important policy area, and the more we as elected representatives can encourage the development of effectiveness auditing in government, the better off we'll all be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How would it be if I asked Louise to supplement your report and then we can deal with the questions? Okay?

Louise.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I agree with Mr. Fox. The technical presentation was certainly very impressive. The opening comments introduced a new word, I think, to a number of people. A lot of the delegates had actually never heard the word before, and that was "paradigms." It's something we all have in us. It's a filter we all have that will accept or reject new ideas. They were actually encouraging auditors and accountants not to have these paradigms and to look beyond to the fringe for new ideas in reporting and what have you.

The speaker gave an excellent example of how in 1968 Switzerland dominated the watch industry. As we know now, watches all have quartz movements. That was taken over by the Japanese. But the interesting thing is that the idea was discovered by a Swiss scientist. When he presented it to the watch industry, they said it would never fly and rejected it totally and in fact did not even protect the idea with a patent. We all know what happened after that Texas Instruments and the Japanese took over, and now they dominate the watch industry.

So I found that throughout sessions the word "paradigm" came up quite often, encouraging the accountants, as I said, not to have tunnel vision and to report to the CEO and if you have to go beyond the CEO - by CEO they mean the chief executive officer - report to the auditor or presidents of corporations and what have you.

The first day of the conference was even more interesting than the second. There were some people from Environment Canada that talked about how municipal and provincial and federal governments should work together with regard to all environmental situations and not duplicate costs, and they had representatives from both private industry and the government.

I think that about covers it. I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity of sending me to the conference. Again, if there are a number of questions to answer, I'd be more than happy to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Questions? Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Derek, did you find that the mandate from province to province is different? The mandate of an Auditor General is different here in that we don't have value-for-money audit. Do they have that in other provinces?

MR. FOX: I don't think it's common practice in other provinces, although there was a presentation from Quebec that dealt with it. I think they're moving on it there. But certainly J.J. Macdonell sort of pioneered that consciousness in the federal government, and the mandate of the federal Auditor General has always been broader than the mandate for our Auditor General. There are real differences - and Don Salmon alluded to it yesterday - between the offices of the Auditor General in each province, but as far as I'm aware, their mandate doesn't allow them to move dramatically toward effectiveness auditing yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, since we're having this discussion and Don Salmon is not with us, it's important for the record that, as he indicated yesterday and did a year ago in his office, he would not want to see his mandate expanded, because the moment you do that you close doors in departments because they're concerned that the auditor is looking over their shoulder in other than a straight accounting manner. So his advice to the committee was: "Do not expand; I do not recommend that the mandate be expanded to go into those areas. I can be more effective with the current mandate." But if you want to follow up on that further, we'll do so when we're back with the Auditor General.

2:13

MR. FOX: I would point out that the Deputy Minister of Family and Social Services was there, and he's on the board of governors of this group. So there is a real awareness of the need to measure effectiveness and auditing in government departments, and some are moving towards that. As a sidebar to that, I was at the conference five years ago, and the only presentation from an Alberta government official was from the then Deputy Minister of Family and Social Services. It wasn't the same person, but there seems to be a consistent interest in this area in that department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anyone else?

I have a question. Did the question of governments wrestling with deficits and fiscal restraint come up during the discussions, and what was the general flavour and mood?

MR. FOX: Well, it's a sort of universal problem. It doesn't matter what government, what agency, what level of government. There were people there from public utilities, from hospitals, and from local, provincial, and federal governments. The problem of deficits and managing expenditures is presently everywhere, and the feeling is that although there's an expense attached to comprehensive auditing because it's another layer of analysis, the returns can be substantial in terms of getting more bang for the buck's worth.

MR. HYLAND: Last year I went to that, and I think there was one other politician registered. I think he was from the Territories or Ontario or somewhere. Anyway, I met only one other MLA, plus two or three federal MPs slipped in probably because it was in Ottawa. Beyond that... I thought it would have created more going, but obviously if there was no one there but you as an elected person, it still hasn't caught on in that aspect.

MR. FOX: No. It seems to me a very appropriate kind of conference for elected people to be involved with, because they're dealing with providing the information we need to make decisions as legislators. I do have to comment that in one session when the Queen Elizabeth hospital talked about the application of their comprehensive audit and went through all the process of how you bring people in, it was quite complex, but I still found myself begging for a bottom-line kind of answer when they were finished.

