

[Chairman: Dr. Elliott]

[2:34 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will call the meeting to order. Welcome, Jim. I think this is the first meeting we've had since you've been on the job. We hope you enjoy the meeting and the assignment and contribute the way Grant did. Grant really was a good contributor, and we expect the same from you. We expect at least that much and won't accept anything less. We do try to be official, but your chairman sometimes slips a cog. I notice that my meetings are a little different from some of the other legislative meetings. We have everything going on tape so there will be a record. But we also have had unanimous agreement from this group in the past that anytime we want the plug pulled on the machine, it's no problem. We can pull the plug and have a really good discussion and then plug it again and keep on talking. So if you don't have any objection to that, we'll continue with that particular approach.

MR. GURNETT: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody has the agenda, items 1 to 7, that Louise prepared for us. I think most of the things we want to talk about are there. Looking at the agenda items then, number 1, left over from March 4, 1985: our committee had a meeting and we have a set of minutes for approval. Do I have a motion? David has moved acceptance of the minutes. Any question on the motion? Those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's carried.

Item 2 from January 22, '85: we had discussion on a letter received from Brian Sawyer, our Ombudsman, regarding the hiring contract for investigator-writer. This has been circulated to everybody. When we visited the Ombudsman's office, he left us with the distinct impression that he preferred to go the way of a contract as opposed to whatever other arrangement there is — hiring on a pay scale. He also left us with the impression that he'd like to have an expression of opinion from us as to whether we have any problem with what he's doing. Those of us who have read the thing over can see no problem with his going in that direction, but he did seem to think it was

important to him to have our support for what he's doing with the contract for that particular position. Can I ask for comments now, please?

DR. CARTER: The motion to concur — we don't need to approve, but we can concur in his action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's an interesting observation. I'd just add to that for a minute for Jim's benefit. We sometimes struggle with the relationship with respect to this meeting to the various offices, the Ombudsman, Chief Electoral Officer, and Auditor General. It's their privilege to ask us for a comment on what we think about something they might be doing, and it's our privilege to comment. They don't have to come to us for approval or ratification of any of the things they're doing, but if they ask for our comment on something like this contract arrangement — what was the word you used, David?

DR. CARTER: Concurrence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will concur. John Thompson just made the motion that this committee concur with the . . .

MR. THOMPSON: With the stipulation that it falls within the budget.

DR. CARTER: Actually, I think it saves him money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine, John. Any question on the motion?

MR. HIEBERT: I would make this expression. I think we should support. I also recommend that there's a performance base in there which will give the Ombudsman a great deal of latitude. Then it will meet the objectives of the office in a way that they'll be developing reports that are going to meet the Ombudsman's satisfaction. So I heartily endorse the approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. Would that have anything to do with extending the contract? That's part of the latitude: that he use the contract as he sees fit to get the job done in his office.

MR. HIEBERT: If the performance is such, they will continue, and if it is not, severance is going to start. I think it gives him a good deal of latitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comment on this topic? We have a motion. Those in favour of the motion? That motion is carried.

I'm looking at item 3 from our committee on April 30, 1985: discussion of the letter received from Brian Sawyer regarding his recent trip to Australia to attend meetings involving the International Ombudsman Institute. That letter was circulated to all members. Is there any comment at this time? By the way, I don't think there's an urgency here. If anybody feels that they've not had an opportunity to review that correspondence recently and that we're moving too quickly, I can see no reason why we can't hold this over for a short while to another meeting. I ask for your guidance on that one if anybody feels uncomfortable with discussing it now. Does somebody have a comment?

MR. ANDERSON: I haven't reviewed it, Mr. Chairman, but if the others have and feel comfortable with discussing it, I wouldn't hold up the meeting.

MR. PURDY: I was going to make the same comment, Mr. Chairman. I haven't reviewed it either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do the people who have reviewed it have any comments in view of that? David, I believe you've reviewed it.

