

[Chairman: Mr. Stewart]

[12:09 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee members, I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. All of us have, I'm sure, time constraints, and we do want to get through the day's business.

Item 2 is the approval of the February 3, 1988, committee meeting minutes. They are contained in your binder under number 2, and they have been previously circulated to you. So I would ask for a motion in respect to those minutes.

MR. DROBOT: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Drobot. Seconder? Mr. Mitchell. I guess we don't really need a seconder, do we? Okay, it's been a long time since the last meeting. All in favour of the motion approving the minutes? Carried.

Item 3 is the approval of the February 24 committee minutes. May we have a mover in respect to those minutes?

DR. ELLIOTT: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Elliott. All those in favour of approval of those minutes? Carried.

Item 4 of our agenda. We have the opportunity of meeting once again with our Ombudsman, Mr. Trawick. He has now been in the office of Ombudsman since October 1 of last year, and as you'll recall, it was suggested by the committee, and indeed concurred with by Mr. Trawick, that after he'd had a few months under his belt, as it were, it would be a good idea for the committee to meet with him to find out just how things were working out and how his general objectives were being met. He has provided us with a pretty complete written report by letter of April 5, which is in your binder under Item 4. I know this has been circulated to all members, and you've had an opportunity to peruse that report, but perhaps we might ask you, Mr. Ombudsman, if you wouldn't mind, just to briefly take us through that, and then we will perhaps open it up for discussion by members: questions and comments, and so on.

MR. TRAWICK: Thank you, Fred. I will briefly take you through that report and then mention two or three other items of what I think are of note that I think the committee should be aware of.

Just in briefly dealing with the report, when I took office there was a staff position vacant and that was a very important one, the executive assistant/investigator/writer. Of course, since the annual report has to be produced, we had to fill that. Secondly, the position of solicitor was coming vacant as of the end of the year. I am pleased to be able to report to you that we've filled both those positions. We have hired Mary Marshall as our solicitor, who came to us from the Department of Health in the province of Ontario. She is a nationally renowned legal scholar in the area of health and mental health, is the editor of the law reports on health that are published by Butterworth, and has just finished writing a book with Gilbert Sharpe, who is the deputy minister in Ontario on mental health matters. It was one of those lucky things. Her husband took a position as a professor at the University of Alberta -- and those are hard to get these days -- so she decided she could make the move, and I'm delighted to be able to have gotten her on staff.

We have hired a woman named Dixie Watson as the executive assistant/writer/investigator, and I'm pleased to tell you that the first volume of the annual report was delivered to the

printers last week and the second volume this week. Of course, she's come in cold to do that, and we're very pleased there. She also has a substantial background with aged people and used to be the executive director of the Institute of Gerontology at the University of Alberta. I think that really adds to the complement of our office because a lot of our complainants are older people, and a lot of the issues that we deal with, especially in social services, have to do with the services to the elderly. So I think that's a big addition to our staff.

We've made some changes in personnel matters. I believe in regular personnel reviews and properly documented personnel files, and those have now been instituted in the office.

We've done some reorganization of our computer program, which is always the case when you institute a new computer program; after you've had about a year's experience, you can see what else to do with it. We've done some reorganization there. We're also looking now at upgrading and integrating the word processing because we're really in a secretarial bind at the moment because of the increase we're receiving.

I must say, these figures in here -- we've taken off the figures for the year -- are wrong. Our oral complaints are up 127 percent for 1987 over 1986. Of course, oral complaints are not just oral complaints; they have to be followed up, the people have to be assisted, and they have to be documented. That is really creating quite a backlog in secretarial staff. We were also up 33 percent on formal, written complaints 1987, and the increase looks like it's again going to be almost as dramatic. The increase in oral complaints, by the way, over the previous two years is 254 percent. So I guess I'm warning you as well, Mr. Chairman and committee, that we may need some additional secretarial help.

We have prepared a jurisdictional manual, summarizing all jurisdictional decisions the office has made and, as well, all jurisdictional decisions that we could find in other jurisdictions. Those aren't necessarily legal decisions, but they're procedural decisions that we've made in the office as to where our jurisdiction goes. That manual has been prepared and is now being summarized and circulated to our investigators, and I think it will be a big help.

As you will see from the list here, I have done what the committee asked me to do in terms of getting out and speaking to groups whenever possible. I've conducted the speaking events that you see in there. Since March 22 I have spoken to eight further groups, and I have six more speaking engagements scheduled before the end of June. So we're still keeping up with that.

As you also see, we did our first tour of the province since I took office, of the northeast part of the province in February. Luckily enough, we reached Bonnyville on the coldest day that the town has ever recorded, and the mayor gave me a little cube that's got the logo of Bonnyville inside it. It's got a little inscription on it that thanks you for coming there when one of the well sites outside of the city registered minus 56 that night. One of the investigators that went with us I don't think will ever recover from that and still talks about the fact that she almost froze to death when she was up there. We've been advertising the tours in advance. We did a radio commercial that we've been airing on various radio stations and, as well, have been doing some newspaper advertising and did it up there. We found that because the commercial and the newspaper advertising specifically set out what we can do and what we can't, one of the problems in past tours that we've had has been done away with, and that's people showing up that have nonjurisdictional com-

plaints. Virtually everyone that came to see us on the tour had a jurisdictional complaint that we could deal with. I think that made quite a difference.

So we're planning to do more of those. I have one scheduled that will take place in the central part of the province, centring around my addressing the Michener Centre convention in Red Deer on May 17. We are going to be touring Drayton Valley, Red Deer, Olds, and the surrounding area on May 16 and 17. Again, in June we're going to be touring the south part of the province and really hitting most of the centres in the south part of the province, ending up in my addressing, first of all, the Canadian Mental Health Association annual meeting on June 11 in Lethbridge.

We have also been able to have made a small display, which I wanted to have done because you go out to these offices and sometimes you use government buildings and sometimes you have to use hotel rooms. It seems to me important to be able to identify that the office is there and is taking complaints and that people will be seen to as well. However, I don't have the staff to have an additional staff person out there simply standing guard. So we made up a display, and that's one of the things that you can snap open and stand up. It tries to show what the office does and how it works and also to give those kinds of instructions. That's a one-time-only expense. Any time I've worked with those in the past, they usually work forever. It's a velcro type of thing, so we'll be able to change the scenes and the instructions on it with different panels as time goes on. Hopefully, that will be of some assistance.

As you know, we've instituted the special investigation into the Principal collapse and have been working very heavily on that. Our first document review produced over 250,000 pages of documents from government. My special investigators, Joe Pennett and Doug Fulford, have been summarizing those for me and have summarized them into manuals that I've been reviewing. We've been monitoring the Code investigation, and of course we'll continue to monitor it. You don't have somebody seated there every day; that seems to be a waste of time. But we have set up a television and a VCR in our office, and we're monitoring the testimony we want and also taking copies of that testimony as we think it's going to be necessary later. We also have a person who is on a part-time basis who is very experienced, who is summarizing the transcript for us and pointing out areas that we want to look into further.

