

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[10:11 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's proceed. First is the Approval of August 3, 1989, Committee Meeting Minutes, and that's under tab 2 of our book. Is there a motion to approve the minutes?

MR. SIGURDSON: So move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Tom. All in favour? Carried. Thank you.

Okay. Item 3 can legitimately be called housekeeping in that we need to formally enter into an agreement with Kingston Ross on the work which has already been done. That was, as you recall, the main purpose of the meeting of August 3, to approve the account with Kingston Ross. So we're going back and tidying up, and that is a direct result of the call of the election, which disrupted the work of this committee. So may we have a motion to approve the letter of engagement with Kingston Ross?

MRS. GAGNON: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much.

MR. TANNAS: May I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. TANNAS: Were they an accounting firm that did any work for the Principal Group?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise, would you have any idea?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I have no idea.

MR. FOX: I can provide for members a little information about the situation last time. I think Reid was the auditor. Reid Cameron or something . . .

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Reid Cameron, yes.

MR. FOX: . . . did the audit of the Auditor General. They appreciated the business, but it excluded them from receiving accounts from the Auditor General, doing audits on behalf of the Auditor General, and they had a chance to do some audits. The committee felt that it was important to keep that separation, that it wouldn't be proper to have someone auditing the Auditor General if they're doing work for the Auditor General at the same time.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Didn't they join with Touche Ross as well?

MR. FOX: That's right. Reid Cameron joined with Touche Ross. The small amount of business our committee gives them to audit the Auditor General was peanuts to them compared to the importance of having some business passed their way by the Auditor General. So we may have need of changing this from time to time to keep that separation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack, we have a motion to approve the letter of engagement with Kingston Ross, and we've been discussing some of the background to it. Any other questions? Are we

ready for the vote? Call for the question. All in favour? Opposed? Thank you. Carried.

Oh, Jack, we dealt with conference attendance before you got here, and we've decided who's going where. You'll be very pleased to know you're going to Manyberries, and that's February 4 through 20.

MR. ADY: How did you know that's where I wanted to go?

MR. FOX: First prize is Manyberries for a week; second prize is Manyberries for a month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's just like I had a revelation on the issue.

Okay. Item 4, conferences. I'd like to make a couple of comments before we get into this. I know some of you have been on the committee before. I understand from speaking with Louise that in the past there's been a great deal of flexibility in terms of how members have decided which preference they had for various conferences but that if your spouse traveled with you, the travel was at your expense. Of course, your hotel room would be covered, and your out-of-pocket expenses would be your own responsibility as well.

There is an inconsistency here, and the inconsistency is that . . . I'll use as an example the Members' Services Committee and members who are selected by the Speaker to attend parliamentary conference meetings either in Canada or overseas, as well as the events -- we do send delegates to one conference in the United States each year, and in that particular case travel is provided by the Assembly for the spouse. Now, obviously we have a budget that's built in at the present time. It's based on this committee's former practice of a spouse traveling at your expense. I would ask the committee to consider some flexibility in that matter even if it means reducing the number of conferences we attend this year and then going back in our budget submission to the Members' Services Committee next year, because I think it's a very important opportunity for a member to travel with his or her spouse. I know I found in my past experience as a minister that that was a very valuable time, and I believe the same is true for those who attend parliamentary conferences. Clearly, if it's done and the practice has been established and accepted through Parliamentary Association meetings, then the same is true for our committee. So I'll throw it out for brief discussion, see what your thoughts are.

Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Rather than suggest that we cut back, because there aren't that many conferences there that I can see, could we not just ask for an increase for this committee's budget? I think it's valid. It isn't frequent, you know, where you can go with your spouse and make up for some lost time kind of thing, especially if you don't represent a riding that's in Edmonton. So I think it's valid that you would want to bring your spouse. I wouldn't have any problem having to pay for my spouse. If that's what we decide, that's fine; it's still a break. Rather than cut down on the number of events, I would prefer for us to ask for an increase in this committee's budget. Isn't that the first step? We only cut back if they say no or if it's too late or if the budget is determined for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't suggesting that we go back to Members' Services Committee and ask for additional moneys for this year's budget. I think that puts us in an awkward

position.

