

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[2:04 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll officially declare this meeting open. We're proceeding to the third part of our budget review, the office of the Ombudsman, and it's section 10 in our budget documentation.

The process we've been following is to allow for some opening comments and then encourage a frank, open discussion between members of the committee and yourselves to ensure there are no matters we've overlooked. If there are any sensitive issues you feel should only be discussed in camera, that opportunity is certainly available to the committee and yourselves. Once we've satisfied ourselves that pertinent questions have been asked and responses given, we'll thank you very much and proceed with the rest of our budget deliberations.

MR. CHETNER: Well, basically, we've submitted to you the proposed budget, with a covering letter which I feel pretty well covers the significant issues. I'm quite prepared to review them in detail if there are any questions.

I should point out that last year's budget apparently was not properly submitted, and as a result you may feel the total manpower seems to be rather high in comparison to last year's budget. I should point out that we've had to operate short-staffed pretty well most of the year, and hopefully we will be within our budget. Basically, what I'm talking about is that we've had two staff members off on pregnancy leave who were not replaced, and we had one new position effective April 1 which was not filled until August 1. So by shuffling, in addition to the lack of the Ombudsman, we don't have to pay salaries, so I think we're going to turn out well within our budget. You will notice that seems to be the big difference between the 1989-90 estimates and the '90-91 estimates. That is the reason, because it was not properly submitted last year.

MR. HYLAND: In reality, how much of an increase is it then?

MR. CHETNER: We're showing here approximately \$110,000. Can you answer the actual, Dixie?

MS WATSON: In rough terms, I think the figures last year were understated by at least \$100,000. As Ed said, it's been very difficult to determine, because we had our solicitor and a long-time investigator on maternity leave and one position filled late. Last year we went through all the reclassification, so it's difficult to say exactly. We've been trying to determine that.

MR. HYLAND: Percentage-wise, though, it's not a . . . From what should actually have been submitted to what's here now is not a great deal from what was, that is, but from what should have been.

MR. CHETNER: About 10 percent should have been added . . .

MR. HYLAND: Ten should have been added.

MR. CHETNER: . . . from the look of the figures, between the estimates last year and this year, which makes a big difference why we seem to be increasing at an abnormal rate.

To add to that, we had three additional positions created last year which were approved. We had a reclassification of the investigative positions, and we're providing for increases,

obviously, in the cost of living and the merit increments. In addition - this is kind of self-serving - the PAO didn't really go along with our management reclassifications, so subject to the new Ombudsman agreeing, we will again try that with PAO, and that's included in this year's budget. We've also guesstimated the pay you're going to give to the new Ombudsman. We don't know at what pay he's coming on - or she; I've got to be very careful here. So that's thrown in there. It could make a difference to this figure. We're going on the basis that the Ombudsman will come on under a contract basis. If the Ombudsman does not come on under a contract basis, then there could be additional costs in this Manpower category.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Yes, Don.

MR. TANNAS: You mentioned that three new positions had been created. Was that at the request of the office?

MR. CHETNER: Right, and it was approved in last year's budget: two support staff and one investigator.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. That should answer a request from [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why it does not show as the positions.

MR. CHETNER: There's no increase this year.

MR. TANNAS: Oh, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Don?

MR. TANNAS: No, that's everything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stan, then Derek.

MR. NELSON: I was just looking at a couple of items on here, particularly Contract Services. I assume that's regarding the Principal Group, isn't it, where you had such a large jump in your forecast?

MR. CHETNER: Right. The \$92,000 in brackets covers the amount for Contract Services for the special warrant under Principal, and that's added into the \$119,000 where we had only estimated \$27,000.

MR. NELSON: What gives you reason to believe that \$50,000 is a number you should use for Contract Services next fiscal?

MR. CHETNER: Well, included in there is \$20,000 for this computer system which we are planning for. Technically, it's really \$30,000 if you want to compare it to last year's estimates of \$27,000. The \$20,000 Contract Services will be what we're going to utilize for the computer system, this local area network system we're hoping to acquire if the budget is approved.

MR. NELSON: The other one I note here of some significant increase is Other Purchased Services.

MR. CHETNER: This is commented upon - it's a one-time - in the covering letter. Basically, that would cover the transfer

of an employee from Edmonton to Calgary, the cost of moving and so on and so forth. It may be high, but it's based on the cost of moving Mr. Trawick from Calgary to Edmonton two years ago. That was the reason for it.

MR. NELSON: Why are we transferring people or using that? Why don't we just hire someone in Calgary?

MR. CHETNER: We're talking about the manager's position in Calgary. I've got to be careful – self-serving again. The two investigators are fairly recent employees. Now, I suggest to you that the costs are maybe high, but the basis was the cost of moving Mr. Trawick from Calgary to Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess, just before Derek and then Yolande, I've got to express a concern about the numbers we're looking at, because it's evident in a number of areas – telephone and Repairs and Maintenance – that we've got to get some hard reasons for the numbers, or I don't think the committee is going to approve them.

MR. CHETNER: Okay. The Telephone and Communication . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we start at the top?

MR. CHETNER: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But first, the general questions. I didn't mean to cut off either Derek or Yolande. General questions, and then maybe we can come back and go through it line by line.

MR. FOX: Yeah, it might be easier to go line by line. Then we can . . .

MRS. GAGNON: I was just going to ask if Other Purchased Services also included the possibility that the Ombudsman we select will also have to be relocated.

MR. CHETNER: That's part of it. We put it in without knowing.

MRS. GAGNON: It may or may not.

MR. CHETNER: It may or may not. Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's go back up, then, to Travel Expenses, do the Supplies and Services, stop, discuss it, and then do the Fixed Assets at the bottom.

MR. CHETNER: Okay, Manpower. You're satisfied . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on Manpower at the moment?
Derek.

MR. FOX: Yeah. I just want to understand you, Ed. You said that the budget was not properly presented last year. Is that because the three approved positions weren't allocated? I'm not clear on why that was.