DR. CARTER: We should certainly carry it on as an item on our agenda for a future meeting and perhaps couple it with the possibility of inviting Jones over from the university so that we might either tour the facility there or have him come over and do some explanation here. I say the name Frank Jones in particular rather than the present executive officer of the International Ombudsman Institute.

The letter really has done nothing more than confirm our concerns about the expenditure of funds in a rather less than prudent fashion by the institute. The fact that a decision was made by the committee to send our present Ombudsman to Australia was a very useful move, because it certainly gives us a better handle on what is more than a concern. It's a

real worry as to the past expenditure of funds, the present expenditure of funds, and what is supposedly on the books for what lies ahead. There's no justification to have convened a conference in Australia simply to talk about the next International Ombudsman Institute seminar to held in two years' time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll ask David a question first. If we put this item back on the agenda, would you suggest that we attach again some of the other correspondence and documents I had from an earlier visit with the -- did we not receive a letter from the Minister of Advanced Education on this topic? This is all related, is it not?

DR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, in light of the remarks made and the fact that maybe we should spend some more time on the total problem, I move at this time that we table this for some future agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Any question on that motion? Those in favour of that motion? We'll carry it forward, and the comment with respect to again attaching the other correspondence might be helpful.

Item 4, from the committee discussion of May 8: correspondence received from Brian Lee with respect to Bill 215, An Act to Amend the Ombudsman Act. Brian sent a letter to me, as chairman of this committee, requesting that he meet with us. As your chairman I saw fit to run that past the Legislative Counsel, got a response, returned it to Brian, and provided you people with copies of all that correspondence. I just want to put it here to flag it if anybody has any comment with respect to the actions taken by the chairman, good or bad. Otherwise, we're on to item 5.

MR. ANDERSON: I would like to say that I think the chairman handled that very well and appropriately.

MR. PURDY: I concur with his decision.

DR. CARTER: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Item 6 . . .

MR. HIEBERT: Number 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Did I skip one? Item 5: approval of expenditures for the committee members attending the Ombudsman conference in Quebec. That's probably the most important piece of business we have here, and I just about went past it.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, if I could. Before we actually look at the approval of expenditures for the members going to the Ombudsman conference, it's my understanding that Bud Miller and I have been chosen as representatives and that there is a possible addition to that. I would like to move that John Thompson be sent as a delegate as well to this particular conference in Quebec.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. Any comments on the motion?

MR. THOMPSON: If I vote on it, Al, is that a conflict of interest?

DR. CARTER: Yes, it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the motion?

MR. ANDERSON: When is that conference?

MR. CHAIRMAN: June 16 to 19, 1985. There again, I'm working from a sheet that shows the travel plans we put out at an earlier meeting. If anybody is short of some information in your files and you want to refer to it, we can make arrangements now to have it attached to the minutes or you can contact our secretary.

MR. ANDERSON: I'd like a copy of that.

DR. CARTER: She already has it right there.

DR. CARTER: What took you so long, Louise?

MRS. EMPSON: The photocopier was slow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That motion was carried. Since we have that piece of paper in front of us, I'd just draw your attention to the plans. We have the Ombudsman conference in June. We have the Legislative Auditors in July in Whitehorse.

DR. CARTER: To which you're going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm accompanying the Auditor General to that. Jim, are you a member of the Public Accounts Committee?

MR. GURNETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then you'll be there, too, as a member of Public Accounts.

MR. GURNETT: No. Ray is going, but I'm not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we have one in December, the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation in Ottawa or Toronto. The first week in December '85 we have the Council on Government Ethics Laws in Chicago. Those last two conferences we have put on hold with respect to assigning people to monitor our activities. We'll bring them up for discussion later.

DR. CARTER: Just one point. We'll send only one person to the comprehensive auditing one, whereas we could probably send two to the one in Chicago. It's that initial conference fee, which is \$400-and-some I think.

MRS. EMPSON: It's \$375, which is still high.

