

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

Chairman: Dr. Elliott

2 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's call the meeting to order, please. We have a very brief agenda. At two o'clock, it calls for chairman's comments. At 2:30 we will be starting the first of our three interviews. The Chief Electoral Officer will be here at 2:30, the Ombudsman at 3, and the Auditor General at 3:30. He will be represented by Don Salmon.

For introductory comments, all I have to say right now is that we are going to confine our activities today to salaries for these three offices. I've asked our vice-chairman, David Carter, to act as the chairman of a subcommittee, so to speak, on salaries. If he has any briefings or comments he wants to make to us at this point, we will be happy to receive them.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, we have two pieces of information with respect to salary comparisons. I'll pass these around so the members have them for reference. You see the first sheet looks after the Chief Electoral Officer, Ombudsman, and the Law Clerk. For purposes of today, we ignore the last category. You'll notice that it gives you the salary situations plus benefits for the years '81, '82, and '83. So we have that for comparison. Then again the second document . . .

MR. PURDY: Just a question on the particular salary and benefits. Does the total of 65,800 include the lease of the car?

DR. CARTER: It's my understanding, but maybe we can ask for clarification on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by the question, does it include?

MR. MILLER: The benefits are \$8,040 but then on the first it says, plus car, 3,600 lease. Does the 8,000 include the 3,600?

MR. PURDY: That's right.

DR. CARTER: Which I don't know the answer to.

The second document is the information supplied by Mr. Salmon, I think, in the Auditor General's department. The second document gives you the other information to add in from the Auditor General. Then some other comments are on page 2.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that, as you've mentioned, the people come in and we ask them questions for clarification. Then at the end of the day we as a committee decide that we meet again to go over the information we've had distributed and also what we pick up during the day. It may be that they have to supply additional information to us before the next meeting of the committee, when we can then sit down and set the three main salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any question on that?

MR. THOMPSON: Where did you get your figures from, David? I'm talking about this sheet.

DR. CARTER: That sheet was supplied to me from Treasury.

MR. THOMPSON: There seems to be some discrepancy.

DR. CARTER: That's one of the reasons I think we need to go back and do some additional checking at the end of the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discrepancies within the table itself, or between this and other material you've seen?

MR. THOMPSON: The second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree. Any other questions on what we've heard to this point? Do you generally agree with the strategy for the afternoon?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, why would the chart have the '83-84 figures? Does that imply that that is in place futuristically?

DR. CARTER: I didn't get this information directly from Mr. Hyndman. I haven't had a chance to go back to him about it. Again, that's why I say it's distributed so we can do some . . .

MR. BLAIN: Perhaps I might answer that question -- '83-84 is probably because management salary anniversary is in . . . No, I'm sorry, I backtracked. That's not right. But there is something there because I'm familiar with these salaries, and the salaries which are quoted for '83-84 are the current salaries without adjustment.

MR. HIEBERT: They are the current salaries, but when would they run out?

MR. BLAIN: June 1, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're saying the decisions we make today are to do with the salaries starting a year from now?

MR. BLAIN: The decisions we make today will be the norm, the salaries that start this year. They should be retroactive to April 1.

DR. CARTER: Or whatever their anniversary date was. I thought we tried to rationalize it to make it . . .

MR. BLAIN: Last year, the salary adjustments were late. A 1 per cent increase was granted to compensate for retroactivity. But that was just a one-time thing. It was from then, forwarded to be April 1.

MR. MILLER: Doug, are we wrong on these years where we have '83-84? Shouldn't it be '80-81, '81-82?

MR. BLAIN: I suspect that whoever prepared the document is a year out. It should start at '80-81 and go to '82-83.

DR. CARTER: Well we can find that out fast enough. Ask the first one through the door what his salary is.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, then it falls in line with the previous question that some of the understandings as to the figures might differ slightly. We may as well check out those date requirements as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any clue in the footnotes on the table that David handed out where it says, source: '83-84, '82-83 budget submissions?

DR. CARTER: I think there's another piece of paper around where the salary figure for the Chief Electoral Officer, approved on April 18, '83, was at 57,780.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that was the budget that was approved.

DR. CARTER: So 57,780 corresponds to what is at the top of the page for the Chief Electoral Officer in '83-84. It does not include the benefits.

MR. BLAIN: The salary figures that appeared on the budget sheets -- everything else is the projected money for the new fiscal year. But by Treasury directive, we are not allowed to project a new salary in the estimates. We project the current salaries and when any adjustments are made -- I may just be refreshing your memories on this -- and funds are required, they're drawn from the salary contingency vote, which you remember was voted on at the same time as the Treasury vote. So that is probably the explanation for the '83-84. Those would be the figures which appeared on the '83-84 budget documentation. But they're actually current figures in effect at the date that documentation was made public, which was before the estimates were approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which means that we concern ourselves with the salary topic, but not the benefits.

MR. BLAIN: The benefits are automatic. They show these benefits as a percentage of the salary. Treasury estimates that your benefits are worth X per cent of your salary. In many instances, they're actually potential rather than real benefits, the best example of course being your life insurance coverage. In real terms, it's not a benefit unless you're dead. It's a benefit that you're covered by it, but it's not a cash benefit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions on the point? Do we feel that we're starting from the same point? Any other question or topic you want to introduce here as to the afternoon strategy, David?

DR. CARTER: To clarify one thing Mr. Blain just mentioned, I think it is appropriate for members to ask the Chief Electoral Officer, the Ombudsman and, I assume, the Auditor General, if the cost of leasing the car is included in their benefits.

MR. BLAIN: I don't know if they would know. I don't think it is.

MR. PURDY: I don't think it is either. If you look at the figure of the Law Clerk, it's very close to the benefit figure of the other two people.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, I'm quite sure it isn't. The cost of leasing a car is indeed a benefit, and it's actually a benefit in real terms in the respect that it's a taxable benefit. Income tax is paid on it, and it is therefore a pensionable benefit because a pension contribution can be paid on the amount. They don't pay income tax on the full amount, but a person who has a car pays income tax on that as a cash benefit and consequently can pay a pension contribution on that part of it. So it's a benefit in that sense.

DR. CARTER: I think you're right. Mr. Chairman, I just say that we have the folks in and ask them the questions. Then we have to go and do some more double-checking.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get Mr. Blain to give us a list of what's included in benefits. I don't know if it's material, but I'm curious at least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have something like that at your fingertips?.

MR. BLAIN: There's the pension, the . . .

MR. THOMPSON: Excuse me, I mean for our next meeting, not at this special time.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, of course, quite easily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would something attached to the minutes be acceptable?

MR. MILLER: Douglas, it says the benefits are the per cent of salaries. Do they take the salary and divide it by seven?

MR. BLAIN: I don't have this in black and white. In fact, I think it's more a matter of practice than regulation. But Treasury says that the benefits payable to an employee, depending on the level of the employee's position in the government or Assembly hierarchy, are worth from 13 to 23 per cent of the actual salary.

MR. MILLER: That doesn't work out. Or does it?

MR. BLAIN: As you can plainly see, I have here our financial expert, who can probably give me the answer to your question right now. I was trying to remember what constitutes benefits, Charlene. I'll write down what I figure, and you can correct me.

MR. ANDERSON: We don't have any comparative figures do we, David, in terms of other provinces?

DR. CARTER: We'd have to update them. But I'm sure that in the files of the previous committees there are some comparisons for two years ago.

MR. BLAIN: Our expert brought me up to date. I will provide you with a written statement on this. Because the government contributes to them all, this is the group that constitutes employee benefits: the pension plan, the health care plan, the dental plan, vacation leave, Canada Pension Plan, unemployment insurance, life insurance, and Blue Cross. The other benefit, but I leave that aside because it only applies to certain people, is for people who have cars. As I've already explained, that is a taxable benefit and therefore it's a pensionable benefit also. I've forgotten who asked the question. Does that answer your question, John?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? I wish to interrupt for one minute here. I put together three pieces of paper that I thought would be partially related to what we're talking about today in terms of things like term of office, when we approve the budget of these various offices, and salaries as I understood them. Those who have that -- the last item on that page, I had the Law Clerk down as 69,990, legislative offices under salaries; it's 60,990. Please

correct that. You'll notice it happens to fit with the piece of paper that David Carter handed out. I don't know what use that thing of mine is, except for the term of office, where we have the Auditor General's term to March 31, '86, the Chief Electoral Officer is one year after the polling date, and -- help me with my memory; we haven't done anything about that yet?

MR. BLAIN: Not yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Ombudsman is March 31, '84. While we're on the Ombudsman -- and we're running one minute into the other guy's time right now -- is he or is he not employed somewhere else this time next year? Did he accept a job, qualify for a job, or did he just apply for a job? Does anybody have anything on that? People tell me it was in the newspaper and things like this.

DR. CARTER: His was one of the names put in the nomination for Anglican Bishop of Calgary. He didn't make it. Some of the others of us withdrew.

MR. MILLER: In the event that he were to resign or a new appointment made, what's the time frame? In other words, could he stay and resign right at the last moment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand our Ombudsman is in position until March 31, 1984. If he wishes to resign before then, I gather we would have a resignation to consider. Other than that, he's our Ombudsman till March 31, 1984.

MR. MILLER: In the event that a new one was to be appointed, when would that time frame be in place?

MR. CHAIRMAN: April 1, and it would be for a five-year term.

It is now 2:34. I think we should bring in the Chief Electoral Officer and give him as much of his 30 minutes as we possibly can.

Thank you, Mr. Blain.

Mr. Kenneth Wark joined the committee

MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel badly that we're four minutes into your time now, Mr. Wark. We asked you to come for 30 minutes to discuss only one topic; that is, salaries. We allowed half an hour and, if that's not long enough, we'll make other arrangements. If we can do it in half an hour, fine. Don't let the gentleman with the coffee spill it on you or interrupt your thinking or anything like that.

We have documentation before us that tells us something about your salary. It's no secret to this group what we have here. We have here that your salary is \$57,780 plus benefits, plus a car allowance. Is that what you understand it to be at present?