We are just beginning to review witnesses now and, of course, we're going to, as we've said before — and I know this is for publication and I don't mind, because I've we've said this before — go right back to 1954 to the inception of the companies and study the regulatory procedures that were adapted and used with those companies right up until the time they collapsed and probably for about six months thereafter. We expect that our report will be in, hopefully, six weeks to two months after the Code report is finished. We naturally cannot report before the Code inquiry report is finished.

One of the things that I must mention to you is that our special warrant, of course, ran out at the end of the year with some moneys unexpended. We tried to build the best projection we had into our current budget for the additional costs of the Code investigation. The timing is not ours. Code has now announced he will go at least two more months past the time he said he was going to go when we built in our budget. So we've budgeted for staff to monitor that inquiry and to work until the end of June. It looks now like he's going to go to the end of August. Probably we will have to come back and deal with further funds in that

matter. It's just something totally outside of our control, and we can't quit monitoring the inquiry about 90 percent of the way through it and have our investigation be in any way meaningful.

We are doing some other special investigations, specifically one that we announced publicly that is into the drug testing practices in correctional institutions that were introduced this year. We're very close to having a final report out on it. We have retained a toxicologist who is reviewing the information my investigators have brought me on procedures, and we're doing an extensive legal review because there's a question of Charter compliance with these. Certainly we hope to have a report out before June 1. We've also undertaken some other confidential investigations at the request of various departments, and we are very gratified that departments of government will come to us, trusting that our investigations will be confidential, and ask us to assist them in a matter such as that. I think that is certainly a more than appropriate function of the office and certainly one that it's followed in the past.

The annual report has been a bit delayed this year simply because we've got a new person writing it without any background and, as well, it's a report that's in effect mostly over work that was done prior to my taking office. We also wanted to change the format of the report because in past Ombudsman's reports there has been some lamenting, if you will, about the length of time and difficulty in preparing the annual report. Now that we have a computer and a word processing system, we're attempting to set it up in such a way that the report will have a specific format to it, the statistics will have a specific format, and we should be able to plug in the comment that is germane to the particular year. We're hoping that the extra time we're taking this year to get it appropriately organized so it's set up in that way will come back to us: casting our bread upon the waters a little bit, if you will, so that the next year when we do it, it will be something that is routine and we can work through easily. I can tell you it's gone to the printer's. I can tell you that we expect to tender it to the Legislature prior to the end of this month. The exact date of that has not yet been worked out and, of course, will be worked out in conjunction with the Speaker's office.

That deals with an overview of the report that I gave. There are a couple of other issues I'd like to deal with that are a little more current, if you will, a couple of which I have dealt with. But if anybody's got any questions at this point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to suggest that perhaps we would just move to questions and comments with respect to the report itself as you've given it and as members have had an opportunity to read it previous to this meeting.

Mr. Fox?

MR. FOX: A couple of questions, Mr. Chairman, about the percentage increase in oral and written complaints. The figures you've got here are 33 percent and 38 percent. Does that refer to different time periods than the one that you've mentioned to us?

MR. TRAWICK: The figures that are referred to in that report are the first figures that the computer spewed out, and I put them in the letter because I was doing it that day, Mr. Fox. I realized, after looking at what the computer was doing, that our program was operating incorrectly, and I got the computer reprogrammed and got the correct figures. So I apologize for that.

MR. FOX: Okay. So 33 percent is a hundred and . . .

MR. TRAWICK: No, the figures that we have, our numerical increase in oral complaints from 1986 to 1987 is: in 1986 the figure was 4,171; in 1987 the figure was 5,585. The percentage increase is 34 percent. Figures over the two-year period '85 to '87 show an increase of 254 percent over those two years, or a 127 percent average.

MR. FOX: Oh, I see. So '87 is a 34 percent increase over '86, but in a two-year period . . .

MR. TRAWICK: Right. Over a two-year period it's a 254 percent increase because in '85 we only have 1,104 of those, so I may have again given you some information that's not correct.

The written complaints are increased 33 percent between 1986 and 1987, and the number there is from 915 to 1,219. Now, you appreciate in our system that most of the oral complaints result in our giving assistance to the complainant, usually referring them back to the appropriate complaint system of government where they can get help. We assist them not only with where they can go but whom they should see and how they should go about it, which is of course time consuming, and that is again documented, which is why the oral complaint system takes a fair amount of secretarial and a lot of investigator time. We always advise them that if they're unsatisfied after they've gone through the specific complaint procedures of government, they may come back to us. That results in a lot of the written complaints coming back. We then go ahead with a formal investigation.

MR. FOX: But a formal investigation would only proceed through written complaint. Is that right?

MR. TRAWICK: That's correct. That's the only way it can proceed. Again, I do want to assure the committee, because I've had press questions about this, that we don't let the requirement of a written complaint stand in the way of a complainant doing anything. The investigators will meet with the complainant, either in our offices or at the complainant's home when they travel over the province, and will work with a complainant who cannot reduce their complaints to writing to the system, to do so. We simply won't allow that to be a barrier to what we do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo, followed by Mr. Mitchell.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not knowing the contents of the report and not knowing what may be in the report, I want to ask the Ombudsman a couple of questions. Can you recall, Mr. Ombudsman, from memory, with the increase in the complaints whether or not there were a significant number as a result of the change in the government's health care policy on sterilization? Did that prompt an unusually great number, either that or the Supreme Court decision on abortion? Does that ring a bell in terms of the written complaints?

MR. TRAWICK: Mr. Gogo, it certainly rings a bell in terms of our being aware that it took place. A complaint dealing with either of those policies would probably be nonjurisdictional. We did not during 1987 receive a formal complaint concerning either of them; I can tell you that. A complaint on the sterilization change is, of course, a complaint about a political decision of government, and that is nonjurisdictional to our office. We

would refer that complaint back to the appropriate minister and/or to the Premier. I suppose it's conceivable a complaint about the abortion procedures could be jurisdictional if someone complained to us that they were unable to obtain an abortion and felt that the laws, procedures, and whatever of government should have allowed them to do so, but we've not received any such complaint.

MR. GOGO: I'm sorry. I thought, when you told me about the increased number of oral and written complaints -- I didn't realize whether or not you said they were jurisdictional. I thought you just said they were complaints.

MR. TRAWICK: Oh. All right.

MR. GOGO: Was the increase only on the basis of jurisdictional?