MRS. GAGNON: Uh huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But keep in mind we're almost at the point where we will be reviewing our budget for the 1990-91 season, and when we do that, we can certainly build in the necessary dollars to meet the needs.

MR. FOX: A couple of points to be made here. The budgeting one is a very important one, and we've found in the past that we've had to be quite strict with ourselves as a committee to follow through the budget guidelines that have been allocated through the Members' Services Committee to come up with a budget that reflects some responsibility on our part. So that's something to be considered.

One of the things that helps our budget this year, I guess, is that there was a conference held in Edmonton, so there was no expense to the committee involved there. But expenses is a big item. We had extensive debate in the committee before about members attending conferences, some feeling that we've got two reasons to attend a conference. One is to provide committee support for the officer involved. If it's the Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, for example, it's good to have someone from the committee there with the Auditor General showing that we're there willing to learn and taking an interest in his responsibilities. So there's that aspect of it. Then there's also the opportunity for members to gain a better, more complete understanding of what our responsibilities are as a committee.

I've been torn on the issue. Sometimes it seemed to me that there was probably no need to have more than one member at a given conference, but I can see the merit for arguments the other way. I think what we decided was that we would not be too formal in terms of numbers of members per conference or anything but try and move within our established budget. If that meant, for example, that one person went to one meeting and three to another, it would be better than being very rigid in that regard.

MR. SIGURDSON: I know there's an awful lot of concern about the budget, and there ought to be. Last year I had the opportunity to attend a conference at the invitation of Speaker Carter, and of course my wife was invited to attend as well, and she did. When we looked into our travel arrangements, we were advised by the Speaker's office that we were entitled to fly, I think, business class. In that we knew long in advance the dates of the conference, we were able to book well in advance and deep discount. In fact, the two of us flew for less than the cost of one ticket on business class. I would suggest that we have the dates well in advance. We see that before us; the first one coming up is October 30. That's long enough in the future that we would be able to secure from any carrier deep-discount tickets. We know the dates. We can certainly ensure that our schedules have no conflicts so that we can take advantage of deep-discount tickets. Whether you fly in business class or a few seats back, the difference is that you arrive five or six seconds earlier to wait for your luggage. So I don't see any benefit in flying in business class, because you have to wait at the bottom end anyway. I would hope we would keep that in mind when we book tickets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Tom.  
Don, then Jack.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. I'd certainly echo Tom's suggestion about that. The other thing we could do -- and I don't know if this is kosher, or cricket. I flew up today. Now, I'm entitled to 52 flights a year. You know, if I put that on as an MLA expense, then it doesn't get written against this committee.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: It doesn't get written against the committee.

MR. TANNAS: Is that allowed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: No. Your flying up here for committee meetings does not get written against the committee's budget. It goes into the MLA expenses.

MR. TANNAS: Ah, okay. So that's not a saving.

MR. FOX: You do do other work when you're here.

MR. TANNAS: Yes, indeed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this specific point, Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Back on it -- it's related. I'm just wondering about the accumulated bonus points that we have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members' Services have been struggling with that issue.

MR. SIGURDSON: There may be an opportunity to expend some of those bonus points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Don, had you finished your comments?

MR. TANNAS: Yes, I have, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thanks.  
Jack.

MR. ADY: Yes, thanks. Just to pick up on Tom's comments. Last year when we traveled, we did access the discounts by booking way ahead. We were able to get some really good rates, and it enabled more of us to go to conferences. It was well worth while. Louise did a great job in doing that for us. Certainly we should be looking at that sort of thing, because it's just really money on the table if we, just for the sake of a little planning...

I want to pick up on some comments that Derek made. I certainly subscribe to the fact that I would not want to see our conference attendance closely structured. I think we have to leave some leeway to consider the interests of the member. Some members perhaps have been on the committee before and have been to a certain conference, and it might appear that that's where we should have the majority of people going. But when you consider that, that member perhaps would want to go to another one and broaden his interests. So the bottom line is that I would not want to see it closely structured but certainly a lot of input from the interests of the member and his decision of where he or she would like to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks.

Don, did you have your hand up?