MR. WARK: Yes, that is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you please take it from there and give us your comments. Then we'll ask questions, or would you rather we ask questions first?

MR. WARK: I don't need very long. First, I'd like to say it's the first opportunity I've had to appear in the flesh before the committee. Bill Purdy sat on the last one I appeared before, and that wasn't a select standing; that was a special committee in '79, if you recall, Bill. But some things have been happening that I'd like to relate to you in person so that you can take

them into consideration. You might not regard them as very substantial, but I think they're worth mentioning.

First, I'd like to mention that I'm not attempting at all to compare salaries for officers of the Legislature. That's none of my business and I'm not sure whether you do and, again, it's not any of my business whether you do or not. But some things have been told to me -- and I'll tell you by whom -- and things that I took for fact that I'm not sure are still in effect. When this position was established in 1977 -- and there were some rather nice words said about how important it was -- the salary was established at \$45,000. The comparable Ombudsman salary at that time was \$36,400. The Ombudsman now is about \$61,000, which is about a \$25,000 raise and the CEO is at \$57,800, which is about half that amount of a raise. Again, it's not my purpose to attempt to indicate that you should be comparing officers. I simply relate that because to me, and I must be frank with you, that indicates some lack of confidence. Something must have happened to this position between 1977 and now.

I was advised by the chairman of the special committee -- that was the one Bill sat on -- that on the first salary adjustment that was done in '79, there would be a rate differential between the Auditor General and the other two officers for reasons best known to the committee. I can understand those. But the Ombudsman and the Chief Electoral Officer would be retained at approximately the same salary. That's kind of a quote-unquote given to me by the chairman. I accept that.

I have that problem plus two others, if I could call them problems. I don't think the reimbursement for the Chief Electoral Officer is commensurate with the responsibilities, compared to two things. Other management employees -- and I'm not talking about other deputy ministers here; I'm talking about the skills in the management classifications. I have difficulty satisfying myself I guess, if I can say it that way, with why a deputy minister, which I am -- an officer of the Legislature, someone who can assume the task of commissioner under the Public Inquiries Act, a member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, someone who is responsible for administering three statutes now -- should be paid less money than two of the levels in the management classification, namely exec. officers I and II. Those people are not any of the things I just mentioned, and I have some difficulty rationalizing that.

Secondly, I should perhaps acquaint you with something. I think you folks, who've been close to the Election Act, are probably aware. I find that in some circles there's an opinion that all the Chief Electoral Officer does is look after elections and enumerations when they come around every year or every four years under that Act. If I can, I'd like to assure you that that's something less than 40 per cent of our work. We've worked out a time and work study just to see approximately what it was. Sixty-five per cent of my job comes under the other statute, the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, concerning registrations, public disclosure, and all the briefings to the various levels, particularly chief financial officers of candidates, parties, and constituency associations.

Just comparing this office with a total staff of eight -- by history you perhaps know we started at 10. It was suggested that I could go to 15. We never did. I pulled it back to eight. Nothing worse, I think, than someone sitting around waiting for a job. We are all two- or three-hatted, and I think we're busy all the time.

Let me just compare a few jurisdictions -- and I hope you won't think this is unfair, but it's the only thing I have to compare. B.C. has a Chief Electoral Officer whose current salary, due for review in October, is just a little past \$54,000. He has a total staff of 32, plus 27 part-time regional office staff. He administers one statute only. There is no financial Act. He doesn't conduct enumerations. In effect, I suppose I could say about half

the job. I don't want to infer anything concerning his management. Just give you an idea, I went out there for the election. Of course it'll be public knowledge when the election report comes out. The cost of the election was about \$9 million to administer with less polls than we administer in 57 ridings. Our election cost was \$3.5 million, about one-third, for 79 electoral divisions with a little more than a third of the staff.

Ontario has a total staff of 28 in two offices to run these two statutes which, I'm going to say quite frankly, aren't nearly as well written as ours; far more difficult to administer because of the way they're written. Under the registrations and administration Act for the financing -- perhaps I can say that an all-party committee administers it, run by an executive paid over \$60,000, an executive director who collects \$57,000, plus a Chief Electoral Officer who's at \$64,000. The total would be about three times my salary. They have not yet taken action in any way to apply the Act. The only candidate who has ever been taken to court was an Independent. They decided to pick on him, if I could put it that way. There hasn't been the deregistration of any party, which we have done. There hasn't been the deregistration of any constituency associations or any candidates. I mention that so that you might get a feel for what I consider to be management. If there's a statute, it should be applied.

Quebec: staff of 102 in the Chief Electoral Officer's office alone. His salary is \$71,000, at my last recollection. A very fine individual who has one statute to administer, the Election Act. They enumerate on the same basis we do: a completely separate staff in a completely separate city, Montreal. The Chief Electoral Officer is in Quebec City. The office in Montreal looks after election financing. I don't really have an idea of what salary those folks are at.

I've probably picked the best cases to give you to compare. There are other jurisdictions. I guess Saskatchewan, if I could say in this room, is the worst, since the Chief Electoral Officer works directly for the Premier and is a public servant. I really don't compare it to this office. There is no independence there and no application *per se* of the Act, except to make sure everybody gets out to vote at election time.

In conclusion, I think I can say to you gentlemen that we have the two finest statutes anywhere in Canada. Our Election Act is the only one where I can say to any voter in the province of Alberta, there is a system for you to vote no matter where you are in the world at an election. There isn't another statute in this country that allows that: not the federal one, not Ontario, not any other. In fact, there are more infringements in other statutes as to whether or not a person can vote than there are systems to make sure. Personally, I think an Election Act should make sure everyone has the right to the franchise, albeit some might have more difficulty than others if they happen to be in Phoenix or Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, those are the things I wanted to mention: the comparison with other jurisdictions and the comparison with management classifications without any of the innate responsibilities of this office. As you're fully aware, I don't have a minister to front for me, if I could put it that way, or that I can go to. I had difficulty with the union after the '79 election as to whether I'd apply the Public Inquiries Act. I fined the union, and they paid it. I've had party difficulties -- it's on file, so I'm not revealing any confidences -- with Rod Sykes concerning debentures he was going to set up for the Social Credit Party, which I disallowed. He advised me that we were going to court; we never did. You know of some difficulties I had with a Member of the Legislative Assembly concerning the allowability or otherwise of a party name. It became a little volatile.

I think it's worth my time to mention these things to you. If I can say it, it isn't just any deputy minister running the Chief Electoral Office. It's a

rather unique situation. The bottom line: I would like you to recognize the uniqueness, if you would, and I would particularly like to ask you to consider an in-range adjustment. I realize you have a market or a management adjustment that you might make, and I hope it's not downward. I'd like you to consider an in-range adjustment, so that the Chief Electoral Officer is not paid less than someone in the management classification, particularly the Exec. Officer II.

I think that's it, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabor the point, but I wanted to make those points to you and, if I can, clarify anything I've said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. This is exactly the kind of discussion I was hoping to receive.

I have one question. One thing we haven't done yet as a committee, but we will be, is working within the rules described in the Act with respect to reappointing your office. We also have your correspondence with respect to the time frame on redistribution and the next enumeration -- how those things fit together -- and your recommendation on the possible amendments to the Act. We thank you for that.

MR. WARK: On that point, I delivered those to the Hon. Bill Payne today. They're not very voluminous, but they are things we found from experience at the last election. I gather they're going to cabinet next Tuesday. The Premier has directed that all fall legislation be brought to cabinet next Tuesday, so Bill asked me to bring it to him right away. It's there and, if you'd like a copy of that, Mr. Chairman -- it normally doesn't come to this committee, but if you'd like a copy . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't want anything we don't need.

MR. WARK: Yes, okay. You have enough, of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's important to us, we know where we can get it. Do you agree with that? Does anybody here feel they would like a copy of that, as offered to us?

DR. CARTER: No, perhaps if we had one on file for the committee's reference.

MR. WARK: I'll send one with a note on it "for information only". How's that? That will keep you clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your salary time frame: was your last adjustment effective up to the end of March '83?

MR. WARK: It was made effective June 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: June 1, '82.

MR. WARK: A very peculiar thing was done last time. It has been wandering. For regulatory reasons, the committee sometimes set it effective January, sometimes effective April. When your committee met last year -- I wasn't present; I could only react -- the increase was set at 6 per cent, plus 1 per cent for merit. Mine had been January 1; the other two officers had been effective April. They were all made effective June 1. I asked the chairman to at least make up the three months I lost, since it amounted to another 1.5 per cent, but I was advised that that had been discussed at the committee, and it was decided to level them all out as of June 1.

So my recollection is that it commenced June 1, and I thought that was probably to line it up with the management salaries and the order in council that approves the deputy ministers' and senior officers' salaries. I'm not sure it's out yet. Sometimes it used to come out in the fall and be effective September 1. Doug would probably know.

MR. BLAIN: It's not out yet; consequently, I don't know what date it will be effective.

MR. WARK: Last year it was June 1 as well. It appeared to me that our categories were all going to made effective June 1 in future, but it was just a guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've monopolized the questioning here. Let's go around the table.

MR. PURDY: One question to Ken. Can you give the committee an example of Executive Officer I and Executive Officer II? You indicated that some of those were higher salaries than what you receive. Who are these people, and what are their responsibilities?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have that information on file, Bill.

MR. PURDY: Okay. I haven't seen it, then.

MR. WARK: I'm not sure that I know. Again, I was reacting to the salary scale that just came out from the Public Service Commissioner. The top level of Exec. Officer II is \$67,248. An Exec Officer I, which is next down the scale, is about \$4,000 past the Chief Electoral Officer's salary, as of June 1.

MR. BLAIN: As executive officers, those salaries are still in the classified area. They don't apply to the Chief Electoral Officer or to deputy ministers.

DR. CARTER: The other question that comes of that: do the salaries for an EOII include the benefits or not? Do the benefits get added?

MR. BLAIN: No, that's the salary.

DR. CARTER: And then they get the benefits.

MR. BLAIN: The value of the benefits is estimated by Treasury. But as I said to you earlier, that isn't a real value, in the sense that you get that much cash divided by 12 each month.

