

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Thursday, July 14, 1983

Chairman: Dr. Elliott

1:35 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These starting delays are always a problem, but Louise is so busy preparing so many goodies for us that it's terrible to neglect them on the way in. So it takes a little time to get squared away.

My opening comments will consist of this. I have three items. The minutes from the last meeting; my second item: under Chairman's comments, I would like to refer to four letters I have received or had contact with people. The third item on my agenda is what I consider our assignment for today; that is, to get as far as we can with reviewing the salaries for the offices we are looking at.

Going back to number one, referring to the minutes that have been distributed to us, we'll do whatever has to be done to dispose of this topic. Are there any questions with respect to understanding the minutes or their completeness? Later on, perhaps we'll discuss some of the detail and topics in the minutes. Does anybody have any problem with the minutes? Agreed? Okay, we have agreement on the minutes.

Getting on to my second topic then, from the Chair. As Chairman, I have exercised the privilege of having . . . Would you like a motion on that?

DR. CARTER: It was moved by Mr. Notley and seconded by me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any question on the motion? Those in favor? That fills in that gap.

Following the last meeting, we had questions about getting some reaction from Lou Hyndman and Neil Crawford with respect to some of the original contracts that were involved or the original arrangements with hiring the Ombudsman, the Auditor General, and the Chief Electoral Officer. Their memories are the same as what Mr. Blain was able to provide for us at the last meeting, that these offices are not in fact linked with any particular office in a scale. They're not linked to any provincial deputy minister or something like this. These people were hired to do a job, and the salary was set. That is what they recall. So I did make that contact.

The third item under my comments would be that I also have a letter from Michael Clegg. His concern is that he wants to make sure that any salary adjustment with respect to his pay respects what he considers to be his anniversary date, which is April 1. He feels that the last time this topic was reviewed on his behalf, his anniversary date wasn't properly honored. It resulted in a slightly lower salary adjustment for him. I have that correspondence.

The fourth item under Chairman's comments would be a letter from the Chief Electoral Officer, in which he refers to . . . It's only for our information, involving amendments to the Election Act, where he's sending materials through to Bill Payne. It doesn't involve salaries or the items which I consider are part of our responsibility. So we have that document too. It looks like this. Is it your wish to have this kind of thing attached to the minutes? Because I as Chairman receive it, does it mean we should attach it to the minutes? Or is it good enough if we have it filed with Louise so that it's available to whatever? I'll pass it around. I need your help, please.

MR. HIEBERT: Let's take a look at it first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. It's just a fistful of paper, and I don't want to have to duplicate it a thousand times if it isn't necessary.

DR. CARTER: Is it a number of changes to his Act?

MR. HIEBERT: Yes, two.

DR. CARTER: I know that one of them is with respect to that private member's Bill I was sponsoring, that they're prepared to make those changes in the Act to make it crystal clear that residents, inmates, in penal institutions do have the right to vote during provincial elections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, I don't consider that kind of topic to be the business of this table here.

DR. CARTER: But his Act is the business of this table. I think that maybe . . .

MR. HIEBERT: He has not included the proposed amendments to sections 41 and 113 as proposed in Bill 210.

DR. CARTER: He has not?

MR. HIEBERT: Yes, that's what he says: you may wish to consider inclusion of these two amendments in the amending legislation; I agree with the recommendations proposed by Dr. Carter.

DR. CARTER: Okay.

MR. HIEBERT: He goes on to say: I would be grateful if the recommended amendments to the Election Act could be actioned during the fall sitting of the Legislature; this would facilitate the required follow-up action to process the order in council for approval of a regulation. He says: the majority of the recommended changes are administrative details and do not constitute changes in policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a word of guidance to us? Is that kind of thing material that we would concern ourselves with? For some reason, we're privileged with a copy of it.

MR. BLAIN: It's not a matter for this committee, except in terms of general information. The business of the Legislative Offices Committee is salaries and any matters relating to the general administration of those offices that they might wish to be referred to the committee. But matters of that nature are for information only.