They weren't able to tell us whether or not they're confident they can deliver the same or a better level of service for equal or less money. From my point of view that is the bottom line, and I think some of them were struggling with that as well. You have to make sure it doesn't develop into a make-work project for auditors and accountants, a self-fulfilling kind of prophecy where you can spend endless hours and dollars measuring something and not learning anything substantial from it.

MR. HYLAND: The Public Accounts Committee from Alberta never sent anybody to the conference this year?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: They don't normally send someone to the CCA conferences.

MR. HYLAND: I think last year Barry was there, or was that for something else?

MR. FOX: No, it was a public accounts conference.

MR. SIGURDSON: The year I went, Mr. Chairman, Barry was there in his capacity as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. He went there to present a paper along with, I think, three other Chairs of public accounts committees from across Canada. They went in the capacity of Chairs and presented papers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But normally the Public Accounts Committee does send someone to the public accounts conference. They send two delegates and this committee sends two.

MR. HYLAND: This is the ...

MR. SIGURDSON: Comprehensive Auditing Foundation.

MR. HYLAND: ... Comprehensive Auditing Foundation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I'm back to the conference Barry attended where he presented his paper. He did present a paper at the public accounts conference along with a couple of others.

MR. SIGURDSON: Also at the Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. He did the same paper at both conferences?

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh, I don't know that. I'm not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. HYLAND: One thing that was said in discussion and talking to other members from the year I was there is that our Auditor General - and others believe him - has been able to achieve more things than some of the others by talking to people in government and convincing them to achieve better ways of auditing. Because there's been confrontation, some of the auditors versus the government, because their terms of reference have been changed, et cetera. He can prove - and I guess maybe he's delivered papers or whatever, but I know the discussion was there - that he's achieved more through negotiation than many others have through confrontation. They're starting to look at his methods of achieving auditing versus their methods of confronting all the time and dealing in the press versus dealing face to face

and through groups and ministers to achieve the proper end in auditing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else on the conference? Well, thank you very much, Derek and Louise.

There are a couple of other reports we should go through first. The Chief Electoral Officer called yesterday and advised that he had been invited by the federal Chief Electoral Officer to accompany that individual along with three Members of Parliament and, I believe, one other provincial Chief Electoral Officer to supervise the referendum being held in the Ukraine this Sunday. The two questions I asked the Chief Electoral Officer were, one, are all costs being borne by the federal government? The answer was yes. The second question was: have you cleared this with the chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission to ensure that this in no way will impede the work of the commission and therefore the interim report's final presentation? The response to the latter question was that commission members have completed their task and the work being done now is the actual technical work in preparing the document for printing. So there was not a difficulty in his leaving at this time. I authorized the visit on that basis.

That's one thing we should come back to at some future point in time, because I'm not aware that our committee has ever established a policy on how we wish to deal with our officers when they are invited to participate in activities outside the country. That's a discussion we should have at some future time.

MR. NELSON: I have a question. No, I'll save it. It's not a very nice one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right

Moving on then, could you give us an update, Louise, on recruitment for the ...

Tom, did you have a question?

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, there's just something that popped into my mind. I know that when we as members of the Legislature travel to international conferences, we're covered for hospitalization, and in the event that something goes wrong medically, we are covered through our insurance plans. Does the Chief Electoral Officer have that same kind of insurance plan?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we need to spend some time as a committee identifying questions like that so we can formulate a policy so we're comfortable that we are covered, that those officers are covered.

MR. SIGURDSON: But if he's going away this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I asked the question relating to costs. I was thinking of travel and accommodation and that sort of thing. I was given the assurance that all those costs are being covered by the federal government. I did not think to ask about travel insurance or related disability costs. But again, I think that's something we need to come back to.

Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: I'd like to make a comment. I think it's the third or fourth time that Mr. Ledgerwood or people of his staff have been invited to supervise elections elsewhere where a democracy is being reborn. I think it's a great honour. They must think very highly of him to invite him. I'd like that on the record.

2:23

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. We'll deal with it in a comprehensive way so we do have some framework as a committee, because I think Tom put his finger on a very key point: is there a liability if something should happen?