DR. CARTER: But it's fair to say, in theory, that an EOII gets roughly the same percentage in add-on benefits as what we're talking about here with the Chief Electoral Officer or the Ombudsman.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. WARK: If I could mention the car, just so you'll understand . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one moment; don't lose that question.

Bill, I've just given Doug a piece of paper. I was going to have him confirm that that is the answer to your question on what Ken is talking about. Is that Exec Officer II, when it says "range"?

MR. BLAIN: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, then. That's why I wanted to interrupt, to make sure. This is range one, two, three, four, and so on.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, but that range is covered by the order in council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's not the answer, then, to the question Bill was asking.

MR. BLAIN: No. Those are order in council.

MR. PURDY: Can we get that information for the committee?

MR. BLAIN: I can get it, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So then we can better understand what Mr. Wark is talking about when he talks about Exec. Officer II. We will find out, then.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, I can get that for you with no trouble.

MR. WARK: I have a sheet that I can gladly leave with you. I happened to bring a copy of what the Public Service Commissioner just issued in the last two weeks. These are the management salaries; these are, as Doug says, in the classification range. They're for management employees, issued by the Public Service Commissioner, effective June 1. If you want that one, Mr. Chairman, I don't need to take it back, but Doug can probably get something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's very good.

MR. WARK: If I could mention something, Mr. Chairman, so the committee will understand. The car isn't quite what it appears to be. There was a misunderstanding with the committee on the last two occasions. I noticed the minutes recorded it in error, I think.

The car doesn't come free. For that benefit, I had added to my taxable income \$3,240. Now, it is maintained, it is serviced and, of course, all my gas on duty is paid. But with my T-4 slip -- and I suppose this happens to all the cars, although I don't know -- comes an additional form I have to fill out indicating how many miles I used it for, how many were this and that, in and out of the province and various categories, et cetera, and then I am assessed. If you'll accept my memory, I think approximately \$3,240 went right on the top of my income tax.

It is a benefit, and I don't mind it. I use it, and it's probably worth more than that, because I put a lot of miles on the car. I don't like to sit in my office, in a sort of white tower. I like to get out and talk to the people I'm supposed to be helping. But it didn't come free.

MR. BLAIN: It's also a pensionable benefit.

MR. WARK: Yes. I think the sum is also included *per se* for pension. So that is a plus. I don't mean to mention all the minuses. I just didn't think of that.

MR. MILLER: Two things, Mr. Wark. First of all, I'm delighted to see that you were able to cut your staff from 10 to eight. What are the salary and the status of the person who is immediately below you?

MR. WARK: His name is Pat Ledgerwood. He just came aboard in March, so of course he started fairly well down the scale. The other fellow had been here since '77. If I could put it this way, if the previous fellow were still here -- the range for that position has just gone to \$52,000. Doug would have to confirm that. SOIIC, top range, Doug?

MR. BLAIN: Yes, that's right.

MR. WARK: He would be at \$52,000 something. This fellow is not. I offered him a contract after interview at about \$47,500, which was about a \$4,000 cut from the job he had with the federal government. I happened to know he was willing to come and an excellent fellow, so we took him.

MR. MILLER: Is that with or without benefits?

MR. WARK: Whatever benefits come with the position. He doesn't have a car. I'm not sure what other benefits there might be; the normal leave and all the various entitlements.

MR. BLAIN: All the benefits I recited to you.

MR. MILLER: In other words, his salary is just \$2,000 less than yours.

MR. WARK: No, his would be at \$52,000 plus, and mine is \$57,000.

MR. MILLER: This is assuming the same fellow had stayed, not this fellow.

MR. WARK: It would be \$52,000 plus.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Wark, you came in '77.

MR. WARK: Yes.

DR. CARTER: Do you think part of the discrepancy in the salary range between you and the Ombudsman is the fact that he came in '74?

MR. WARK: Yes, it's possible.

DR. CARTER: As a committee, are we to take that we're going to have to peg both of you at exactly the same salaries, even though one of you arrived earlier?

MR. WARK: I don't know. I don't know what salary he started at.

DR. CARTER: And in the range of things -- your information seems to be pretty good. I don't know what that would be, but that's beside the point. In the normal course of events, if the Ombudsman is not reappointed at the end of his term -- and we have already assured you that we're going to reappoint you if, hopefully, you're going to stay -- then you're going to be making more money than the Ombudsman. Or are we going to take a new Ombudsman and slot him in immediately at your figure?

MR. WARK: Good point. If I can use any background I have, I've sat on -- I was going to say thousands -- hundreds of classification and pay allotment committees with the federal government. When there was a comparison between seniority in positions of individuals, there was always a base line, and I think it applies with our non-management employees. For instance, the top for

getting longevity pay in the non-management sector is seven years' service with the provincial government. Doug can confirm this. You might want to develop a base line that, once both individuals are over it, you'd consider paying them the same money. Until they are, there should be a disparity. Maybe you'd agree to let the individuals know what the policy is.

That's why I'm so delighted to be here. On previous occasions, Mr. Chairman, for what it's worth, I've had the opportunity to discuss with the chairman what I thought and was asked once to put in a paper. When things came out completely opposite to what I had been advised had been discussed, the chairman then gave me some other reasons; I don't mean to go through those. But I'd like to reiterate that it's so beneficial for me to be here, because at least I know the sort of questions you're searching, and whether I've told you the right part of the story, of course, then gets tabled at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. More questions?

DR. CARTER: Just two brief comments, one with respect to comparison to other provinces. I appreciate it's difficult because, as you've outlined, there are different job descriptions and responsibilities. At the same time, there are also different numbers of people in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, as compared to here, I assume.

MR. WARK: Yes. And B.C.

DR. CARTER: So that might have ramifications.

The other thing is with respect to when you came on board in '77. That was under the chairmanship of Dr. McCrimmon. Last time around we had another chairman, and now you have yet another chairman. Part of the difficulty is a lack of continuity on behalf of a legislative committee. As the only member here from the previous committee, I apologize for the fact you weren't asked, because it was my understanding that you were asked. But again, all I can really do is offer an apology on behalf of the committee.

MR. WARK: It's not necessary. We did a budget review.

I want to comment that, in my view, if you'll agree that we're looking at senior management, this is a nicer way to do it. It's certainly better for me, because then if there's anything the matter with what I'm doing, eyeball to eyeball you can say: look, Wark, you just don't shape up or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While we're on that point, not the shaping up bit, but the eyeball to eyeball bit, I made the assumption that you knew everybody here when I made that very casual introduction, Ken. If there are people here you haven't met, I apologize.

MR. WARK: No, I believe I've met everybody. I have a file on everybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So do I. I got mine from the Alberta Teachers' Association. Where did you find yours?

MR. WARK: Well, there's the odd fellow I meet at the race track, too, since I'm a habitue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How are we doing for questions? We are fighting the clock, as usual.

MR. PURDY: I had one, Mr. Chairman. It's probably not applicable. It was one of the remarks Mr. Wark made when he indicated that it cost B.C. \$9 million to run the election, and the last provincial election was in the neighborhood of \$3.2 million. Does that include our enumeration costs?

MR. WARK: No, they are separate. They don't enumerate either, at any rate. But they were separate, yes. Our enumeration would have been another \$2.8 million.

MR. PURDY: I thought so.

MR. WARK: It's a good point. I just use those for comparisons. I'm not attempting in any way to criticize British Columbia. Their system is different from ours, and there are reasons for it, I'm sure. I was just trying to underscore what good managers we are in that office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How are we doing now? Any other questions?

DR. CARTER: Just to thank Mr. Wark for coming, Mr. Chairman, and to point out that we're not likely to be making a decision today. We don't want to get your expectation level too high or speeded up.

MR. WARK: I would just ask that you don't lower the scale.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand. Does anybody else have any final comments or questions?

I'm also going to thank you for coming, Ken. We will consider that the visit for now. We have on our list of unfinished business other visits with you; for example, we want to have coffee from your coffee pot one of these days, and we're going to arrange a visit.

MR. WARK: I'd welcome that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd like to see where your office is, see those boxes of useless ballots, and things like this. I'm just being facetious.

MR. WARK: I'd like you to see the public files. These are the ones -- and you might like to look at your own -- that the press look at. They're getting quite voluminous now. Some of the party files -- we're going to have to start a new file cabinet. But they're used. We had two press in yesterday.

I might mention something else you might find amusing. We get threats on our lives. We had an amusing one last week, just to take a minute. We have a fellow who wants to form a political party. If I can say it, all the bricks aren't there; if you met him, you'd realize it. But we called the police last Thursday. This fellow had decided -- he'd been threatening my secretary rather obliquely. We discussed it, and she was getting a little bit concerned. She's the front-office girl. He phoned a week ago Thursday, and said that he was going to shoot a member of the Ku Klux Klan within the hour and was Mr. Wark in? She said, yes. He said, I'll be over in 20 minutes, and I'm going to blow him out of this world. We called the police and sat in my conference room and talked to this gent. That's the second occasion.

We had a threat during the election from a kook who happens to be the president of one of the WCC constituency associations in Edmonton, who was under conviction at the time. He phoned during the election. I mention these just for interest's sake. Perhaps you would consider some pay for security. [laughter] He phoned and indicated he was on his way to a 7-11 store -- this is polling day, the November 2 election. It was about five in the afternoon,

and I had a TV fellow in at the time. He was going to get the appropriate bottles, and was I aware of what you could do with a Molotov cocktail? He was aware that the office was all glass, and things like that. We called the police, but he never did appear. So if you'd consider any pay for security, please do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't believe you can have all that fun and want a pay cheque, too.

MR. BLAIN: I wouldn't want you to be discouraged, but take comfort in the fact that it's inherent that all servants of the Crown are expendable. [laughter]

DR. CARTER: And perhaps all politicians.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much.

MR. WARK: Thank you again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference was made to a letter that I had with respect to the last discussion, and I'm also going to have it attached to the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll start this portion of our meeting, please. One of my problems as chairman is trying to keep one eye on the clock and the other eye on this committee. Somewhere along the line they don't seem to be coterminous.

