

[Chairman: Dr. Elliott]

[1:35 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call this meeting to order, ladies and gentlemen. The meeting has three specific items on the agenda, and they are to meet with these three officers at one, two, and three o'clock for purposes of budget review. It's understood, of course, that their working papers went through earlier to the Treasurer to be incorporated into the overall budget. It's also understood that that has no bearing on us doing our work this afternoon. We will do our work. If we have recommendations to make, the Treasurer will receive and acknowledge our recommendations. We are to do our job today.

The Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Wark, and his assistant, Pat Ledgerwood, are outside. They're ready to come in. At two o'clock, Bill Rogers and his advisers will be here, and at three o'clock, Dr. Ivany and staff for his budget review.

Are there any questions as to procedure or whatever from anybody that we might have to review at this moment?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, you had some discussion with the Provincial Treasurer. Perhaps you could just make a brief comment about that for the two members who weren't here at the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The comment this morning about the Treasurer's office was that the general guidelines that have gone through from the government to these officers we will be dealing with are zero increases as far as possible, understanding that that doesn't necessarily reflect as a zero increase in budget because of built-in increases like salaries. Anything less than 5 per cent, and hopefully closer to zero, is what the total overall instruction was to these three officers. I share that with you because those are the guidelines that they're working with, and we have that in the back of our minds as we're working with them. Are we ready to receive them?

Can we call the meeting to order. Welcome to our Chief Electoral Officer, Ken Wark, and to Mr. Ledgerwood. The purpose of our gathering here has been well reviewed — before, since, and during. For the sake of time, I'm going to ask you to do your thing and lead us through your submission. We've all had our copy for a few days. We'll let you do your presentation first, and then we'll go into discussion.

MR. WARK: Fine, Mr. Chairman. Thanks. I sent over the booklets. I imagine everybody has them. I don't think there's anything too involved. You'll find that the bottom line is that we're going to spend just a little less than last year, and I'll explain why.

In the letter, I indicated that we followed Mr. Hyndman's instructions and sent over the budget last September, as we were required to do. But I didn't plague you with a copy of that, because of course it was completely out of whack since we had about \$3.7 million in there for the enumeration. As soon as the amendments to the Election Act were approved, I cancelled the enumeration.

Perhaps the first page on the top, under A, would be the thing we could look at first. It just gives you a comparison of what we are proposing for '84-85 and what we did in '83-84. As you'll see, it's just a little less. The administration is the same. We have no change in staff; there are eight positions. The enumeration is the same. I might explain why we

want to spend some money on an enumeration next fiscal year. The election is a little less, and the reason is that we won't be training any returning officers concerning an election.

If we could just leave Appendix A alone — I call those the computer input forms, and they're a little involved. They're really the machine input bit, and they don't do very much for explaining what's happening. We did Appendix B, which is next, and that just gives you a rundown of what's involved in the \$366,761 in the admin element. As you can see by the comparison, there's no change whatsoever from last year.

Just flipping over one, Appendix C is a breakdown of the enumeration element. In effect we want to have on hand the same sum as last year. There is an explanatory page under it, on which my controller has broken down the \$264,000. The large sums are forms. As you saw when you visited us, the shelves were empty. We've just started to order some of the forms so that we can get some paid for in the '83-84 budget. But the forms changes — and I just took the order in council to Mr. Payne at noon. We'll be changing about 28 forms. Some were required because of the amendments we made to the Act. Some are changed because of experience at the last election so we will be able to facilitate administration.

I need about \$203,600, the biggest sum in there. Included in that of course is the monthly honorarium for returning officers. As you know, each returning officer gets \$75 a month, and that's included there. Other than that, there isn't anything new shown there.

The next Appendix is D, and that takes care of the election element. It's down a little. As I explained, we're not going to fuss with the returning officers about briefings for the election yet. We're kind of getting them on track for the enumeration. The \$240,000, which is the big figure, is enough to conduct perhaps two by-elections. Maybe we would be able to get by with three. Depending on where it is, a by-election costs somewhere between \$45,000 and \$70,000. So we've catered enough there for two or three by-elections and the new election forms.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, that is it. The budget per se is down by a figure of something like \$52,000, and it's mostly because we don't have to fuss about an election. Could I be that brief?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We have a question here.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, a question to Ken. I don't see anything in here for the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Does that come out of Executive Council budget, or does that come out of yours?

MR. WARK: I'm not too sure. I guess Doug is trying to find out as well, on behalf of the Speaker's office.

Just a little background there. Just before Christmas I put the question to Bill Payne, because we knew you'd want to review the budget. He advised me that when he did the amendments to the Act, he had put up a proposed budget. I don't know who that was reviewed by. His direction to me was that it will be approved by special warrant anyway and probably through the Legislative Assembly office, so you shouldn't put it in your budget.

We've been getting all sorts of calls, though. I'm interested in knowing who will fund it. I'm going to a meeting today. The first meeting is set up for January 26, and somebody is going to have to process all the necessary claims and all. I've had all sorts of calls. I think that Bob Giffin from the Executive Council office has been involved in it as well.

I'm not sure, Doug, whether you can add anything to it. Treasury was suggesting that it was the Legislative Assembly office. Doug gave us a call and said: from what I've heard, it probably should be your office. But at any rate, bottom line, I didn't put anything in the budget. For instance, there isn't anything in anybody's budget for this fiscal year, which will run out April 1, for the boundaries commission. So someone is going to have to do a special warrant. That's kind of a long answer, but I thought you might like the background.

MR. PURDY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the decision is made, you'll probably be the first to know. Then you'll advise Doug, so he . . .

MR. WARK: Doug will probably know before I know. We have no objection to doing the job, except I wasn't prepared to step in front of the curtain and say, we've got it, we're going to do it; and have somebody say, look, would you kindly mind your own business, it's not your part of the action. So we haven't done it. I only have two secretaries, but we can do it all right. I'm not suggesting we wouldn't do it if we were told to do it. I'd just like somebody to tell us to do it, if it has to be us.

I think Mr. Payne felt that it more properly fell in the Legislative Assembly office, but we didn't discuss it. He just said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill, how does that fit for an answer? Did you get the answer to your question?

MR. PURDY: I would like to know what the projection was. If Mr. Payne has a projection of what the budget is going to be, it should be brought before this committee.

MR. WARK: We had the question from the Speaker's office as to what the last one cost. Of course, we weren't in existence in '76, when the last one was done, and have no records. I imagine the Clerk's office has it, because the Clerk sat on the commission the last time.

MR. NOTLEY: Could I just ask, Mr. Chairman, if it was done through the Clerk's office last time?

MR. BLAIN: It was at that time, because of course the Clerk was the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, that's correct.

MR. BLAIN: The commission was already working when I came here. I filled in for a period of time between the departure of the former Clerk and the appointment of the present Clerk. To the best of my recollection, it was in the neighborhood of \$50,000 that was funded for the purpose.

Unfortunately, the Clerk is out at the moment. I did discuss with him on Thursday, I think, as to who should include this money in their budget and who

should make the special warrant for the purpose. His view was that it should be done by the Chief Electoral Officer. His reasoning — and I was largely in agreement with his reasoning — is that of course we're not aware of the plans of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. We know nothing of the expenditures it plans on making: what the commission's plans are for public hearings, what the expenses will be for mapping, how many times it plans to meet, and so forth.

But the point that concerns me — and I raised this with the Clerk and asked him if he would discuss it with the Chief Electoral Officer, because I feel there is some risk of it falling through the crack. The money must be there. In any event, regardless of which office does it, it will appear in the Legislation estimates, whether it comes under the Legislative Assembly office or under the Chief Electoral Officer's office.

Someone commented that one of the reasons they felt it should be done by the Clerk's office was that expenses would be paid to MLAs. But that really isn't particularly valid, because they're not being paid as MLAs but as members of the commission. At the moment, I think — and I assume from Mr. Wark's non-comment — that the opportunity has not arisen for the Clerk to discuss the matter with you.

MR. WARK: He hasn't called me yet.

MR. BLAIN: He's working on a program just now for the Speaker, and he's out momentarily. When he returns, perhaps I could nip out and raise the question with him.

MR. WARK: I've got that item on the agenda for the first meeting. I think there was a letter done to the chairman of the commission indicating he should strike a budget. So I've put it on the agenda, if he wants to.

It's a little unusual, if I can say so. Without criticizing it, the order in council, which could have solved it all, could have said who would look after it. It doesn't include any expenses for the Chief Electoral Officer at all. It mentions how everyone else gets reimbursed for hotels, accommodation, et cetera. I called the Attorney General's office and said I wasn't concerned — I have enough in my own budget for my travel — but whoever is keeping track of the total, since it has to go in the report, will be keeping track of six-sevenths of it. I got the rationale that it wasn't proper to put a named position in an order in council, which is all right; I didn't fuss with that. I guess I'm saying that it could have all been done in the order in council.

I'm not fighting the issue. I'd just like somebody to tell me to please get on with it; it's your part of the action. The Act doesn't speak to it all. The Act doesn't say who provides it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this topic, Bill, in response to your question, I'm assuming that if we in this committee have a responsibility, somebody will have the wisdom, knowledge, or authority to spell out the responsibility that we have as a committee.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I would imagine that it would fall under the responsibility of this committee or the Members' Services Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we feel brave enough to make

a recommendation to the Clerk or to the other committee? Or should we just let it drop?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I think we should wait to hear the results of the discussion between the two persons as identified. We'll have a meeting sometime soon and work on it from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine.

MR. NOTLEY: There's no imminent — the meeting will be on the 26th. Obviously the meeting on the 26th will work on a budget as to who deals with it, whether it's the Clerk's office or your office.

