

2:58 p.m.

Wednesday, November 30, 1994

[Chairman: Mr. Hierath]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I will call the Select Special Information and Privacy Commissioner Search Committee to order and seek approval of the agenda.

MR. BRUSEKER: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Frank. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The mandate of the search committee is under tab 3, and I would like to have *Hansard* read the mandate into the record, please.

Be it resolved that

- (1) A select special information and privacy commissioner search committee of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be appointed consisting of the following members: Mr. Hierath, chairman, Mr. Sohal, Mr. Brassard, Mr. Bruseker, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Doerksen, Mr. Friedel, Mrs. Fritz, and Dr. Massey for the purpose of considering applications for the position of information and privacy commissioner and to recommend to the Assembly the applicant that it considers most suitable for appointment to that position.
- (2) The chairman and members of the committee shall be paid in accordance with the schedule of category A committees provided in the Members' Services Committee Allowances Order 4/93.
- (3) Reasonable disbursements by the committee for advertising, staff assistance, equipment and supplies, rent, travel, and other expenditures necessary for the effective conduct of its responsibilities shall be paid subject to the approval of the chairman.
- (4) In carrying out its responsibilities, the committee may with the concurrence of the head of the department utilize the services of members of the public service employed in that department or of the staff employed by the Assembly.
- (5) The committee may without leave of the Assembly sit during a period when the Assembly is adjourned.
- (6) When its work has been completed, the committee shall report to the Assembly if it is then sitting. During a period when the Assembly is adjourned, the committee may release its report by depositing a copy with the Clerk and forwarding a copy to each member of the Assembly.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just a question, Mr. Chairman, under point 1. Unfortunately, we have a vacancy on the list with Mr. Sohal. Is he going to be replaced?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay.

MR. BRASSARD: As vice chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. You mean an added person or the deputy chairman?

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, I guess really there were two questions. One is: are we going to get another person, another body in here

to replace Mr. Sohal? Then, of course, we need to find another vice-chairman, but I take it that would be covered under the next item, point 4, on the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point 4, right. So we'll discuss that now. The Legislature appoints committee members, so we will run with eight members on this committee. I guess it would be my prerogative to appoint a deputy chairman, and I've asked Gary Friedel to act as deputy chairman of this search committee. I need a motion to accept Gary Friedel.

MR. DOERKSEN: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Victor moves. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DR. MASSEY: There's no car with this one either.

MR. BRUSEKER: I was just wondering if he was going to get three cars, because he's deputy chairman of Public Accounts and deputy chairman of Leg. Offices and now deputy chairman of this subcommittee.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, maybe just one limousine will do.

MR. BRUSEKER: Either that or we'll give you a three-wheeled cart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So now under item 5 of the agenda I'd like to open the discussion to what approach our search committee will take in this search. I want to just open by making a couple of general comments. It seems to me that we have a couple of options. One is that some discussion has taken place, I think in both political parties, that the debate would centre around a freestanding, new officer versus the possibility of amalgamating the freedom of information commissioner in the future with one of the officers of our committee: the Ombudsman or the Ethics Commissioner or even maybe the Chief Electoral Officer. So with that kind of broad scope, I will open it up for some discussion. I've got Roy first and then Gary and Gary.

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not certain exactly of the amount of time involved in the duties of the Privacy Commissioner, but it would seem to me on the surface to be something in the order of half time or less, and that could vary certainly depending on how long it would take to get established and so on. I believe that a very strong case could be made for amalgamating this position with an existing position, and it's to that that I would like to speak and specifically refer to the Ethics Commissioner as being kind of a logical choice not only because of the similarity in the nature of their respective duties but also because of the job fit and so on. I would like to make a strong recommendation that we give this our first consideration: combining this with the Ethics Commissioner and evaluating the two mandates to see if they do coincide and can work well together and go from there.

MR. DICKSON: I've heard this sentiment before, the interest in terms of trying to roll this new office into one of the existing offices, and I've got some problems with it. I'll come at it from a couple of different ways. The first one is that this is a brand-new office. I'm going to encourage everybody to read the report prepared by the all-party panel on freedom of information and refer specifically to page 13 of that report, where it was the

unanimous recommendation not only of Friedel and Dickson but everybody else on that committee that, and I quote, "the Office of the Commissioner should be separate and not combined with other offices."