MR. CHETNER: We don't know. The individual who pre-

pared it is no longer with the office. He did not provide for already agreed to cost-of-living increases. We know that much. But he didn't allow for sufficient increases in manpower costs for the current year. As a result, we weren't able to work this out.

MR. FOX: So the \$998,400 is based on the actual number of employees you have on the currently negotiated . . .

MR. CHETNER: The only person we have a guesstimate on is the Ombudsman, and the potential reclassification of managers' positions we've added in there. The rest is actual, based on increments and suspected cost of living increases.

If we look at Travel Expenses, basically the increase there from \$67,000 to \$84,000 is because we will have, for all intents and purposes, two more investigative staff for the full year. We will recommence tours, which have not occurred during the past year because the Ombudsman has not been traveling. So we're talking about approximately five tours through the year through the province, adding for a certain amount of cost of living. The question of travel expenses has been a question that we have to do it. If we're conducting investigations, we have to travel to them. In addition, we have to allow for travel to a conference next year in Nova Scotia. Now, as we found out this year, in Québec they're starting to charge registration fees, so that's an additional thing we never had before.

Also contained in there is the Ombudsman's travel, which was \$15,000 on one occasion, the last occasion, and his vehicle which he gets. Frankly, we're not paying for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're sure that vehicle comes out of travel?

MR. CHETNER: The office pays for the vehicle rental out of travel. He has a portion that he pays, but the remainder . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise, will you find out why Treasury is using a different approach here than in other areas? It doesn't make sense.

MR. ADY: In what respect, Bob? They charge it off against committees, that kind of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I don't think under Travel Expenses.

MR. ADY: Oh, I'm not sure of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it comes under another code. I'm just curious as to why we're . . . What it's doing is inflating your travel expenses, because if we're thinking of travel expenses excluding the cost of the vehicle that's provided for the Ombudsman, if you factor that in, knowing what vehicles come out at per year, there could be \$6,000 built into this cost for his vehicle.

MR. ADY: Louise at the same time should be determining if it was done the same way last year, so you've got a differential distributed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's true. I'm just looking for consistency between the office of the Ombudsman and other areas, and this is something that would have come from Treasury, not the office. All right.

MR. CHETNER: Okay. There is a decrease under Rentals, and that's basically because our NBI equipment is now paid off and we no longer have to pay a rental fee. We were renting to purchase.

MR. FOX: Can I back up to Travel Expenses? You mentioned something about a \$15,000 expense for a particular travel item. Did I hear you correctly?

MR. CHETNER: That's what the Ombudsman's travel has been.

MR. FOX: Oh, for the year.

MR. CHETNER: For the year, yeah.

MR. FOX: Okay. I misunderstood when you said it at first. Thank you.

MR. NELSON: Maybe it would save some work and time for Louise if we could identify whether or not Travel Expenses in fact has the vehicle in there in the previous years. If that's the case, then you've got a comparative thing.

MR. CHETNER: Well, I know the expenses that occur with the vehicle are submitted. The gas and oil all go on his expense account and show his travel expenses. I don't know about the rest of it. I've seen those submitted.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Where would the actual charge of the vehicle go? Under travel?

MR. ADY: The lease.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: It's understandable that the gas and the oil goes under Travel Expenses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the leasing cost, the telephone charge, and so on.

MR. CHETNER: Dixie says she doubled-checked that, and it's charged against.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CHETNER: The insurance I'll mention down below here. The next out of the ordinary expense is Telephone and Communication. Basically what we are looking at is a dedicated line. We don't know for sure the total. We've allowed \$10,000. This is to have a tie with the Calgary office and our computer system in Edmonton and the wiring in of this. The inference — we did check on it; we didn't get a definite amount — was that we felt it would be close to \$10,000.

MR. NELSON: Why would you be considering entering into basically a totally integrated computer age between two offices? Is that really necessary?

MR. CHETNER: I think it is. If the people in Calgary are going to be dealing with people phoning in, they can instantly contact the main computer and obtain the information regarding the complaint and so on and so forth.

MR. NELSON: How has that been handled in the past?

MR. CHETNER: In the past basically by telephone or fax.

MR. NELSON: And that's not satisfactory?

MR. CHETNER: I think it's satisfactory. We're going to this new system. We don't have it in at the present time. I don't know how satisfactory it will be, but if we don't have the same system in both places, I think we've got problems. And I'm not too sure it will be satisfactory, but that was the way the former Ombudsman looked at it, that we should have an integrated system offering the same service in Calgary that we have here in Edmonton and be able to assist people in that way.

MR. TANNAS: On this point, if you have a telephone-accessible computer system, then your data base is available to every hacker in the country.

MR. CHETNER: Not with a dedicated line. That's the whole . . .

MR. TANNAS: So the dedicated line is so you don't have to . . .

MR. CHETNER: It's secure. That's what we're talking about. That's why it's costing so much. So we are not using a modem; we are using a secure line.

MR. ADY: Is that an ongoing cost for that dedicated line, or is that a one-time shot?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if it were one-time, it would be under Fixed Assets.

MR. NELSON: It's an annual cost.

MR. CHETNER: Seventy-two hundred, and it allows for a hookup. Now, we don't know what the cost of that hookup is, but it's an annual fee of \$7,200.

The question of security is very important if we're going to have this type of integrated system, from our point of view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on the telephone? Yes.

MR. ADY: I guess I'd like you to walk me through that just a little bit. Now, I understand you're going to have a computer system in Edmonton, you're going to have a computer system in Calgary, and this is to tie them together so either office can get information out of either system. That's the process, isn't it?

MR. CHETNER: Right. And there will be passing of . . . The word processing aspect: the reports will be coming directly through this system. The letters the Ombudsman has to sign will be coming through. They can be instantly changed and so on and so forth.

MR. NELSON: One system that's integrated into the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we piggyback on your question, Jack? I want to make sure. There's quite a large expenditure under Data Processing. Is that part of what . . .

MR. CHETNER: In the letter, you'll see we set a total of \$130,000, and it's spread through about five or six categories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is in place now?