Dr. Ivany, welcome to this meeting. We thank you very much for making yourself available. All we've set aside this afternoon is 30 minutes to discuss only one topic; that is, salary. So you'll know what we're looking at, we have certain documents before us which say that your salary is \$61,020 plus benefits, plus a car. Does that fit at all with what you understand?

DR. IVANY: The salary figure is \$60,990 and a car and whatever other . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The salary figure is \$60,990. What I was going to say next, on behalf of the committee, was that we're here to listen to you and ask questions. If you have anything you'd like to say to us, we'd be happy to listen now. Or would you like to have the questions first?

DR. IVANY: Let's have the questions. I have no particular representation to make, other than the conversations you and I had earlier on, but I'm quite happy to respond to any questions you may have.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the first one is the concern that your legislative counsel is making more money than you are. What's the state?

DR. IVANY: David, I simply raised it with the chairman. I raised it with the previous chairman of this committee, in the sense that it had been a fact of life for some four years, and I think it's something the committee should be aware of. I don't find it entirely disturbing. Mr. Weir has been in the office since the beginning of the Ombudsman institution. He had been with the Department of Agriculture as legal counsel before that. I wanted to make it quite clear that I was not prepared to hold my senior staff back so that they

would not surpass me insofar as salary figure is concerned. They're entitled to their annual increments and annual raises. I think they must have them.

DR. CARTER: What amount is he getting now, salary plus benefits?

DR. IVANY: As of June 1, his salary will be \$64,536.

DR. CARTER: Plus benefits on top of that, or does that include?

DR. IVANY: Well, whatever the regular benefits are. He does not have a car.

DR. CARTER: Your car figure is \$3,600?

DR. IVANY: I'm not sure, David.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

DR. IVANY: The legal counsel, I believe, get an added increment. This is just the regular 5 per cent that he was raised effective June 1. He will be entitled to another increment in September, as will our solicitor in Calgary.

DR. CARTER: And what's the level of increment in September? Either one of you.

DR. IVANY: I really can't tell you.

MR. BLAIN: That has yet to be determined.

DR. CARTER: September 1 or September 30?

MR. BLAIN: September 1.

MR. ANDERSON: What does the solicitor in Calgary make, if I might ask that?

DR. IVANY: The solicitor in Calgary was hired in a dual role, but mainly as an investigator. The salary there is \$40,800.

MR. ANDERSON: I see. So if you were to hire a new solicitor for Edmonton for some reason, at what salary would that person be hired?

DR. IVANY: I believe the range is \$49,000 to \$69,000 -- somewhere in there -- for a senior solicitor. The difference is that Weir is in management and the solicitor in Calgary is not in management.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go into this business of the legal counsel just a little further and find out what his status is, what his official title is, how long he's been with -- maybe you can't tell me.

DR. IVANY: Well, he's a member of management. There are four management people in the office. He has been legal counsel to the Ombudsman since 1967 or shortly thereafter; it may have been the early part of '68. George McLellan brought him into the office. He has been in that position ever since.

MR. THOMPSON: Does he have a grade or number?

DR. IVANY: Yes, he's legal officer . . .

MR. BLAIN: Is he an Executive Officer II -- Legal?

DR. IVANY: Right. He's an Executive Officer II, legal category.

MR. BLAIN: In that case, his range is from \$51,528 to a maximum of \$71,988.

DR. IVANY: You have a newer sheet than I have, I think.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, this is the latest one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we talking about Mr. Weir?

DR. IVANY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John, did you . . .

MR. THOMPSON: No, I just wanted to find out his seniority and his title.

DR. IVANY: He is the next senior to me, in the sense that if I'm out of the office, Mr. Weir is in charge of the office.

MR. THOMPSON: He's your deputy.

DR. IVANY: Absolutely.

MR. MILLER: Is he the only one on your staff who is above your present salary?

DR. IVANY: Yes, sir. The next closest is Joe Pennett, who is the administrative officer. He's at \$43,000.

MR. MILLER: Could you give me further information as to your salary? You started in 1974 at a salary, and you've had increases every year, I presume. As well, perhaps you could give an indication as to the growth of your staff in that period of time.

DR. IVANY: Since 1974 the staff has increased by three. We have added investigators and, of course, we had an investigator in the Calgary office, which was fairly new when I took over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was from 14 to 17 people then?

DR. IVANY: There's a total of 18, including myself. There were 15 in 1974. The increases have mainly been in the investigative and secretarial area. I'm sorry, your other question was?

MR. MILLER: Salary.

DR. IVANY: In 1974? Thirty thousand, I think.

MR. MILLER: Thirty thousand. So it's more than doubled.

MR. THOMPSON: So has yours.

DR. CARTER: That isn't accurate.

MR. THOMPSON: I never said it was accurate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Miller, do you want to pursue that topic further? Mr. Miller had a topic he wanted to pursue, and I think he's been sidetracked. You can come back to it.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, a question to Dr. Ivany. You indicate that in 1974 your salary was approximately \$30,000. Can you give us a comparison of the salaries of other ombudsmen across Canada in relationship to yours and in relationship to the staff they have?

DR. IVANY: I sent that material to Mr. Mack. I don't think I've given it to you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure that I have it with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think I've seen it.

MR. PURDY: Could that be sent over, then?

DR. IVANY: Yes, it can. I can tell you that in four instances in Canada -- Ontario, British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Quebec -- the salaries are aligned to a Supreme Court judge. That was where the salaries were set. In Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba, they're not tied to anything. I would have to get an up-to-date list; I haven't got one. The one I have is probably two years old, but I will get an up-to-date one and let you have it.

MR. MILLER: Dr. Ivany, your salary isn't tied to anything here in Alberta?

DR. IVANY: No, sir.

MR. MILLER: It's just what the committee decides on.

DR. IVANY: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Ivany mentioned earlier -- and I'll read a paragraph he gave me earlier, expressing an opinion of his at that time. It said: section 8(2) of the Ombudsman Act states that the Ombudsman shall receive similar benefits to those provided to deputy ministers. That subsection refers to benefits and not directly to salary. It appears to me that the Ombudsman, as a senior officer of the Legislature, should be on the same plane as a deputy minister. Certainly in my dealings with government, I am constantly dealing with officials at the deputy minister level. Do you have any further comment on that statement today, Dr. Ivany?

DR. IVANY: I would only refer, gentlemen, to the schedule of senior positions. The one I have, Mr. Blain, is dated 1981. There is probably a later one than that. That's the order in council. The salary at that time was in salary range number 3, which is below the deputy minister level. As a matter of fact, salary range number 3, as I have it, would be members of the Alberta Liquor Control Board, members of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission -- that sort of level, the executive director.

MR. BLAIN: Members of boards and commissions.

DR. IVANY: Yes, that's where the salary of the Ombudsman or was at that particular time. Obviously this has gone up and changed as well. So it's not at the deputy minister level and hasn't been for at least three years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Doug, could we have the page referring to boards, commissions, and deputy ministers attached to our minutes for this meeting?

MR. BLAIN: Yes. That would be last year, '82; '83 isn't issued yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. If we could have the most recent one attached, so we'll have . . .

DR. IVANY: Doug, the one I have is dated August 26, 1981, so obviously it . .

MR. BLAIN: There is one since then -- '82 -- and this year's isn't published yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one you provided to us, in the folder, I assume is the one you're going to leave.

DR. IVANY: It's a copy of this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: August '81. Any questions?

MR. MILLER: Dr. Ivany, I appreciate your concern that you are the Ombudsman and the fact is that you have an employee who is paid more than you receive. And I appreciate the fact that you would not want his salary cut back. I presume you would like your salary level brought up comparable to what he's receiving. Would that be a fair statement?

DR. IVANY: Mr. Miller, I think that is probably a fair statement. If we consider the paragraph that I referred to the Chairman, I think that the salary of the Ombudsman should at least be on a comparable level to the deputy minister in which he's categorized.

MR. MILLER: If I could follow that up then, the salary of the deputy minister is generally tied to years of service. Is that correct?

DR. IVANY: I really don't know, sir. It may well be. I'm now in my ninth year as . . .

MR. BLAIN: Generally speaking, yes.

DR. CARTER: Doesn't it also follow, Mr. Miller, that the deputy is paid more than the minister?

MR. MILLER: Yes, that's a fact.

MR. BLAIN: There are certain officials who equate to deputy ministers, but their salary scale is not the deputy ministers' salary scale.

DR. IVANY: Executive directors.

MR. BLAIN: Yes. They equate to deputy ministers.

MR. MILLER: To follow David's remark, there are deputy ministers who receive more remuneration than ministers.

MR. BLAIN: That's correct in quite a number of cases, because they're career public servants with, in some instances -- the most prominent instance that comes to my mind is the chief deputy minister of community health and social welfare, who is a medical man with many years of service as a public servant. So the combination of pay for a public servant plus his medical qualifications

places him in a very high range, perhaps the highest deputy minister range, which is far in excess of his minister. There are other examples, but he is the most prominent.

MR. PURDY: The Deputy Provincial Treasurer, too.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's not within the terms of reference of the committee today, but we might like to look at it.

MR. HIEBERT: I would just make this comment. When you start getting into comparability of salaries and start justifying on just that basis, I think you run into difficulty in many areas. It is not uncommon that the people with the skill -- for example, coaches are often paid less than the expertise and skill on the team. We can get into difficulty on just that factor. Therefore, my request to Dr. Ivany is: outside the area of comparability, are there any other areas that you can argue or put before the committee to justify re-examining the argument of raising the salary?

DR. IVANY: If you want to use it as an argument, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the fact that the Ombudsman is set within the deputy minister level -- and I'm simply pointing out to you that the salary of the Ombudsman at the present time is not within the deputy minister level; it is lower than the deputy minister level. When you see the new order in council that was issued last year, '82, I think you will see that it's still at least in salary range 3, which is down to the members of boards and that area. I think that should certainly be looked at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

DR. CARTER: Just one that perhaps the Ombudsman could comment on. The committee has been faced with one or two other people who say that they want to be paid at the same level as the Ombudsman. How do we deal with that, because somewhere in there is probably the factor of how much longer you have been in your position compared to the other positions involved? I want to relate that to the seniority you've spoken of with regard to Alex Weir. But since he's been there since the beginning of the office, which would take you back to '69, '70 . . .