MR. WARK: I think the Justice is rather anxious to know. The order in council doesn't address it at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to accept the next question then. Is that acceptable?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Wark. In going through this thing, it looks like you have the same number of people working for you and the same amount of wages. Obviously, you're not planning on any increase in salary. Is that right?

MR. WARK: Well, you know how that's actioned. We will be advised from Treasury. I think all departments work the same way. Everybody puts in the salary range for the previous year. Then an amendment action takes place about February or March, I think. We then have to fill in some AFIS forms and send them over, indicating what the raise was for our union employees. It's caught up in arrears. From my experience it's an unusual way of doing it, but it gets it done. In the budget, you're not allowed to react to pay raises. It's done as a separate item.

MR. HIEBERT: During the last election an enumerator at the door made an unusual comment, indicating they felt that the amount the enumerators were getting was rather handsome. My question is: how do we compare to other provinces with regard to this enumeration, and is it reflected here in the budget?

MR. WARK: Mostly forms or training sessions here. Talking about the fee schedule for election officials — that is, the returning officer, the deputy, and all the enumerators and people — we're yards ahead of anybody in Canada. Each year at the annual Chief Electoral Officer's conference, each jurisdiction tables its latest copy of the fee schedule. At the one last July in Halifax, we took a little flak about how far ahead we are. Ours are very generous. The federal people might be reasonably close, but some of the jurisdictions are something as far as 40 per cent behind.

Ours was raised extensively in 1980. It hasn't been touched since. Mr. Payne asked if I was going to put up an order in council for a fee change this year. I said no, I was going to wait until we got closer to an enumeration.

MR. NOTLEY: Ken, have you been holding periodic meetings with the various party functionaries? How has that been working out in terms of the operation

of your office — as a helpful process or not?

MR. WARK: We used to have something called the ad hoc committee on electoral activities. That's when the Act came in, in '78. We kept that committee together right through and beyond the '79 election. Since '80, we haven't had any formal meetings. I guess in defence of that: I think we know each so well now, we pick up the phone if there's a problem. And in large part, the problems have disappeared. The largest action we now have in that regard is people who want to form new parties — three last week, two calls this morning; I guess we all saw the publicity over Mr. Kesler. We have 16 files. This doesn't require a lot of work, but we have a standard package we send to people if they want to form a party. They give us the name first, and we get that cleared. That's the largest part of the activity as far as explaining the Act to people.

Seminars for chief financial officers more than anything, Grant, because they're the folks who make us look either good or bad. I think it applies the same in your constituency associations. Those are the unpaid volunteers who get one of the three notices we send at the end of the year. We send one in December, one in January, and one in February, saying that the annual report is due March 31; please don't lose that date or you'll become deregistered. They are just working on it now, the 400 and some odd. We've had as many as 12 in the office some days. Those folks come in themselves and say: I've got all my bills, records, and bank statement; what do I do? But not so much with parties — I think everyone understands what to do now. That particularly applies to your staff, Grant.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, just one question to the Chief Electoral Officer. In both '83-84 and '84-85 budgets, I see in Code 600 on materials and supplies that electoral division maps are the same figure of \$30,605. I assume that the figure for this time is going to simply reflect the new electoral boundaries.

MR. WARK: We hope so. It all depends on the commission. The budget that will have to be struck for the boundaries commission — and Pat has already discussed it with Mr. Kennedy, who is the director there. They have a floating system. Sometimes they have a 100 per cent recovery, sometimes 50 per cent, and sometimes not that much. This time they have given us a figure based on what we've suggested will be changed. They've given us a figure to use, and it is all for overtime if there's any overtime involved. So that will have to go in the commission budget.

The 30,000 we show here is for producing the ongoing maps. If the commission's work is finished by March 31, 1985, we'll have a great scramble to have all the maps done for the returning officers to do that year's enumeration, because they have to write to each of the registered constituency associations the first week of June. When they write you they have to know, if you're in charge of such and such a constituency association, what the map looks like. They have to have divided it up into subdivisions to enumerate, so that they can write you and say: we're going to have 80 subdivisions; we need 160 enumerators; would you kindly give us that number, if you can.

DR. CARTER: I've forgotten. What's the time limit on the reporting back on the redistribution?

MR. NOTLEY: I don't think there's a formal time limit.

MR. WARK: Eighteen months.

MR. NOTLEY: I hope the objective would be to get it done this year.

MR. WARK: It's a bit critical. I've talked to Mr. Payne, because he's on the committee. If we don't get the boundaries approved — that is, the Bill amending the Electoral Divisions Act — by March 1, 1985, I must enumerate in September '85 based on the current boundaries of the current '79 electoral divisions. I wouldn't want to spend \$4 million doing that, because we'd throw it away as soon as we finished it.

So really the driving point, as a member of the commission, Grant, is to — I'm working back from December 1 of this year, so it can be in front of the Assembly, if the committee and the chairman will agree; so the spring session in February '85 will deal with it and approve it in one form or another by March 1. Then I can direct the enumerators under section 12 of the Election Act to enumerate based on the '83 electoral divisions and the new boundaries. I don't think it's an unfair timetable, but I'm only one of six.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was a question on the time frame, and the answer was 18 months. Did you mean 18 months from December 1?

MR. WARK: Yes. The commission is required to put in its interim report within 12 months of the date of establishment of the commission. That would be December 14, 1984. The final report has to be in within six months of the filing of the interim. So they could take 18 months. The last one took 17 months and 15 days. So it's a little tight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, that was your question. Are there any other questions? The Chair doesn't see any hands going up. Because of the time — and I'm at the risk of sounding rude — I just want to say thank you very much. We'll let you get on with the other problems of the day.

I'll just take one minute and see if there's anything Doug wants to say to us before we let you go. We were just finishing up at this stage when you walked in, Doug.

MR. BLAIN: I have nothing I want to say, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have your approval to let these gentlemen leave, or do you want to say anything to us first?

MR. BLAIN: With your permission, are these gentlemen aware of the contents of this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. BLAIN: Would you like them to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're going to tell us what it is, because we couldn't decipher it. You're the only one who had the code. This is the note that came in the door. I handed it to Doug, and Doug went out for clarification. Now he will tell us what it's all about.

MR. BLAIN: I have a note here which was passed to the chairman. It was originated by the Treasurer's executive assistant to Bob Giffin, who is one of the executive assistants to the Premier. It says:

re: Chief Electoral Officer, Ken Wark

In reference to a budget for the Electoral Boundaries Commission, it was agreed that, as before, the Electoral Boundaries Commission operating expenses would be part of Vote 1, support to the Legislative Assembly, but that mapping costs would be borne by the Chief Electoral Officer in his budget. Bob Giffin spoke to Ken Wark in this regard last week. There will have therefore to be an amount allocated in the CEO budget for the costs of mapping for the Electoral Boundaries Commission, most of which are cost recoverable to General Revenue since a charge is levied for the maps. If there's any question, call me . . .

Which I did. The question I posed to Nancy was — and I think it's the obvious question to everyone — by whom was it agreed? The substance of her answer was that it was agreed in Executive Council. So it would appear to me — and I also caught the Clerk on this one — that we will comply with this memorandum, and the funding for the Electoral Boundaries Commission, other than the funding for mapping, will appear in Vote 1, support to the Legislative Assembly. If the Chief Electoral Officer's estimates don't reflect the cost of mapping, they will have to be amended to reflect it. I haven't read it in detail. Do they reflect the cost of mapping?

MR. WARK: There's enough there. I should really defer to my chief financial officer. Is there enough there from what you've heard from Mr. Kennedy?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes.

MR. WARK: There's enough there. We don't have to fuss with it all. That 30,000 we show will do it nicely.

MR. BLAIN: If I may continue briefly, Mr. Chairman. Then it would appear that there is no problem in inserting the money in the Legislative Assembly estimates. But someone — and the logical someone to inform us is the Chief Electoral Officer — will have to provide us with a schedule of operations for the commission and the funds required to give effect to that schedule.

MR. WARK: We'll need to see a budget and a schedule.

MR. BLAIN: All we're saying is that you must make up the estimate, and we'll include it in our submission.

MR. WARK: Maybe I'll start with Mr. Payne's, but we can take that up. There's been one done. There's one error there: maps are not cost recoverable. I did a memo to all the MLAs. It's just not a justifiable system to charge two bits or a dollar for a map, so

we don't recover a penny.

MR. BLAIN: As an academic or extraneous comment, based on my experience from the last Electoral Boundaries Commission, although it was eight years ago, I don't really see the point in splitting it this way. The funding was done in its entirety for operation and mapping, which is part of operations. However, this has apparently been decided.

MR. WARK: Just to elaborate on the question I had from Mr. Giffin the other day, he didn't tell me who he'd been talking to but he did ask what the mapping charges would be for the boundaries commission. I said: those maps that the mapping people had to do for the commission to facilitate the interim report and the final report. That will be a map of every electoral division, and there will be all the detailed legal descriptions in there. The maps that follow, once the Bill is approved — because we wouldn't order any maps until the Bill is approved — are our job, and that's what I have the 30,000 in there for. But I agree with Doug: all the charges up to then are commission charges, because I can't use any of that. It's not law; it's just a proposal. So I agree with Doug: it's a little hairy.

I could mention another little item, Mr. Chairman, if the Clerk's office is going to do it. The order in council talks about reimbursing, let's say, Mr. Notley; it talks about how everybody except the Chief Electoral Officer gets reimbursed. It talks about actual costs for expenditures which, having talked to Treasury, means that the Hon. Steinhauer and the Hon. Chief Justice have to submit a chit for every expense. According to Treasury, "actual" means just that. It means that the cabinet ministers, the hon. Notley, and the other members have to do the same thing.