MR. CHETNER: In place now in our office? We have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the \$130,000 would give you a complete new communications tool.

MR. CHETNER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not in year 2 or year 3 of a phase-in.

MR. CHETNER: Well, we have two terminals, one computer, and a printer at the present time. This would finish off, hopefully, the system. It would be an outright purchase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to mention that, Jack, so that we're aware of it. Okay, go ahead.

MR. ADY: Well, to just try and pick out those things that will be ongoing in the budget, you clarified that under code 712H that would be an ongoing charge.

MR. CHETNER: No, \$7,200 of it would be.

MR. ADY: Okay. Now do we have an ongoing charge under 712L, or is that a one-time thing? In other words, we've added \$10,000; will that be \$10,000 again on an ongoing basis?

MR. CHETNER: No.

MR. ADY: One time there, eh?

MR. CHETNER: Under Contract Services we have \$20,000. Five thousand dollars is for training our people. I suppose if we got new people, they would have to be trained to a certain extent in the future. The other \$15,000 is Public Works, Supply and Services; we're contracting to them to overlook the system for the current year and get us going.

MR. ADY: That's under which code?

MR. CHETNER: That's under L.

MR. ADY: Okay.

Then we move down to 712N. That's part of this system again?

MR. CHETNER: Sixty-one hundred dollars is Other Purchased Services; that's my understanding. That Other Purchased Services is the moving. That has nothing to do with . . .

MR. ADY: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, let's hold the discussion on the moving until we finish.

MR. ADY: I'm sorry; that was my fault, Bob. We did discuss that before.

MR. CHETNER: Then 724C, Purchase of Data Processing Equipment, where you've got \$78,500, which is a one time.

MR. ADY: That's one time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much of that \$78,500 is the equipment? The whole thing?

MR. CHETNER: The whole thing, right.

MR. ADY: So that won't be back next year.

MR. CHETNER: No.

Now, my understanding is that in the past when they were purchasing this type of equipment, it was done on a lease basis over five years, but they've now changed to buying it outright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Derek?

MR. FOX: I was just wondering if the proposed purchase here of the computer equipment has been done in consultation with Public Works.

MR. CHETNER: Yes.

MR. FOX: So it's a system, as I understand from the letter, that's compatible with the one we use in the Legislature, at *Hansard* and . . .

MR. CHETNER: Right.

MR. FOX: Okay. I'm wondering - you mentioned under Contract Services that \$20,000 of that related to the computer purchase. Is that for training or installation or . . .

MR. CHETNER: Five thousand of it is for training of our staff. They've got to become knowledgeable in WordPerfect and data base, and so on and so forth; that's my understanding. The remainder, \$15,000, is what we will end up paying Public Works to oversee the system through the first year.

MR. FOX: That's a charge levied by them to the office?

MR. CHETNER: Right.

MR. TANNAS: I'm wondering about the whole idea of the computer. Did you come to this committee and get approval for this in the previous committee? What is the process, I guess I'm really asking, of how you get approved to move into the computer age kind of thing, at this kind of level? Or is that what you're asking now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is all proposed.

MR. CHETNER: I think it was brought to the committee and indicated we were going to do a study, which Mr. Trawick completed, and I guess this is basically the proposal for the purchase.

MR. ADY: So did the previous committee receive the study?

MR. CHETNER: Now you've got me. Was it ever submitted?

MR. ADY: No.

MS WATSON: Basically, two years ago Mr. Trawick, in consultation, actually hired Public Works to conduct a study to see what our needs were and what sort of technological communications support we needed to facilitate the office. They conducted a study with the principle that it was sort of set aside for awhile. Then it was brought back out. We reviewed it again about four months ago with Public Works; they updated our prices and that for us. So basically they have been involved since day one. They conducted the study that basically told us what we needed to meet our office needs.

MR. CHETNER: I guess what we're doing is saying: this is what we require and this is what it's going to cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Yeah. I have a question of Dixie, I guess. Do you feel that with this new equipment you might actually save in other areas? Is it going to make it much more cost-efficient as far as hours?

MS WATSON: I think it will. The main complaint system is in Edmonton. A similar complaint system is not kept in Calgary. Everything is maintained in Edmonton. We are constantly transferring files down there, keeping a copy of the correspondence up here. The investigators in our office have the advantage of going to the computer and seeing, for example, if a person phones in, have they phoned in before; do we have an active investigation. We have that at our fingertips. Calgary does not. Now, when I say we have it at our fingertips, we have one terminal for everybody in the whole office, basically, that that complaint system is in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess I have to ask a question. Why do you need it in Calgary? Departments of government have their head offices in Edmonton. Some have branches in Calgary. Some have branches in other parts of the province. We've got a total manpower component of 20 people. Maybe you'd better go back and run the philosophy by us again as to what we're talking about in Calgary. Is it the same kind of element we have in Edmonton with the network tying the two? And why?

MR. CHETNER: Basically the Calgary office services an equal amount of population, if you want to go on the basis of population, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: But with the RITE lines and so on, a resident of Jack's in Cardston can phone Edmonton as easily as he can Calgary. And does it matter, as long as he gets an answer to his question?

MR. CHETNER: Well, except that when they ask for the Ombudsman's office they normally get put through to the closest office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if they do, it's because we've directed it that way, isn't it?

MR. CHETNER: No, no. As a matter of fact, if they use our Zenith number they come into Edmonton, but for some reason or other . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I have a hard time understanding that. I mean, my constituents know the Ombudsman works out of Edmonton, not Calgary. So if they're going through Calgary, somebody's directing them.

MR. CHETNER: I guess maybe the RITE operators are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe they are. Can you give us again the philosophy of what we're trying to achieve?

MR. CHETNER: What we're trying to achieve is that Calgary is operating the same way Edmonton is. They're on line. There's no delay because the investigators are operating out of Calgary. The letters can be changed very quickly if there has to be a change. The reports can get through just as quickly. The investigators can get access to the information in the computers without tying up somebody in Edmonton - through a phone call and so on - doing their work for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: I guess I have two questions related to that. Number one, I think what we're a bit fearful of is unnecessary duplication. Number two goes back to the new equipment or the possible new equipment. Would you need most of that whether or not you have a fully functional Calgary office?