DR. CARTER: Bud and I were there last year. The conference paid for one of us and we paid the other. That was our recommendation, that only one go to that and two to the other. We can decide that in July.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we looking at item 6?

MR. HIEBERT: We still have to approve the expenditures, Mr. Chairman.

DR. CARTER: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion from David Carter approving expenditures for the addition of John Thompson to that conference. Are there questions on the motion? Those in favour of the motion? That motion is carried.

Item 6: approval of expenditures for the chairman attending the conference of Legislative Auditors in Whitehorse. Now, there's a motion. Thank you, Dennis.

DR. CARTER: I'd like to amend the motion, that it's one way.

MR. PURDY: Dogteam back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we make it one way, would you consider extending it half way around the Pacific Rim, around Tahiti or something?

MR. HIEBERT: Provided you add it to Ray Martin's budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did I ask for a vote on that one? Yes, I did.

DR. CARTER: We didn't vote on it.

MR. PURDY: We have the amendment first.

DR. CARTER: Do I need unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see why it's difficult chairing this meeting? John Thompson, are you ready for the question? Those in favour of that last motion? Thank you.

Item 7: committee meeting with respect to the farewell function for our Chief Electoral Officer, Kenneth Wark. David would you please take this one?

DR. CARTER: We'll have to arrange a suitable farewell function, hopefully through the Speaker and in the Speaker's suite, similar to the one that was held for Dr. Ivany when he left. Possibly that would occur sometime in July, and failing that, within the first week of August. I think he's got conferences in Quebec City and may well be away most of July. I expect he will be back around August 1, so we'll have to have a date set at the joint discretion of the chairman and the Speaker.

One of the things we did because — I had undertaken that I would do what I hope you will agree is a suitable plaque to present to him at that time. I thought we should well make use of the enhanced coat of arms for the province and that that would be presented on behalf of the committee. If the committee agrees with that, hopefully they'll concur with the approval to pay the bill of \$38.35.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise will be the custodian of it until we move, or yourself, or whatever.

MRS. EMPSON: My office can hold it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as we know where it is.

We have the motion. Any question on the motion? Those in favour of the motion? The motion is carried.

With respect to the farewell function, we talked about the plaque. Would it be acceptable if I and/or David, as our vice-chairman, work with the Speaker and set something up?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'll likely hear about this through a notice of some kind further down the line.

There'll be a replacement coming in, I understand. We're in the search and select process, I gather, and somewhere down the line there will be a new Chief Electoral Officer. We will plan a get-to-know-him or a welcome thing later in the fall. The impression I got from last fall's reception — when we had our three officers for sandwiches and coffee that day in September or October up in 512, it was for the MLAs to come and say hello and meet these three people — is that it was considered to be an acceptable function and people felt quite good. Would that be a time to introduce our new Chief Electoral Officer, or would you want something different from that? If you think that was good enough for the new Ombudsman last fall, we'll treat the new . . .

MR. PURDY: I suggest that maybe we should have a private get-together with the new Chief Electoral Officer and this particular committee and maybe the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prior to . . .

MR. PURDY: Prior to any . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's check with the Speaker. David and/or I can check it out with the Speaker and see if this involves a special swearing-in of some kind. We went through that exercise with the Ombudsman. Okay, we'll follow up on that. Good point. So there will be two functions involved.

MR. HIEBERT: I agree with that, because the Chief Electoral Officer will identify with the subcommittee that's doing the interviewing. I think it's important that he identify with the overall legislative [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once he's in position, then he becomes part of our concern. That's why we exist, to maintain that contact with him. That's a good point.

DR. CARTER: That also would take place sometime in August. We should do that quite early. We really should have a kind of melding of people's times, when they're available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't mix the goodbye to the old and hello to the new at the same function. We really have three things coming up with respect to semi-social functions as a function of this committee. Any other comment with respect to the topic of the new officer coming on force?