MR. SIGURDSON: Anything that goes wrong could cost thousands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. All right.

Louise, could you give us an update, please, on the recruitment for the Ethics Commissioner? Then we'll supplement that with the senior administrator position for the office.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: To date we have received 115 resumes from people from all walks of life in Alberta, and I'm sure it's going to get a little heavier by the cutoff date of Friday. By cutoff date I mean we'll still accept resumes that are postdated Friday. Phone calls are still coming in for copies of the position profile. There are questions on: how many references should they include; how long should their resume be; do we have an application form to send out? It's interesting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are next meetings Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th?

MR. NELSON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Monday afternoon beginning at 1 p.m.; Tuesday afternoon at 1 p.m.

MR. NELSON: Nine to 4 on Tuesday is what we have in our book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We won't need the 9th unless you'd like to come in earlier to deal with other issues.

MR. HYLAND: One o'clock on the 9th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One o'clock on the 9th.

If I can deal first with the request re the Ethics Commissioner position. If we can come in at 1 o'clock on Monday the 9th, Grant Nicol by then will have prioritized the candidates. Our meetings, of course, will be in camera. He will have the candidates broken into three categories, A, B, and C. The A's he will recommend automatically go ahead for interviews by himself and his staff; the B's are ones he needs some guidance from the committee on; the C's would be those he's recommending not proceed to the interview stage. So he'll go through the three lists on the Monday. Then on the Tuesday at 1 o'clock, assuming we're comfortable with all the As, we will begin again with the Bs, spend time on those and if there's any further consideration to be given to those on the C list. That way he can get on with his work. We as a committee would not revisit the issue until February 3 and 4.

So in terms of process for the Ethics Commissioner ...
Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: I have two questions. Will we at any point be interviewing his A short list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would be interviewing the short list of what is left from the A plus any of the B list who make it, and I'm not precluding someone from the C list.

MRS. GAGNON: Right. Okay. Is there any possibility that the committee could meet Tuesday morning the 10th rather than the afternoon so we don't have the whole morning - you know, for those of us from out of town - sort of waiting for this meeting to occur? Or are there conflicts?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We as a committee have reserved the morning and the afternoon.

MRS. GAGNON: Oh, the morning of the 10th as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the morning of the 10th.

MRS. GAGNON: I'm sorry. I heard you just say 1 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I suggested 1 o'clock. That was something Grant and I worked out today in our discussion. I was going to ask the question: would the committee like to come back for any other discussions; i.e., the discussion we just had on travel out of province for any of our officers and/or their staff, insurance matters? We can shift into the morning the interview process and then carry on in the afternoon if you'd like, or if you want to postpone that discussion. So further to Yolande's request, why don't we meet at 10 o'clock on the Tuesday morning? Is that all right? Give ourselves a little bit of time in the office to return phone calls and so on and meet again ...

MR. ADY: I can't be here that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can't? What time can you come in?

MR. ADY: Well, the heritage committee meets at 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did we not book, then, the Tuesday around heritage fund, or is that something that's come in since?

MR. ADY: We booked in the afternoon at 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stan, you just told me we're in the morning.

MR. NELSON: I've got in my book that we're booked from 9 to 4 on Tuesday.

MRS. GAGNON: Yeah, I have morning as well.

MR. ADY: Nine to 4. Well, go ahead if we're booked from 9 till 4, because normally I probably wouldn't have to be away very long because the voting doesn't usually take ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What time does heritage fund begin on the Tuesday morning?

MR. ADY: At 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What if we meet at 8?

MRS. GAGNON: That's fine with me. I'd just as soon meet and get out of here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan, do you think you can make it?

MR. HYLAND: If you can, I can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; 8.

MR. ADY: So then are we meeting again at 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just a moment. With the understanding that if we have not completed our review of the list by 10, we would continue on?

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right

MR. FOX: So we've got 1 to 5 booked on the 9th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have 1 to 5 on the 9th, and 8 until question mark on the 10th. We'll aim for 10, but it may take longer.