When we made that unanimous recommendation, we had spent a lot of time reviewing a specific proposal from the Ombudsman, who talked about expanding and rolling the two offices together, and we looked at that. It's been suggested I think in one other jurisdiction. They've done something similar in Saskatchewan with having a part-time Freedom of Information Commissioner. In the report, which then resulted in Bill 18, what we did was we elected to follow a very different model. The Saskatchewan model is based on the old federal freedom of information law, which is a little more than 10 years old. We elected not to follow that model; we followed the models of Ontario and B.C.

What that means is a commissioner who in fact has broad, far-reaching responsibilities in terms of information management, and it's a very busy job. In fact, there was a FIPA conference, the Freedom of Information and Privacy Association, held in Calgary in the fall of 1993, and they brought to it the freedom of information commissioners from Quebec, Saskatchewan, Ontario, and B.C. These people spoke, and if I had any thought before I heard them speak that maybe it was possible to have freedom of information rolled in with another Leg. office, I was quickly disabused of that notion, because what these people will tell you – and Bruce Phillips, who is the federal commissioner, was there – is that it's a very broad mandate, a very complex mandate, and it requires somebody full-time. It also requires somebody who has some particular skills.

That leads into, I guess, my next point, and it is this: I've always been opposed to trying to go with an individual and then write the job description around that person. I've always believed and I still feel strongly that we've got a public responsibility to have an open competition for the very best person we can find. I think sometimes what happens when we sort of start off with somebody in mind is that we end up sort of skewing the process in a way that I don't think is appropriate.

I make a final point, and it's this: Roy has suggested specifically the Ethics Commissioner, but there's a problem with that because the Conflicts of Interest Act, section 31(2), specifically says that the Ethics Commissioner

may not hold any office or engage in any occupation or business that might cause a conflict with the Ethics Commissioner's duties.

There's a potential conflict between a commissioner acting under the freedom of information law and the Ethics Commissioner. So as a result of that, there's that obvious conflict.

I can tell you also that there was a proposal by the government in a draft Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act that we saw just midway through the fall session to remove that provision in the Conflicts of Interest Act, but that was deleted, so that was not part of the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act.

So right now, on the face of it, my view is that it's not possible to consider the Ethics Commissioner in any event. As I say, for the earlier reasons I mentioned, I think it's important that we regard this as a stand-alone position, follow the advice of the all-party committee, and look for just the best qualified person we can find. It's going to require somebody with skills in terms of information management, a sophisticated understanding of data bases. It doesn't have to be a lawyer, but it's going to have to be somebody who has some reasonably . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: It's probably best it not be.

3:08

MR. DICKSON: I'm just ignoring these cheap shots, Mr. Chairman, and press on just so I can finish my point.

. . . sophisticated understanding of statute law, regulatory law.

Finally, I'd just say that because this is the first person that's going to hold this position, it becomes really important that we not make compromises and that we just try and find the very best qualified person that we can.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I've got Gary Friedel and Frank next on the list. Before Gary starts, I've asked Frank Work to do a little memorandum here on this dual commissioner approach. I'll just hand it out while Gary Friedel is making some of his points.

MR. FRIEDEL: I was on the freedom of information and protection of privacy special select committee – if that's the right name for it – and at the time this particular issue was discussed, I was quite concerned about the amount of time that the office would be required to fulfill. I was fairly adamant at the time that it should start out at least being not more than part-time, and I haven't changed my mind on that. I think if the duties tend to grow, then you have to deal with that. I still feel strongly that we should start out with part-time and possibly, for the sake of argument, a half-time commissioner.

The other thing I want to correct – now, I understand that it's in the record that way – is the idea that the freedom of information commissioner must be separate from any other one of the legislative offices. That was not a unanimous decision. I was opposed to that, and if it appears in the record that that is the case, I'm correcting now that I felt at the time that it was possible to combine the two. There probably are no written records of our debate on it, but I was certainly actively opposed to the concept that it must be separate, and by saying so in *Hansard* here now, I'm going to correct that notion.