Going on then, I have added a topic. I want to comment about the annual report that was put together while the House was sitting. We had it typed, proofread, and edited, and we put it to press and tabled it with the Legislature in the usual manner for filing in the Library or something. One change I made from when I had it put together in the first place was that in my first copy I had the salaries of the officers displayed along with that back page which showed their term of assignment or the period for the salary scale, along with their budget item. The second-last page is the one I'm referring to, I guess, because the last page is our budget. We as a committee have a budget. I also had the officers' salaries displayed on the second-last page. It was brought to my attention that even though the officers' salaries are public, it doesn't necessarily mean that we go around publicizing. There's a slight difference, so I withdrew that information. It's still public information, and we can find those numbers any time we want. All we have to do is ask. But I didn't include them in the report to show what their annual incomes are.

MR. THOMPSON You just showed the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, their final budget item, which, by the way, is the budget item we approved here. I noticed there are a few dollars

and cents different than what was finally presented in the Assembly. We stuck to the item we approved here, so if anybody tries to compare that item with the one that was printed in the accounts statement . . .

That's just a comment I made on that. I don't think the annual report that was presented was necessarily a masterpiece of literature but met the minimum requirements. If anybody wants to retain a sample and take on the task of writing one next year, we'd be happy to share the job.

DR. CARTER: Having received the message, we think it's a terrific report. Actually, it was good and that's all one needs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a put up or shut up thing.

I have to admit that when I drafted it originally I had Jim Gurnett in mind, because I thought if a person really wanted to read this thing and was serious about reading it and wanted to know what we did in the last year, that would probably give you as good an overview in the fewest possible words that I could put together. I happen to be an annual report addict. I think a person should be able to go back and have some brief record of what we did in the last year.

Item 9, which also isn't on your list of items, is finalizing the process of the Chief Electoral Officer, if we have a responsibility there. David, you're chairing the search and select committee. Do you have a comment you want to make with respect to what has to be done yet? Is this for an update?

DR. CARTER: This is an update as to the process. We'll keep with the Chief Electoral Officer for a moment, and then a couple of items from now perhaps I can give just a brief update on where we are with the search for the new Auditor General as well.

With the Chief Electoral Officer, we had 200 applicants and then shortened the list to 16. We're in the interview process, and this week we interviewed six. We have another three for Monday. We have an additional group of about six that are being interviewed in Ottawa next week. We hope to have the decision finalized by the last week of June or no later than the first week of July.

Then the process is that we file a copy of the report, a very brief report, with every member

of the Assembly. Then there must be convened a special meeting of the Legislative Offices Committee to approve what the search committee recommended. It is our understanding that we will give one name to this committee. That's a process which has to flow through because of the legislation. This committee in turn gives the recommendation to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make the appointment. The time line is a bit short because we want to have the new Chief Electoral Officer in place for August 1. Also, whoever is selected will hopefully attend the meeting of electoral officers which is being held in Quebec City; a very popular place, a very nice city. That's occurring in the month of July.

That's the update about the finalization of the process. As soon as we finish the search committee, we're going to have a very quickly called meeting of this committee to go on from here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much lead time can you give us on a meeting?

MR. THOMPSON: Twenty-four hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm afraid that's about what you're looking at too.

DR. CARTER: We'll have to look at our date books at the end of this meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right now . . .

DR. CARTER: The first week of July at the worst.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It takes four of us at any one time to hold a meeting.

MRS. EMPSON: One-third; you can actually do it with three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can actually do it with three. The chairman is included, because I am a person.

DR. CARTER: All those in favour of that motion, please say aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jim, as I've told you before, we would try to find you first, because I can

quickly add two of us at any time to make a meeting. I don't want to get into the position where we're holding meetings without having as much of the Legislative Assembly represented as possible. Your group has always had representation. There's another, third, group here that has never yet come to a meeting. I don't take it seriously. I can't worry about that.

David, it's up to you. When you're ready to call a meeting, you just have to let us know. You know that you're working through the offices of the opposition and me to make sure you get us together.