MR. CHETNER: We will need most of the equipment because our NBI equipment is becoming dated and has to be replaced for the word processing aspect. The total amount of money involved here: in the overall operation we're talking an additional \$130,000, of which I would guesstimate that \$100,000 is a one-time fee and then we will have maybe \$30,000 per year; I don't know. To give us a system that will be modern, yes, we're going to have to replace the NBI equipment in Calgary as well. It's getting dated, and this will be a double function where you will have your data base as well as your word processing feature in the one system.

MRS. GAGNON: So to just clarify, if the Calgary office offers additional service or equivalent service to the Edmonton office, what are the additional costs? Just to clarify, which are those that will happen no matter what, and which are those that will happen . . .

MR. CHETNER: I think the additional cost is the cost of the dedicated line, because if you approve it, we're going to buy the equipment and we're going to have to have it in both places. The one will only be used for the word processing feature on it.

MR. ADY: Again I've got to go back to the basics. You've probably been there a long time and can tell me, but going back to when the Ombudsman's office was originally established, likely there was an office in Edmonton with all the facilities here, whatever we had at that time.

MR. CHETNER: Right.

MR. ADY: Then likely we started out with some investigators being stationed in Calgary and probably had an office to go to. Now are we bringing ourselves to the point where we're going to have two totally functioning independent offices, the only difference really being that one of them has got the chief

Ombudsman in it and the other one hasn't? Are we getting to that position?

MR. CHETNER: Well, we're basically at that position. But the Ombudsman controls all investigations, so to suggest that yes, we want them to operate . . . All investigators operate independently conducting their investigations and also operate independently when they're dealing with the public, taking phone calls and so on and so forth. This will not add or detract from that aspect of what is currently happening. The Ombudsman doesn't sit and direct every word these people give to the public when they phone in and so on and so forth. This will just improve the service they're able to give from a time point of view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions on the computer communications equipment? Ed, would you feel more comfortable if we held the Other Purchased Services, the travel, and dealt with that in camera?

MR. CHETNER: I could. Yeah. No problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Why don't we deal with other matters before we move in camera? Are there any other questions that members wish to ask either under Supplies and Services or Fixed Assets before we go in camera? Yes, Don?

MR. TANNAS: The only question I would have on that is that under the Purchase of Office Equipment there's nothing scheduled here, and you're going to take on several new people. Did you happen to buy more desks than you needed the last time?

MR. CHETNER: No, no. They were taken on last year. We have no additional people coming on this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That means the positions were approved last year and the office supplies purchased?

MR. CHETNER: Well, we had them from previous years. Actually, every time we get an Ombudsman, one cuts and the other one . . . So we don't really turn in the furniture.

MR. FOX: I'd like to just ask a question, Ed, about the positions then. There are 20 people on staff. I assume there's only one position not filled at present and that is the Ombudsman's position.

MR. CHETNER: No, we have another support staff that we have not filled recently.

MR. FOX: On maternity leave?

MR. CHETNER: Basically it's the Ombudsman's secretary. We have a potential for that position. We decided we would hold off filling it until the Ombudsman was appointed.

MR. FOX: Okay. Of those, 15 are salaried positions and five are contract positions. How do you decide who's contract and who's permanent?

MR. CHETNER: The contract positions: one is the Ombudsman - we take for granted that he's coming in on a contract position - and four are investigative staff. They were hired on

contract. This was done when Mr. Sawyer was first appointed. He decided the easiest way to deal with people was to bring them in under contract, watch them for a year, and if they were satisfactory, fine; they would have the choice of remaining under contract or going permanent. Three of the four have been with us for some time, and they have all chosen to remain under contract rather than go on to permanent positions.

MR. FOX: Can you give us just a quick rundown - it's been a while since we were at the office there - of the number of support staff, investigators? How many are in Calgary; how many are in Edmonton? I think that thumbnail sketch would be useful.

MR. CHETNER: Calgary is easy. There are three investigators and two support staff. One of the investigators is the manager of the Calgary office. I should point out that all of our managers, solicitor, and everybody who is involved are involved in doing investigations. For example, Dixie's in charge of administration, so she does investigations into Treasury, PAO, pensions, things of that sort: the complaints we get in those areas. We have six support staff in Edmonton and one vacancy, so that's really seven. What does that leave us with? Eight investigators. One happens to be a solicitor, one is a manager of investigations, one is manager of administration, and an Ombudsman.

MR. FOX: Is the manager of investigations the same - that's your position - as the senior investigator or the manager . . .

MR. CHETNER: The senior investigator.

MR. FOX: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. HYLAND: So right now you're wearing two hats?

MR. CHETNER: Trying to, yeah.

MR. FOX: A hat and a toque.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Want to move that we go in camera?

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we go in camera so we can discuss some other things with Mr. Chetner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour? Let the record show it's unanimous.

[The committee met in camera from 2:43 p.m. to 3:25 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Do you have the wording of the motion we made?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: No, but I'll reword it when . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're ready, I think, for the Ombudsman first. The three components?

MR. ADY: I'll make the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Jack so moves.

MR. ADY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is on the Ombudsman, and this is to ensure that the committee's approval must be obtained for the transfer of funds from one element to either of the other two. If dollars are to be transferred within the element, they will now, as they have in the past, work with Treasury officials. And we'll check on the wording of the motion to ensure it's consistent with that in the Auditor General's and the soon-to-be Chief Electoral Officer's.

Any further questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has been called. All in favour? Let the record show it's unanimous.
Now, on the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. SIGURDSON: I move the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom so moves. This is the same essence, and we'll just put that in.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: They'll be the same, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. In *Hansard* too.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Are we ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question's been called. All in favour? Let the record show it's unanimous.