I support the idea that legislative offices could be combined into two functions, without suggesting specifically that it has to be a person, but I believe we do have a situation right now where the Ethics Commissioner, Bob Clark, would be eminently qualified to perform both of these duties. I believe this committee should discuss that as a possibility, and I understand that it would require a relatively minor change in the legislation of the Ethics Commissioner Act.

I understand where you're coming from, Gary, that there is a potential for conflict if ever the freedom of information commissioner is required to rule on something that would deal with the Ethics Commissioner, but I believe that could be quite readily dealt with through the judicial system, where that specifically would have to be dealt with by someone other than the commissioner himself.

I would support, and perhaps after there is some debate on this – no; I'm going to change that. I'm actually going to move for the sake of debate

that this committee consider soliciting the present Ethics Commissioner to perform the duties of the freedom of information commissioner on a part-time basis and that this committee recommend to the Legislature amending the Conflicts of Interest Act, section 31(2) to provide for this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we have a motion. I think we will accommodate discussion. I guess there won't be any problem focusing in on the pros and cons to the motion. Frank is next on the list.

MR. BRUSEKER: Notwithstanding the powerful oratory of the three previous speakers, I'm not convinced one way or another because I simply don't feel I have enough information. So I'm disagreeing with all three of them, Mr. Chairman.

What I would like to know, for example, is if we were to pursue the concept that Gary Friedel has put forward, then we have an obvious difficulty right off the bat which is that they're both five-year terms. Do we appoint Bob Clark as Ethics Commissioner for a five-year term that ends, for argument's sake, in 1998 and a Privacy Commissioner for a five-year term that perhaps ends in the year 2000? We run into some difficulties right there if the concept is to tie it to an individual.

I guess what I would like is some information from other privacy commissioners. I know we have a motion on the floor, but I would like to suggest that we get some information from the most recently created privacy commissioner, whoever that may be, because that would probably be the most contemporary legislation . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: B.C.

MR. BRUSEKER: Is it B.C.? . . . in terms of the kind of workload that that individual faces and then perhaps also from the federal House, from the privacy commissioner there, or whatever the appropriate title is, to find out what kind of workload that individual faces, because quite honestly we are creating a new position here. We don't have any yardstick to measure from within the province of Alberta, and perhaps the best thing we could do is get a little bit of information from there.

So for the moment I would not support the motion. I would like to get a little bit more information as to the kind of work that is involved. In all honesty, I would also like to hear from the Saskatchewan individual who does fulfill both roles right now, because, as I understand it, that's the only individual that does that. I'd like to have a look at the legislation that they have, because I know that Gary Dickson has expressed some concerns that the legislation that is there is 10 or so years out of date and it's perhaps not the most current. So before we make any move to go ahead, I'd like to get a little bit more background. I'd like to request information be obtained from those three individuals: the B.C. ethics commissioner, the federal ethics commissioner, and the individual that holds the joint roles in Saskatchewan of both ethics commissioner and . . .

MR. DICKSON: You mean FOI people.

MR. BRUSEKER: FOI, yes. I'm sorry. The federal privacy commissioner, the British Columbia privacy commissioner – I'm sorry, I misspoke myself – and the Saskatchewan ethics commissioner/privacy commissioner, that has both roles. I'd like to have that before we proceed on either route.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next person on the list is Don Massey and then Victor and then Yvonne.

DR. MASSEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm following somewhat in Frank's footsteps. I really don't know the information from other places: Saskatchewan, B.C., and the Ontario model. I would hate us to appoint a freedom of information officer and have the first public display, the criticism elsewhere of that process, the press pick up all the negatives from Saskatchewan and say, "Look; here's the committee that just went ahead and did what people elsewhere are having a really bad experience with." I don't think that would serve us very well. So I think the need

for information is really, as Frank has said, pretty well established. We should find out what has been the experience and how it's been received publicly. I would hope we would get that.