MR. TRAWICK: No, the increase is not on the basis of jurisdictional. I just wanted to make it clear that it would not be jurisdictional. We did not receive during 1987 a specific complaint regarding either of those matters.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, those members who either attended or read the minutes of the annual meeting of the Canadian Ombudsmen last year in Edmonton may recall the experience of Ontario, which had an aggressive and assertive and mobile Ombudsman traveling around the province. There was a very dramatic increase in complaints as a result of the traveling Ombudsman going into the remotest corners of the province. There's no question, looking at the Ombudsman's schedule, that we're in for a similar type of activity, and I think the committee was aware of that when we interviewed Mr. Trawick in the first instance. So I would anticipate that not long down the road, judging by his travel schedule, we're going to be faced as a committee with a request of some kind in terms of some type of assistance for his office to accommodate the dramatic increase in his activities.

The other question I had: have you had any and do you offer any solace to those who come to you on the question of language? In other words, are you getting complaints from people in a language other than English, and are you able to accommodate them?

MR. TRAWICK: If you're talking about complainants who speak another language and not English, we have instituted a liaison both in the Calgary and Edmonton offices with the -- and I'm sorry I can't remember the name of the organization -- organization that provides aid and assistance to immigrants, because they also offer a clearinghouse service of interpreters for people, in excess of 20 languages, both in Calgary and Edmonton. When I took office, some of the investigators were trying to struggle with some complainants who, while they could speak some English, were not fluent in the language, and it was making things difficult. So we made this liaison, and we now operate with an interpreter in any situation where we're concerned that we're not getting proper communication.

MR. GOGO: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Trawick, would

you offhand be able to tell us what percentage of total complaints are Workers' Compensation Board?

MR. TRAWICK: It is the second largest source of our complaints. Having said that, let me see if I can tell you, Mr. Mitchell. I'm sorry; my tables on this -- and this is just a rough draft of the report -- are not the subject of a spread sheet yet. I may be able to give you that total, and then again I may not. I don't think I can.

I can tell you that it is the second largest source of complaints and always really, historically, has been second to social services and community health. I think the percentage is in the high teens in terms of the total number of complaints, and I can tell you that towards the end of last year the number of complaints in proportion was up. That was primarily as a result of the problems with the board not having a full complement of members and not processing the complaints to the board level as quickly as possible. I've had several meetings with Mr. Pals about that matter and also a meeting with Mr. Dinning. Now that the new members of the board have been appointed, I'm hopeful the backlog is going to slow down. We also participated, of course, in the recent study that was released, and it's our intention to make a formal presentation to the hearings that are going to take place on that study. We're preparing one now.

MR. MITCHELL: Good. Can you give us some indication of how many times you reverse a Workers' Compensation Board decision, where you have determined that their policy hasn't been implemented properly? What portion of those times would you be supportive?

MR. TRAWICK: In terms of supporting workers' compensation complaints, the percentage is fairly low. I couldn't tell you what it is offhand, and I wouldn't want to try it offhand, but it's fairly low. Our general percentage of supported complaints, historically through the years the office has existed, has been something around 20 percent. It varies between 18 and 22 percent. I would think that our percentage on supporting workers' compensation complaints is a little bit lower than that.

Basically, of course, what we look for is procedural fairness. We look to make sure that all evidence that the worker has produced has been considered as well as that of the board. One would only recommend that the board rehear the matter, look at it again, if one was convinced that they had ignored important evidence. That certainly sometimes happens. But I do have to say to you that while the procedures are not as fast as I would like to see, the scrutiny of the complaints by the board itself does seem to have been fairly thorough. We don't recommend on those probably as much as we might on some other departments.

MR. GOGO: Could you indicate to Mr. Mitchell that you cannot reverse decisions of anybody? You can simply use moral suasion and recommendations. I think there's a misunderstanding.

MR. MITCHELL: Where would you... What proportion would you disagree with?

MR. TRAWICK: And, of course, that's what we do. On an administrative tribunal, which the Worker's Compensation Board is, we review it. And we're entitled -- and legally that's

now been clarified for Canada by a decision of the province of Ontario -- both to review the factual decision and the nature of the decision as well as the procedural fairness. But we can only make recommendation that it be looked at again, taking into account particular factors that weren't looked at before with a different orientation. And those are the kinds of recommendations we make.

MR. MITCHELL: Would you be able to assess whether you feel that the Workers' Compensation Board -- the policy under which it is structured, its philosophy, and so on -- is broad enough or not broad enough, that it's missing certain kinds of injuries or not meeting certain kinds of needs? Or is that non-jurisdictional, that kind of decision?

MR. TRAWICK: If we were to be convinced that, for example, by reason of the way the policies were drawn or even the Act was drawn, a particular type of injury wasn't covered and we felt it was fair that it should, we could certainly make a recommendation on that. Section 20 of our Act allows us to do that. I don't have any information about that at the moment, but we could make such recommendations.

But as far as dealing with the scheme of the Act or what is there or the purpose of it, those are political matters. I frankly think many Ombudsmen offices both in Canada and internationally have gotten themselves into difficulty by involving themselves in political and lobbying matters, and I don't think we should be doing that; I think we should refer it back to the elected representatives.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay. Contraceptive counseling, to pursue the point originally raised by Mr. Gogo. There is confusion, it seems, possibly in the application of that policy. On the one hand, there's an indication that contraceptive counseling has been deinsured. On the other hand, the minister and the government have said, "No, you can still get contraceptive counseling." Are you receiving complaints from people for whom that policy isn't working? That isn't a political question as much as it is the application.

MR. TRAWICK: We have not received complaints of that nature. I think they would be jurisdictional, but we've not received any such complaint.

MR. MITCHELL: Have you received complaints from small businesspeople or others who are dealing with organizations like the Alberta Opportunity Company who have tried to get funding but can't and feel that those guidelines haven't been applied fairly?

MR. TRAWICK: Yes, we often receive complaints from small business dealing with any of the programs: Alberta Opportunity Company, the agricultural programs sometimes, Department of Tourism supported programs. We also receive complaints about the Treasury Branches which are jurisdictional, that they don't dispense money freely enough. So we often work in those financial areas.

MR. MITCHELL: Will you be reporting on those in your report?

MR. TRAWICK: Well, every complaint that we have... There's going to be a different format, and I don't mind talking

about it a bit. But I do want to have a little bit of the drama and take the curtain up on my report when it's tabled, so I don't want our *Sun* reporter to know all about it today, or the committee. But what we are going to be doing in this particular report -- and again because we have the benefit of the computer, we are going to be providing a very short, one-line summary that depicts each and every complaint that the office has received so there will be no doubt about what complaints we have received and looked at, rather than examples.

MR. MITCHELL: That sounds very good, to the extent that there may be some policy implications in the area of small business. There could be. We should be able to garner that.