DR. CARTER: In this regard I hope we might look at the possibility of a meeting on June 25, the morning of the 28th, or Tuesday, July 2.

MR. ANDERSON: The afternoon of the 25th, David?

DR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: That would be good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I happen to be at the other end, I can come in in the morning by airplane, do the business, and go home that evening if that seems to make sense.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, I definitely can't go on the 25th. Really, the 25th and 28th are bad. July 2 is the best of the three for my choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: July 2 is the best for you. Does that seem to fit for most people? Does it look like we could hold a meeting on July 2?

MR. ANDERSON: The 2nd would be fine for me, in the afternoon.

DR. CARTER: We really have to lay the proviso on the table that we might have to call a meeting without the full committee because of the time line. Given the fact that Ray is on the committee, that shouldn't present a problem, should it?

MR. GURNETT: No, I just mentioned it so you're aware of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The agenda topic will be quite clearly defined, so the people who aren't

here will know what is going on. Let's leave it at that.

DR. CARTER: Sorry to be so vague.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd say you're very emphatic.

DR. CARTER: Shy and retiring as always. I've got the message.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What else do you have to offer on that topic?

DR. CARTER: The other one is just to discuss the parameters of salary guidelines for the Chief Electoral Officer. Louise, I notice in your file — could you pass that bottom foolscap page around if you have enough copies, please?

The committee is starting to run into the challenge of what kind of salary range we will negotiate with the new Chief Electoral Officer. With the Ombudsman we decided we could enter into a contract, because that's what he wished. We're not certain if we can do a contract on this basis. We still have to get it straightened away with Parliamentary Counsel as to whether we can offer a contract.

MRS. EMPSON: Yes, you can, if you're very careful with how you word it.

DR. CARTER: He's going to have a very short contract, with the wording. If he gets appointed now and there's an election, say, during 1986, then a year after the polling date is when he must be reconfirmed or rejected. So that makes for fun doing a contract.

At any rate, the salary guideline is this figure here. We haven't done any work on approving any increased salaries for these officers, so that's where it sits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. We have not taken any action on approving any of them for the last — well, we have the dates they were made effective right here. The Auditor General was March 31. I'm sorry; it's the annual report that has it. That second last page tells us, John.

MRS. EMPSON: They didn't receive an increase last year. All three officers received 5 percent the year before.

DR. CARTER: Is that one of our floating items?

MRS. EMPSON: No. Remember? Last year you were waiting for guidelines from Treasury.

DR. CARTER: Oh, yes. They usually come out each summer. Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: The other trouble is, don't they receive their increases at different times of the year? Weren't we trying to struggle with making that a regular date for all of them?

MR. THOMPSON: Identical date.

MR. ANDERSON: Right.

DR. CARTER: It makes it very difficult to arrange. The basic sum and substance of it is that this committee will set the salary, but somehow I think we should give a motion to allow the other committee to enter into some kind of negotiation. I don't see how we can get out of that deadlock. Perhaps some of the other search committee members might respond to that as well. That's the one issue.

The other issue is that in speaking with the Provincial Treasurer on salary range, it may well be that we could go as high as \$70,000 plus the car and benefits. I think what we're looking at here is almost coming to the position of equating the salary and perks of the Ombudsman with those of the Chief Electoral Officer as a general guideline for room to move. If the committee can negotiate a more economic figure, so be it.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I completely support what David says. We've interviewed — how many? — half a dozen people now, and it would really hamstring the committee. Some of the ones we have interviewed would not go in there. In fact, there are only one or two that would. So unless we have some latitude in this area, it will certainly shorten the short committee as far it goes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a question, David. The way you put that suggestion was that this committee pass a motion giving the search and select committee certain latitude to negotiate. Can we delegate that kind of thing? Can we abdicate our responsibilities

there? I'm only asking what the legal aspects of this are, because sometimes it seems like we're out on thin ice.