MR. TANNAS: Yes, I did. Just an additional point, having had a travel agency for 13 years. If you stay over a Saturday night -- for instance, the October 30 conference. The 29th is a Sunday. If you fly down on a Sunday, you're beat, so you can fly down on the Saturday. As long as it's over the Saturday night, then you get the deal. Lots of times that is worth it.

MR. ADY: And we did that last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Louise is very astute on the various opportunities. I know the work she has done for members on CPA conferences overseas in helping to book them in in the best possible ways. It's also important to remember that -- again, guidelines out of Members' Services -- if you're on an extended trip, the extra arm room on business class is nice. Obviously, if it's a shorter trip -- you're going to central Canada -- economy is fine. But Louise looks at all of those aspects through the guidelines of the Speaker and the Members' Services Committee.

MR. FOX: Some of us need more arm room than others.

MR. ADY: Big guys need space.

MR. FOX: You southern boys are well irrigated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not the irrigation.

Any other comments on the matter? I sense a consensus that we do a couple of things: that there be flexibility so that we can respond to the interests of members; also, tied in with that flexibility is a concurrence that we look at spousal travel included in the package. Is there someone who'd like to make a motion to that effect? Jack?

MR. FOX: Could I say prior to that that the understanding would always be that members' attendance at functions would take precedence over ... I mean, living within the terms of our budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That goes without saying.

MR. FOX: Good thing I didn't say it.

MR. ADY: Fine. I'll make a motion according to what they both said.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or didn't say.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. Because it's as clear as mud, as clear as the Saskatchewan River ... My God, isn't that a dirty river compared to the Bow? You can see it from here.

For instance, the Quebec City conference. If three of us decide to go, as it stands according to this motion, is the travel of our spouse paid for or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MRS. GAGNON: It isn't.

MR. ADY: Not this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next step we'll have to look at is what interest there is by members to travel to various conferences.

MRS. GAGNON: Oh, and then if it's the sort of thing ... Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For instance, speaking for myself, as much as I might like to go to one or more of the conferences, I haven't got the time. I just don't have the time this year. So if some other members of the committee are in a similar position, we may have the dollars that would allow a spouse to travel with a member this year, but we are certainly taking it as a given in terms of our budget preparations for the next fiscal year.

MR. TANNAS: One of the things I wouldn't mind proposing or suggesting is that, for instance, if I were to go to a conference I would wish to take my wife to, I would pay for her ticket. If at the end of the year, or near the end of your fiscal year, you find you have X hundreds or thousands of dollars and then wanted to pay it back, or you can't ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's pretty complicated. I think the motion gives us flexibility. Regardless of how we deal with the motion, the next step is to try to ascertain members' interests in various conferences so that when we have our meetings in September, we can report back with something fairly definitive.

Any other question on the motion?

MR. ADY: Do you need any help on the motion? You've got it, don't you?

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

Now if we could get an interest from members on the conferences, that in turn will allow us to do a bit of work in preparation for our September meeting when we can try to finalize it. Let's start with the Canadian Ombudsman Conference, Quebec City, October 30 to November 1.

MRS. GAGNON: I would like to go to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yolande and Don. Two members are interested.

Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, November 19 to 21. No?

December 5 to 8: Council on Governmental Ethics Laws Conference, New Orleans.

MR. TANNAS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don. Possibly? Okay. I know where Tom's going to be during the next few months, and he knows where I'm going to be.

MR. SIGURDSON: We're paired.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We both know where Derek is.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah, Bob and I are paired.

MR. FOX: I'd be very interested in attending the Ombudsman conferences as well, you know, but it's difficult to make time commitments that far ahead of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Well, like yourself, I've . . .

MR. ADY: We have two members not here today, and in fairness I would think we should revisit this discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we will do is contact them after today's meeting. That goes without saying. If a member is not present and we set a process in motion, we'll contact the members, give them an opportunity to respond so that can be part of the workup plan for our September meeting. Okay? Anything else on conferences?

Okay, moving on then. Item 5 is the appointment of a Chief Electoral Officer before March 1990. As members of the committee are aware, the Ombudsman's term runs from a general election through to the next general election.

MR. FOX: Pardon me. Chief Electoral Officer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chief Electoral Officer. I said Ombudsman?