MR. TRAWICK: Yes, and the other thing that we are going to summarize in the report, because I've always thought it important, is each and every policy change of administration that's come about as a result of our intervention.

MR. MITCHELL: Finally, I'm interested in the nonjurisdictional/jurisdictional split, and I appreciate what you're doing in defining that. I'd like your opinion on it, and then we could maybe make a motion. Would it be possible for you to consider a report to this committee on whether there are nonjurisdictional issues that require a process of review or redress that would fall into a number of categories: nonjurisdictional but still within some arm of government, whether remote or otherwise -- for example, a complaint to AGT; I don't know -- or whether there are nonjurisdictional areas that fall outside even that but still require some redress and might, for example, be solved or addressed with the recommendation of an advocate of some kind? For example, do you see that there are areas for the aged in nursing homes and so on, perhaps, where an advocate might be more appropriate than the Ombudsman? Yet we don't have an advocate, so there are legitimate concerns that aren't being met.

MR. TRAWICK: Certainly in the past Ombudsmen have done that, and in the annual report they're often reported to the Legislatures. In the last annual report of my predecessor he recommended, for example, that advocates be appointed to advocate on behalf of the mentally ill, whether involuntary or not, and also recommended our jurisdiction would be involuntary patients and, over such advocacy service, be maintained and continued. That's been a usual thing, and we will continue to do that.

As you may not be aware -- I think some of you are -- in 1977 this committee, not too long after it was first instituted, did a review that included hearings around the province about the Ombudsman's jurisdiction and recommended some changes to the Act. It will be my intention to at some stage, probably prior to the end of my first year in office, report to the committee on jurisdictional matters that we see that may cause us any problems.

And, of course, if we have any specific jurisdictional matters that arise where there's a doubt about jurisdiction, my intention is to bring that matter to the committee first before we consider a challenge in the courts, in order to see whether we can obtain consensus. So I think we are going to be quite forthcoming on that, and as well, one of the things I speak on when I'm doing this public speaking is the jurisdiction of the office. I won't bore you with my standard speech today, but any member of the committee that wants to review our jurisdictional manual sum-

mary once it's boiled down or wants to speak to us -- because it doesn't contain anything about specific cases; it just deals with jurisdictions -- or wants to come over and meet with us and go through those things, I'd be more than happy.

MR. MITCHELL: So you anticipate your report at the end of the year on the issue of jurisdiction will cover areas which might under no circumstances be included in your jurisdiction but which could be handled in some other way?

MR. TRAWICK: It may. It'll depend whether we see a need. Now, our annual report isn't going to cover that because it's the activities of 1987. But certainly if I see a need, that will come to this committee.

MR. MITCHELL: Great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Elliott.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ombudsman, my questions are to do with the profile of the office, and I'm happy to report that I've had some very favourable comments coming back to me about your speaking engagements and some of the activities there. With the exception of one or two I can detect perhaps originating in your office, I'm assuming that these are almost without exception invitational engagements. Is this half the invitations or 100 percent of the invitations? Do you meet them all or half of them or what? How does that fit?

MR. TRAWICK: I'd sort of like to be like the girl at the dance where you have to fill in the dance card and tell you that they were fighting over me. But I've tried to accept every invitation from every group that I think would act as a resource group, and if you look through the nature of the groups, you will see that sort of thing.

DR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MR. TRAWICK: It seems to me that if you can get out and speak to 50 people and they're people who are going to talk to other people, then you've got a form of ripple effect. I have only turned down speaking engagements when my schedule just won't allow that to happen or if there's a conflict. Three of my investigators have expressed interest in speaking to them and have now handled some speaking engagements. I wanted them, first of all, to go out with me and sort of do a team speaking thing just to see how they did. I've been happy with that, and they're now starting to do that. I have a third investigator that now wants to do that as well, so we're going to increase our team. We're going to still try to meet the demand that comes in. I guess I'm still new enough I'm flattered people want me to speak, and I'll go.

DR. ELLIOTT: Your comments about taking a team are interesting because my next question is with respect to the questions and answers. Do you have a recorder with you, a staff member, to reflect the tone of the questions that are being asked in any given community? Is that useful information?

MR. TRAWICK: I have done one or two speaking engagements without a question period, where the group really resisted it, but I try to insist that I won't speak unless there's a 15- or 20-minute opportunity for questions from the audience. It's in-

teresting to note that . . . Just as an example, last week I spoke to the Safety Net II Conference in Calgary on Thursday at noon. There were 300 people there, most of them involved in child welfare and Children's Guardian matters, a lot of them professionals. I left time for questions, and I didn't get any, which is one of the first times that's happened. In the evening I spoke to the Kiwanis Club in Sherwood Park, who had organized a bit of a community meeting. They had other people that came. There were about 65 people there, and I was peppered with questions. In fact, the question period went on for about an hour, and people appeared interested. So you never know what kind of group will ask you questions, but I really like to do that.

As far as taking somebody along and recording, it I guess one of things that I don't like is to tie up staff people. I mean, I am not an elected representative or whatever. My schedule's not that tight. I don't really like to tie up staff people to go along and shepherd me through matters just so they can hear questions. I try to keep track of them, at least in my own mind, but I don't have somebody along to do that.

DR. ELLIOTT: I noticed in your organized tour to a place like St. Paul and so on, you had speaking engagements there. Does that originate at the other end, or do you encourage that while you are out on those tours?

MR. TRAWICK: Well, it works both ways. For example, we are going to do the tour of the central part of the province, and the reason I chose that at that time is that Michener Centre asked me to be the keynote speaker at their two-day conference. I had had a request for some time from the St. Paul association for the handicapped to speak to them, so I incorporated that up there.

What we did when we went out — one of my investigators used to be the editor of the *Bonnyville Nouvelle*, so he knows the area pretty well. What we tried to do was to get what we would think of as being the gatekeeper organizations to ask us to come and then formally meet with them. I guess I didn't indicate it there, but we held two community meetings in two of the districts. They weren't as successful as we'd like because of the cold weather, but some people came out. They were the people that we would normally think would interact with people who should have the office, so we met with them over breakfast on both dates and tried to spread the word that way.

DR. ELLIOTT: When you first appeared before us in the interview time, you had certain firm opinions in your own mind about the profile of the office and what your reaction might be. How does this series of engagements reflect your expectations now with respect to the profile of the office?

MR. TRAWICK: They certainly bring in complaints. You will meet with the people, and the first interesting thing was that most of them were jurisdictional. In the past my investigators had told me that they would often get people on tours that really didn't know why the office was there and just came to visit. And I think the specific advertising helps. But you certainly get complaints from those people, and you always find you will get about half again as many complaints from people who weren't there but have heard about it from their friends. Generally, they're jurisdictional, so I think that they're helpful.