So at the first meeting, on behalf of whoever is going to look after the budget, I'd like to be able to tell all the folks: if you took lunch today, make sure you get a receipt. I don't know why the order in council was done that way. But according to Treasury, "actual" means actual; it doesn't mean the normal daily rate. It's not my business why it was done that way, except that it's going to make the administration just a fair amount tougher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask Doug or Ken: do you have any guidance for the Chair at this moment as to having anything recorded at this meeting with respect to this topic? Or do we have no action to take?

MR. WARK: My opinion would be no. It doesn't appear to have been part of discussion with the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My closing comment would be that I would like it noted that this committee goes to great length to answer Bill Purdy's questions.

MR. PURDY: Thank you.

MR. BLAIN: Before you go any further, may I make a comment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do. We have a question here from Doug Blain.

MR. BLAIN: In view of this discussion, this note, and Mr. Wark's comment, unless he has any objection I think it would be advisable to record in the minutes that Mr. Wark feels that his budget provides sufficient funds for this mapping operation.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are you happy, Mr. Wark, with our activity to this point? We'll say thank you very much for making yourself available at our request. We'll be catching up to you again shortly.

MR. NOTLEY: And keep those receipts.

MR. WARK: That's going to be something else. Thanks very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask the meeting, do you wish to react to this budget now with a motion, or would you leave it until we're through the three? Does anybody have any feeling for that position?

DR. CARTER: I move acceptance of the budget as presented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. Do we have a seconder? Thank you. I can't remember whether we use seconders here or not.

MR. PURDY: It's not necessary.

MR. BLAIN: No, you don't need seconders. If you do, it doesn't matter, but we don't need them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. For a minute there I had a lapse. Any question on the motion? Those in favor of the motion? The motion is carried. Thank you very much.

Are we ready to bring in Mr. Rogers? Everybody has a coffee and is ready to go to work? Bill, I would like to ask you, for the benefit of all of us, to introduce your staff again, please. It's been 12 months for some of us since we've seen them, but not for all of us.

MR. ROGERS: Andrew Wingate, across from me, Don Salmon, Ken Smith, Neil Henkelman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Any questions about our committee — we're what you see. We're assuming you have our committee, because we've been over your way more often maybe.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We've all had a chance to go through your submission, Bill, but we're going to ask if you would be patient with us and present it briefly. Then we'll all be following at the same time. We'll have perhaps one member of your group talk us through it, and then we'll all be at the same place at the same time. So we'll leave it with you.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, just to put it in perspective, I thought I would have a quick overview just for a few moments to look at what has occurred since the office commenced in '78-79, which was our first year of operation. As you all know, the office of the Auditor General was created by legislation, and commenced operation April 1, 1978. So the first

fiscal year was '78-79.

The first column gives the total government expenditure in dollars audited; consequently it includes not only the expenditures in the consolidated financial statements but also the expenditures of other entities such as the colleges, the universities, owned hospitals, and other entities that we audit.

The second column shows the percentage year-over-year increase. In other words 1980 increased over 1979 by 22.42 per cent and in subsequent years 39.9 per cent, 27.63 per cent, and 29.78 per cent. Those have been the increases up to and including 1983. Of course we don't have any figures yet for 1984 or 1985.

The remainder of the columns relate to the office of the Auditor General and show a total expenditure for the same years and the percentages year-over-year increase. You can see that 1983 over 1982 was 13.55 per cent; the 1984 forecast, 9.1 per cent; then the budget 1985 over that, 5.41 per cent. I'll say more about that later.

We then picked out the main expenditure types. Our most significant ones in the office are: salaries and wages of direct employees; then the professional services, which of course include the agents; and the other, which includes all other expenditure codes including fixed assets.

The third column from the end is the authorized establishment over those years, the authorized man-years, and then an interesting measurement, the cents per \$100 of expenditures. You'll notice that that has come down from 7.43 to 5.57 cents per \$100 audited. I think that represents to some extent an indication of increased productivity.

I'd like to go back now and just look at the actual authorized establishment. In 1978-79, we were really auditing 1977-78. So I was auditing that first year as the old Provincial Auditor — in other words, the preparation of the 1977-78 public accounts. The following year we were establishing the office. In the budget submission for 1980-81, which of course would be in the fall of 1979, we said that the increase of 20 positions was mainly attributable to the need to provide for additional staff in the electronic data processing audit division, to provide the time required for staff training and professional development, and to provide additional pool staff for the general and departmental audit division. In other words, this was the setting up of the office in order to carry out the responsibilities of Auditor General.

I made a statement that year to the committee:

It is the firm intention of this office to establish a new plateau at the level of approximately 185 positions whereby increased workload will be absorbed through the next several years by striving to increase productivity and audit effectiveness through the use of new techniques and automation. As staff proceed up the learning curve in these techniques, increased efficiency should result. It is anticipated that any significant increases that I request in the next several years will be specifically identified as relating to major new government programs.

The increases that you see from 185 to 189 were attributable to new programs, mainly corporate tax and several other major programs.

This year, in light of the general economic situation and the measures adopted by the

government in other areas, and generally we're responding to this situation independently, we feel that we are willing to reduce the authorized establishment for 1984-85 to 185 positions, which was the number of positions that was initially authorized in order to carry out the new mandate. Yet during this time, as you can see, there has been a considerable increase in the bodies and the size of the bodies which are audited.

So that is sort of some general background. If there are any questions, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to entertain them before moving on to specific budget questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions on this portion of the submission?

MR. MILLER: I would like your comments. It's always amazed me that with all the computers and electronic devices we've put in place — and the idea of putting them in was for greater efficiency and greater capacity per man. However, generally speaking it hasn't resulted in any decrease in manpower, which was what it was being sold on: you'll be able to have these, and then you'll be able to decrease the number of people involved. That seems to be the message that has come out, not only in your department but generally speaking. Would you comment as to whether this is a true statement, and if so, why haven't we had greater efficiency?

MR. ROGERS: I've been involved in EDP in this government since the early days; in fact the late 50s and early 60s. To my knowledge, the claim has never been that staff would be decreased through the use of computers. What has happened, and I think we've seen sufficient evidence of this — in the early days I did some studies, for instance, on the issue of driver's licences and motor vehicle registration. On one line I plotted the curve of what had occurred prior to the introduction of computers, and on another line the number of vehicle registrations and driver's licences issued. The two seemed to track each other until we introduced the computer system, at which time there was a levelling off and very much less of an increase in staff, whereas the number of driver's licences and motor vehicle registrations continued to climb.

So the effect generally — and I think this is followed through on most of the systems involved — is that if you use computers, the ability to cope with expansion, which we've experienced throughout that time really, can be handled with a lesser increase than would otherwise have occurred. When you're introducing a computer system into an expanding economy or an expanding operation — if you didn't introduce the computers over here, you would end up with more people employed than you do if the computers are introduced.

I think it would be virtually impossible — that's a strong word, but I think it would be virtually impossible to cope on a purely manual basis with, say, medicare, doing what is being done today; for instance, 40,000 or 50,000 claims a day. I think it would be very difficult to cope with. Perhaps I should say it wouldn't be practical to do it, rather than the word "impossible"; I guess everything is possible. But that has been my experience with the use of computers, and that is following through with auditing. We are able to compress thousands of hours of work into comparably few hours. But the whole audit base, that which we are auditing, is expanding,

as you can see by that second column. Andrew, you're sort of specialized in this area.

MR. WINGATE: The acid test of the question is what would happen if you took the computers away. I think the answer to that is that if you took the computers away with health care, you'd get an enormous expansion in the requirement for staff.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate that. The only analogy I would like to leave with you is that we tend to underestimate agriculture. Yet with the technology that has been developed in bigger and better machines, one man is now doing what probably 20 men did 30 years ago. So I would leave you with the fact that agriculture as we know it in Alberta is probably the most efficient in the world, and other occupations can look to that as their guideline.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to follow up on Bud's thing, and I want to take it out of the context of the Auditor General's department. I want to talk computers per se, because they're into Workers' Compensation Board and the whole thing. What I heard Mr. Rogers say — and if I'm wrong, I want to be corrected — is that all we're doing with these computers is getting more and more detailed information. I wonder how relevant a lot of this detailed information we get is. As government people who went through your office, we are sold — and I'm not pointing my finger or anything; it's a question that really bothers me. I go over to Workers' Compensation Board. They have all these machines over there, where they're going to get rid of all these files and put them on microchips and the whole bit. Just press a button and zing — instead of going to the file and picking out a file and shuffling through it, it's there in front of them. But we don't see any fewer stenographers; in fact they're telling us over there they need more space.

I have real problems in the Legislature understanding in the long run what we're doing with all this computerization. Maybe I'm wrong and I'm not seeing the big picture, but I have real problems understanding the so-called advantages of computerization. I'm like Bud: I wonder at times what we're doing with it. It's working; I don't say that there's any person out there who isn't doing their job or anything else. It just seems like we're getting information for information's sake, so to speak. I have some problems with that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've made your point, Mr. Thompson. I don't know whether your comment requires a reply.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm asking to see if whether I'm way out in left field or am on second base, striking out, or going home.

DR. CARTER: Down in the south quarter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest it might take two bottles of rye to really go through that subject properly. Does anybody wish to put forth a follow-up?

MR. ROGERS: I'd like to comment on that, Mr. Chairman, because I sort of sympathize with that observation. This matter of detailed information: I

don't think any manager should have information he doesn't need. In fact when you're designing a system, the very first step is to determine what your information needs are. So if management is doing a proper job — and we don't have any evidence to the contrary — we have to assume that they do need that information for one reason or another, very often as a result of the needs stemming from legislation. It's quite often the case.