DR. CARTER: As we have for purposes of the minutes -- if we had general concurrence that the parameters would be that we could carry on in negotiation toward a contract if that's what the individual wishes, and secondly, that we could operate in an area that would be within the general guidelines of the same salary as the Ombudsman's office. Once we've done all that, then we'd have to bring that and have that confirmed legally by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've had some discussion. Did you make the motion? I'm sorry, Bill.

MR. PURDY: I have another question, Mr. Chairman. I don't think there are any guidelines from Executive Council for deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, and chairmen of boards and agencies. But I'm just wondering. These three positions are not outlined in any of those salary scales, from \$42,000 to \$100,000 and some.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have never seen an area where they are defined, although I have to admit that occasionally, when we get into the discussion with these three officers, we invariably seem to relate them to deputy ministers. But that's not an official position that I know of.

MR. THOMPSON: We're not locked into that position.

MR. PURDY: That's what I'm trying to clarify right now.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I realize circumstances change. I'm just trying to recall for the purpose of some consistency -- didn't we reject a request from the retiring Chief Electoral Officer to move toward the Ombudsman's salary? What was our rationale at that time that we now have to overcome to move in that direction?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you care to comment on that one?

DR. CARTER: The rationale at that time --

we're now dealing with the personalities of Mr. Wark and Dr. Ivany. When we hired the present Ombudsman and moved it to a contractual basis -- this figure represents the withdrawal of the pension factor. After we ratified that, I had a discussion with the present Chief Electoral Officer to let him know that when you discount some of the benefits, that shrinks the \$75,000 closer toward to the roughly \$61,000 the present Chief Electoral Officer is making. So that's why. When you have contracts -- depending on what goes into the contract, we'll have to try to build it as closely as possible to the Ombudsman, if that's indeed what the person wants. But if the person wants a straight salary plus the benefits, then we'll probably be seeing a figure which is more like \$63,000 or \$64,000, as a guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any suggestion that the perquisites would change from what the present Chief Electoral Officer is receiving, in terms of car and so on?

DR. CARTER: No. There would be nothing less than what's presently there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have another question here. Al?

MR. HIEBERT: I was going to introduce a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're into discussion now. If we're all through with the discussion, the Chair would be happy to receive a motion.

MR. HIEBERT: I move that this committee extend some latitude to the subcommittee in its dealings with the new officers and that the subcommittee in turn come back to this committee and make a recommendation for consideration.

MRS. EMPSON: Except that the search committee is not a subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The search and select is a legislative committee, but I think it's just a matter of wording.

MR. HIEBERT: Okay. Call it the legislative search committee -- and that that committee come back to the Legislative Offices

Committee with a recommendation of salary.

DR. CARTER: With respect to the CEO.

MR. HIEBERT: With respect to the Chief Electoral Officer.

DR. CARTER: We'll have to do the same performance again a little later on.

MR. PURDY: A question on that. That puts us into another meeting.

DR. CARTER: It could be done at the same time as the approval.

MR. PURDY: Yes, but — okay, I see.

MR. THOMPSON: Trust us, Bill.

MR. PURDY: We might reject it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other question on that motion? Those in favour of the motion? That motion is carried.

DR. CARTER: One quick comment on that. All this has been in the context, once again, of saying to the Provincial Treasurer and others responsible that we have to start paying better dollars or we're going to get raided even more. That applies at all levels, but at least here we're able to get a better effect on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comment on that?
We were going to go to one other topic, with respect to the Auditor General.

DR. CARTER: Just a quick update on that one. The committee has had a couple of quick meetings to get things authorized. The advertisement will appear in trade journals and in the media across Canada on June 15. The deadline for application is August 15. The position profile has now been proofread and, I gather, is off to Creative Services. So that will be in place for us to mail out as soon as the applicants start coming in. The time line on that one has been moved ahead because the Auditor General, as you know, has chosen not to have his term extended. It expires March 31, and because of the importance of the position it is hoped there will be someone in place for January 2 so there's a three-month overlap.