MR. ADY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chief Electoral Officer runs from general election through to the next general election. What I would propose is that at our October meeting we come back with something more definitive on this matter. It's merely on the agenda today as an information item to make members aware.

MRS. GAGNON: A question, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: What is the procedure? Is this a position which is advertised or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the things the committee has to decide is how we deal with it, because we have a position which is currently occupied. Mr. Ledgerwood has made no indication to myself -- if he has to any member of the committee, I'd appreciate hearing from you -- that he intends to step down. On the other hand, we have a responsibility as a committee not merely to rubber stamp another three-, four-, or five-year term. It's on notice today so members can be thinking about it, to come back at our full meeting in October. All right?

MR. FOX: The understanding, Yolande -- if the position was vacant, then certainly it's filled through wide as possible advertising, and his selection would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

MR. FOX: . . . the same way we're choosing the new Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the incumbent should not automatically feel that because he wants to renew the contract the committee will feel the same. I'm not suggesting we won't; I'm just saying

it should not be taken as a given.

Item 6: Appointment of Acting Ombudsman. I had a telephone conversation with the Ombudsman some days ago, and he was asking for direction on this matter. On behalf of the committee, I asked that he give us a recommended acting Ombudsman to fill in between the time of his departure, which is September 15, and the time a new Ombudsman is confirmed. He will have that information for us prior to our next meetings. The committee then will have an opportunity to deal with the matter. Those of you who were on the committee during the past term know the process that occurred when Brian Sawyer left and before Aleck Trawick was engaged, and that is that Marcel Arcand was appointed the acting Ombudsman. He was the executive director. Marcel is currently on sick leave in the Ombudsman's office. So in any event, again it's an information item. It will come back at our September meeting for a decision.

MR. ADY: A question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Jack.

MR. ADY: If you can tell us, is Mr. Arcand on an extended sick leave, or is he to be considered? Or is that a fair question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I asked a question in a similar way to the Ombudsman, and I believe he is going to speak with Mr. Arcand. I really can't speculate beyond that. Once we receive the recommendation from the current Ombudsman, we can deal with the matter. But he is definitely going to speak with Mr. Arcand. Those of you who have worked with Marcel in the past through this committee -- I worked with him, as he was the assistant deputy Minister in Social Services and Community Health when I was minister -- know that he's a very fine, hardworking member of the public service. Okay?

Date of Next Meeting. Now, you recall that in the first memo I circulated I made reference to sitting down with the three officers who work through our committee: the Chief Electoral Officer, the Auditor General, and the Ombudsman. For those of you who have served on the committee in the past and may have all the answers you need, I ask you to bear with those of us who are new to the committee so that we might learn and try to catch up to you.

So the idea was that we would spend an afternoon and visit one of the officers, meet with -- the first one we had on our list was the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Ledgerwood. He then would introduce us to his staff, explain his duties and responsibilities, have a general discussion -- not get into specifics re budget or manpower but get a knowledge base for ourselves -- so that when we do have those subsequent meetings, we've got something to fall back on in addition to the ideas we've gathered over time. On day two we would meet with the Ombudsman and save time in the afternoon for a meeting of the committee so we could deal with a couple of items we're holding over from today's meeting -- conferences and the appointment of an acting Ombudsman -- although I'd like to keep the business at that meeting at a minimum. Louise will not be with us; she is taking a well-deserved holiday. So I think we'll deal with whatever business is absolutely necessary that day, otherwise keep it as short as possible. Then on the third day, the 14th, we'd be dealing with the Auditor General and again going through the visitation. It was our suggestion that we start each of those days by

having a brief meeting here so we can travel over to their respective offices together and, once we've completed our visit, then return to the building.

First of all, are there any concerns with the dates that have tentatively been set: the 12th, 13th, 14th. Yes, Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Thursday the 14th both Derek Fox and I have a caucus meeting that has been set up, and it's going to be a full-day meeting.

MR. ADY: Which day, Tom? I'm sorry.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thursday the 14th. I was wondering and hoping that perhaps maybe we could, if it's at all possible, reschedule the meeting with the Auditor General that is scheduled currently on the 14th to, say, Monday afternoon the 11th, if that would be at all possible.

MR. TANNAS: I'm out that day and so is John Drobot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Monday the 11th is not suitable for you?