I think it just also helps that people have it in their minds. Every time we've gone to a city like that or done a speaking engagement outside of a city, the press has always reported in the weekly newspaper that we were there and have pretty specifi-

cally reported what we do. That's free advertising that I think works quite well. So it's bringing in, if you will, work. But the object, of course, is not to bring in work. The object is to make sure that everybody who has already paid for the office by paying their taxes knows that they can come.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX: Well, at the risk of incurring the wrath of the Chairman, I want to reaffirm that objectivity is an essential part of your operation, Mr. Ombudsman, and I'm wondering if you were able to be scrupulous in that regard during the battle of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is definitely out of order.

MR. MITCHELL: Were there any complaints about the referee, for Calgary?

MR. TRAWICK: Well, I can tell you this. I was in Calgary taking public complaints, which is another thing that one of my investigators convinced me was a good idea and works well. In other words, I'm in Calgary fairly often but to take perhaps the two days a month that I'm there and to advertise that I'm there and that I will personally see people . . . I did that during the playoffs and got a nice call from my former law firm during the afternoon that they'd found a ticket for me and I should go with them. But I must say on Friday the complainants found a very disappointed Ombudsman after that Thursday night game was lost by the Calgary Flames.

MR. FOX: It was won by the Edmonton Oilers.

MR. TRAWICK: It was indeed, Mr. Fox, won by the Edmonton Oilers. I noticed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything further?

MR. FOX: I didn't mean to be frivolous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Buck?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, my apologies for being a little bit late. I guess I've been around since we started this business, Mr. Trawick. You've been in the office long enough now to be able to review some of the work of your predecessors. Are you in a position to be able to indicate that the office is doing what it was meant to do from the time we set it up? Do you feel comfortable in that?

MR. TRAWICK: Very much so. I think that the individual personality of the individual Ombudsman may change to some extent the public's perception of the office. The staff are good. They're dedicated. In my particular case I came upon a staff that was absolutely determined that the office would serve people well even though there was no Ombudsman there. The acting Ombudsman, of course, gets great credit for that, but so did the rest of the staff. The office everyday serves people who call up and they need to use us as a clearinghouse, they need to use us to take their complaints, they need to use us to get their problems solved, and everybody that calls us gets some form of help.

I think the office is doing exactly what a democracy needs, and exactly what it was designed to do in the first place.

You know, you hear about things like the Principal Group, which is an anomaly and everything else. The most satisfying thing is when someone phones up with a very minor complaint; they're satisfying a need personally. They phone with a very minor complaint but an appropriate complaint. We can deal with it, we can handle it, we can help them, and even though it's worth \$2, \$200, \$2 million, or nothing, we can put the resources to work and get the problem solved. Having practised law where we're continually telling people that something has wronged them but they can't afford to follow it up, that's very gratifying to me. Yes, I think it's working very well.

I should also tell you that my predecessor, Mr. Sawyer, who I think has received some fairly short shrift from the media, was instrumental. My report will be dealing with this in making sure that the investigators were able to operate on an entrepreneurial basis, to immediately take control of a situation and attempt to resolve it as quickly as possible. Because of his background, having been the police chief that introduced the concept of zone policing into Canada, I think he had a real feel for helping people sort of on a first-meeting basis and getting working on that. The investigators do that in the office. He pioneered that, they are very happy with it, and it works very well.

DR. BUCK: I'm glad to hear about that because you can imagine the discussions that went around when we were looking at appointing the first Ombudsman. So I'm glad to see that the enthusiasm is being perpetuated.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, committee, that we will now move over from the report itself to the other items the Ombudsman wishes to raise with the committee.

MR. TRAWICK: Some of them are housekeeping and some of them are more important.

I did mention to you that the Code inquiry is going to go on longer, and I guess, if you will, Mr. Chairman, tried to soften you up a little bit for the fact that we may need something more there.

In terms of our last year's budget, we've got the final figures in, and we came in, I think, pretty well on our budget. We had not thought that we would spend all the special warrant moneys, and we did not. We have left from last year's budget, unexpended -- and I think the figures are pretty well final -- about \$70,534. That represents around one-third of the Code money. We'd expected to have have two-thirds of it expended and did have two-thirds of it expended, and we're about right on the budget for last year. So I thought that was worth while setting out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions with respect to the budgetary matters or the investigation of the Ombudsman into the Principal affair?

MR. FOX: I'm sure when you next need money we can arrange a loan guarantee.

MR. GOGO: You're pretty cocky today, aren't you?

MR. TRAWICK: I was going to ask if that extended to the personal affairs of the Ombudsman, but I suppose that would be out

of order.

The secretarial matter. I may well need to come back for some help regarding secretarial positions. As you will recall, my predecessor dropped two secretarial positions. We are in the position now that our solicitor is handwriting legal opinions to me, which I think we will be able to get away from once we get the word processing system operating better with some form letters, which is something we hope to be able to do by the end of the month. But I think we're going to be short on secretarial help. So I may be back to look for some assistance there. I want to run it through the summer, because our complaints slow down during the summer, and get an idea.

The point that I think this committee will understand but perhaps some others don't is that under section 11(1) of my Act, we have no control over our work input. We must in this province mandatorily investigate every jurisdictional complaint that comes along. Section 11(1) of my Act says it is my "function and duty" to investigate. Every other Ombudsman Act in Canada says the Ombudsman "may", and so they may turn down investigations. I think ours is the appropriate one, but we've got to react when the complaints come in. So if volume goes up, we're simply going to have to deal with that.

I've updated you on my speaking engagements, I believe. The only other problem that I have at the moment is going to be a reclassification problem with investigators. I spoke to you briefly about that at our earlier meeting, and that is that a number of the investigators are on contract. The personnel office has said to us we should not have people on contract for more than two years; we should convert them to permanent staff. But, of course, the reason they were on contract was to maximize the pay schedule so that we could hire as a result of that last hiring, as you know and we discussed. So I may have to look for some reclassification of those positions as well.

I think, speaking very frankly, the decision to go onto contract for investigators probably wasn't investigated as thoroughly by the office as it ought to have been when it was brought in. Because we will either have to continue with that and get this committee, as it can under the Act, to recommend that we be exempted from the requirements of the personnel administration office, or we will have to make some changes that will result in some budgetary changes to go back to permanent staff. Quite frankly, I can't tell people that PAO insists they convert to permanent staff at the end of two years and yet have them take a 25 percent cut in their wages. I suspect that some of them may find that to be unacceptable. That's a housekeeping matter but, again, one I wanted to bring to your attention now that I may be bringing back to the committee later. It's certainly not going to be a difficult matter to deal with or any crisis. It's just something that will have to be dealt with.