When you backtrack from that, discount for Christmas and all the rest of it, and then have to build in worrying about moving someone, we're looking at trying to get an appointment sometime in September or October, if we could do that. Then we would have everything all tidied up. Then we can start dealing with salaries.

MR. HIEBERT: We would have two of them on the payroll at the same time. Is that what you're saying?

DR. CARTER: We're going to have to make separate allowance for that. That's going to come out of their budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on that information?

MR. THOMPSON: David triggered something in my mind and it's a minor point. While we were talking with new applicants for Chief Electoral Officer, one of them mentioned: is there any allowance for moving? I suppose we should discuss with either or both of these people whether this committee feels there should be an allowance for moving in the negotiations. I can't recall our ever doing that before. I just bring that to your attention.

DR. CARTER: Good question. I'm going to have to go out and check it with Personnel Administration. Perhaps there would be some allowance made. I'll have to check with the Ombudsman too, because I'm not certain whether we did.

MRS. EMPSON: I think you did.

MR. THOMPSON: With these contracts, did you also agree to moving allowances?

DR. CARTER: Louise, I'm sorry I had forgotten that we asked about the contract. How many of those? Do you have enough for everyone?

MRS. EMPSON: Yes, I do.

DR. CARTER: Perhaps committee members would like to take these, but please treat them as confidential.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was a sample that was

used for Brian Sawyer.

DR. CARTER: It's item 9: will be entitled to reimbursement of moving expenses from Calgary to Edmonton as well as at the end of the term.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, with that precedent there, it would be something to be negotiated with the rest of the contract.

MRS. EMPSON: At least if you're in Edmonton, you don't have to worry about it.

DR. CARTER: Do you want to scratch "confidential" across the top of the page, please?

MR. HIEBERT: Either that or return it.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd just as soon. I expect that any time I want to take a look at it, I can run down and get Louise to show it to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One other question you had there. Is it exactly the same committee of the Legislature that is running the search and select for the Chief Electoral Officer as it is for the new Auditor General? Is the makeup of the committee the same?

DR. CARTER: The same government members but Jim is with us on the Auditor General search committee and Ray Martin is with us on the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see. One other observation I want to make at this time and it'll end up in a question — my observations usually do — and that is this. We had an Ombudsman in Alberta, and we replaced him in 1984 with an increase in salary. The discussion we've had in the last few minutes implies that we're going to be doing exactly the same thing with the Chief Electoral Officer. We have one in place today at a salary. We're going to be replacing him, and the information I'm hearing is that it's likely going to have to move from here up to here. I also bring to your attention that we have an Auditor General who had his last increase on January 1, 1983. I suspect that when we replace that Auditor General, there'll be another increase in salary.

The question is: do we want to take any time

to review that particular situation and make a recommendation to anybody with respect to the Auditor General's salary, not looking at whether it's high enough or low enough but as to whether or not the time lapse is such that would justify an increase. I've made one assumption, that it might cost us more than the present rate of pay to replace the Auditor General when we find a replacement at the end of this year or the first of next year. We as a committee have not gone back and actually said to ourselves: no, we will not consider it further. I think that we as a committee should at least provide ourselves with that opportunity to sit here, look at it, and say no, we're not going to worry about it, or yes, we should consider it and here are suggestions for such and such. I need some guidance on this.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, has anyone done a comparison of Auditors General, or whatever terminology is used, in comparison to the budget we have in Alberta with other provinces in Canada?

DR. CARTER: Louise, just happens to have another handout.

MR. PURDY: She hasn't been coaching me or anything.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if this discussion wouldn't be most effective, especially now that I have quickly perused this, where we seem to be above the norm in the provinces — if it wouldn't be best taken the same way we've just had the discussion on Chief Electoral Officer: once the search committee has got a feel for some of the market, to see at what price we can get people. This indicates what they're being paid now, but that may be considerably different from what we could obtain the proper person for in that unique position.