You mention stenographers, and we have in our own office a sort of a small living example of that. We've not increased the number of stenographers for four years. Yet in those four years, we've greatly increased the amount of work that is being completed by those stenographers. The increase in productivity is solely due to the use of word processing equipment, which is another form of computerization. You can call up information you require on a screen, instead of having to ask a file clerk for a file and then two days later, when the file is delivered having to say, now what did I ask for that file for? The fact that you can immediately call up the information quite obviously increases productivity of that person.

Whether the increase in productivity is always fully realized by decreasing the number of staff, I think is a problem all management is wrestling with. As far as we're concerned, as can be seen by this presentation here, the last column does show that productivity is increasing. The only way it's increasing is through staff that are more experienced — once you're doing a job for the second or third time, it's a lot easier than having to do it the first time — and also the increased use of the computer. I believe that the impact of computers is increased productivity.

Whether management exploits that increased productivity varies from instance to instance. That's something we are increasingly on the lookout for, will be this coming year more so than ever: looking to see, in systems that are put into place, that the savings that were predicted when the systems were first authorized were indeed achieved.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat less uneasy now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's encouraging for all of us. Any other comment at this point? Bill, I'd ask you to carry on then.

MR. ROGERS: Fine, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. If we could look at the budget presentation, you'll notice the very first line says: the expenditure estimates for '84-85 increased to \$9,354,515 from \$9,061,265 in '83-84, an increase of \$293,250 or 3.24 per cent. Here we're comparing the budget for one year with the budget for the next year. But I think — and having gone through this, you probably also realize — that the economic increases given to non-management staff on April 1 are not budgeted ahead of time, and the subsequent increases given to management staff in June of the year are not budgeted ahead of time. So those represent additional expenditures over and above the budget for a year.

If you look at the \$9,061,000 for 1983-84, in that year we have on an annualized basis given increases of \$363,000 that were not budgeted for. That's both the April economic increase — not the merit; we provide for the merit — which we have no knowledge of ahead of time, because it's based on the

negotiations with the union in the first place, and the management one in June. The total of those two gave us a commitment of \$363,000 over and above what we'd seen in our last year's budget. Consequently we had in effect our own built-in inflation factor of approximately 4 per cent. To the extent that the raw figures of our budget for 1984-85 are only 3.24 per cent over the estimate for 1983-84, in sort of constant dollars we've actually decreased slightly. I think that's a realistic way of looking at it.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, the main headings of the budget for '84-85 are: manpower of \$7,161,390, supplies and services of \$2,046,125, grants of \$59,000, and fixed assets of \$88,000. On the fixed assets, I would say that part of it is an investment for the future because, as you know, we are proceeding to expand the use of computers, which expansion will be reflected in further increases in productivity as represented by a lower cost per audit per \$100.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no questions at this point, I will ask Mr. Henkelman to make some comments on manpower.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, there is one. Just so I have it clear in my mind, Mr. Rogers, you indicated that the change that will occur as a result of the negotiated settlement and then the change with respect to management, which presumably is in the \$9,061,000. However, with respect to the \$9,354,000, I take it that those changes are yet to occur.

MR. ROGERS: No, those are . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Those are estimated.

MR. ROGERS: If there is an economic this coming April and a management increase this coming June, that would be over and above.

MR. SALMON: Yes, that's over and above the \$9.3 million.

MR. ROGERS: That's right, but we have no knowledge of that at this time. It may be zero for all we know.

MR. SALMON: But the '84-85 has the one that wasn't in, in '83-84.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I understand that. So what we are looking at is a figure of \$321,000 actual increase in manpower, which may be slightly larger depending on whatever happens with respect to . . .

MR. ROGERS: Whatever happens in the future; yes, that's right.

MR. NOTLEY: And what does the \$321,000 represent — merit increases?

MR. ROGERS: It really represents a netting of the \$363,000 increase that was given last year, because that gets carried ahead. Then netted against that is the savings through a reduced number of positions that we've managed to . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Would that also take into account any merit increases as well?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, we've already taken the merit

increases. So carried forward from last year is the additional merit increases, and then that has to be reduced by the savings of a lesser number of staff.

MR. NOTLEY: I understand.

MR. ROGERS: Then of course the supplies and services are slightly down, grants are slightly down, and the fixed assets, as I say, is an investment really for the future.

As you can see from our forecast, we do have a couple of hundred thousand dollars that we will not be spending, which will lapse. To a large extent, that is due to the fact that this last year we held our agents to a more or less zero increase in fees.

MR. SALMON: Yes, we did an extra careful examination of trying to hold the line on all of the fees on those audits, and that's part of it.

MR. ROGERS: As that was the second year in succession that we had done that, we feel that the pressure will be on for increases this coming year. That's why we've provided for that contingency.

Neil, would you like to talk about manpower for a moment or two and save my voice?

MR. HENKELMAN: Yes, certainly. Manpower: we anticipate an increase of \$321,000, which is 4.7 per cent over the previous year's estimate. The \$233,000, shown as an increase in the full-time permanent salaries, is a reflection of the \$363,000 increase that Mr. Rogers previously mentioned, offset by \$100,000 that we anticipate saving on the four positions.

Wages: we anticipate a slight reduction in the wages. Employer contributions: because salaries are up, employer contributions automatically go up. The Canada Pension Plan, unemployment insurance, and provincial pension plan contributions all have to track salaries. So when we have one increase, we have the other. We also felt we were somewhat short on this year's estimate, that is 1983-84, in that we hadn't anticipated some of the additional costs — CPP and so on. We're trying to rectify that in the \$91,000.

Those are the essential components of the \$321,000. As mentioned before, we are reducing by four positions, which also brings our man-years requirement down by four. To arrive at your man-years figure, you have to take into account the number of people you anticipate having on wages and so on, and you have to work that figure in.

We contemplate a 3 per cent vacancy factor this year compared to 1983-84. We're not changing that. We contemplate hiring about 179 employees. We feel we'll have six vacant positions throughout the year.

MR. MILLER: By choice?

MR. HENKELMAN: Yes. Once we build in the 3 per cent factor . . .

MR. ROGERS: We don't have the money for any more.

MR. HENKELMAN: We don't have the moneys there.

MR. ROGERS: So that's the control.

MR. SALMON: It fluctuates, based on the timing of employees leaving and coming on.

MR. ROGERS: Yes. At sometimes of the year we might be slightly over, and at other times we would be under.

MR. MILLER: On that one aspect, if I might, Mr. Chairman. In your recruiting, do you try to get Albertans? That's your first . . .

MR. ROGERS: That's our first, yes. There was a time, only a few years ago, when that was hopeless, and we would go to the east and even overseas, offshore, to the U.K. But in our recruiting attempts, we are now not going beyond Alberta, because we feel there are people in Alberta . . . Although strangely enough, we haven't had the reaction we thought we would be getting from what you hear about the profession on the grapevine. When we have advertised, the response has been comparatively poor. I think that last time we hired two people, did we not? We had 47 responses, and we only found two people who were suitable. I know our standards are perhaps a little high but not that high.

MR. WINGATE: A lot did not qualify.

MR. ROGERS: Yes. A lot didn't have the experience.

MR. HENKELMAN: I believe we offered five, and two accepted.

MR. ROGERS: Yes, two accepted; three turned us down. So let's put it this way: from a hiring point of view it's not quite as bad as we feel it is. You have a feeling that there are a lot of people looking for positions, but we didn't really find that in our attempts to recruit three or four months ago.

MR. MILLER: This surprises me. I hear just the opposite; there are no jobs.

MR. WINGATE: We're looking for chartered accountants.

MR. ROGERS: We're looking for senior people. Our problem is to keep a balance between the qualified people and the unqualified people. The qualified people are needed to make the unqualified people effective. Our shortage was in qualified people. We always have to keep that balance. We have not had any problem getting unqualified people.

MR. MILLER: When you speak of qualified, I presume this is a person with a bachelor's degree in commerce, that he's a C.A. and has five year's experience.

MR. ROGERS: A chartered accountant.

MR. SALMON: Not necessarily that much experience but at least that qualified.

MR. ROGERS: We're basically looking for new graduates, because we'd rather train them in our own way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to have to ask the committee to observe the fact that we started late on this hour, and we're running into our last 10 or 12 minutes now. Can we keep our questions right on target? And we would ask Mr. Rogers and his staff

to perhaps hit the very important features from here on in. Thank you very much. We can go past three for a couple of minutes but not too far. Carry on please, Bill.

MR. HENKELMAN: On page 2, for information purposes, we have shown the number of positions we have and the number we have occupied and vacant. Also for information purposes, we have shown what the employer's contributions cost the office. This coming year we anticipate that it will be \$725,000. If you look at the first two items, we have to provide \$460,000 for the two pension plans. That's an expense we didn't have three years ago when we weren't required to make an employer contribution.

MR. ROGERS: That used to be through Treasury.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I see that provision for CPP/UIC has increased by 12.2 per cent, which is greater than the percentage increase in salaries being paid. Is there some other aspect in there . . .

MR. ROGERS: We spent over our . . .

MR. HENKELMAN: We were short in 1983-84. The \$143,000 is short of what we will require.

On page 3 we show the details of the allowances and supplementary benefits. We anticipate a 16.97 per cent increase. A good portion of that is because of the housing and northern allowance. During the current year, we had to move one employee to Fort McMurray, and we have to provide to the employee a housing subsidy of approximately \$1,000 a month, as well as providing him with an extra \$115 a month northern allowance. So that is a large part of our increase.