Now, who sends in the Auditor General's budget?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I'll have to call them. Just the information they [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll deal with all those together. Okay.
Then let's go to the Chief Electoral Officer's budget. There were several elements.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Tab 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chief Electoral Officer?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I'm sorry. Or were we doing the Auditor General?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eight. Well, there's nothing under the Auditor General, is there?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: No, we haven't done his budget, even approved it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Louise is reminding me that we have not officially approved the Auditor General's budget. Why don't we go to it first? It's tab 6.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I thought we left that one because we're going to see what Kingston Ross had to say, and that had some effect on . . .

MRS. KAMUCHIK: The invoice from Kingston Ross falls under the committee budget.

MR. HYLAND: Oh, for sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does someone wish to move the approval?
Stan.

MR. NELSON: Well, I just have one question here, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where are you at, Stan?

MR. NELSON: The Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, but where?

MR. NELSON: Under this tab 6, under 1990-91 budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We're with you so far, Stan.

MR. NELSON: Okay. I have some concern with two areas, in particular the area of Materials and Supplies, where we're asking for roughly a 13.5 percent increase in that area alone. It was my view that it was a little too much, considering I know that government's going to start looking at these anyway. I mean, they're holding the line or doing minimal re increase. So with that one there I would like to suggest - they've asked for 13; give them a 6 percent increase and that'll be it, so in essence \$6,500, which will give them \$108,000 instead of \$115,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that a motion?

MR. NELSON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any question on the motion? You'll recall that we did discuss this item with the Auditor General as to Supplies and Services, as to why the increase.

MR. FOX: What was the justification given at the time?

MRS. GAGNON: If I recall, it was a subscription for software stuff, wasn't it?

MR. NELSON: It was basically for inflationary increases in paper and supplies in the main, plus they considered some additional usage. The other reason was that there is some reason to believe that with some of the types of paper they have to use with certain new equipment, the costs may be somewhat higher.

MR. FOX: And you don't think that's legitimate?

MR. NELSON: Well, to a certain degree. That's why I'm saying 6 percent instead of going 3 percent.

MR. FOX: You mean 6 instead of 13?

MR. NELSON: Three. I would have suggested 3 percent

without that explanation, based on inflation only.

MRS. GAGNON: Just to recap then: your motion is that we set the figure with a 10 percent increase rather than a 13.5 percent?

MR. NELSON: No, \$108,000, which is about a low 6 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's \$108,000 rather than \$115,000. Any further question on the motion? Derek.

MR. FOX: I'd speak against the motion because I think we're just picking numbers out of the air here. I think when the Auditor General and his staff present it to us, it's based on an estimate of the anticipated increasing cost of the stuff they are buying, and it's proper for us to question them. But I'm reluctant to just pick a figure out of the air and say: "Well, it's not going to cost us that much. It's only going to cost this much." I'd hate to see the Auditor General's office run out of paper and not be able to do the things they need to do. We have to make sure they can justify those expense requests when they come before us, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: In one way it would have been more timely had we dealt with the motion the day we had our meeting, because some of us have forgotten some of the responses given about the increase, and I do recall - I think it was Yolande or Stan who earlier mentioned - that there was an anticipation of increased usage.

MR. NELSON: May I just make a comment, Mr. Chairman? The other thing, too, is that many of our offices have tremendous supplies of paper and other stationery equipment. Now, what you try to do is make them more efficient in the manner and the level of inventory they keep in their offices. I think if all government offices would examine the level of inventory that is actually in place and order as needed rather than placing large inventories, they would operate more efficiently. We've done the same thing at AADAC. We're not allowed any increase in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don, and then Jack.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. Just picking up from what Stan is saying, the fact of the matter is that when you buy paper, if you order two or three thousand sheets, the price is considerably higher than if you order 50,000. So the advantage of buying 100,000 sheets really exceeds 6 percent. It gets into 25, 30, and 40 percent when you get big numbers. So there is an advantage to large numbers.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll let you sum up, okay? Because we've spent a lot of time on this one motion.

Jack, and then Stan.

MR. ADY: On your motion, Stan, I have some problems because I don't have enough background and recall of our discussion on that to arbitrarily make that decision for the Auditor General's department. Surely there must be a rationale for it as opposed to just wanting another \$14,000. I have a problem with just arbitrarily doing it. If we're going to do it

with that category, then we could do it with a number of others there.

MR. NELSON: Well, I'll just make two comments. Number one is that first of all, the government has a general contract to purchase paper for the overall operation. It isn't done by department. So you're going to get the same price whether you reduce the whole thing 6 percent or 5 percent or nothing or increase it.

Secondly, I guess anything we do is going to be arbitrary, Jack, albeit we were talking about \$7,000, and it isn't a great deal of money in the overall picture. That being the case, you might as well just accept what the Auditor General has indicated as what his needs are and just say, "Okay, you've got what you want," and don't change a thing. That's fine.

MR. ADY: No. You're oversimplifying it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly the responsibility of this committee is to ask questions and be satisfied that the proposed budgets as presented by the three officers are indeed warranted. We do have the ability and the responsibility to make changes where we see fit. What I've heard some people say is that we've got to have more factual information before we can do that.

MR. ADY: Is there someone in this committee who can give us a recall on what the discussion was? Because, frankly, it's slipped my mind as to why he wanted that increase. If we could have some kind of accurate . . . I suppose it's in *Hansard*, but I'd really like to have that as part of the discussion if we're going to do it.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take all day of the committee's time to debate \$7,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom first. You've been very patient.

MR. SIGURDSON: Just perhaps a question, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if it necessarily relates to the motion, but I am concerned. As this crosses over into the 1991 calendar year - and I know that governments don't charge other governments our taxation currently - is there going to be some cost with the GST to some of the materials and services that are going to be provided to departments in 1991?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe a directive from Treasury, in a more standard sense, is that you cannot anticipate or you should not try to look into a crystal ball. You work with givens; you work with the legislation that's in place. The GST is still a proposal.

MR. SIGURDSON: Right. Okay.

MRS. GAGNON: It won't come into effect till '91.

MR. SIGURDSON: I know, but this crosses over.

MRS. GAGNON: That's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for the question?