MR. THOMPSON: Bill Rogers has been around a long time. He didn't start at \$92,000. What I mean is that there is an accumulation of annual increases and that type of thing. I would have trouble starting the new Auditor General where Bill Rogers left off. In fact, I think it has always been a thorn in the flesh of these people that one fellow is paid considerably more than the others. Whether he's doing more work or

has more responsibility doesn't matter. We've got three officers here, and one is way out by himself.

I suggest that we try to keep the new Auditor General down among the salary ranges we've got for -- here we've got three people who have been hired in the last year. It's different from what it was before. If there's ever a time to adjust the salaries and get them more or less correlated to each other, now is the time to do it. That's just my opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much.

MR. THOMPSON: We look at this list. There's 71, Nova Scotia 62, Canada is only 103.

MR. PURDY: And a hundred million dollar budget.

MR. THOMPSON: That's just my suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Does anybody else have any comments?

DR. CARTER: I think there are two items. One is what has just been discussed, and the second one is that during the course of the summer, we should actually be thinking about getting some kind of an increment to Rogers right now. It would take him through to the end of this term. That's something that perhaps the chairman could check with Lou Hyndman on, to see what kind of range there is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's really all I'm bringing up. I wanted to bring it to your attention.

MR. THOMPSON: You wanted to talk about Bill Roger's position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Specifically. We have not made an adjustment there since January 1, 1983. I just want to know whether we think an adjustment is fair in view of that.

MR. PURDY: What's happened there, Mr. Chairman, as near as I can recall from memory, is that we've followed the guidelines laid down by Executive Council. Executive Council comes in in June and says that there will be no pay increase to the deputy ministers or chairmen of boards or commissions. We as a committee have accepted that and have not passed any

increase on to the three officers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can confirm that that is still the case.

MR. ANDERSON: If my memory serves me right, though, we also put a cap on it. I think we were concerned about a percentage increase that we had allocated to others moving him past the \$100,000 mark and, frankly, the psychological factor in a downturn. I think there may have been a holding down apart from the others, as I recall.

MR. THOMPSON: As I recall, Mr. Chairman, Bill and I had quite a little discussion. In fact, I was delegated to go over and talk over this delicate subject with him. I think he was entitled to an increase at the time, and we held him back. He didn't really mind so much as far as salary was concerned; it was the implications on his pension. From my point of view, if we made some kind of adjustment now, we wouldn't be too far out of line in doing it; 1983 seems like a long time ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're in the middle of '85.

MR. ANDERSON: Can we table that discussion, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should. I'd just like to leave it at that. I would be comfortable leaving it with that until we get more information back from David's committee and also give us an opportunity.

I'd just say that with numbers like this, I think this committee would serve a real function if we were to add MLAs onto the bottom of this group.

DR. CARTER; Just as a point of information for some of the few who don't know it, we just lost out on hiring a very good deputy minister in one of the departments because we couldn't pay \$125,000. At that price he was taking a drop of \$35,000 to \$40,000 on his present job.

MR. PURDY: From private enterprise.

DR. CARTER: Grist for the mill. Question on the tabling motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just think of the quality the

MLAs would have if we started them all off at \$100,000.

MR. ANDERSON: I'd be happy if we started at \$60,000 right now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMPSON: From where I sit, I'd start at 60 and work down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion before us, secretary?

MR. PURDY: The tabling motion.

MRS. EMPSON: Mr. Anderson's.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour? Thank you very much. The motion is carried.

Is there any other piece of business that needs to be brought forward at this time?

MR. ANDERSON: Our next meeting, Mr. Chairman, just for information will be when Dave is ready to report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When Dave's committee forces us into one. Other than that, it looks like we will play it meeting by meeting through the July and August period. Is that okay? Somewhere in there we'll have some of that reception.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I move adjournment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 3:28 p.m.]