MR. ROGERS: The reason for this is that Syncrude has moved up to Fort McMurray, and all the records that we previously audited here in the city are now in Fort McMurray. Therefore we had to follow the records. That is monitoring compliance with the agreement the province has. In effect, instead of royalty, it's 50 per cent of the deemed net profit. Consequently it's a continuing audit.

MR. THOMPSON: When you say you "have to" give a thousand dollar a month subsidy, what do you mean?

MR. HENKELMAN: We put him in a government house. Through Alberta Housing Corporation, there is a set amount you charge the employee. This figure will disappear in three years, because the employees are being required to buy their homes. It's being phased out, so it's a temporary situation.

MR. THOMPSON: It's a requirement of Alberta Housing.

MR. HENKELMAN: There's what they call an economic grant, and that's the amount we can charge the employee.

MR. THOMPSON: It's nothing to do with you people; it's something else that . . . Alberta Housing is a wonderful organization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bud Miller, do you want to get into this?

MR. MILLER: Yes I do. It's in regard to Syncrude. On page 5 I see that where we have Alberta Syncrude equity, there's a \$15,000 fee.

MR. ROGERS: There are two things. The government is involved in Syncrude as one of the owners. On the other hand, because they own the natural resources, they are paid a royalty by the owners. It is in the computation of the amount payable, as I said, 50 per cent of the deemed net profit. Realizing that there is no net profit from Syncrude itself — Syncrude is only a management company, so there has to be a computation of the net profit on the whole operation because it's a joint venture. We're responsible, under the agreement — we're named in the agreement, and this really predated there being an Auditor General. Without changing the agreement, our office is responsible for determining how much that deemed net profit is and therefore how much royalty is coming to the government. If Syncrude treats any transaction in a way that we feel is not in accordance with the schedule attached to the agreement, we in effect inform the minister that he should challenge Syncrude on that particular item. Over the years we've been responsible for a number of challenges which have had the effect of increasing the royalty received by the government.

MR. SALMON: The agency audit is the equity side, the part that the province . . .

MR. ROGERS: It's determining the profit the owners made.

MR. SALMON: We're using an agent because of there involvement with the Syncrude audit itself. They're able to do this as a separate little job for us, and it ties in with the ownership by the heritage fund.

MR. ROGERS: If we were also to audit the ownership, we would in effect almost be in conflict with ourselves. The other thing is that it would cost a lot more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. Is there anything else?

MR. HENKELMAN: On pages 3 and 4 we provide a summary of supplies and services, the estimate for the two years, and the increase or decrease applicable to each item.

MR. ROGERS: I'd just like to comment that the significant one in that is professional development and conferences. As you can see, there's been a decrease of \$15,750. That is in response to economic conditions; we felt it was appropriate.

MR. THOMPSON: Before we get on, Mr. Chairman, on page 3 you have income tax audits — I know this is a small item — \$5,000, and this next year you don't have anything. What does that income tax audit involve?

MR. ROGERS: Going to Ottawa and auditing records of Alberta tax.

MR. THOMPSON: You mean you don't trust those people?

MR. ROGERS: Not one little bit. My friend over there can speak to that. We have established an alternative to us auditing there. Perhaps you'd like to speak to that, Andrew.

MR. WINGATE: There was a federal/provincial tax task force which was formed, and the objective was to get some assurance that Alberta and the rest of the provinces were getting their rightful share of tax revenue. This was in the absence of the Auditor General of Canada expressing an opinion on the figures. He's now willing to express that opinion, so this audit is no longer necessary.

MR. ROGERS: So we'll reply on what he has done.

MR. HENKELMAN: So the net on supplies and services is approximately a \$50,000 reduction. The major item is a reduction of \$50,000 for moving costs for new staff. As a result of recruiting in Alberta, we don't anticipate having to pay much in the way of moving costs, so we've reduced what we provided last year.

Page 5 includes a list of the entities that will be audited by agents, with the amount of the estimated 1983-84 and 1984-85 audit fees. We contemplate about a \$10,000 net reduction.

MR. ROGERS: There has been some movement in this area, as you can see, in that when we decide to change an agent, we bring it back to the office for at least one year before re-allocating it, if we decide to re-allocate it. That prevents one agent taking over from another, and the possible stresses and strains that could result. It is also healthy to move at reasonable rate, say after say four or five years, to change agents. Would you like to speak to that very quickly, Don?

MR. SALMON: I think the biggest change last year was taking back two of the audits in Calgary and Banff, and allocating the University of Calgary as an agency audit, which was a means whereby we could utilize our Calgary staff in a lot better way. One of the audits we took back has a different year-end, which spread our workload. It has helped us, because of the pressure of a March year-end. Basically the dollars turned out about the same with what we pulled back last year.

MR. ROGERS: And on the quiet, it allows us to periodically monitor the type of work we are getting from our agents.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Rogers, I brought this up with you before, and I wish you would just refresh my memory as to why these aren't charged to the specific department.

MR. SALMON: Why these audits are not charged a fee?

MR. MILLER: The departments. Why is it coming out of your budget? Why isn't this being paid by the . . .?

MR. SALMON: Oh, in these cases?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. SALMON: We are named the auditor in the

legislation by definition of what a provincial agency is or by the specific legislation by the organization. Because we are named the auditor, we have to be the auditor and must therefore do the work. If we chose to go to an agency situation, it did not seem fair to us that anyone else would have to incur the cost of the agent because, in effect, we are not incurring our own staff costs in doing this. The difference we're having to absorb, of course, is the additional cost of hiring outside versus what it would cost within. But other than that, this is a process whereby we can use an outside agent at our discretion and pay the fee ourselves. If the organization is charged an audit fee, then we will charge them an audit fee.

MR. ROGERS: But the decision was made a long time ago that it didn't make sense to charge the General Revenue Fund when our own expenditure was coming out of the General Revenue Fund.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate all that. In some instances that's true, but when you get into some of these irrigation districts — they are not government as much as they are private individuals.

MR. SALMON: We've had some good discussions on irrigation districts. In all of the irrigation districts, we are named the auditor in the actual Irrigation Act. That's why we're doing it. As you know, what we're doing now is increasing the fee to the point where we'll have total recovery for our costs. We're not quite there yet with some of them. It is interesting to note — just as a sideline, Mr. Chairman, to get this over quickly — that all the irrigation districts except one have paid their fees this year. They wrote a very nice but nasty letter stating that they were very upset with our fee and thought we had to justify why we increased our fee to what we did based on our discussions from before. But everyone else paid quietly and were quite happy with it. We have no problem, but we still have one where we have a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like Bud Miller to prepare the response for you on that, Don?

MR. SALMON: I haven't said yet that it's the select standing committee's fault. I haven't said that.

DR. CARTER: You did say that. Which one is it then?

MR. SALMON: Western. We'll get it.

MR. ROGERS: Oh yes, no problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bud, I'm going to suggest that you, with David Carter's help, don't let go of that topic. You and I might be around for another couple of years yet to get this corrected. In the meantime, can we continue with this budget? Where did we leave off? Did we leave off with you? No, Bill Rogers was continuing.

MR. ROGERS: Page 6: we've somewhat cut the grant to the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation. I feel this foundation is now going to be more relevant to our direct needs. They have been responsive to some of our representations. The trouble is that when you speak up, what often happens — Mr. Chairman, I think you know a little

about the background of this — happened; that is, they said, we would like you to chair the committee of legislative auditors as a part of the foundation activity, to work on those areas of direct interest to legislative auditors. I think it is an opportunity to do something very positive; consequently I will be involved. It means about three meetings a year. It's not very onerous, but I think our involvement in the work of the foundation is going to be much more direct than it has been in the past. I would like to continue this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there's a problem at this table.

MR. ROGERS: The purchase of fixed assets, Andrew, I think is partly yours. Perhaps you'd like to speak to what is developing in that area.

MR. WINGATE: The largest item in the '84-85 estimate is the expenditure of \$82,000 for what we call desk top generation equipment. These are microcomputers which can be used throughout the office. But I think the actual expenditure would only be incurred if we're satisfied at some point in '84-85 that good value for money would be received by the acquisitions. In other words, at this juncture it's a statement of intent, but it could very well not go ahead. The MV 10,000 computer installation costs are associated with a new computer we're buying this year.

MR. ROGERS: Not buying in the sense of buying; rather we have an arrangement with Public Works, Supply and Services whereby we pay on a rental basis over a five-year period with no interest factor.

MR. WINGATE: But those are the installation costs associated with that computer. That's about the extent of it. I think I've dealt with the major figure.

MR. ROGERS: The increase in dollars is not very great, because the offset is that we will be carrying out less work on the government's main computers. That's part of the aim. Of course we already pay for that on a use basis, and that will disappear and be replaced by the direct cost.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Rogers, when we were over visiting you, you had some concern regarding your lease. I don't recall whether that was coming up this year or whether you have a year or two yet. Your concern seemed to be that you're putting these computers in place. Would you like to comment on where you are on that aspect?

MR. HENKELMAN: The lease expires in October of this year. Public Works, Supply and Services have been negotiating on our behalf, and our current information is that we will be staying there.

MR. ROGERS: We've asked, as you know. I feel it's very important that we do stay there. As far as we know, it's going to be all right.

DR. CARTER: Are they jacking up the square footage on you? Have they got you as a hostage to ransom?

MR. HENKELMAN: I would hope not, because we alerted them about a year ago. There was lots of

time for them to make a move.

MR. ROGERS: As you know, this is something that is annually in my report. We don't even officially know how much that space is costing, because it is picked up by Public Works. We feel that in order to run it like a proper ship, we should know the cost we're incurring. That should be in here, but the space is not in here. I feel that's one of the shortcomings of the government accounting system employed at the moment.