DR. IVANY: At least '68.

DR. CARTER: Does that help, in part, to give a rationalization for the salary differential, or is there some watershed threshold where that enters into this?

DR. IVANY: I don't know, David. It's certainly a matter that has been discussed amongst ombudsmen when they get together. Some legislatures have found that the simplest thing was to tie the salary to something outside, like the judiciary. Obviously, I don't know who you're referring to, but it may well be that the Ombudsman's salary is being used as a guideline for other potential salaries as well. I haven't heard of that happening elsewhere. I think it's really pretty much what this committee decides. I think you make the rules as you go in that regard, unless you do tie it to something of a nature as Ontario or New Brunswick have done. I really wouldn't want to comment on who or what within the civil service should be tied to my salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The term of appointment of the Ombudsman is five years, according to something I read somewhere.

DR. IVANY: That's right. It's in the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your present term is until March 31, 1984.

DR. IVANY: I think it's the end of April 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minutes will also show a letter dated June 1, 1983, that I received from the Ombudsman with reference to your staff and yourself.

DR. IVANY: I thought that might be useful to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not all members have seen that. It will be part of the minutes of this meeting.

DR. IVANY: That was the one effective June 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is.

DR. IVANY: Evidently there was a discrepancy in my salary when it was set last year. You quoted the figure of \$61,020. In fact it's \$60,990, and that has now been adjusted. I'm not sure whether your June 1 one shows that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It shows \$60,990.

DR. IVANY: It should be \$60,990.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what it is.

DR. IVANY: I thought I sent you a corrected . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what it shows here. That letter will be part of the minutes.

DR. IVANY: And it also has all the salaries of the staff included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it does. It shows that Mr. Weir has \$64,536.

Can I go around the table once more then? Any more questions or comments?

DR. CARTER: One question. You raised the matter of the time of the term. How did it operate last time at your reappointment? That would be '78 or '79.

DR. IVANY: '79. Do you mean the physical act of reappointment?

DR. CARTER: Did you meet with the committee?

DR. IVANY: At that time I'm not even sure we had a committee. The committee is a relatively new thing. I had a call from the Premier; it was a year ahead of my reappointment, as a matter of fact. It was in November of . . . It was well ahead. At that time, he asked me to make a decision fairly quickly because the House was rising. They wanted to make an appointment and announce it before the House rose. So my contact at that time was from the Premier, whereas now it would have to be decided at this august assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was April 30?

DR. IVANY: April 30, 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bud Miller, are you all through?

MR. MILLER: Just following up on David's. That decision would be made -- there would be a fair amount of lead time, would there not? The same as Dr. Ivany said that last time there was about a year or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've exhausted everything I have. I do want to take this opportunity, though, to say thank you again for the material you've made available to us in recent weeks. It has been of considerable assistance and has certainly helped out, not only your binder but a couple of letters.

DR. IVANY: That binder is ready for any or all members of the committee, if you would like. Rather than photostating yours, we have made them up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have looked at it, torn it apart, put it together, and talked about it. The question came up -- the binder scares one; the material inside is not that thick -- and we thought that we'd go ahead and make copies. But you're now telling me that you have it available in quantity.

DR. IVANY: When we made it up, we made copies for all committee members. But I said to you that it would be your decision whether or not they were distributed. I have them in a vault at the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recall your telling me that now. We would appreciate having them.

DR. IVANY: Yes, sir. I will have them delivered to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd like to have about eight copies.

DR. IVANY: I think the committee appreciates that I normally deal through the chairman, and I take your advice. So we'll have them sent to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee will also appreciate that there are certain limitations when you deal through the chairman. We'll consider this part of our discussion over with.

Before we shut everything down here, you might just see us again before the summer is out or whatever. We want to come over and sample your coffee. Is that all right with you?

DR. IVANY: Yes, sir. Any time, you are most welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We talk here about files that nobody should look at. We'd like to know where they are in case we want to get into them.

DR. IVANY: Indeed. As a matter of fact, something has developed since we made that presentation for you, in the sense that we've had people from risk management and Treasury come in and look at our filing system from a security point of view. They have made certain recommendations to us which certainly have to be addressed. That's something we should perhaps talk to you about. While all our files beyond two years of age are on microfiche, they have some concern about the security of current files, particularly open files. I think some arrangements are going to have to be made relatively soon with regard to keeping those files in a very safe place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a policy for eventual discard?

DR. IVANY: We put everything on microfiche, and there are three copies of the microfiche: one goes to the government archives; two copies are kept in our office, one in a vault and the other, which we constantly refer to, in our office. We have things that come back to us that we have to refer to on a fairly regular basis. So we have to keep one copy in the office. But basically, it's the two years of files -- some of them may be closed, some may be open -- plus the current files that we're dealing with. I think we're going to have to change our whole file cabinet system and everything to put it in a situation secure from fire and theft. Whereas now we're using regular file cabinets, they have advised us that we must upgrade that. I think we have to look at that very seriously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Between your files and the income tax people, you probably know how much gum I chew in a day.

DR. IVANY: I would think we could find that out.

MR. MILLER: When you say "they", who is it that says . . .

DR. IVANY: It's a department of Treasury called "risk management".

MR. MILLER: Who are they? I have a concern.

DR. IVANY: Names?

MR. MILLER: Well, I can't see why they're . . . There has been no problem, has there?

DR. IVANY: No, we've been very fortunate there. There has been no problem in the sense that there has been no fire and no theft. I think the potential for that is there. We raised it because of a change in the cleaning procedures, which now all take place in the office at night. So we have people wandering through the offices after hours when there's no one there. It used to be done before four or six o'clock, and now it's done in the evenings or even late at night. I've been in the office at ten or eleven o'clock at night, and we've had people in there cleaning. This became a concern to me. If there were a fire in the office and the files were destroyed, particularly our current operating files, we would have some real difficulty knowing what we were investigating and what to do with it.

MR. MILLER: Dr. Ivany, that's the same the world over.

DR. IVANY: Yes, indeed it is.

MR. MILLER: And the same in this building. Now we can get overly concerned with a lot of this.

DR. IVANY: I quite agree; we have to strike a balance. But it is a matter that's been raised. We've been given certain matters that we should consider, and we're looking at that now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to cut it off here since we're off on another topic. We have one more person waiting for us. A final thank you, and you'll be hearing from us when we want to come to your place for coffee.

DR. IVANY: Right. I hope we can accommodate it. As you know, I'm in the midst of tours around the province during the summer, but we will certainly fit you in whenever you want to come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. You're going to be in Grande Prairie on Tuesday afternoon.

DR. IVANY: Yes, and Lloydminster tomorrow. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call this meeting to order for the review of the salary of the Auditor General. At this point, that is the only item on the agenda. Before you leave, Don, we might see fit to introduce another topic. We have material before us which implies that the Auditor General's salary at this point is \$91,100. In addition to that there is a car, plus benefits. Am I right, Don?

MR. SALMON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any question on what I said? Also, does the salary term of the present Auditor General start April 1? Can anybody correct us on that one? Are we talking about a salary that's retroactive to April 1, 1983? Okay. The other piece of information I have is that the contract with the present Auditor General, or his retirement date in this instance, is March 31, 1986. Is that correct? So we're all starting from the same point in this discussion.

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. SALMON: Does that mean that you've changed the date from a January date to an April date?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR. SALMON: The last two increases were effective January '81 and January '82.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was my question. Should we agree with him?

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We agree with you.

DR. CARTER: So just for the Auditor General it's January 1. The other two offices are April 1. I'm sorry, but is there a car included in this one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, did I hear you correctly when you said the salary was \$91,100, plus benefits on top of that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Plus benefits, plus a car.

MR. MILLER: On top of that number?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I understand. This was confirmed by Don and agreed to by Doug. Does anybody want to reconsider their position on that question?

MR. MILLER: What is the total salary then, including benefits?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't have that number.

MR. SALMON: The benefit on the car is worked out each year for all deputy ministers and others who are in that particular classification. I couldn't tell you the actual number that goes on the T-4 slip. But he does have a car under section 7(2) of the Act, which says that he shall receive similar benefits as provided to deputy ministers. That's been in there since the Act came into being, and it's the same value as their cars.

MR. MILLER: Don, I appreciate that. We have a figure of approximately \$3,600 a year.

MR. SALMON: Yes, it's something like that.

MR. MILLER: It's the other benefits, which I understand can be approximately 15 per cent of the salary.

MR. SALMON: No, the only other benefits are pension. He's on the dental plan and these types of things.

MR. BLAIN: The benefits are standard. They're in addition to the salary. The salary figure is what is paid to the incumbent. But the benefits are . . .

MR. SALMON: Normal benefits that go to salary people.

MR. BLAIN: For example, in the pension area, the benefit is that portion which is paid by the government; and the same for health care. The dental plan, of course, the whole thing is paid by the government. But these are not received in cash, which you understand, of course.

MR. MILLER: Yes, but it must be in the neighborhood of about \$12,000.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, it would be at least. That's the value Treasury sets on it.

MR. MILLER: So then we would be looking at a gross salary of approximately \$103,000 to \$104,000.

MR. BLAIN: Well, not exactly because, as I said, the benefits are not real value. In many instances, they are of potential value. They're not real amounts. Do you agree, Mr. Salmon?

MR. SALMON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Doug, for purposes of this discussion, would you explain salary, benefits, and car in terms of superannuation benefits. Thirty-six hundred for the car . . .

MR. BLAIN: Thirty-six hundred for the car. Now, the individual who is issued with a car pays income tax, not on the full \$3,600, but on an assessed portion of it, I believe.

MR. SALMON: It's done in accordance with the Income Tax Act, which is a stand-by charge.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, an assessed portion of it. Consequently, he can contribute to his pension on that portion of it. So that constitutes a benefit in the long term.