MR. TANNAS: We're already into an all-day meeting.

MRS. GAGNON: And I would have a caucus meeting on the 13th, I'm positive. I'm not sure what time. I've just run into that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, let me ask this question. Are we all comfortable for the 12th and 13th?

MR. ADY: Yes. I'm okay with those two days.

MRS. GAGNON: I would have to slip away for some of it, because we'll have caucus for sure. We do every Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the Wednesday.

MR. FOX: Even out of session? Every Wednesday?

MRS. GAGNON: I think so.

MR. SIGURDSON: Have you today?

MRS. GAGNON: No, we're giving ourselves a break. But that would be a day where you would want to meet here first and then go to the . . . This would be the Human Rights Commission, on the Wednesday, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Wednesday was the Ombudsman.

MRS. GAGNON: The Ombudsman. And at what time would we be leaving to go visit that office?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd gather here at 9 o'clock, leave about 9:15, spend probably an hour or an hour and a half in the Ombudsman's office, and then return. The idea was we'd have a short meeting. Is there any reason we couldn't take that short meeting and move it into the Tuesday immediately after our visit to the Chief Electoral Officer?

MR. FOX: It wouldn't be a problem for me. [Inaudible]

MRS. GAGNON: I would have no problem with it. If we start at 9, I'll just slip away at 11, because usually our meetings are from 11 until 12. So no problem for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. If members are in agreement, then, let us have our brief business meeting on Tuesday the 12th, following our visit to the Chief Electoral Officer. [interjection] No, no. That didn't matter. We're going to deal with that first. I see what you're saying there, but no; I don't think the two are related.

MR. FOX: Is it important for us to have dealt with the issue of reappointment prior to visiting his office?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that was the question Louise just asked, and I said I didn't think so.

MR. FOX: We've still got time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've still got time to do it. What I was trying to do, though, is free up as much of one day as possible so we hold Tuesday afternoon for our meeting with the Chief Electoral Officer and our business meeting following that. Wednesday morning we would visit the Ombudsman's office and then break. Now, Thursday's a bad day. Can we find another day?

MR. TANNAS: What's wrong with Tuesday morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, because some members are traveling in. I try very hard in scheduling these meetings to have the first meeting begin early afternoon so those who are traveling in, whether it's by plane or by car, don't have to come in and spend an extra night in Edmonton.

MR. TANNAS: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: An extra night at home with your wife or your husband and kids is important.

Could we look at . . .

MRS. GAGNON: How about Wednesday afternoon to do the last visit?

MR. HYLAND: You just said you had a caucus meeting.

MRS. GAGNON: No, no; I just said from 11 to 12. I would only be away from this meeting for an hour and a half at the most, I'd say. Try and cut it down to two days then. Too much arranging to try and do two visits in the same day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's your pleasure?

MR. FOX: Well, I think that's a better idea in a lot of ways just in terms of compressing the work of the committee and helping us live within our budget.

MR. TANNAS: I have a meeting at 5:30 that night, and Alan has a meeting at 5:30 in Regina.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, Yolande, your caucus meeting ends at what time?

MRS. GAGNON: Twelve. It would be from 11 till 12, I believe, Wednesday morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what if we were to move our meeting with the Auditor General down to 2 o'clock?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'd have lots of time? All right. So we're moving our meeting on the 14th down to 2 o'clock.

MR. FOX: That's pending his approval? Maybe it would be prudent to check with him right now.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: He's very accommodating. I'm sure he'll go along. I'll check with him today.

MR. FOX: Would it be worth doing that now, while we're . . .

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I can get his number, yes.

MR. FOX: I'm just thinking in case -- he may be out of town, for all we know, that day and back on the Thursday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Assuming that's agreeable, then, looking ahead to October.

MR. FOX: Can I just say, too, that these meetings are important not only for our own edification, so we understand what goes on in the offices of the people we're working with, but it's important for them and the people who work in those offices to know that somebody's paying attention to them, somebody's interested in what they're doing. Our committee is the only contact, the only link they have with elected members, and it's our responsibility to show that interest and to make sure we're kept up to date. So even if we've been there before, it doesn't excuse us from going again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The proposed date for the October meeting will be Wednesday the 18th in the morning. So how does everyone's calendar look?