MR. FOX: Can I ask: is *Hansard* available from our meeting last week?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise said it's not yet ready.

But there's a lesson here for the Chair, and that is that we should deal with each section if possible. Now, we couldn't deal with the Chief Electoral Officer's division because of the questions. In fact, with one of the three elements we had questions on each of the three parts in that element. But we could have dealt with the Auditor General's, and it now appears we should have.

Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has been called. All in favour of the motion? This is the motion to amend the budget by reducing Materials and Supplies from \$115,000 to \$108,000. All those opposed? The motion is lost.

All right, are we ready for another motion?

MR. HYLAND: I would move we accept the office of the Auditor General's budget as submitted at \$11,260,563, the exception being the adjustment for his agreed-upon salary increase. Right? Because that won't be in here.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Normally when there's an increase . . .

MR. HYLAND: Don't mention that, okay?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: No, I wouldn't mention it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're approving the budget as presented.

MR. HYLAND: Okay.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has been called. All in favour? Okay. Let the record show it's unanimous.

Now we move to tab 8. Louise has advised that Mr. Mahon is here from Kingston Ross, so how would it be if we paused for a moment, and we'll invite him in. Now, everyone recalls the reason we invited Mr. Mahon here?

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes. Number of hours.

MRS. GAGNON: We're supposed to give him shit, right?

MR. NELSON: You ought to go in camera. You could cut that off.

MR. TANNAS: Are we in camera?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we are not. Do you wish to go in camera?

MRS. GAGNON: Is that going to be on the transcript? I mean, the Speaker has disciplined me before. I don't know, if it happens again . . .

MR. TANNAS: I would move that we go in camera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. A motion that we move in . . .

MR. ADY: I think in fairness we should be in camera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favour? Opposed, if any?

[The committee met in camera from 3:39 p.m. to 4:21 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're back in. Now, are you ready for our motion? Alan is moving that the firm of Kingston Ross be retained, further to their letter of - what's the date on it, Louise?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: They didn't submit a letter as such.

MR. HYLAND: October 23, 1989.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Well, it's not really a letter. It's a letter of explanation that they sent.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah, but it says, "Actual '89 [audit] fee less budgeted reduction, \$12,475."

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an estimate of \$12,475, based on 166 hours for 1990. That's your motion, Alan?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

Now, does that conclude our discussions on the Auditor General's budget and on our involvement re the audit of the Auditor General? Now we need a motion regarding the salary of the Auditor General. We dealt with that issue, but we did not make a motion when we met last.

MR. HYLAND: Does anybody remember what it was? The actual number?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. FOX: Well, pursuant to our discussions the other day, I'd like to move that the Auditor General's salary be approved for a 7.5 percent increase effective April 1, 1990.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further question on the motion?

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour? Opposed, if any? Carried.

MR. NELSON: You know what? That motion was moved, because I moved it the other day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apparently it wasn't.

All right. Now we can move on to the Chief Electoral Officer. Now we're on tab 8. Louise?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Yes. But look at all the stuff you've got to clear out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know.

MR. NELSON: We're going to have to go in camera on this

one for the salary part.

MR. HYLAND: No; we set it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it's done.

MR. NELSON: Did we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We moved on one but not the other.

We're back to the Chief Electoral Officer's budget, under tab B. We're dealing with \$135,000 under tab B and smaller amounts under tab C that were based on the premise of a new election Act and amendments to the financial disclosures Act coming about in the spring of 1990. The Chief Electoral Officer is advising that he is now satisfied that neither of these two Acts will move in the spring of 1990.

The second item relates to the proposed republishing of an expanded version of *A Report on Alberta Elections 1905-1982*, but I suggest we hold that and deal first with the sections of the budget related to the premise that there'd be amendments made to two of our key Acts.

MR. HYLAND: So we just don't accept that portion of it then? We just have to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, under tab B there's \$75,000 plus \$10,000.

MR. HYLAND: That's \$50,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. That's a separate item, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: Okay, yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's printing and production of a book, which we'll come to next.

Now, under tab C, do we have a breakdown as to what's included there, Louise?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Tab C: if you look at the attachment 1, which would be a letter from Pat Ledgerwood . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Tab C.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: . . . it shows that at the bottom of the page we're dealing with enumeration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just a moment.

MR. NELSON: Okay, do you understand what he's done here with this? Under Enumeration, what he's done - it appears that the first numbers are what's presently in the budget and the second number is what is presently being recommended. In other words, the total element under C is \$311,500; he is now suggesting it be \$156,050.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. Because I was looking over the code on Preparation of Maps, \$50,000. You will see that that comes under C2: maps - \$50,000/0. So I think your interpretation is right.

MR. NELSON: Under the other tab, under B, in essence his budget is \$2,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where do you get \$2,000 from?

MR. NELSON: Election Total. It's got \$135,000/\$2,000, so it's \$2,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. NELSON: So the overall budget would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that should be \$2,000.

MR. HYLAND: The \$117,000, I think, is assuming somewhere along the way . . .

MR. NELSON: So the overall budget under tab 8 for the three totals will now be \$616,905 as against \$905,355.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we deal with them, though, according to the tabs, because there are amendments to B and C? And before we do that, we need to go back and decide about the book and the \$50,000 proposal. Can we move to the book?

MR. ADY: Yeah, let's talk about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone who would recommend that we move in this particular year?

MR. NELSON: I would move we don't.

MR. SIGURDSON: I would certainly like to see other figures come back, a presentation on doing the book by volume, and I don't, therefore, think that spending \$50,000 at this point without having other pieces of information before us is all that wise.

MR. ADY: Mr. Chairman, just to be clear. We have three options on the book. Either we do a printing or we don't do a printing or we do an addendum. Is that clear?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there's a fourth option, and that's really Tom's point, which I think is a consensus of where we were last day, that maybe we as a committee should spend some time between now and next year at this time deciding what we'd like to see in a book and sit down and have some preliminary discussions with the Chief Electoral Officer in advance of the budget.