And a final matter I wanted to raise was the International Ombudsman Conference. I wanted to get an idea whether this committee would be sending any delegates to that conference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That item is on our agenda, later on in the agenda. We'll get back to you as quickly as we can on that.

MR. TRAWICK: So those were the minor other matters I wanted to raise. I'd be interested, too, in any general comments about anything that you're hearing from constituents or otherwise that we could be doing to change or improve, and I'd be interested in that at any time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone have any comments on that par-

ticular point at this time?

MR. FOX: Keep up the good work.

DR. ELLIOTT: A short answer to one short question? Did the nurses' strike or a couple of the teachers' strikes in the last few months reflect much or at all in your office?

MR. TRAWICK: No.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: I should mention to you, Mr. Trawick, that I'm advertising your office in my newsletter. It went out this week, so if you hear of complaints from Edmonton-Meadowlark...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only difficulty is nobody reads it.

MR. GOGO: There's an applicant as an investigator after the next election.

MR. FOX: That's good. Fred's had legal background.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let me just say in wrapping up this particular portion of our meeting that we're pleased to have you here, Mr. Trawick, and to read your report and to hear your comments with respect to what, I think, is very helpful to the committee members. I think it's extremely valuable for us to have a sort of forward-looking type of approach to this thing so that we can follow the progress of the office and where it's going and try to be able to adapt to the changing circumstances as they evolve. I think that's very helpful to us, and I'm sure all members appreciate that and also appreciate your comment with respect to keeping in touch with you even on a one-to-one basis. I know that all members are cognizant of the fact that you've extended that invitation, and we'll be in touch with you as individual concerns come up or if they want to look into that jurisdictional manual aspect or any other aspect of your operations.

Any other matters that you wish to raise before we excuse the Ombudsman? If not, maybe just to say thank you for coming. From the standpoint of getting together again, we could certainly chat about that. It may be very appropriate if members feel that we we'd like to get together. Perhaps the latter part of this year may be an appropriate time that we can discuss that individually with you and arrange for a meeting.

MR. TRAWICK: Well, I'd be delighted to do that. Of course, I know the committee has always attended our offices at least once a year, but some new members may not have, and I'd be delighted to have you over to the offices and show you around and show you what we do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's an excellent suggestion. We may very well convene a meeting at your offices, when you can provide lunch. Keep our budget down?

MR. TRAWICK: Yes, I think I could probably find that in my budget.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
We'll just proceed with our agenda. Item 5 is report items

from the minutes. You recall that arising out of the discussions that we had concerning the budgets of the three offices, we were talking in terms of air travel and air travel policy, and I think Mr. Mitchell made a motion at that point in time which was put in abeyance pending a report back from the Chair concerning the government's policy applicable to air travel for deputy ministers and, indeed, the various offices.

I did have some communications with each of our officers on this point, and let me just briefly review the responses that I got from each. In the case of the Ombudsman, he has a definite policy of no first-class travel; business class, perhaps, if the length of the trip and the requirements to do paper work are such that dictate business class. Apparently, he indicated the former Ombudsman had a policy of first class for overseas, but this is not the case with the present Ombudsman. His Canberra trip to the international conference is already booked, and he did that on the basis of getting the most reasonable fare accommodation for that.

In the case of the Chief Electoral Officer, he has never gone first class and almost always economy. With bookings well in advance he is, in his position and the nature of his responsibilities, always able to determine his travel requirements well ahead of time, which are not great in any event, and he's able to make his bookings accordingly.

In the case of the Auditor General, his policy is to take the most reasonable and cost-effective means of travel. He does not travel first class, he indicated to me, and he travels business class if he's going to a particular meeting where distance or his responsibilities in trying to do some paper work along the way indicate that some privacy is required. So that's the general policy with respect to each of the offices. None of them has a policy that lends itself to first-class travel.

In the case of the public service generally, I chatted with Mr. Jim Dixon of the Public Service Commission. The general policy in the government is that it's economy unless the deputy minister authorizes otherwise. That's to allow a certain amount of flexibility because there are certain circumstances in which travel in either business or first class is in fact required; for example, in an instance where you're on the way to an inter-governmental meeting and the minister and others need to get together to have sort of a meeting on the way. Then privacy may dictate that some other mode of accommodation is reasonable.

So that's basically my report to members in respect to that undertaking. Any comments?

MR. FOX: We appreciate your thoroughness.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have two other report items. There's the status report from the Chief Electoral Officer on the enumeration 1988, and it's contained in your binder, I believe, under 5(b). It's dated February 23. This document was previously circulated to all members, and if any have comments with respect to it or questions, I would entertain those.

If not, perhaps if we just had a motion to receive the report, that might be in order.

MR. FOX: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Moved by Mr. Fox. All in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Report item (c) is a report from the Auditor General on hosting the Heilongjiang Audit Bureau. This report was requested of the Auditor General by the committee, and it's dated March 1, 1988. It's contained in your binder and was previously circulated to all members. It just gives a breakdown of the costs relating to that particular visit. Any comments or questions?

MR. GOGO: Obviously, those hockey tickets weren't scalped.

MR. FOX: Citizens of Edmonton can buy them for less than face value.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got to pay people to go.

May I have a motion then with respect to the receiving of this particular report? Mr. Ady. All in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other business, 6 (a), the 1988 conventions. You'll recall that we have four specific conventions that relate to the offices to which this committee relates. They are in Halifax, Canberra, Montreal, and Florida, and I think all of you are aware of the particular conference that is in each city. In order to get some basic feel from the members as to preferences they might have either by way of the location, the timing, or the subject matter of the various conferences, I canvassed each of you. I can give you sort of a summation, if you wish, of the results of my survey.

Mr. Ady was the four of them, as you have number one now. I've got number two crossed out here. Dr. Buck, Canberra. Mr. Fox is Halifax. I'm just giving the city destination rather than the conference itself. Mr. Mitchell seems to be otherwise occupied throughout the summer months leading to the fall at least. Mr. Gogo, being his usual gracious self, said that he had no strong feelings with respect to any particular one. That doesn't mean that he doesn't want to go to any of them, I presume, or that he feels that any of them might not be of value; it's just no strong feelings on any particular conference. Mr. Clegg, all but the conference that I think is being held in Montreal. Dr. Elliott's first choice was the Florida convention; the second choice was the Halifax convention. Myself, I guess I'm in Mr. Gogo's position; I have no strong feelings about any of them. Mr. Drobot's first choice was the one in Canberra, relating to the Ombudsman I should say, and second choice was Florida.

Also, I think all members are aware — and I don't mean to go through the records; they're here if you wish to — of the past attendance of our various members at conferences in the last year or two, so I won't go into that. I think there is a certain desire to make sure that all members have an opportunity to participate in these worthwhile type of conventions, to participate in the deliberations and discussions and hopefully bring back to the committee a greater understanding of the workings of particular offices which we have responsibility for.