3:18

The other thing. I have some difficulty in terms of combining the offices. We could do that in a variety of ways without it being the same person. For instance, it could be two people working out of the same suite of offices that Bob Clark is in right now with the same support staff. They don't have to be discreet. The administration is set up. So I think there are some permutations we might look at, but first of all, I would like to know what the experience has been elsewhere and the public reaction to that experience.

Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. DOERKSEN: I have a comment, Mr. Chairman, and then a question, which I think is fairly simple to answer. The comment is: I think we need to maybe consider an individual who will be both the freedom of information officer and the Ethics Commissioner. We need to consider whether the two offices are compatible first without reference to an individual. Once we've made the determination that the two officers can perform both functions, then we can decide whether an individual is qualified to run both. Some comments around the table are correct. You don't make the job description to fit a person. You set up the functions and the duties, and then you select an individual who can fit that. I do think we need to seriously consider whether we can operate this office in conjunction with the other one, and that's a deliberation that this committee's going to have to make. So my question, because of that issue, is: do we have any time constraints under which we must appoint a freedom of information officer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. DOERKSEN: So there's no rush to run out tomorrow and do this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. The thing that's important is to do the job properly. The public is waiting for the freedom of information and privacy Act to start working.

MR. DOERKSEN: Along with that consideration, then, of course, is what Dr. Massey has suggested, that maybe the administrative functions could also be there. The whole operational structure is something that we need to debate around the table before we select an individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

I have Yvonne and then Gary Friedel.

MRS. FRITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, believe that we should gather more information in regards to how the two offices would work, as to whether or not they're compatible in their duties. I think that whatever has been put forward here as to who it is that you would like to gather that information from, I'd be quite open to that.

Also, I have to say this. The way that it was presented here before us today, I would be quite supportive of the motion that's on the table, and I'd be supportive of actually voting on that today,

but given that people want more information, I'm willing to gather more information as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gary Friedel, then Gary Dickson.

MR. FRIEDEL: Yeah. I've made the motion sort of on the spur of the moment hoping to focus the direction of the discussion on that as an issue, and I recognize that there are things that would have to be checked, the legality first of all. As I said, I know there would have to be some minor changes made in the legislation, and Frank correctly brought up the issue of the term, which would have to be certainly coincidental to make it workable. There are some things that we have to discuss to see if this is practically and legally possible and if it would be appropriate. Because I don't believe we could adjourn today's meeting having an unvoted on motion, I would withdraw the motion subject to us at a subsequent meeting considering both the practicality, the advisability, and the legality of combining the offices.

MR. DICKSON: I'm hopeful, Mr. Chairman, and I haven't heard it yet. I'm still waiting for the reason or reasons for the initiative to roll these two offices together. The all-party panel dealt with a very strong submission from the Ombudsman, for example, that listed a whole lot of reasons why the Ombudsman thought that those two offices were compatible, a freedom of information commissioner and Ombudsman, because there's a focus of investigation in both cases.

I'd like somebody to help me better understand the reasons. I mean, why the Ethics Commissioner, a statute that probably isn't more than a dozen pages long? The freedom of information statute is quite complex, very detailed, and the amendments and schedules are going to be pages and pages and pages long. I wonder if somebody can help me. Why do we think that it's a good fit? Is it driven by the individual who currently occupies the position or because of some perceived overlap in the two offices? I wonder if somebody can explain that to me, one of the people that would like to see the merger.

MR. FRIEDEL: In a whispered conversation the suggestion was made that rather than withdrawing the motion, it might be more appropriate to table the motion so it stays as a discussion item. Am I allowed to move tabling of my own motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so.

MR. BRASSARD: If not, I would move it.

MR. BRUSEKER: I don't think you can table your own motion.

MR. BRASSARD: Then I ask that this motion be tabled until the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Roy is tabling this.

MR. DICKSON: What's tabled got taken off the table; right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. So that being tabled now, we'll continue with the discussion.

MRS. FRITZ: But you can't discuss a tabled motion.

MR. BRUSEKER: We have to have a vote on it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A vote? Okay. All those in favour of tabling Gary Friedel's motion? Opposed? Carried. The discussion will continue.