MR. SIGURDSON: I think it's a valuable tool to have in reference libraries and a very useful book for politicians and those who just study politics, but I don't want to see us spend a great deal of money every two elections if we can start putting out volumes. So I would hope that we could start looking at that in next year's plans.

MR. ADY: Back on my point, though, part of going in the direction that you're advocating is to delay . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A decision.

MR. ADY: . . . a decision. Okay. So I'm clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And pull the \$50,000 out of the budget.

MR. ADY: Right.

MR. TANNAS: Would you not think it would be worth while to have a few thousand in there to supplement the research? If we're going to do it . . .

MR. HYLAND: It's all there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it isn't research that's needed in terms of making a decision. It's a policy decision on what we want.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. All right.

MR. HYLAND: See, he's got down printing and production costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So if I can just sum up, if that's the consensus, when we are ready for motions, we can deal with tab A, and I think it's tab A as presented. For tab B the new figure would be \$2,000, and for tab C the new figure would be \$156,000.

MR. SIGURDSON: Can we talk about that which is contained under tab C? Or do you want to deal with them . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, let's talk about it before we move to any motions.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. With respect to tab C, because it includes enumeration, I am concerned about - in the letter to you, Mr. Chairman, dated December 15, in the first paragraph, c., it says:

There will be neither a need for a Provincial General Enumeration, nor will there be a Provincial General Election, prior to December 3, 1991.

It's rather presumptuous, I think, for the Chief Electoral Officer to second-guess the will of the Premier, and I think that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just to clarify, at the beginning he indicates that he wishes "to make the following assumptions."

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. Sorry. I apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He qualifies it.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. For the sake of *Hansard* and the Chief Electoral Officer, I want to withdraw that remark that he's presumptuous. Sorry, Pat.

However, having said that, unless there's going to be, and correct me if I'm wrong, an amendment to the Election Act, there wouldn't be an enumeration until September of 1992.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah. The second year after . . .

MR. ADY: The second year and every year thereafter.

MR. FOX: So it would be 1991 in the normal course of affairs?

MR. SIGURDSON: It would be 1991 in the normal course of affairs, which he's saying we ought not to be looking at. I just have some difficulty with not having a general enumeration in September of 1991.

MR. HYLAND: No, that's okay, because that would be in the next year's budget.

MR. NELSON: He's right, because two years is 1991, the '91-92 budget. This only goes to March 31, 1991, and then we go to 1991-92. Your normal enumeration is done in the fall of '91.

MR. ADY: Yeah, the end of the next fiscal year, Tom.

MR. NELSON: So you're okay there, Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. Even though he says that "There will be neither a need for a Provincial General Enumeration . . ."

MR. NELSON: I would think he would be including up to March 31, 1991.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clearly it's a discussion for next year's budget in any event.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, it will be, because you'll have to put it in the '91-92 budget, which runs April 1, 1991, to March 31, 1992, for him to enumerate in September of '91.

MR. SIGURDSON: Right. Okay. Thank you.

MR. FOX: Perhaps it's not fair of me to comment here because I did miss a few moments of the meeting the other day with the Chief Electoral Officer, so I missed some of the discussion here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. FOX: He's submitting a revised budget estimate based on his understanding that the committee wishes him "to make the following assumptions." And I take it from that that he's not comfortable with those assumptions, as someone who wants to be able to have that office election-ready at any time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Derek. Now, let's be clear. When we went through tabs A, B, and C, the question was put to the Chief Electoral Officer - actually, I began by making the statement that I was unaware that we would be amending the two pieces of legislation in the spring of 1990, given the legislative load I believe we'll have in any event. It was agreed that we would double-check and the Chief Electoral Officer would do some checking to see if, in fact, there was a high likelihood that the legislation would indeed be going through in 1990. If in fact it was going to, then it was appropriate to have the figures built in. If it was not, then it's not needed.

The checking was made through two sources: by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff with the Government House Leader, by the Chief Electoral Officer. Both have come back with the same conclusion. That's why the Chief Electoral Officer is now proposing that you reduce the estimates by the figures as presented.

MR. FOX: My reading of this letter is that he's not entirely comfortable with those assumptions, though, that if something . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, would you like to be more specific?

MR. FOX: Well, if there was, for example, an election called prior to December 31, 1991, for whatever unexpected reason, or the boundary amendments came through prior to March 31, 1991, and a by-election should need to be fought in a particular riding . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A by-election? Okay.

MR. FOX: Yeah. What I read him saying in the last paragraph of his letter is that he's not going to go out and restock unnecessarily, not going to buy things that they don't need, but he wants to have the flexibility to make sure that that office is election-ready at the drop of a hat. Again, I missed some of the conversation pursuant to the timing of the proposed electoral boundary changes and what that does to the process, but I worry a little bit about us passing a dramatically pared-down budget and then him not having the tools that he needs to respond to changing circumstances. That's my concern. I'll leave it at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Stan.

MR. NELSON: Well, I'm not having the same concern at the present time, because as far as the enumeration is concerned, I think it's normally two years after the election anyway, which will mean September of 1991, which would fall into the following budget year.

The second point is that the Chief Electoral Officer's office maintains a supply of items for an election; for example, for a by-election or what have you. I forget what he said when we were over there visiting, but he has considerable supplies to do a number of constituencies, should it arise, for a by-election or other purposes.

The third point is that when we're dealing with this a year from now, we will have in place the ability for him to prepare for that between April 1 and September 1 or thereabouts when he actually goes into the enumeration mode. So he's got plenty of time in there. He could be planning between now and that time anyway. So I don't feel that this should be a concern, that that can't be tied together when the appropriate time comes.