Now, as to a means of determining in the final analysis of who goes where, we also have the figures here and available, number one, for our overall budget for this year which is, in this particular category, \$11,725 for all travel expenses inclusive in relation to all of our conventions. Louise has brought copies for each of us, and I can distribute those. We also have some working papers of Louise here that we're not going to table, but she has brought along her working papers from the standpoint of costs relating to accommodation and travel as determined by her

earlier on when we were trying to build our budget in respect to travel.

I know that maybe some of you have also done some investigation with respect to costs of travel, and your information on that may help us too. I think it's just sufficient to remind members that we talked in this committee about the possibility of establishing a sort of one member per conference thing. However, I think the final decision of the committee was that, regardless of how we build our budget, we know we have to live within that budget, and to the extent that flexibility may arise by virtue of excursion or seat sales or whatever that would permit us to send more than one to a conference, that was still a possibility as well.

I think that pretty well sums up from my standpoint where we're at on the thing, so I'll throw it open to members who may wish to speak to a given conference or to indicate some basis upon which we might proceed. Any of your contributions are gratefully received.

Mr. Clegg.

MR. G. CLEGG: Just to follow that up a little bit, I understand you said Louise had, in fact, working papers. I think you've hit it right on the key, that we have to work within that budget. So without knowing the kind of figures that Louise or somebody has got for airfare, because we can look at \$1,400 or we can look at \$500 in many cases . . . Louise, is that the kind of working papers you're talking about? Would it be in order then, Mr. Chairman, to get that first, so we could . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, Louise, you could just give us the information you've got available.

MRS. EMPSON: On the Halifax convention — and this is based on 14-day advance booking; you have to stay over the Saturday night — you can get an excursion rate for \$821 as opposed to the economy rate of \$1,152.

MR. MITCHELL: What would accommodation be there?

MRS. EMPSON: Accommodation has been booked at anywhere — \$125 a night.

MR. GOGO: That's government rate. The normal rate is \$67.

MR. MITCHELL: Do you have a total cost for one person to go to Halifax?

MRS. EMPSON: No, it all depends on the number of nights they stay over, and then the per diem is also separate. The mileage depends; if I have, for instance, someone driving from, say, St. Paul to Edmonton to catch the plane, then there's mileage allowed in there. So it depends on which member goes.

MR. FOX: That's an outrageous price for a plane fare, eh? Considering you can fly to Montreal sometimes for \$290?

MRS. EMPSON: Well, if you get a seat sale, then it's cheaper still. If you can get a seat sale, then by all means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to just give us the rest then, Louise, quickly, and then we'll go round . . .

MRS. EMPSON: Canberra is based on 30-day advance book-

ing, minimum six days stay: \$1,905 for excursion; economy rate is \$4,338. The Montreal convention, 14-day advance booking, excursion rate: \$594, economy rate \$956. Orlando, Florida: excursion rate \$659, economy rate \$928.

MR. FOX: Are the fares cheaper if you take one of those Hawaiian convertible . . .

DR. BUCK: Bring your own fuel like the 747s.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I have Mr. Gogo on my list.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I think you've done a great deal of work. I'm not so sure how a decision should be made. I want to make a suggestion that consideration be given to: there are nine people on the committee; the travel budget's \$11,700. That's \$1,300 per member. It might not be a bad idea to try and allocate \$1,300 per member, and if a member wants to assist another member going, he can simply allocate the fund or a portion of that fund to him.

The one thing I don't think we should deal with is any matter that's going to be acrimonious with regard to members, whether, for example, we're talking about to Canberra, we're talking about to Florida. And it's not surprising only one's interested in Montreal. I don't know why we should penalize anybody in November to go to Montreal, but if that's how Mr. Clegg feels, so be it.

I want to conclude with the comment that the fairest way, Mr. Chairman, is probably if only one can go -- well, we haven't decided this -- but only one can go to Canberra. Then the luck of the draw would not be a precedent, and maybe it's worth consideration; i.e., we had indication of two people interested in Canberra. If that decision is made that only one can go, then the luck of the draw would not be against my nature. That would be a fair way of doing it. The other alternative is for those who are interested in going to flip a coin or discuss amongst themselves. If both are going, then it's going to be a question of how much of the total budget's allocated for that trip for two people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect, if I may, I really think it has to go beyond that. I think we have to take into account other factors such as, for example, previous trips that members have gone on through the committee, also just general interest in the area and what they're able to give to the conference as well as take home. So I think, hopefully, we'd put it on a more subjective basis than a straight draw. That would be my view anyway. I know some of you have expressed to me your desire, for a variety of very sound reasons why you wish to attend a given conference.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? I think when you look back in the records that there are some conferences there are two or three members that go to the same conference. Is that not true of these?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have in the past, yes.

DR. BUCK: Yes, two. Yeah. Two people at least. And of course you know how strong my feelings are that there should be at least two go to every conference, so we won't rethrust that straw. But the fact is that when we break that down there may be the opportunity for two members to go to some of the conferences. Because in the quotations -- and I'm a little out of or-

der here, Mr. Gogo, but when Louise gave some of those quotations . . . We booked 30 days -- mind you this was winter, when we went to curl in Moncton -- and it cost us \$442. Well, that's a hell of a difference even from \$880, which is excursion rate. Do you know what it costs the Ombudsman to book now for Canberra?

MRS. EMPSON: No, I don't.

DR. BUCK: Because if he books this early, I'll bet he's getting down there for \$1,100.

MRS. EMPSON: That's right. That's why I'm mentioning that if you can get a seat sale . . .

DR. BUCK: So I think that, you know, as soon as we get this set up and say, "Okay, I want two tickets to Halifax" and Louise goes down, she may be able to get two people to Halifax for \$800, because that's what we paid for our curling fares.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it your recommendation then, Dr. Buck, that we be precise at this moment in time and get specific figures as to exactly what is the cheapest rate we can get?

DR. BUCK: I know in the past it seemed to work out that we got just about two people at every conference that was available.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, we could perhaps reconvene in a couple of days, and Louise could check the price that morning. We could make a decision and can book that afternoon. People could come to the meeting with an idea of when they would like to leave and when they'd like to come back and how they could work around that.

MR. GOGO: Do you have to pay the day you book?

MRS. EMPSON: No, you don't.

MR. GOGO: Why don't you book, Mr. Chairman, two flights to everything, buy two seats for everything and see what the price is, and then report to Dr. Buck and call a meeting and make the decision of who's going to use them?