In light of that, could we leave flexible this question of out-of-province travel? We may wish to deal with that part on the Monday afternoon if there's time. I think the idea Grant had was that he'd like to go through the B and C lists, give us a chance to think about it, sleep on it, and come back the following day to go through it in more detail. So if we have time on the Monday afternoon, we could then go to other than the Ethics Commissioner selection process. All right?

Anything else on that one? Louise?

I should also mention that I did ask for reassurance from Grant that there would be flexibility on applications that come in. Anything that's postmarked Friday will be accepted into the new week. Any application that comes in postmarked a week late will not be considered, but there's a little flexibility that will be exercised.

Alan.

MR. HYLAND: When are we going to start looking at the lists on the officer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm coming to that next. Okay?

Regarding the officer, the process that's been followed is that *The Bulletin* for this past week - actually this week's *Bulletin* was canceled because of the statements made by the Premier. We have requested through David McNeil in the Leg. offices operation, the Clerk of our Assembly, back to PAO that a special run of *The Bulletin* be issued next week, and that will be done. So *The Bulletin* will be issued across the province to our offices and so on with one position on it and one only, and that is the senior administrator's position. Grant Nicol will then be in a position to brief both Stan as vice-chairman and myself on or about December 18, and then he will proceed with interviewing in that process. Anything else on the administrative position?

MR. TANNAS: So it'll be just like a normal hiring of anybody in the civil service. Is that what we're saying? We won't interview them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a committee? What Grant is coming back to us with on the 18th will be the list, similar to the list we're going to look at on the 9th and 10th. The full committee will then come back and look at the short list. That's in the new year.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that we have scheduled a meeting for December 18?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Grant Nicol with Stan as vice-chairman and myself as chairman.

MRS. GAGNON: I see. Okay, I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not the full committee.

MRS. GAGNON: Right. I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that matter will come back in the new year once Grant has gone through the short listing. Okay? Anything else on the Ethics Commissioner?

Okay. We have two items under the Ombudsman to deal with. One is a request for a motion to fill the vacant investigator position in Calgary and to fill the investigator/solicitor position in Edmonton. You'll recall that yesterday the Ombudsman indicated to us that these positions have been advertised. They were ready to go; they were caught in the freeze. A motion from the committee is necessary to allow the positions to be filled, and I would certainly recommend that the committee do so. So we would need a motion, then, to fill these two positions.

MR. NELSON: I'll make a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stan.

Any further discussion? Yes, Derek.

MR. FOX: Well, it seems pretty straightforward. These are positions that are essential to the operation of the Ombudsman's office. They're currently vacant through circumstance, not by design, and if this office is to provide the service Albertans are accustomed to, they need to be filled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Anyone else on the motion?

2:33

MR. HYLAND: Maybe it was both, but I remember him saying that at least one of those offices had been advertised and they were just about ready to interview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're both ready.

MR. HYLAND: Both? Okay. That, I think, is another key to this situation: they're probably a lot more advanced than most of the other positions that exist out there.

MR. NELSON: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has been called. All in favour? Carried unanimously. Okay.

The second matter relates to the transfer of funds. I would ask that we have a motion to go in camera so that can be discussed.

MR. NELSON: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's moved. All in favour? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

[The committee met in camera from 2:34 p.m. to 2:46 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; we'll reconvene the meeting.
Yes, Derek.

MR. FOX: I would move that the committee endorse the Ombudsman's request to transfer funds from group 1, Manpower, in the '91-92 fiscal year budget to group 2, Supplies and Services, and group 3, Fixed Assets, in principle, and that these specific requested amounts be authorized by the hand of the Chair of the committee.

MR. NELSON: I'd like to just put a caveat on that, if I may. I believe there is equipment available through public works that is presently in stock that may preclude a necessary recovering or purchase of chairs and to facilitate one of the items that has been requested. I would ask that we convey that message to the Ombudsman: to check first with public works to obtain the necessary equipment from them before expending additional moneys on recovering or buying chairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that mean you're in favour of or opposed to the motion?

MR. NELSON: I just want to put a caveat on it.

MR. FOX: You put a caveat on it? That means I can't sell the motion without paying him off.

MR. NELSON: No, no.

MR. FOX: Just teasing. Just teasing. It's a legal term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

All right. Are we ready for a motion to adjourn?

MR. ADY: I think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So moved. All in favour? Carried.
Thank you.