Mr. Chairman, we will of course do whatever you wish about copying the document and appending it to the minutes. In addition to that, I might say -- and I'm sure I'm only refreshing your memories -- that in my office, or physically in Louise's office, we maintain a library of master minute books and committee files for all committees. Any member of any committee is of course more than welcome to see them in the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any question about that statement of guidance? Then the minutes will show that we accept this document as information.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I am also going to exercise another privilege here. I'm going to consider it the business of this committee, for its guidance, to have the letter from Mr. Clegg. This is written as confidential, but I consider that as confidential to this committee. Have you got a couple of spares down there? Very good. This is the other letter I was referring to, from Mr. Clegg. I consider this information for all committee members, to assist us in making our decisions on this topic.

I will want to refer to that again later on perhaps, but I would like now to go back to my very brief agenda. With your permission, I suggest that we now continue the review of the salaries of the people for whom we are responsible. Does anybody have any preference where we start? I recommend that we start with the Ombudsman and the Chief Electoral Officer, from that area, and perhaps Mr. Clegg, and leave the Auditor General until last.

David, do you want to come in on that?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion that we increase the salary of the Auditor General by 5 per cent, effective on the anniversary date which has been in place.

MR. THOMPSON: The Auditor General?

DR. CARTER: I'm sorry. The Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. To increase the salary of the Ombudsman 5 per cent, recognizing the anniversary date that's in place. Is that what I heard you say, David?

DR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you know his anniversary date? April 1.

MR. PURDY: I have a question on the motion. Is that retroactive to April 1, 1983.

DR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. My question for clarification, David: remember the last meeting we talked about a base salary and a salary and another salary, and then it added up to something else? Should we identify which figure the 5 per cent is applying to in your motion?

DR. CARTER: It's the base salary. He claimed it was \$60,990.

MR. BLAIN: So the increase you propose to give is 5 per cent of \$60,990.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that correct, David?

DR. CARTER: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's your motion. Are there any other questions or discussion on the motion?

MR. NOTLEY: Could I just ask, Mr. Chairman, if that \$60,990 is the base salary, or -- then we have a car, \$3,600. How is that included? I see '82-83

is \$57,000 here, and '83-84 is \$60,990. It may just be that I'm not following clearly here.

MR. BLAIN: Grant, perhaps you will remember this question came up before, and I said to you that when estimates are constructed, we must estimate the salaries at the current figure. So although it shows \$60,990 for '83-84, that is not literally correct. It's \$60,990 at the beginning of that year, but any increases are added to that and drawn from the salary contingency fund.

MR. NOTLEY: Okay. Thank you, Doug. That clears it up.

DR. CARTER: Do we need a seconder, Mr. Chairman? Did we get a seconder?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR. BLAIN: You don't need a seconder.

DR. CARTER: I just want to make sure. I don't want to get hung up on any technicalities.

MR. BLAIN: You could if you wished but, as you recall, seconders are not required in the House; therefore, they're not required in committees. But you have to vote on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll ask for the vote. Those in favor of the motion? The motion is carried.

Does anybody have any other question or comment with respect to the Ombudsman on this topic?

MR. BLAIN: As an administrative comment, that is a dollar value of \$3,049.50.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we consider our business on this topic with respect to the Ombudsman completed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask you, then, to direct your attention to the Chief Electoral Officer. I'm looking at the page that came to us in the minutes, with this display of salaries, benefits, totals, and so on. In the case of the Chief Electoral Officer, his anniversary date is also April 1 and, according to my display, his salary is \$57,780. Anybody wish to start the discussion?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would think a similar increase in the Electoral Officer's position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Bud. I'm going to ask for a seconder for that, since we've [inaudible] that practice. Thanks, Grant.

Now, let's discuss that motion, please. Are there any questions on that motion? We're talking 5 per cent on the Chief Electoral Officer's salary.

DR. CARTER: And the same anniversary date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They both have the same anniversary date of April 1, and we're going to retain that. Those in favor of the motion? The motion is carried unanimously.

I now ask you to direct your attention to the . . .

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, would Mr. Blain be able to supply us with the book value of that fairly rapidly, as he did so well in the previous case?

MR. BLAIN: I make that to be \$2,889.

DR. CARTER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to direct your attention, please, to the Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Clegg. I have a reason for putting them in this order. I'm leaving the Auditor General till last.

DR. CARTER: Would that be the Law Clerk on Appendix I?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BLAIN: Parliamentary Counsel is a job title which has been assigned to him at his own request, but as far as *Standing Orders* go, he is still the Law Clerk. So "Law Clerk" is the working title for him.

DR. CARTER: Thank you.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I move that we extend the 5 per cent increase on the base figure of \$60,990, retroactive to the anniversary date of April 1, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. Can we have a seconder for that?