MR. HYLAND: I guess I should have said - I don't think I did - that I checked with Jim Horsman regarding the Acts. He said he didn't see it unless something changed, and he hadn't even discussed it with other House leaders. So even if there was a movement, it's a long ways down the road, probably not in this session, to get those two Acts - those three Acts really - forward. So there was no need to budget for reprinting if we're not going to do the Acts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Let's be clear, and possibly you weren't present when the Chief Electoral Officer gave the explanation last Friday. The items pulled out of the budget under tabs B and C all should relate to or be based on the assumption that we'd have two new Acts in place. Without the two new Acts in place, the dollars are not needed because the materials are there. Within the elements, if you'll look at your analysis sheet, you'll note that the returning officers' fees and honorariums are in place, other resupply figures are in place, so the only parts of the budget being pulled out are those parts that can't be used anyway unless the Acts are changed. We've checked from two sources; we don't believe the Acts are going to be changed. Therefore, we're saying, "Why build into your budget dollars that you're certain will not be needed?" It should

not affect the operation of the Chief Electoral Officer or the appointment of the 83 returning officers across the province.

MR. HYLAND: And I think he felt comfortable with that. He felt uncomfortable putting it in not knowing what was going to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone else on this point?

MR. ADY: Well, I just think we've gone through the point of clarifying those Acts, and now it's clear that we don't need to budget for those things. The fall of 1991 is the first time we're going to need any new enumeration material.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yes, Derek?

MR. FOX: I understand what's being said here. So the returning officers would be reappointed and in place in the ridings. In case something happened that required a by-election in a given riding prior to boundaries being changed, they've got the supplies, they've got the - I see the budgeted amount here for the returning officers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. It's unchanged. It is the same figure that appeared for the returning officers before: \$117,050.

MR. FOX: Now, is there any way money could be saved that way in terms of having returning officers in place, or is that considered to be too risky a thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry?

MR. FOX: Well, if we're hiring returning officers when - if there's no enumeration in the next budget year and not likely an election, is it just sort of a hedge against . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the enumeration would occur in the 1990-91 budget year.

MR. HYLAND: I think that's in the Act. It says the year after the election we have to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we're dealing with a red herring.

MR. FOX: The enumeration will occur in the 1991-92 budget year.

MR. HYLAND: But I think Derek's question . . . I think that's in the Act, that we have to have those in place even though we're not having an enumeration. I think there's a time frame on the appointment of returning officers.

MR. SIGURDSON: Derek, I had asked the question of the Chief Electoral Officer, and he said that in the event of a by-election the Act stipulates that there has to be a returning officer resident inside the boundaries of the constituency.

MR. ADY: That's right.

MR. SIGURDSON: So that was one of the reasons they're maintaining all of the appointments. Because my thoughts were very much the same as yours. He also offered a couple of other reasons for maintaining them.

MR. HYLAND: There was only one constituency he could have done himself. That was the one he lived in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I had earlier suggested that we might deal with three motions, because we've amended two of the three parts. Is that in order with the committee?

MR. HYLAND: I would like to move the Administration Element budget. Do we want the number or just say "as submitted?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. HYLAND: The number is \$458,855.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been moved by Alan. Any further question? Ready for the motion?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question has been called. All in favour? Opposed, if any? Carried.

Okay, tab B. Who would like to move that? Don.

MR. TANNAS: I would move that the Election Element be amended to read \$2,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further question on the motion? All in favour? Carried.

Tab C.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, I'll move it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stan? The new figure is \$156,000.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, \$156,050.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And \$50. Ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question's called. All in favour? Carried.

There; that deals with the budget. Tomorrow we will come back to the Ombudsman's budget.

MR. NELSON: And you expect to do that tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, could I move we go in camera briefly?

MR. TANNAS: Do you want to go in camera or adjourn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just go in camera briefly.

MR. TANNAS: Why don't we have a coffee break?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Coffee break?

MR. HYLAND: Yeah, that's fine.

[The committee met in camera from 4:44 p.m. to 5:07 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would entertain a motion to go in camera so that we may determine by secret ballot whether or not there is a need to do a full search for a Chief Electoral Officer, keeping in mind the Chief Electoral Officer's term ends on March 20, 1990.

MR. SIGURDSON: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom has moved. All in favour? Carried unanimously.

[The committee met in camera from 5:08 p.m. to 5:09 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Let the record show that following an extensive discussion with the Chief Electoral Officer last Friday and a further discussion of committee members while we were in camera today, a secret vote was taken. Let the record further show that it was unanimously agreed to that the position of Chief Electoral Officer be offered to the incumbent, Mr. Patrick Ledgerwood, for the next term. A motion to that effect would be appreciated. So moved by Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. ADY: Can I have a discussion on this motion?

MR. FOX: It's got to be moved first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A discussion on . . .

MR. ADY: Did you want to include in that process . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's do that later.

MR. ADY: Later? All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So Cypress-Redcliff moves.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Question has been called. All in favour? Let the record show it's unanimous.

We further discussed the process for the three officers, that we will go through annual reviews and . . . Want to make that motion, Tom?

MR. SIGURDSON: I would move that the officers who report to this committee have the opportunity to annually meet with this committee to discuss areas of mutual concern, whether they deal with legislation or problems contained at their office. Now, I hope that they would not see it as something offensive. I hope it's going to be seen as mutually beneficial. And perhaps for those incumbent officers who have some difficulty with it, we might put it into future job descriptions of other incoming officers.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, question's been called. All in favour? Carried unanimously.

All right. That leaves . . . [interjection] We've dealt with that.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: We're going to come back to the book

during the next year's vote.

MR. TANNAS: What is the disposition of these books is all I want . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think they should go back to Pat Ledgerwood.

All right. For tomorrow evening we have two agenda items. We've got the wrap-up budget for the committee, we've got the elements remaining in the Ombudsman's budget, and then we may have a report from the search committee re a new Ombudsman.

MR. NELSON: You're talking probably 9:30, 10 o'clock?

MR. ADY: How can the search committee give a report and make a recommendation when we perhaps won't have had an opportunity to do all the checks that are necessary to do?

MR. HYLAND: Just a minute. We'd better adjourn this meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought I prefaced it by saying we may have a report.

MR. NELSON: I think we'll adjourn, and then we can talk about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It would be subject to recommendation.

MR. NELSON: Can we adjourn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Motion to adjourn? Jack.

[The committee adjourned at 5:13 p.m.]