MR. BRASSARD: I originally started out by saying that I would encourage us to look at the mandate of both of these to see if there was a fit. I base that on a couple of things. I felt that the very nature of both these positions deals in strict confidentiality issues. In both instances they are taking information of a confidential nature dealing with an individual and determining what action should be taken on it. Secondly, I don't see, as I read them, that either one of these constitutes a full mandate, a full job . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: A full-time position.

MR. BRASSARD: A full-time position. Thank you, Frank. I think that because of the nature, because of the time constraints as I see them, there very well could be to a degree an overlap of some of the responsibilities, so it would make a good fit. I have to be honest when I state that the individual currently involved was part of that consideration, because I think that given his background of dealing with political, sensitive, confidential issues, he is to a large degree a natural in this instance. I guess, finally, I would have to say that budget considerations being what they are today, that was part of my recommendation as well. So from those standpoints, Mr. Chairman, I continue to press for a close examination of the mandate of these two offices to see if there is a good fit. That's where I'm coming from.

3:28

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have had discussion on direction. I guess that it's been pointed out by many of the members that they want to receive more information from other jurisdictions: the federal government, B.C., Saskatchewan, and I think Don mentioned Ontario. With the tabling of the motion, then, I guess, other than someone making a motion that we go to a public search, we will just reconvene at a later date with more information.

MR. BRUSEKER: Mr. Chairman, do you need a motion to ask for information from those individuals, or can you just pursue that as chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. From the discussion that's been recorded, we will.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay; that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So if that's to everyone's satisfaction, that's maybe where we should leave it rest this afternoon.

MR. DICKSON: Just one suggestion. Would it be useful to members to set up a telephone appointment and while we're sitting around the table, to engage, for example, some of these commissioners on the telephone and be able to ask some questions?

DR. MASSEY: I would rather read first. I'd rather have some background before I got into that. So if it could be staged that way.

MR. BRUSEKER: That's not a bad suggestion. If we could get the information from those four officers that were mentioned to members of this committee, say, a week in advance or whatever. It may be a little bit of orchestration, but if we could get their

report first and then have a meeting with a conference call here after we've had a chance to read the report – I like that. We're marrying the two concepts together.

MR. FRIEDEL: But how many are we going to be interviewing? You're talking about getting information from three or four or five of them. That's going to get a little bit awkward, I would suggest.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, we suggested four. Personally, I would like to speak to the B.C. commissioner and the Saskatchewan commissioner. I have a particular interest, given the nature of the motion, in wanting to speak to the Saskatchewan person simply because that is, as far as I understand, the only individual who currently occupies a dual-type position. So I'd like to speak to that individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I have Vic and then Gary.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, I think we ask for the information. Then we can make the determination of whom we want to talk to, if we want to talk to anybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the point was, you know, that there would likely be another meeting. But a good suggestion.

MR. DICKSON: I was just going to say that I don't know whether members would find it helpful, but since the job description is really in the statute, it might be useful that members be provided with copies of the B.C. and Saskatchewan statutes so we can compare and contrast and so on. I don't know what other sort of material we're going to get from these commissioners, but it would be useful for members to be able to look through some major changes and differences in the two statutes. We should have access to that.

The other thing. I think it's important that the all-party panel unanimous report has got a lot of material in there that's not reflected in the statute because they were policy considerations that weren't for legislation but ideas after we received 68 or 70 submissions or whatever it was and all of the oral submissions. I think it'd be useful for members of this committee to be able to have a peek at that. If we have some facility of making sure that every member has a copy of that report together with the other material while we're deciding this.

MRS. FRITZ: How thick is the report, Gary?

MR. DICKSON: I'm happy to go through and flag the things that are relevant and provide that to the chairman or Diane and make sure that's in the booklet next time, if that's satisfactory. I'd encourage everybody to read the full report, because I think it all bears hugely on this question we're wrestling with now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we all have that report at our disposal. I mean, I certainly have read it. I don't say that I remember everything that I read, but I think we were all sent that in our offices. Am I correct? I'm sure we were.

MR. DICKSON: You would have been; sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I would encourage the members to dig in their files and maybe bring it to the next meeting or refresh themselves on it.