MR. MILLER: You're responsible for the installation of these computers and providing the infrastructure that's needed to keep them cool and everything, are you not? So you would have that expense in case you had to move. But that's not in this budget.

MR. ROGERS: No, and in any event, Public Works would be faced with that expense if we did move. But in the larger interest, I don't think the government should move us unless they are faced with a landlord who is entirely unreasonable. We're quite happy where we are for a good number of years I would say.

MR. HENKELMAN: But there is that danger of being held hostage if they don't move on it fast enough.

MR. ROGERS: With present conditions being what they are, I can't see . . .

MR. NOTLEY: For the time being, I think you're fairly safe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. THOMPSON: This is a windup question. You mentioned the fact that your CPP and that was a little more than you expected, but taking the estimate as a whole, adding the pluses and the minuses, how close were you? Nobody can hit it right on the nose. For instance, on page 4, office repairs \$23,500; this year it's \$38,000. It sounds to me like maybe you were a little under last year. Generally speaking, how close were you on it?

MR. HENKELMAN: In total, we're about \$200,000 less than last year's estimate. We feel we're going to be short on manpower but over on supplies and services. We'll be slightly over on grants, slightly under on fixed assets. We're up and down on all of them, but in total approximately \$200,000 less.

MR. MILLER: I notice that your hospitality and lunches have gone from \$5,000 to \$3,000. Does that mean there'll be no coffee if we come over?

MR. ROGERS: I think we can get the coffee.

MR. HENKELMAN: But nothing beyond that.

MR. NOTLEY: You could have a user fee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill Rogers and crew, I think that's a good question to wind up. I'm assuming there are no other questions at this time, unless you have anything final you want to say yourselves. We had the time set aside to do this job; I think we've done it. Thank you very much for making yourselves available to be with us.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the committee for their patience. Thank you very much.

MR. MILLER: We always enjoy having you and your staff come, Mr. Rogers. You give us a lot of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And it's always to review the irrigation districts.

MR. THOMPSON: It sure beats Public Accounts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the Chair declares a three minute, 14 second break. When we come back, we will be with the Ombudsman.

[The committee recessed at 3:12 p.m. and resumed at 3:17 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Ivany, welcome to our committee again for budget review. For the benefit of us all, we'd ask you to introduce your staff and give us your verbal presentation. We'll probably interrupt as you go along.

DR. IVANY: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we'll all be at the same place at the same time.

DR. IVANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to confirm that I called you and suggested that I would bring Mr. Pennett, who is the administrative officer, and Mr. Wyatt — Bob Wyatt and Joe Pennett. They are involved in the day-to-day concerns about the budget, and I felt that it was advantageous to have them here. I think we sent a copy of the budget, along with the explanatory notes. If everyone does not have a copy, we can certainly supply additional ones. Everybody got one? All right.

You realize of course that the salary figures will not ultimately be the final figures at the end of next year; it's simply the way the budgeting process is. There will be increases, and those are recovered from the salary contingency fund. At the present time, the forecast is something like \$601,000, and that includes only the increments that will come into effect during the year. We show a total figure under salaries of \$597,594. Under wages there is no increase from the '83-84 budget. As in each of the past years, this includes an amount that allows for hiring a student for the summer months for specialized projects.

The other categories, I think — category 130: there is no increase from the '83-84 budget. Employer contributions, 140: this amount is obtained by following the guidelines of the Deputy Provincial Treasurer and covers the employer costs for UIC, CPP, dental plans, insurance plans, et cetera. The amount, 4.5 per cent, is based on the salaries and wage portion of the budget.

Allowances and supplementary benefits: there's a reduction of \$2,500 in the amount shown here from the budget year '83-84. That's basically the Law Society levy, which we've had to deal with over the last couple of years. Evidently it won't be as high this coming year as it has been in previous years, so we've reduced that amount to \$5,000.

MR. NOTLEY: We've been caught paying that.

DR. IVANY: Yes, all government lawyers are caught paying it if they belong to the Law Society.

DR. CARTER: The problem is they hope they don't catch any more lawyers.

MR. NOTLEY: If they do, they'll take the heritage trust fund to pay it.

DR. IVANY: That's the manpower control group, Mr. Chairman. If there are any questions, we can manage to look at those.

MR. MILLER: In regard to this student you hired for the summer months for specialized projects, would you give me some idea as to what that might be?

DR. IVANY: Last summer we had to use him as a part-time investigator. He's done research for the office; he's assisted investigators; he's done various things with me with regard to tours and so on. Generally speaking he is sort of a fill-in for people who are on vacation and a number of other varying things that come up during the year. He's done some statistical stuff in the office with regard to our reports — special reports, annual reports, and so on.

MR. MILLER: Is this under one of the government programs, STEP?

DR. IVANY: This student? No.

MR. MILLER: Why?

DR. IVANY: The student we've had over the last two years was a former employee of the office who went back to study law. We have not explored STEP or government programs for this. We've simply put it in our budget and proceeded to hire on that basis. I think we discussed with the members here on another occasion that perhaps this year we might advertise a little more widely with regard to the student we would bring in.

MR. MILLER: Is this the student that got the \$18,000 that was paid?

DR. IVANY: What was his salary, Joe?

MR. PENNETT: No, \$18,000 was the total amount. That would include any temporary staff we had in while other staff was away. That's the total wages, including all temporary staff.

DR. IVANY: Do you know what Paul's salary was for the year?

MR. PENNETT: \$1,500 per month for four or five months.

DR. IVANY: Five months.

MR. MILLER: I see wages are going up by 23.4 per cent. Joe, could you please clarify that aspect for me?

MR. WYATT: No, they're going down by 23.4 per cent.

DR. IVANY: They are going down, Mr. Chairman. That's a minus sign after the end.

MR. MILLER: On other ones we've had, they put a bracket around it for a decrease; I'm sorry.

DR. IVANY: The \$18,000 is not a minus; the 23.4 per cent is the minus over what it was last year. Last year it was \$23,500.

MR. MILLER: I see. Thank you.

DR. IVANY: All right, the next section: the increase in the travel expenses includes the international conference in Stockholm and the seminar in Helsinki. It also includes a sum for the new Ombudsman, which we were asked by Mr. Carter to put in to cover travel for him or her to go to the conference as well. The figure last year was some \$70,000. We're going to be . . .

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, let's just spend a little time on travel expenses. As I understand it, your total budget is around \$864,000, and \$100,000 is for travel expenses. I'm talking personally now as a member of this committee. Don't you think you're getting carried away to some degree with travelling? The office is set up for Albertans. I'm getting somewhat uneasy about the direction we're going in this area. Here we are in what I would say is an apparent restraint program, and we have 11 per cent of the budget set aside for travel. I think it needs a certain amount of justification, Mr. Ivany.

DR. IVANY: Well, sir, our investigators are on the road all the time. We do tours of the province, which we were asked to do. That has been a factor every year, and that is expensive. The alternative, I suppose, is to cut down on the tours and the investigators' travelling.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, and I would think some of this international travel too. I may be wrong, but basically from my point of view — I have problems with this. I think the people should be coming to the Ombudsman, not the Ombudsman particularly going to the people all the time. This is a major item in the budget. We may have a difference in philosophy on the thing, but \$100,000 out of an \$860,000 budget seems a considerable amount. For the record, it's one I question.

DR. IVANY: Certainly the philosophy of the office has been to go to the people, not to sit in our offices and let the people come to us. I have made it a practice to get around the province as much as possible. I think that is a policy that has certainly been endorsed by the Premier, if not by the cabinet. It can certainly be cut down if that's your wish.

MR. THOMPSON: That's my observation anyway. I think it should bear a certain amount of looking into. I would personally like to see the travel expenses broken down to find out — and possibly you can do that for us — how much is inside the province and how much is outside.

DR. IVANY: We can give you a breakdown on the current year, sure.

MR. MILLER: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. I see that you and three members of your staff are going to Stockholm and Helsinki, and you have one person going to the International Bar Association meeting in

Vienna. Could you identify the members who are going and why they're going?

DR. IVANY: Yes. Alex Weir is the chairman of the ombudsman forum of the IBA. As it happens, that meets this year as well. The international conference is every four years; the IBA meets every two years. They both fall in this particular year. He will be going to Vienna. The three members of the staff that have been proposed to go — and we've rotated this over past conferences — are Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Pennett, Bob Wyatt, and myself. As I say, extra funds are also there for the new Ombudsman.

MR. MILLER: You feel that it's essential that these people all attend, I presume.

DR. IVANY: The conference and the seminar, the seminar in particular, is — we have made a practice of rotating so that three members of the staff can go. The seminar in particular is put on for the members of the staff. That was certainly my proposal.

MR. MILLER: Do they prepare a report that could be presented to this committee? Has it been the practice that a report come to this committee from people who attend these conferences?

DR. IVANY: Not to this committee. They certainly share their experiences with the Ombudsman's staff. If the members want a report on the conference and the seminar, that can be provided.

MR. MILLER: I think it would be useful for the committee to have that information.

DR. IVANY: Sure.

MR. THOMPSON: It would give us some idea as to the importance of this international trip.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you finish with your question, Bud?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

DR. CARTER: I'd just comment vis-a-vis the international travel of the Ombudsman. A fair amount of it obviously has to do with the fact that the International Ombudsman Institute papers are here at the University of Alberta, and the present Ombudsman has certainly been instrumental in that relationship. So the building up in terms of the conference — it's quite certain that no one on the committee questions the fact of the Ombudsman's presence. It's a question of the numbers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comment on that topic? A question that went through my mind a minute ago was on staff. What about removal for a new Ombudsman, hiring, transportation, moving of staff, and so on?