MR. THOMPSON: I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions or discussion on that one? Yes, Bill.

MR. PURDY: One question. The memorandum sent to you from the Parliamentary Counsel doesn't indicate the anniversary date, but is it April 1 as indicated by the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I found it on page 2, the very last of that top paragraph.

DR. CARTER: Yes, it is April 1.

MR. BLAIN: That is indeed his established anniversary date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Therefore I assume that the anniversary date remains April 1. Mr. Blain confirms that that is in fact the anniversary date for that position.

MR. BLAIN: I think you'll see in the somewhat lengthy memorandum, Mr. Chairman, that he raises the point that the last time around, his increase was made effective June 1, which was really wrong, but he was compensated by an additional 1 per cent to cover the retroactive period. So it really came to the same thing. It was from April 1 last time, and that's the established anniversary date. The dollar value, of course, is the same as the Ombudsman's.

MR. HIEBERT: I think the intent of the motion is to alleviate the concern that is in the memo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other question on the motion? Those in favor of the motion? Those opposed? Again, the motion is carried unanimously.

Could I have the recording device off for a moment.

ADJ.?

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to my agenda, we are now prepared to discuss the salary of the Auditor General. I left this to last by design because, if I may summarize as I understand it, there has been some concern about the salary of the Auditor General getting to a level where it will exceed that of the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. We might want to consider that in our discussions and think about it.

As chairman, I have taken the liberty to review this with our Provincial Treasurer and Attorney General to see if they had any guidance for us on this topic, and the suggestion was that we should keep it reasonably close. Having it go above is not a serious matter as far as they're concerned, but keeping it reasonably close seemed to be important to them. Since I asked for guidance, those are the comments they made, and they agreed on that. I'm repeating myself, but they also told me that at no time was it ever suggested that it should necessarily be linked to any particular position.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, if I could add just a crumb to that. I certainly wouldn't want to differ from those two eminent gentlemen -- indeed, I don't. I've looked into this and can't find anything in writing anywhere, but it seems to be an unwritten policy that the two salaries should be tied closely together. The two positions, the Deputy Provincial Treasurer and the Auditor General, should relate closely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess that's what they were telling me by innuendo as much as anything else. It doesn't have to match right on, but keep it closely related.

MR. BLAIN: I think it's generally been indicated that it be not desirable for the one to exceed the other.

MR. NOTLEY: What is the recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The recommendation is that it be something less than 2 per cent to keep it in line with . . .

David, I turned a lot of this over to you at an early time. I wasn't trying to be facetious when I called you the chairman of our subcommittee on salaries, and I had you collect a certain amount of these papers. Will you pick up the discussion from here on this particular topic, please?

DR. CARTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only comment I would make on it is that this is a real, legitimate concern that was expressed by the committee before. It's fairly obvious that we have Mr. Rogers, whom we all respect, sort of being the first guy to hurdle through that \$100,000 salary, soon to be followed no doubt by the Leader of the Opposition. [laughter]

MR. NOTLEY: You can cross the floor, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: His office doesn't come under the jurisdiction of the committee, though, does it?

DR. CARTER: Nor does his kind offer for me to cross the floor.

But I think there is some real concern in that, and I know, given the position of the Auditor General -- we're all very much aware of his reluctance to discuss his own salary before the committee. I think my suggestion really would be, Mr. Chairman, that since we're going to meet again -- tomorrow we're at the Auditor General's shop, and then we're due to meet again on Monday -- I would like to think that perhaps on our behalf you could meet with the Auditor General and have some preliminary discussion as to would he be comfortable with a 2 or 3 per cent thing. I really don't see how I, in all conscience, could vote for giving him 5 per cent, because we're in the midst of difficult times.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, my difficulty is the fact that the last committee took the bonus, which was over \$4,000, and put it into his base salary. I have real problems with that. I would suggest to the committee that we consider that not being part of his base salary we're now figuring. You can go at it either way. You can either leave that in there and give him the 2 per cent, or you can take that back out and give him the 4 or 5 per cent. I just don't understand why the Auditor General allowed that to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I go to your question, I'm going to ask for clarification of what John Thompson just said. I'm going to ask Doug Blain to explain what John just said.