Health care: the government matches the premium paid on health care. Vacation leave, of course, is considered a benefit in the sense that you're on holidays but drawing your normal pay while you're on holidays. Canada Pension Plan: the government matches the premium paid by the employee or by the official -- however you'd like to describe him; the same with unemployment insurance. Insurance: the government pays the premium on the insurance; no premium is paid by the insured. Blue Cross: the government matches the contributor's premium on Blue Cross. None of that is a direct cash benefit in addition to the salary, but it's a benefit in the sense that that coverage exists.

MR. THOMPSON: I've been listening to this, Doug. This is the second or third go-around. You're an accountant, Mr. Salmon. Anybody who tells me that you have a life insurance policy and the premiums are paid for you, and that that isn't a direct benefit -- I have real problems understanding that. To me, if you have -- I don't know what this policy is; we'll say \$100,000, whatever it is. Surely, if you get your premiums paid on your life insurance, that is a direct benefit.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, I said that was a benefit. But it's a potential benefit.

MR. THOMPSON: It's a direct benefit. It's a benefit that you don't have to pay.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, John, I just finished saying that the coverage was a benefit. But the payable insurance is not a direct benefit.

MR. HIEBERT: To go out and buy that insurance costs X number of dollars, and X number of dollars is the benefit.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, that's what I said. The price of the coverage is a benefit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thompson and I share what you call drawbar philosophy on this. That's an approach to life that you get from hours on a tractor. I'm with you, John.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, that's quite true. It has a cash value, but it's not cash in hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, you made your point, John.

MR. THOMPSON: I just had to get that out of my system.

MR. BLAIN: Well, I agree. I agree completely.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, when we looked at the other legislative officers' salaries, we had the salary plus the benefits, and then we came to a total.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, that's what the job is worth. The job is worth the salary plus the benefits.

MR. MILLER: Then why haven't we got it for the Auditor General?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because it wasn't included in that little piece of arithmetic that was done. It wasn't left out intentionally; it just wasn't included in the discussion at the time that form was put together.

DR. CARTER: But it will be done for the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It sure will. It will be in our minutes.

MR. MILLER: Okay.

MR. HIEBERT: It's safe to say it's probably around \$12,000, in that vicinity. Mr. Chairman, is my understanding correct that when the Auditor General's position was opened up, the salary was set at an amount equal to that of the most senior deputy minister's salary?

MR. SALMON: That's correct.

MR. HIEBERT: And subsequently there was a lump-sum increase that made a difference between the most senior deputy minister and the Auditor General. Is that correct?

MR. SALMON: If I may explain. In August 1981, when the deputy ministers' salary was changed by order in council, the maximum amount of salary was \$87,000, with a lump-sum bonus of \$4,100 provided for those who had earned it. When the select standing committee examined the Auditor's salary in January 1982, they did not give him \$87,000. They gave him \$87,000 plus the bonus, because that was the amount that had been paid to the senior deputy the previous August. That's how come he's at \$91,100, which was the same value the senior deputy received in August '81, five months before.

MR. HIEBERT: Have the most senior deputy ministers had their settlement now?

MR. SALMON: The most senior deputy ministers received an increase in August '82. You have to remember your years and your flip-flops there. They had an increase of 6 per cent on \$87,000, which was the previous year, bringing their salary to \$92,200. Of course, they are then due for another one in August '83, which I would say is more than likely 5 per cent, based on what's happened to others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't want you to leave here with that figure in the back of your mind.

MR. SALMON: No, I'm only saying that based on other management people. I'm not in any way predicting. That's the picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you get the answer to your question, Al? Any other questions on that topic?

DR. CARTER: In the documentation we received from your office, bearing in mind the matter of the changes last August for deputy ministers' salaries, you can look at this and say, '82 ranges reflect a 6 per cent increase over the '81 figures; applying 6 per cent to the Auditor General's salary would increase it

to \$96,500, exclusive of those benefits. Does that not put us into the position that the Auditor General will now command the highest salary in the whole civil service? And what does that do to the whole system?

MR. SALMON: I guess if I'm sitting here and you permit me to do some analysis on my own, I would say that by figures from an annual point of view, he would possibly be ahead of the most senior deputy for five months. However, if you wanted to work it out on a month-by-month basis, even at that, he still will not attain the actual dollar figure that that same deputy minister would have received over the same period, having received his increase from August '81, if you understand what I'm saying.

DR. CARTER: Yes. Do the deputy ministers get cars, too?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. CARTER: I'd like to make one other comment, Mr. Chairman. It's tied to another. Number one, because the committee is meeting today doesn't necessarily mean we're going to decide what the salaries are today. From past experience, I think both you and the Auditor General realize. Just so we don't have any false signals out there.

MR. SALMON: Right.

DR. CARTER: But from a political point of view, in the present economy and all the rest of it, I don't know whether we can pull off the miracle of talking about 5 and 6 per cent. That's strictly my personal thrown-into-the-air statement at this stage of the game. I have a lot of concern with how soon it is that the Auditor General blasts through the \$100,000 figure in the actual salary, because he's already gone through it in terms of salary plus benefits. And I assume that he's not the only one who has gone through that.

MR. SALMON: No, there would be others.

DR. CARTER: That raises some concern, legitimate or otherwise, as to what the Premier gets or what cabinet ministers get. We won't even bring into it where the MLAs are.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. Salmon if, through a practical way, we could reconcile the other chief deputy ministers' salaries with the Auditor General's salary? Is there some way he might suggest of bringing the dates together or otherwise dealing with it, so we don't have a perceptual difference that indicates the Auditor General makes more? I think that's a problem for us in a political sense.

MR. SALMON: He might not like me saying this, but he's not here to defend himself. If I were looking at it from the point of view of that particular concern -- and if that is a legitimate concern, then it needs to be looked at seriously -- it would be to change the effective date and put his salary retroactive to August '82, so it's the same as the deputy ministers', and look at it again in August '83. That's the only way I see that the thing would merge.

DR. CARTER: May I ask you a question, then, with respect to your own department? We're then trying to spend money that was spent in a previous fiscal year. How far back are we able to do this exercise?

MR. SALMON: There has never been any concern in the past with retroactive increases.

DR. CARTER: Wait a minute. In your department, there's been concern in this committee in the past.

MR. SALMON: I'm just saying that as a general rule, with those in management or opted out, there are increases that go beyond a particular year end, and that is usually drawn out of salary contingencies. I'm talking about government generally, not just our department.

MR. BLAIN: Many of the negotiated agreements are backdated for months before they're finally paid, and that's the purpose of the salary contingency.

MR. SALMON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don, in view of the fact that you're here on his behalf -- which, by the way, we appreciate very much; quite frankly, I think he does too because I don't think he wanted to come -- do you have any general comments about the office of the Auditor General with respect to changes in workload, responsibility, duties, or things like this that you would like to leave with us at this time?

MR. SALMON: For your information, he has never sat in on these meetings himself. It has always been somebody from the office.

MR. MILLER: Why?

MR. SALMON: I don't know. He just hasn't ever done it in the past.

MR. PURDY: I think he should start doing it.

MR. SALMON: He's never been instructed to come, and he has always left it up to somebody else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's been invited, but has chosen to send an alternate on his behalf because he felt that . . .

MR. SALMON: He just hates to come and defend his own salary.

MR. MILLER: We have to do it every election.

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure exactly what you're suggesting: some possible changes in our responsibilities? I don't know quite what your question is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't know either. I'm wondering if there is anything that has happened in the last five years that has made the Auditor General's job in this province different than what it was, or is it heading in a different direction? What do we have ahead of us? We're talking about one of the highest paid members of the provincial service. It must be some very special kind of job to get it to where it is.

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure everyone appreciates the fact that some five years ago an additional load was placed upon the office to publicly report. I think that in itself created a considerable number of changes and approaches to the operation of the office. Prior to that time, we did not

have that responsibility, and that in itself has added considerable pressure, you might say, to preparing a report on the workings of the office, as well as the findings that need to be brought to the attention of the Legislative Assembly. That is the prime thing.

I think the salaries have reflected things that have occurred over the last five years, not only with our responsibility but with the comparison somewhat with the outside world and the pressures of the kind of job he has. I'm not here to defend what we do. It's in the Act, and we function in accordance with it. But there's nothing of recent months that's changed, of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that lead to any other questions, gentlemen? Do we feel we have the information we need, then? We're talking about the position of the Auditor General. It's an eight-year appointment; the term of office is eight years. We know at present his salary starts January 1. We know that his present term expires March 31, '86, which also happens to be his retirement date. Is there any other information we need?

MR. MILLER: Is there any reason why that should be an eight-year appointment, rather than five?

MR. SALMON: I think it could have been less in accordance with the Act. I believe the time of doing it, April '78, was eight years to his 65th birthday. I think the Legislature automatically made it eight years, subject to his decision whether he stayed on. I suppose he could have chosen to retire earlier, but he has not done so; therefore, there was an eight-year appointment.

MR. MILLER: In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion that consideration be given to the next appointment being for a term of five years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you hold the motion till the next meeting, Bud? I'll accept the motion but at the next meeting. We'll not use it in today's minutes.

DR. CARTER: What other provinces have an auditor general set up the same way we have? Or are we unique?

MR. SALMON: Do you mean appointment-wise or salary-wise?

DR. CARTER: Appointment, with about the same type of jurisdiction as we have here.

MR. SALMON: Basically, the ones we would probably compare with today would be Ontario and British Columbia, which both received new Acts within the last five years, as well. Quebec is basically the same, too, but some of the other smaller provinces haven't changed as much as those three have in the mandate they have under their legislation.

DR. CARTER: Could you get us some information and apply it to the same sort of salary breakdown as what we have here, as to what their auditor generals are paid, plus the benefits and whether there is a car?

MR. SALMON: Yes, we could obtain a comparison with other provinces.

DR. CARTER: I'll settle for the ones you named: B.C., Ontario, and Quebec.

MR. SALMON: Okay.

MR. MILLER: Don, would you refresh our memories as to what the duties were prior to 1978 when they changed it? What were the duties then vis-a-vis what they are now? You say you have to prepare a report but other than that, what differences are there?