DR. IVANY: Moving staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moving or replacing the Ombudsman. If there's a new Ombudsman hired, would that be in this budget?

DR. IVANY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BLAIN: It should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon.

DR. CARTER: How do you . . .

MR. BLAIN: That's true, but it belongs in this budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this where it belongs, in this budget?

MR. NOTLEY: There's no way we can begin to make an estimate.

DR. CARTER: It's one of those insurmountable "should-bes".

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll cope with that.

MR. NOTLEY: That's one order in council the opposition won't criticize.

DR. CARTER: Especially if the person's coming from Spirit River-Fairview.

DR. IVANY: We could open up a branch office there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've interrupted your presentation, you might have thought. Where did you leave off?

DR. IVANY: I left off at travel. We're moving to 260, advertising.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 260? On page?

DR. IVANY: I'm using the total budget. It's broken down into three parts: Calgary office, Edmonton office, and the total. I'm using the third page, which is the total budget. The next item is insurance. That category has been raised from \$2,000 to \$2,500 — basically inflation.

MR. PENNETT: That's advertising.

DR. IVANY: Sorry. Yes, I'm getting ahead of myself here. That amount was overspent slightly in our budget this year, so we thought we would increase it by \$500.

Freight and postage: there's no increase in that item over the present year.

Rental of properties: there's a decrease in item 350. This rental category is reduced by \$5,250. The rented word processor was returned during the present budget year, because we purchased a machine, so it was replaced by that.

Telephone and communications, category 400, has been increased by \$500. Maintenance and repairs is the same. The next item, professional, technical, and labor services, is the same. The next item, data processing services, is the same. Hospitality: again no change. Other purchased services: there's no change.

Materials and supplies: there's an increase of \$3,000 anticipated in this category. That results primarily from a survey we had done with regard to

security in the office. In the area where we store our old files and various things, we've had to install a security door and upgrade our file cabinets with bars and other security measures. The security and risk management branch of Treasury came over and looked at the office and recommended these changes be made. That is basically the increase there, some \$3,000. And that is that group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions? John Thompson has one.

MR. THOMPSON: Dr. Ivany, that's a leased office; that isn't a government building, is it?

DR. IVANY: No, the space is covered by Public Works, Supply and Services. I think we sent you the figures you asked for earlier on that. Both our offices, Calgary and Edmonton, come under the same . . .

MR. THOMPSON: The point I was trying to make was: do you feel you will need increased space in the future? I look back on the report and the complaints increased by something like 17 per cent last year. I suspect they will increase a certain amount more this year.

DR. IVANY: Twenty per cent, I think, in jurisdiction complaints this year — we've just done the statistics for the annual report.

MR. THOMPSON: But you feel you have adequate space there for the present future, if you understand what I'm getting at.

DR. IVANY: We have no room for expansion in our present location. Our staff, as I think I pointed out to this committee on a number of occasions, has not increased in the last six years. That basically is because of the type of people we have in the office. Now we've handled it; I think we can handle it. There are certainly times when we could do with another investigator or two, but we come through it. And I think it's purely the dedication of the staff we have. I certainly don't want to speak for whoever is coming into office. I prefer to work with a small, dedicated staff. I think we've been able to that, and I'm very proud of the way that we have been able to do it.

In looking at ombudsmen's offices in various parts of the country, I have seen them proliferate into bureaucracies, if you like, for want of a better word. You can have a bureaucracy with three as well as with 30. Our staff of 18 that we've maintained over the last number of years has done the job, and I think they've done it extremely well, sir.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. But basically you feel that you are bumping your head on the ceiling. If this increase continues — a 15 to 20 per cent increase in your workload each year — sooner or later that magic number of 18 is going to have to change to 22.

DR. IVANY: Yes, I think under other circumstances it probably would have changed before now. It's not impractical to visualize that some place down the road it's going to have to increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Bud Miller.

MR. MILLER: Dr. Ivany, when you're selecting your

investigators, I presume that you use pretty well the same criteria that is used, for example, in selecting a person like yourself for the job of Ombudsman. Would it be a correct statement that you look for the same type of individual?

DR. IVANY: I look for people who have had some investigative experience or somebody that we feel we can certainly teach investigative techniques. We certainly look for people with common sense who can get along with the public. So, yes, there would be a similar kind of anticipation in looking for investigators. We've been very fortunate. When was the last time we hired an investigator, Joe? Some three years anyway. Our staff has remained pretty constant over the years, so we've been very fortunate in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? How are we making out?

DR. IVANY: There are two items left, Mr. Chairman: purchase of office equipment and purchased fixed assets. I'm sorry, there's one item left: purchase of office equipment. The amount there of course has dropped by 86 per cent, because the proposed amount in this category last year was to cover the purchase of an AES machine, and that's not there this year. So we have just the basics of \$2,000 in that category.

The total forecast is an overall increase of 3.2 per cent in the budget.

There is another matter which we would like to augment the budget. If it's all right with you, we'll simply pass this around. That has to do with the computer we discussed at an earlier time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's table it right now then.

DR. IVANY: All right, sir. Bob, you might like to speak to that.

MR. WYATT: Mr. Chairman, the background information is fairly self-explanatory. In terms of statistical analysis and record management, we're finding that we are occupying an increasing amount of staff time. One-half clerical year translated to dollars would probably run between \$8,000 and \$9,000. We believe that's going to increase as we continue to experience an increase in the number of complaints. We feel we can cut that by at least 50 per cent through the use of modern technology, a computer.

At the moment we take our statistics for the annual report through a word processor. It's a long and cumbersome process during which we lose use of the word processor as a word processor. We had information services division of Public Works, Supply and Services come over and do an informal survey of our office and our needs. They have prepared a short report which is attached to this background information, which indicates that we should go in one of two directions. One is to do a full-scale survey of the electronic data processing and word processing needs at a cost of approximately \$10,000. The second is to purchase a computer at \$20,000. The position Dr. Ivany is taking is that there is little point in spending \$10,000 for a study which is likely going to recommend purchasing a \$20,000 computer. So we're asking the select committee to consider including within the budget this year the amount

\$20,000 for a computer.

MR. THOMPSON: Do we get the \$10,000?

DR. IVANY: You can certainly work on it. It's not a bad idea.

MR. WYATT: The survey through information services division was in several parts. The first part was an overview. The second part — they sent someone over who deals specifically with word processing equipment, and he confirmed that the word processor is not the way to be doing what we're trying to do.

DR. IVANY: Mr. Chairman, I think this also goes back to the point about manpower that Mr. Thompson raised earlier. It would certainly cut down on an increase in staff in the future. It ought to be the way we're looking, I think, for future development within the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I heard you say "cut down" on the increase.

DR. IVANY: I'm not saying cut the 18; I'm simply saying that it would cut down on any increase that we might anticipate, particularly in the clerical area.

MR. WYATT: The clerical employees who are now responsible for day-to-day input of these statistics are also — one of them is Mr. Pennett's secretary and the administrative clerk to the office; the other doubles as a secretary to the investigators. With an increase in case loads, the investigators obviously are writing more memoranda, which means they are putting greater demands on the secretarial staff, which means statistics get put — there has to be more shuffling of time.

We feel we can reduce the workload considerably, in addition to having increased capability to do periodic reports. From time to time, an MLA will say: what's happening in my constituency, who are they complaining about? Or a department or agency may come and say: what is the trend in your complaint pattern involving our department, and what types of complaints are you getting? At the moment it's a cumbersome process to compile that information. In many cases it's faster to do it manually than to use the word processor, and we're still not getting the type of information we feel we should be able to readily access.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the security aspect with your computer?

MR. WYATT: The program which would be compiled would have a security element to it. Initially we had discussion with information services division about tying into the government mainframe computer. Their recommendation was that we not do that because of the confidentiality provisions of the Act. They felt that although there was a level of security, they weren't prepared to guarantee the office of the Ombudsman the security we feel we need for our file information.

One of the things we're hoping to do is avoid a lot of coding. If a complaint is about delay, put in delay rather than code 74 and have to interpret it later. If we do that, there's more information on the computer than has ever existed before, and it will identify a

complainant and the nature of the complaint. Obviously we would prefer that no one else have access to that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anything tricky about how we cope with this? It sounds to me like we are receiving two budgets: one on one hand, and a supplementary or an additional or . . .

DR. IVANY: I think it has to be put in as a separate proposal, what they used to call a B budget. Basically what I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, is present it to you and the committee for your consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we're favorably impressed, then would you engineer it through some other channels?

DR. IVANY: Upon learning that, I suppose we would then take the necessary steps to have the B budget, or whatever they call it now, prepared for submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob, did you want to add that first, and then I'll take a question?

MR. WYATT: Just one thing, Mr. Chairman. You may be familiar with the computer system that the Northern Alberta Development Council purchased during the last fiscal year. Their needs are much the same as ours in terms of both statistics and document inventory. We propose to purchase basically the same type of equipment. They have built a security precaution into their system.

DR. IVANY: When we were in the north, we dropped in to look at theirs and handle it. Definitely it does fulfil the same kind of purpose that we . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suspect your need for security would be much greater than the Northern Alberta Development Council.

DR. IVANY: Security would, but that can be handled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But what you're saying is that it has that capability for your purposes.

DR. IVANY: Right.

MR. MILLER: Where did you get this figure of \$10,000 for a study? That seems extremely high.

MR. WYATT: That's in the memorandum from Public Works, Supply and Services, paragraph two, the fourth line from the bottom. The estimate of their people who deal with computers each day is \$10,000.