MR. ADY: We're going to hear something from the NDs on that?

MR. FOX: Yeah. Again, Mr. Chairman, that conflicts with the prescheduled caucus meeting. We're going to be in Taber-Warner for a three-day caucus meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Go on down. Spend a little of that money.

MR. FOX: No. Anyway, we do have a prearranged caucus meeting all day that day.

MR. SIGURDSON: And the remainder of the week as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the remainder of the week?

MR. FOX: Yes. Wednesday, Thursday, Friday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, how about the following Wednesday,

the 25th? We have caucus -- well, I've got marked down on the Thursday, Friday.

MR. ADY: Twenty-sixth and 27th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But on the 25th?

MR. ADY: Mr. Chairman, what are the possibilities of backing it up as opposed to putting it ahead? I'm talking about . . .

MR. FOX: The 17th?

MR. ADY: . . . even the afternoon of the 16th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the difficulty that I've got -- we haven't had our first meeting of the electoral boundaries committee yet, but we've agreed in principle to block out three days at a time because we've got a massive amount of work to do in a short period of time.

We're currently looking at Monday afternoon, all day Tuesday, and Wednesday afternoon.

MRS. GAGNON: That's the day of the municipal election anyway, the 16th. I don't think it would be good to be away.

MR. FOX: We'll be toasting our new Senator nominee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Back to the 25th. Is there a problem with that date?

MR. ADY: Well, the only problem I have with it, and it may not turn out to be a problem, is that I'm trying to schedule the Heritage Savings Trust Fund hearings, and I have given that day. But if you pick an afternoon, I'll block it out. I think Louise could perhaps . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we block out the afternoon of the 25th for this committee?

MR. ADY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The afternoon at 1 o'clock?

MRS. GAGNON: Okay.

MR. FOX: Say again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One o'clock the afternoon of the 25th. Is 1 o'clock good, or 2 o'clock?

MR. FOX: One's fine.

MR. ADY: One-thirty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan.

MR. HYLAND: It doesn't matter; 1:30 is fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. One-thirty. Okay. And we're comfortable with this room as a meeting room?

MR. FOX: Always handy.

MR. HYLAND: It'll be cooler by then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It'll be cooler by then; right.

So we've agreed we'll meet on September 12 and 13 and on October 25. By that date we'll be well into our budget process.

MR. TANNAS: On the 12th it begins at 1:30; not at 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: September 12 begins at 1:30. That's right. Are we okay for the Auditor General?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Yes, we are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Auditor General: 2 o'clock on the 13th. We've had to move our October date to Wednesday afternoon, October 25, one week later, at 1:30 p.m. in this room, please.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: If I can get this room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we can get the room. Yes.

MR. ADY: Louise, we need to do something with the heritage fund hearings that afternoon.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Okay.

MR. ADY: Make a note.

MR. FOX: Have you booked the beginning of your meetings there, Jack?

MR. ADY: Yes.

MR. FOX: When do they start?

MR. ADY: They start the 5th, being the Premier's. There'll be some visits prior to that, yes.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, as well, I suspect that when we meet with the Chief Electoral Officer, one of the things he'd want to talk about and we'd want to talk about with him -- and you and

Al being a suitable link there, I would think -- is what impact the work of the electoral boundaries review commission, or whatever you call yourself, would have on his agenda. Currently the Act requires that an enumeration be held not the year after the election but the year following that. So he'd be thinking ahead already to an enumeration in September of '91, I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. FOX: Yeah, September of '91. And it may be that your commission's work will have some impact on that in terms of whether or not boundaries are firmly established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we'll have a better feel when we're in October than we do right now.

MR. FOX: [Inaudible] I'm sorry, yeah. I was just thinking that that may come up for discussion from his point of view at our September orientation meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other matters to be raised today? Any other matters you wish placed on the agenda either in September or October? Okay. Thank you very much.

I ask for a motion to adjourn.

MR. ADY: Before you do that, why did you ask this? Just for information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for information.

MR. ADY: Okay. You're not going to deal with any of this now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. ADY: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan Hyland; thank you. All in favour? There we go.

[The committee adjourned at 10:50 a.m.]