MR. SALMON: Prior to '78, we had the responsibility of the financial audits of all Crown corporations, boards, and agencies, but we also had the responsibility -- in effect, the Auditor General was the controller as well. At that time, we had what we have in the controller shop, a pre-audit or pre-examination of expenditures prior to issue of cheques. That was an arm of the Office of the Auditor General. The new legislation and the removal of that arm, which was a logical way to go, provided that the Auditor could be more independent from the government with respect to the goings on and could report independently with the responsibility to publicly report, which wasn't there before.

We issued opinions; we issued the opinion on the General Revenue Fund. Also, in the older years, we had the responsibility for putting together the actual public accounts. Now we audit the document and the statements, rather than actually physically putting it together. Prior to '78, it was something that grew up for many years.

Some of us were involved for a number of those years when the Provincial Auditor, as he was called, was basically the financial man of the province. Then, of course, with the new Financial Administration Act, it was a case of being able to separate that arm and letting him operate properly as an auditor and an officer of the Legislative Assembly in reporting to the Legislative Assembly in an independent fashion. That's the way everything was geared, with us having then to prepare ourselves for public reporting, which wasn't there before.

MR. MILLER: In that regard, I would think you'd have had a heavier workload before. In effect, you're telling me that where before you had a pre-audit, you now have a post-audit.

MR. SALMON: In some ways the duties have changed, but the responsibility has probably increased in a different direction. We have also seen a very substantial increase in volumes of spending, revenues, and so forth, which certainly hasn't made it any easier to handle the volume we have. Although we haven't really increased staff tremendously, that's why we have certainly had an increased cost to accomplish the work we do.

MR. MILLER: This is my final question. Does it ever occur to you that you people might be part of the problem as far as some of the extra staff government has to employ to be able to satisfy your needs as auditors? In other words, we are employing people to count pencils and erasers and account for them, whereas the cost of doing all this is greater than the benefits received.

MR. SALMON: I would have to take exception to that and say that I don't think any of our recommendations were ever intended to increase the cost. I believe that with the expansion of government and the kind of spending that's been going on, there have to be certain types of controls. I would say that our main purpose would be to examine and report on where the weaknesses are in order that savings could result.

Now if, in the eyes of some, we have suggested some controls that are going to cost more money -- we've even said in our own report that if it is not expedient that that control should go in because it is not cost effective, that shouldn't happen. If the administration chooses to expand and put in

certain controls that are going to cost more money, again, we cannot control that. But we can certainly point out where weakness can be. I'm sure the government would not want to have an administration that was weak in its accounting and systems controls. That's what we're really trying to work on in that aspect, which is also included in our legislation.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I'd love to do this one another day. I have a whole series of things along the same line: paper that gets stuck in other places; examples of payments delayed for six weeks and then coming back to you because the postal code isn't on it; in-house kinds of things happening in departmental audit sections because they're looking over their shoulders saying, the Auditor General is going to come and visit us one day.

MR. SALMON: May I just add one thing? I have been with the office for a number of years, as you may know, and I have always known that the big excuse on the other side is to use us as the ones wielding the big whip. In effect, we are not wielding the whip. Today the controller's responsibility is to monitor and see that those controls are in place. Heavy pressure is put on in many ways, because they say we're coming back through and we can publicly report.

It's interesting; I'd love to discuss it freely some time, when we have the time.

DR. CARTER: That leads into the other thing we're going to talk about. Can we see them some time?

MR. SALMON: It would be a good debate. It's something I've done a lot of thinking about, and we talk about it a lot in the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're saying is that we the public, or the government, are asking for certain controls, and then we're asking you to apply the controls and that sort of thing.

MR. SALMON: We're actually to find out whether they exist, and report whether they don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As David just implied, this leads to the next discussion; that is, we as a committee are going to visit you and have coffee at your place.

MR. SALMON: Yes, we're looking forward to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd like fruit cake, both the light and dark kinds.

MR. SALMON: We hope we can at least help you to get more acquainted, by coming to the office, with what an audit office really is and what we're trying to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what we would like to do.

Can we quickly sum up the assigned topic, the salary of the Auditor General? Last round, now: has everybody said everything they want to say? With your permission, I want to change the topic for just one minute before we let Don go.

MR. THOMPSON: Just one question on this little document we have here. Where was this compiled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: David thought that up last night in his sleep.

MR. THOMPSON: I won't make any more comments, David.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not true, John. Don Salmon prepared that and gave it to David earlier. Would you look at it, Don? That came from your office, did it not?

MR. SALMON: That came from our administration division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, John? Last question, Bill?

MR. PURDY: No, no more questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, all through? All right, I'm going to change the topic. The Auditor General left us with orders to sign. We have signed two of them, and I was wondering if these have been communicated to you yet.

MR. SALMON: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would like you to know that we have signed two of them -- two which were not too hard to sign.

MR. SALMON: We would appreciate knowing which ones you have signed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what we wanted to do. I wanted to make sure you leave here with these today. We've agreed to sign two of them, but Louise says I haven't signed them yet. We should just take one minute to do that piece of business, if we can, and then we'll send you merrily on your way.

MR. SALMON: If I may just ask one more question, are you still working on the others? We'd be happy to be of any assistance. If I may, I would leave another one for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please leave it with us, and it will be added to the others. We just had to have more work on some of them.

MR. SALMON: This is very similar to the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. One we agreed to sign was order AG-1, which had to do with authorization to charge fees for professional services rendered by his office on the following basis. That's one we've approved to sign. Is that any help to you?

MR. SALMON: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't think so. Well, we're going to sign it anyway.

MR. SALMON: That's fine. No, it's the starting help. It's the first one that has to be signed; I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. There's another one.

MRS. EMPSON: This is the one that's been changed. We haven't changed the figures, which were for an increase across the board for irrigation districts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Authorization to vary the fees chargeable to irrigation districts.

MR. SALMON: Number six?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. CARTER: Didn't we have a motion that cleared that one in the committee?

MRS. EMPSON: You haven't approved the minutes yet, so I don't think we should let this go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see? Did everybody here see that?

DR. CARTER: That's why she carries the pencils, and you don't.

MRS. EMPSON: The figures all have to be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you see the troubles I have?

DR. CARTER: Will you settle for one?

MR. SALMON: I can go away and wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will be approving minutes, if I can keep this group together for another five minutes today, and we will be letting you know the progress we make.

MR. SALMON: Thank you. Just for your information, Mr. Chairman, it's number nine that I need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need number nine, do you?

DR. CARTER: What is number nine?

MR. SALMON: It happens to be like six, which is the varying fees. Because we brought forward to you the irrigation districts for the current year and got into that discussion, we have not yet billed the irrigation districts for those amounts for the last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 1982 internal standard costs and the fee recommended.

MR. SALMON: Mr. Rogers felt we ought to wait until we had the order, so we're waiting for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As he pointed out to me the last time I saw him, the government of Alberta is out quite a bit of money waiting for these fees to be collected.

MR. SALMON: Right. It would just about pay for his salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We will be looking at our minutes, and we'll be reviewing these. Thank you for your guidance and direction on number nine. We will get them to you at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. SALMON: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That terminates this portion of this meeting, if that's all right with you. If it isn't, holler.

MR. SALMON: That's fine. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming on behalf of the Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is 22 minutes after four. Can I ask for approval of minutes as circulated? We have three sets of minutes out. Does anybody have any objection if we add this to the agenda? Hearing no objection on adding other items to the agenda, I would like to have a motion approving the minutes of April 22. The members present that day were Carter, Thompson, Anderson, Miller, and myself. Do I have a motion?

DR. CARTER: Motion to approve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a motion to approve. Any question on the motion? Those in favor? That motion is carried.

The April 26 meeting was in the Carillon Room, and the members present were Carter, Anderson, Miller, Notley, and Thompson. Do I have a motion approving those minutes?

MR. MILLER: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any question on the motion? Those in favor? That motion is carried.

On Tuesday, May 3, we met in the Carillon Room, and the members present were Carter, Hiebert, Miller, Thompson, and Elliott. Do I have a motion? John Thompson, thank you. Any question on the motion? Those in favor of the motion? The motion is carried.

Now, Louise, will you let me sign the order that we approved?

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you'd hear me on two quick points before you break up. I'd like to say I'm sorry. I obviously confused you on the salary and benefits, because I was using expressions with which I work. What I would like to clarify, if I can, is that salary plus benefits equal the job value. But salary plus benefits don't equal the total salary. For example, in this particular case the Auditor General is paid \$91,100; that's the salary. He gets benefits of an estimated value of \$12,000 a year and, as everybody says -- and I agree -- they are indeed direct benefits. But they are not direct payments. So the total job value is salary plus benefits. I regret the confusion I've caused by using the other expressions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any further questions on those comments?

Before I introduce the new topic of minutes, following up on the last visitor we had, what I should have done -- and I apologize for this -- is stuck with the agenda we had on salaries, and made sure we recorded any thoughts we had. I would ask our secretary, in the preparation of minutes, to make sure she separates this and gets our follow-up discussion on salaries.

Can we go forward for a few minutes, then, on the topic of the salaries? If I can come back to my other topic later, I'll do so with your permission.

MR. THOMPSON: As David was a member of the last committee, I would like to understand the rationale of taking the bonus the deputy ministers got and putting it forevermore into the salary of the Auditor General.

DR. CARTER: John, as only a partial attempt to answer that, my feeling of the previous committee was that, in terms of the whole operation of the committee,

we got sidetracked with the salary level. Last year, we ran into the problem -- it was pre-election, so we didn't really finish all the things we should have. We really had no vice-chairman of the committee, in many respects, so it was all being done by the chairman, who was involved in a lot of political difficulties last year.

I really don't feel the committee had as much access to all the information it should have had. In part of the notes I've been making today is a series of questions that I think have to be put by the chairman or by the committee to appropriate people in Treasury; for example, with respect to how we get out of the problem of anniversary dates, as Dennis so rightly raised. We're getting played off against each other by these various offices.