Okay. Certainly that gives us some direction to go for the next meeting. That being the case, when is the next meeting?

MR. BRUSEKER: Do we need to look at draft budget estimates at all, Mr. Chairman, agenda item 6?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We need to approve those.

MRS. SHUMYLA: If you wanted to approve them, the only problem is we don't know whether there would be any advertising or any professional, technical, and labour. So you may want to defer that to another meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. We just have to leave those for now.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay.

MR. DICKSON: Just so I'm clear: if the motion that has been tabled were to be put back on the table then and were to be passed, there would be no open competition for the position. Do I understand that correctly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like Diane to read the motion? Is that what you're asking, Gary?

MR. DICKSON: I just want to be clear. I don't think we addressed an open competition, and I just think we should be clear. Is it the intention of people that would like to see us go that road that there be no open competition for the position?

MR. BRASSARD: Yes.

MR. DICKSON: Because that's a huge impact, then, in terms of the budget.

MR. BRASSARD: That would be my consideration, yes.

MRS. FRITZ: That was the intent; wasn't it?

MR. FRIEDEL: That definitely was my intent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's why we'll leave the draft budget estimates. We won't bother approving them today.

So what is your wish as far as the next meeting date? Will we try to piggyback that with Roy's committee and the Legislative Offices Committee or the search committee? What's your wish?

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, certainly I would recommend that we try to piggyback with the Legislative Offices Committee. I'm not sure about our subcommittee working in that way.

MR. BRASSARD: We're going to be here on the 19th. You're saying that it would be easier if we could all meet on the 19th and do all of this, make a full day of it?

MR. DOERKSEN: Would you have the information by that time?

MR. BRASSARD: Sure.

MR. FRIEDEL: There are two people that couldn't be available on that date. What we were talking about before could be done with less than an entire committee, but I think this decision should not be made without all the members here.

MR. DICKSON: My suggestion would be to pick a date in January that could dovetail with something else we're going to be doing. I think to get the material and so on, it may take some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It wouldn't take more than a month. I mean the 19th. Okay, fine. I mean, the other date that we have is the 18th of January.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, let's piggyback on that one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the dates that we had tentatively booked as budget estimate dates for the three other officers that we supervise.

MR. BRASSARD: Do you want to start earlier than 1 o'clock then? Is that what you're saying? Or go later?

3:38

MR. DOERKSEN: I'm not sure if the Alberta heritage savings trust fund is that morning; I can't remember. That would be a good day to do it either at one end of the day or the other. I mean, we're here anyway. We spent the mileage to get here. We might as well make a day of it.

MRS. SHUMYLA: Heritage doesn't meet until the 25th of January.

MR. BRASSARD: What time would we have to start then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's start at 9 a.m.

MR. BRUSEKER: So that would be a date, Mr. Chairman, that we would be looking at the budgets of the three existing officers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. We did the Ethics Commissioner today, and we've got three more to do. They are not as complicated as the ones that we did. I mean, they're a little less in depth. I mean, they're adding a year onto their budget estimates, and we're checking to see how close they came in to what their estimates were. So those three were going to be scheduled for an afternoon on the 18th. We may be able if possible to compress that down from three hours to two or something. All I'm suggesting at this point is that we start at 9 in the morning with the search committee and the Legislative Offices Committee versus with regards to the Ombudsman. Okay?

HON. MEMBERS: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Plan for all day, out of here by 4 in the afternoon. Okay? We'll have that info for sure by then, by that time in January. As far as a teleconference call, we will try to arrange a couple of them with Saskatchewan and B.C.

MR. BRUSEKER: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman: if possible, could we get the information from these officers ahead, say, by the 10th? You know, if we had it a week ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Absolutely. You can count on it.

MR. BRUSEKER: Roy and I do that all the time. We're always reading stuff.

MR. BRASSARD: What's that?

MR. BRUSEKER: You and I. We're always reading stuff.

MR. BRASSARD: Oh, yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then if that's the case, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

DR. MASSEY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don Massey. All in favour? Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 3:40 p.m.]