DR. IVANY: I agree with you, Mr. Miller, and that was one of the reasons that I thought it would be ridiculous to have a \$10,000 study to purchase a \$20,000 machine.

MR. WYATT: What they propose to do — it is not done within the government; it goes to the private sector. You hire a consultant who comes in and spends two or three weeks and tells you whether you need to upgrade your word processing equipment, whether you need to buy a computer, what interfaces you should buy, what software you should buy, and so on. In our view, we have that information now from

information services division.

DR. IVANY: For nothing.

MR. NOTLEY: And this is the proposal, the particular type of machine that you're . . .

MR. WYATT: Yes. What they do is provide specifications. They will not recommend a model. We would then go to the purchasing division of Public Works, Supply and Services, and provide them with the specifications. They would tender. The \$20,000 seems a little high, given NADC's experience. The computer market at the moment is very, very competitive. NADC got all their equipment, including software, graphics printer, and everything else they need for a little more than \$12,000; \$20,000 is an outside range. However, I'm not prepared to substitute my knowledge for their knowledge. If they're saying it may cost \$20,000, we thought we should give you the top figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a question, Bob. Before NADC bought theirs, did they go through something equivalent to this \$10,000 search and select thing?

MR. WYATT: No, they didn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was wondering if you had a background package there.

MR. WYATT: The administrative officer at NADC told me that they concluded they needed the computer, went through the same system we've gone through to this point, and decided to go and get a computer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They made their decision. Bud, did we cut you off before you were through with your discussion?

MR. MILLER: No, that was my question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MR. MILLER: I understand that you're giving this as a proposal, and you will give us a little time to think it over and come back.

DR. IVANY: Take your time, sir.

MR. WYATT: If the committee approves, then it will go through the same process this budget goes through when it goes to the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. Not agreed to the proposal, but agreed to the way in which you're handling it.

DR. IVANY: Without rushing you, if we can meet the deadline, so much the better.

MR. NOTLEY: They have the computer just outside the door.

DR. IVANY: Actually it's over at the office.

MR. WYATT: The proposal ties in as well, Mr. Chairman. If the computer proposal is accepted, the student we would be looking for this year would be someone with computing services background who

would start programming the computer and putting the information into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has a daughter looking for a job.

MR. WYATT: We propose putting all the files going back to 1967 into the computer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't have any electronic capability in your . . .

MR. WYATT: Word processing. In days gone by, it was thought that a word processor would also act as a computer. Current knowledge is that if you want a word processor, buy a word processor; if you want a computer, buy a computer.

DR. IVANY: On the other hand, that's not to denigrate the word processors we have. They fulfil a very worth-while function within the two offices. But they're different functions that we're looking at. As we age — more and more statistics, more and more matters of this sort — we would be aided by a computer. There's no question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the committee, how are we doing?

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much.

DR. IVANY: Mr. Chairman, there's just one other thing. I believe Mr. Carter and Mr. Miller want to meet with me for a few minutes. I'm prepared to do that. In preparing some stuff for them on the International Ombudsman Institute, I simply made enough copies for members of this committee as well. I thought they might like to have a history of the IOI, the procedures, the board members, and so on. I'm certainly pleased to leave that with you for distribution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's just fine. If we are through with our Ombudsman and his staff, I would like to officially thank you and terminate this portion of our meeting. We only have about two minutes of business left. So if we can hang onto Bud for two minutes and then let him go, whatever arrangement you and he and David have is up to you people. Can I do that, Bud?

MR. MILLER: Sure, that's fine.

DR. IVANY: If you can get Carter back, good luck to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He got a love letter or something and away he went. But we're still legal without him. I count noses here.

DR. IVANY: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for making yourself available at our request. We picked the time, date, and place, you'll notice, and you responded; thank you. We'll be in touch. Good to meet you, Joe. See you again.

I think we have at least two motions that are required to complete today's work. We should have a motion with respect to the Auditor General's budget.

MR. THOMPSON: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have a motion. Any question on the motion on the Auditor General?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. We now require a motion on the Ombudsman's budget. Any question on that? Any other comment?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to travel expenses. I would like these people to send us a breakdown of what it costs them to run around the province and what it costs them to run around the world. I have a problem with that kind of money going out for travel. It may be very well justified, but at the present time, I have a problem. I hope that maybe we could get some feeling for the \$100,000 for travel in that budget before we even pass the motion on this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the one that started out as 80 or 90 and then they jumped it to 100?

MR. NOTLEY: Seventy to 100.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it was jumped because of the discussion about taking the new Ombudsman on the international?

MR. THOMPSON: Obviously the Ombudsman has to go to the international conference. There's no doubt about that. I have no problem with that. It's bringing three or four of the staff along too. They've done it in the past; that's fine. I have nothing against that. But it's still a question of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to do something, John, that perhaps isn't usually done in a meeting like this, and maybe it will never be done again. I'm going to ask Doug Blain to share his thoughts on this on this very topic. Would you please, Doug? You've seen the Ombudsman's budget. You've seen his request to take people from his office on international travel. Have you any observations that you might want to share with us from other committees or discussions you've been involved with.

MR. BLAIN: It's a little difficult for me to do so, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want the tape off?

MR. BLAIN: Yes, perhaps it would be a good idea.

[The committee met in camera for 10 minutes]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you have any objections to making a motion?

MR. NOTLEY: I would move that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe it's John's motion, is it? Whatever you want. Don't let me push you around.

MR. NOTLEY: John raised it, so it's fair that way.

MR. THOMPSON: I made a motion that we request some additional information on the travel item, especially the international aspect. Besides that I

would like to have a total breakdown of how much is spent on investigative travel, on other travel inside the province, plus on the other side how much is spent for international travel. I'd just like to get the breakdown on the travel expense item.

DR. CARTER: All out of the province.

MR. THOMPSON: Out of province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now because of Grant Notley's involvement in your discussion, does that fit your understanding of what the requirement is, Grant?

MR. NOTLEY: Basically what you're saying, John, is that you want a breakdown of investigational travel, promotional travel, and all out-of-province travel.

MR. THOMPSON: And a justification for the out-of-province travel.

DR. CARTER: And the breakdown would be per person, not all lumped.

MR. THOMPSON: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm glad we have that on tape, because I think that Louise can now make a motion out of it. Four of us work at it. Bud, I'm proud of your silence on that one issue.

MR. MILLER: There's a message there. I agreed with Grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's on the record too; Bud agreed with Grant.

Any further comment on John's motion? Those in favor? That motion then is carried.

This leads us to the next item: selecting a new time, place, and date for our next meeting. I think we should deal with this quite soon. Maybe if we leave this with . . .

DR. CARTER: I'm sorry, I had to go out of the room. But what do we do about the extra computer issue?

MR. NOTLEY: Table it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the next issue.

MR. NOTLEY: I recommend . . . why do we not just defer this to the next meeting at which the chairman and the vice-chairman can make a recommendation to us? Why not? We're having another meeting, and there's no great rush. I move that it be tabled to the next meeting, at which we will hear a report from the chairman and vice-chairman, and recommendation thereon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we talk to John Thompson, the answer is liable to be this way; if we talk to the guys at Peace River and the Northern Alberta Development Council . . .

MR. THOMPSON: I'm going to surprise you. I'm in favor of their computer.

MR. MILLER: Bob, were you here when we talked about having the meeting on January 31?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that was the last meeting you people had. Did you have one suggested for the 31st?

MR. NOTLEY: If we could have it that day, it probably would finalize a number of things. We wouldn't hold up their budget. We wouldn't be unfair to them.

MR. THOMPSON: I won't be there, but I've got so much faith in the integrity and the good judgment of this committee that whatever you say is fine with me.

MR. MILLER: Better change the date.

DR. CARTER: We'll have to tough it out without having our competent secretaries around.

MR. BLAIN: We have a competent secretary already.

MRS. EMPSON: Oh, already replaced. Not even gone, and I'm already replaced.

MR. BLAIN: Easy come, easy go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I hear you say one o'clock in this room on Tuesday, January 31, 1984? The topics will be the Ombudsman's budget, the study of the Ombudsman's travel, and the Ombudsman's request for a computer.

Is there anything else that has to be dealt with at this moment?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, we have tentatively set a time of 3:30 for the Ombudsman's search committee to meet. We'll need some time at that time, so as long as we remember that we have just two and a half hours.

Have we approved the budget for the Auditor General?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes we did. We have other little pieces of business which we might have to leave until that day, like approving some minutes. We have to talk about some travel for three members of this group. That's been suggested for another group. I have no problem leaving them, because if we don't have visitors the Chair is in better control and we can ram this stuff through.

DR. CARTER: Just two questions, Mr. Chairman, on the follow-up items. Did we receive No. 1 from the Ombudsman yet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The terms of reference are to be prepared by that commission when they have their first meeting. Apparently they have something to do with building their own terms of reference. They have yet to hold their first meeting.

DR. CARTER: So it's pending.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have it? No. Is it coming? Yes.

Attendance at various conferences: we can deal with that at the next meeting on the 31st. The question comes in regarding the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. That has not been answered.

DR. CARTER: That was a carryover raised by Dennis Anderson about extending the Ombudsman's

jurisdiction to municipalities. We just keep pushing that on, and I see it being pushed on some more. There's no point doing it with one going out and the other one coming in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can accept that kind of direction. At the next meeting, we can approve minutes for three minutes.

DR. CARTER: If you want, I'm prepared to move the adoption of the minutes as circulated December 14, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Any question on the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There we are. We got rid of that one too. How about that. We're up to date.

MR. THOMPSON: I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much.

[The meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.]

This page intentionally left blank