I think the other thing that was a major difficulty for the committee was that the matter of the parliamentary counsel's salary and benefits got thrown to the committee, which consumed an awful lot of time before we as a committee had had a chance to develop a rationale as to how we were going to pay all of these people and fit it back to SOIIs, SOIs, and deputy ministers. As you recall, the Ombudsman was talking about some provinces trying to plug it into a grid level with chief justices or provincial court judges, and I recollect that we had some discussion with the Attorney General in that regard.

I think we're right into the morass again. How do we do a rationalization? And I detect within this committee a much firmer resolve to come up with a rationalization that will apply to them all. But it means we have to relate not only to Treasury but to the Attorney General and Personnel Administration, to try to see if there is an interconnecting grid that we can fit into.

That's not really an answer to what you're after, but it's indicative of the problem that we had.

MR. THOMPSON: That's fine, David.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, do you have a recommendation for us as to where we go from here at this moment? What do you think we can accomplish today on this topic? Should we schedule this into some of these other dates we have been kicking around?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I think we should just set the dates for about the next three meetings. In the meantime, there's a series of questions out of today's meeting that you have to deal with. Perhaps you and I, as chairman and vice-chairman, can meet with at least three ministers involved, so we have a rationalization before we get around to deciding what we're going to do. In that regard, let's leave it like that and not even get ourselves into the issue of parliamentary counsel at this stage of the game.

MR. ANDERSON: Might I just suggest that along with that -- I'm not sure it would be resolved by the ministers; I'm thinking more at an administrative level -- in terms of reconciling the varied dates we have, there be some groundwork done somewhere as to how we can reconcile those dates and then apply a grid generally to those. I think that's the major problem we have. The figures need to be worked out, as to what the ramifications would be of moving those dates around. I think a major goal of this committee this year should be to reconcile those dates.

MR. BLAIN: From the view of somebody who works to a certain extent on salary reviews and salary anniversaries -- and you can ignore me on this one -- but I do agree. In effect, there are two dates, or a date and a group of dates, which embrace the greater part of the public service. That is to say, the management anniversary date is common at June 1. The other dates, of course, for the clerical people, are as per the negotiations. But if you could at

least match the management anniversary date and these anniversary dates, that would streamline things considerably and make the work of the committee much easier. Dennis, I think you put your finger right on it. Mr. Mack didn't want me to sit with the committee, so I didn't, although I'm Clerk of Committees. But I do recall, from reading the minutes and transcripts, the tremendous amount of time you had to spend last year thrashing these things out and getting set dates for them, particularly when the Law Clerk was pumped into the operation.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could suggest that under the direction of you and the vice-chairman, Mr. Blain try to bring those figures to the next meeting, whenever we set that date for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks for the suggestion. Does anybody else want to jump into this at this time?

I'm looking at my calendar for July. It's been suggested somewhere along the way that the afternoon of July 14 would be one time available -- to most of us, anyway -- for the next meeting, and the morning of July 15.

MR. ANDERSON: I couldn't make it for the 15th; the 14th is possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the 14th possible?

MR. BLAIN: Dr. Elliott, I don't think you'll be here on the 14th. You'll be at Queen's Park.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the 13th.

MR. BLAIN: Oh, are you coming back on the 14th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will I be here by noon?

MRS. EMPSON: Yes.

MR. BLAIN: Oh, sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No problem. I didn't know for sure; I was just guessing. Louise says I'll be here before noon. So 1:30 then on the 14th would be our next opportunity to meet.

DR. CARTER: Well, let's do that for tackling the salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can identify the agenda for that afternoon, and the next morning will be continuation of salaries. All right? David, there is some homework to be done between now and then. You and I and Doug will have to figure out what we're going to do for that later on.

Can we identify the afternoon of July 18? That was another day that seemed to be acceptable to quite a number of members of this committee.

MR. ANDERSON: I won't be around for that date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You won't be able to make it that day. How about the others? Does that seem to be reasonably good for the others involved?

MR. THOMPSON: I can get here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

Can we look ahead all the way into August? What about the afternoon of August 16, starting at 1:30? That's just prior to a caucus meeting.

MR. ANDERSON: I have Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. THOMPSON: So do I, but I think we can switch off.

DR. CARTER: There are enough of your members, that you could . . .

MR. ANDERSON: There are some conflicts there, too, with the workers' compensation. I don't know which dates those are.

MRS. EMPSON: No, not at that time in August.

MR. THOMPSON: No, I don't think workers' compensation is on the 16th; not that I know of.

MR. BLAIN: I won't be here on August 16, but you'll have Louise, and what more could you ask for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very little, I assure you.

DR. CARTER: Just Louise and a box of pencils; that's all anybody needs.

MR. HIEBERT: You're not going to get everybody here on any single date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, if we can just get the work going, and those who can, can come.

MR. ANDERSON: What do we need for a quorum?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four. So we're actually doing quite well.

DR. CARTER: Could we use the morning of July 15 as a back-up position and go for the last hour and a half over to visit, say, the Auditor General?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the afternoon of the 14th and the morning of the 15th.

DR. CARTER: Are you not in Calgary on the 15th?

MR. ANDERSON: I'll be gone on holidays that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was that the Auditor General you'd like to visit that morning?

DR. CARTER: Well, I'm just suggesting that we have to work them in some time, so if we went there at about 11 o'clock, that gives us an hour and a half here to do any tidying up we need to, then go there, and we're done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Bud, did you want to get into this?

MR. MILLER: As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, you and David are going to meet with the Treasury people to get some guidelines as to the salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I understood David to say, yes.

MR. MILLER: In that respect, do you think it's going to take us all of one afternoon plus part of the next morning to resolve that?

DR. CARTER: Well, it might. The other thing we could do for that Friday morning is put in two tentative places to go to, one being the Auditor General and the other, say, the Chief Electoral Officer. Then, if we need more time, we'll just have to phone and say, sorry, we'll come later.

MR. MILLER: Right.

MRS. EMPSON: Do we still want to make it 11 o'clock, or do you want to make it earlier than that?

DR. CARTER: We'll do one at 9:00 and the other one at 11:00. We would be with them for an hour and a half and then have time to get on to the next place.

MRS. EMPSON: What would you do in the afternoon?

DR. CARTER: This would be Friday, the 15th. We would adjourn at 'noonish'.

MRS. EMPSON: Okay, and then you'll be finished.

MR. ANDERSON: We're talking July 14 and 15, and August 16.

DR. CARTER: Yes, and there was one other as well, July 18.

MRS. EMPSON: In the afternoon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: July 18, 1:30 in the afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And August 16, 1:30. I'm going to change the agenda then for just one second. We approved the minutes.

MRS. EMPSON: This is the one that needs a 5 per cent increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, but have we approved the minutes, though, to give it that 5 per cent?

MRS. EMPSON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So now we have to change these figures, and then I can sign it.

DR. CARTER: Or you instruct them to change the figures and bring it back, and sign the one they have changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good point.

MR. MILLER: You don't want to make any mistakes with the Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. You heard Don Salmon ask if we could work with 09. He's asking for approval under order AG-1, authorization to vary fees chargeable, and this includes the Aetna Irrigation District, the Bow River Irrigation District, and so on: Magrath, Mountain View, Raymond, Ross Creek, St. Mary River, United, and Western.

Would somebody remind me what the concern was that we felt we were unable to approve that earlier? We wanted to take another look at it for some reason.

DR. CARTER: What's the difference between this one and this one?

MRS. EMPSON: That's for last year, 1982; they're waiting to bill. This is for them to do 1983; they haven't been done, nor have they been billed. You wanted to change the billing structure to the same districts.

DR. CARTER: Okay, this is for 1982.

MRS. EMPSON: There's no reason not to sign that one.

DR. CARTER: So that one should be signed, and that's over and done with. But the one where we told them to do a 5 per cent increase is for 1983. We've already agreed on that. We were just going to go along with the 1982 one, we raised the 1983, and then we were going to take that on for further discussion with some other people before we get into the next year. I think that was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That seems to fit.

DR. CARTER: Is that your recollection also?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Bud Miller and John Thompson were involved in that discussion.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. It's not only the irrigation districts; there are several organizations getting under the blanket, so to speak, of pretty well a free ride on their auditing. I think that there's not only this committee -- I think we should be aware of how much it's costing the government to do this type of thing. The irrigations are one of about 30 people, as I recall.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, with your permission. The other ones we're holding up cover that category, and that's why we held them up. We're not going to move on these today, because we want more information. They're part of another list of questions to be raised. I think that's where we left it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, you can add the one which just came in today to the list. We have copies for everybody. We all have this information, by the way.

MR. MILLER: David, did I understand you correctly, that we would be signing for 1982, which is behind us? I have no problem with that, but I do have a problem with signing 1983.

DR. CARTER: For 1983, by resolution of this committee, we increased the rates by 5 per cent. That's what we decided we would do as an interim measure for this year, until we had further opportunity to discuss everything: irrigation districts, Olympic development, and all the colleges. We felt that under the time pressure, we needed to do that for now, but with no commitment as to how we were going to handle it in the future.

MR. THOMPSON: In fact, it needs further study.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine.

Now, on the basis of the minutes we've approved, Louise says I can sign one of these today, instruct them to change one as per the minutes, and then we'll sign it.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the others we're holding.

Now, was there anything else to be attended to today? I'll be doing two things yet before the day is out. I'm going to corner David long enough for him and me and Doug Blain to get a date together to get some information. And I have to draft and get a letter typed to the Premier to be able to hand it to him tomorrow morning at caucus, as to what we have done and what we're going to do. Please don't look for too much detail in this letter; it will be very loose around the edges. But we have accomplished enough that we'll be able to write a report.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we have to deal fairly soon with either the reappointment or search for a new Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to make a decision very soon to reappoint or otherwise. Yes, I agree with you.

MR. ANDERSON: As well, I suppose some selection process for an Auditor General, since the retirement date is coming up.

MR. MILLER: In '86. We have a bit of time.

DR. CARTER: There might be an election between.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I move we officially adjourn the meeting at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I accept that, and we declare the meeting adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.