MRS. EMPSON: What could conceivably happen is between now and the time, you know -- say, a few months before the conference, the one in Canberra I'm addressing now -- is that there's a seat sale announced by Wardair or whatever, and then you get, again, a better price break.

MR. MITCHELL: Could you not still get the advantage of that? Because you could cancel excursion or normal flight and take a seat sale.

MRS. EMPSON: Oh yes, I'm sure we could.

MR. FOX: There's a penalty on canceling.

MR. MITCHELL: But there may be a seat sale right now.

MR. FOX: Take cancellation insurance.

MR. MITCHELL: The only risk is that if there were an election between now and then, Mr. Chairman, and some of these guys

weren't back . . .

MR. DROBOT: The chairman and Mr. Gogo haven't specified any particular place, but I'm sure they want to go, and perhaps they can go where they can. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm easy, quite frankly. If I didn't go to any of them, it wouldn't bother me.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I was going to move a motion that either the chairman or the vice-chairman accompany everybody on every trip.

DR. BUCK: I'm sorry; I didn't hear what Mr. Drobot said. I've got one bad ear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He was suggesting that perhaps John Gogo and I were being overly generous in not indicating any preferences at all. Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX: Just thinking that subjective information that you were talking about might be useful, because I'm pretty sure in the two years you've been on the committee, you've not attended any conferences with officers. And I'm thinking that that might be useful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've actually looked ahead at all of the agendas and what was going to be taken up in conferences and found I knew it all anyway.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Piquette, if I could ask you to repeat that.

MR. FOX: Okay. In 1987 the Ombudsman conference was in Edmonton, and we all went because it was right here. But in 1986 was it in Vancouver? Where was it?

MRS. EMPSON: It was in Quebec City.

MR. FOX: And who went there? Well, can I get this information? It might be useful, Mr. Chairman, for members to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise has just brought forward a good point, that all of us, I'm sure, are putting in our frequent flyer points, and they build up, because you've got no place to utilize them. I don't know why I hand the card in each time. However, maybe this is an opportunity to utilize those sorts of things, because they could legitimately be used on a frequent flyer basis.

MRS. EMPSON: Because you're traveling on government business.

MR. G. CLEGG: That makes me eligible for all three trips.

MR. FOX: Did nobody else consider this information useful that I was trying to seek in terms of who'd been where when? I was just wondering, there must have been someone go to the Ombudsman Conference in 1986; was it someone who is not on the committee now?

DR. ELLIOTT: It was here in Edmonton.

MRS. EMPSON: No, '87 was here in Edmonton.

MR. FOX: Yeah, but in '86, the year before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure. It may have occurred . . . I don't recall it happening at all after the election.

MRS. EMPSON: Possibly no one went.

MR. FOX: Could be. Could be. How about last year, the auditors' conference, the legislative auditors, public accounts?

MRS. EMPSON: Mr. Drobot and Mr. Clegg went.

MR. FOX: Well, no. That was comprehensive auditing, wasn't it? [interjection] Yeah, but the legislative auditors conference is a different one.

MRS. EMPSON: That's right. Well, they're tied in together.

MR. FOX: No.

MRS. EMPSON: Which one are you referring to?

MR. FOX: Mr. Drobot and Mr. Clegg went to the Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference last year, and Mr. Drobot and I went the year before to that conference. The other conference is the one of legislative auditors in conjunction with the public accounts.

MRS. EMPSON: It was Mr. Gogo and Dr. Buck, I think.

MR. FOX: That was in '87?

MRS. EMPSON: That's right. It was in Quebec City.

MR. FOX: And in '86 did anybody go?

DR. BUCK: John, what were we at in Halifax? Was that . . .

MRS. EMPSON: No, you were in Quebec City.

DR. BUCK: No, no, but a couple of years before that, three years before.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, is there really going to be a conflict here? I don't see that everybody who wants to go can't go and that we couldn't even send two people to every conference, within our budget, just roughly. I'm not going, so there's money there, and you're not going, so there's money there. So we're talking about five people for \$11,000 which is, maximum, eight trips, right?

DR. BUCK: Grant, that's exactly the way it always works out. Somebody says, "I can't go because I've got commitments." The other guy says, "Well, I can only go to this one." And then, six weeks before that, they say, "Well, gosh." They're scrambling around looking for somebody to go, Louise. That's the way it works out.

MR. MITCHELL: Why don't I make a suggestion? Why don't we just get Louise to list the people who want to go to each conference? In an ideal world, just put down what you would want to go to. Go back and figure out how many days they're going to have to stay there, how much that's going to cost in food and

so on, and then we'll see if we're over \$11,000.

DR. BUCK: Reason is prevailing, Grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That sounds like a good approach.

MR. MITCHELL: This is how we'd run the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg.

MR. G. CLEGG: I just want to clarify one position that John said, that I don't know why I'd want to go to Montreal. Whether I was not using my mind -- I said I didn't want to be selfish, but I did not want to go to Montreal because I had been to the auditors'. But he said . . . I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. FOX: Could I make one more point? Mr. Chairman, if in order to get a decent fare to Halifax one has to stay over a Saturday, then you'd best take my name off there, because I've got important commitments both weekends in the constituency, so I'd . . . I mean, if that affects the . . .

MRS. EMPSON: It does affect it.

MR. FOX: Yeah. I don't know if that affects seat sales; I know it affects excursion fares.

DR. BUCK: There's the nighthawk flight, Derek. I don't what it would cost you without a Saturday or a Sunday. Because we went down that way seven or eight years ago and took the kids and never slept for two days. But you might be able to catch the Saturday thing.

MR. FOX: We might still be in session by then, for Pete's sake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

We have two minutes until 1:30, when some of us have commitments. So Grant Mitchell has made a suggestion here with respect to compiling some further information. Is everybody agreed with that? And then we would reconvene sort of at the call of the Chair? Or would you like to set a date right now? Maybe that would be appropriate while we've got you right here.

MR. GOGO: Next Wednesday morning at 11:59.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May 11, one week from today? At what

time?

MR. GOGO: Eleven fifty-nine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I've got the Forum for Young Albertans. I've got to give a talk at that time.

DR. ELLIOTT: Not available, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about early in the morning? Who's all on Private Bills and all that sort of stuff? What about Tuesday, May 10?

MR. MITCHELL: Seven-thirty, Wednesday morning.

MR. GOGO: How about Tuesday?

MR. MITCHELL: Tuesday, 7:30?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eight?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eight?

MR. GOGO: Noon. Social planning at 8.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Noon? Is noon a bad time for people? Noon, May 10.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

DR. ELLIOTT: I can't be there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOX: If two out of three ain't bad, then eight out of 10 ain't bad.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. May I have a motion, then, for adjournment?

DR. ELLIOTT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Dr. Elliott. We are adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 1:28 p.m.]