MR. BLAIN: Well, I have a little difficulty in explaining this in this particular instance, but I can explain the general policy on that sort of thing. In the classified area -- executive officers, senior officers, and so -- there are established minimum and maximum salaries. If at the end of a year there is a percentage increase and that percentage increase carries the incumbent past his maximum, then he generally receives a cash bonus to compensate for that. That is not considered to be part of the maximum salary. It's a lump sum bonus, but his maximum remains the same. Am I making myself clear? Perhaps I'm not.

MR. THOMPSON: I follow you.

MR. BLAIN: I could perhaps give you a hypothetical example and say that an individual is making \$60,000, and his maximum is \$62,000. The market increase for that year is 5 per cent, which of course is \$3,000. So \$2,000 would take him to his maximum, but to ensure that he got the market increase he would get a \$1,000 lump sum settlement. His maximum would still remain at \$62,000. I think that's the point that you're making. That lump sum was put into the Auditor General's salary, thereby creating a new maximum, which is now the floor for any future increases.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. You explained it very well as far as I'm concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes and no, because I'm still lost. You're implying then, or you explained to us, that the Auditor does have a maximum?

MR. BLAIN: No, I'm sorry. I was speaking of the classified area to explain the principle. The Auditor General's salary is tied to that order in council which is produced each year and says that salaries for deputy ministers, heads of Crown corporations, and so on, shall be that much for a given period. But the Auditor General, as I recall, doesn't normally appear on the table of that order in council, and that's why his salary is judged against the Deputy

Provincial Treasurer. He's not a government official; he's an officer of the Legislature. But that's used as the guide for his salary.

MR. THOMPSON: But isn't that the crux of the whole matter? If we're trying to keep these people more or less in tandem here . . .

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: If his bonus becomes the base part of his salary, then obviously he's going to start leaping past the others.

MR. BLAIN: Yes. He did on that one occasion, and I don't understand why. I don't remember if all you hon. gentlemen were on the previous committee, but I'm a little inhibited because Mr. Mack would never allow me to attend your committee meetings. It would have been perfectly within my right as an officer of the committee to insist on attending. However, I didn't want to push my luck, so I never insisted. So I'm not too familiar with a lot of things that went on, even from the minutes, because some of the decisions that were reached are recorded in principle in the minutes, but I'm not familiar with the discussions that went on. Again, I hope I'm not confusing you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John, I'm just wondering, how does that apply now to the Auditor General in this case? Would you recommend specific action that we should consider?

MR. THOMPSON: No. I'm just saying to the committee that if we rescinded that bonus being put in the base, you could give him the 5 per cent, or if you're going to leave it in the base, you're down to the 2 per cent. What I'm getting at is that you can go either way. If he says, well, the rest of them are getting 5 per cent, I want 5 per cent, then we'll say let's work off the actual base instead of the new base. I don't care how we do it. But if we're going to try to keep the Deputy Provincial Treasurer's salary and Roger's salary together, we've got to come up with some rationale. Which is easier for him to accept, I don't know.

MR. BLAIN: I know this particular one has been a difficult study for the committee, and I hate to suggest delay -- and it needn't be undue delay; we're meeting again tomorrow and Monday. The new order in council, to the best of my knowledge -- I spoke to Mr. Dixon about it some time back -- doesn't normally come out until August. I don't think it's out yet. But if we had that order in council and knew what the established salary was for the Deputy Provincial Treasurer this time round, it could very well be a guide for the Auditor General's salary, which would of course have to be made retroactive to his anniversary date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the case of the Auditor General, the anniversary date is January 1, 1983.

MR. BLAIN: While we're on that subject, I wonder if I could make a comment on the question that was asked by Mr. Anderson at the last meeting, relative to marrying up those dates, the two sets of anniversary dates and the cost of doing so. I'm sorry that at this moment I have only a partial answer, because I've been away quite a bit and had other committees on hand. But I did pose this question to a senior official in Personnel Administration, who is an expert in this field. I explained the circumstances to him and the committee's concern, and I asked him what problems he would foresee in doing this. He said he really didn't foresee any. He thought, as I did, that this

could be done by committee resolution, the crux of the question being that if we shift Mr. Rogers' anniversary date to coincide with April 1, we would have to prorate any increases to compensate him for that overlapping period. But from that time forward, the Auditor General's anniversary date could be coincident with the other anniversary dates.

Mr. Elliott referred me to Mr. Harford, who deals even more closely with this matter, because there has been a change since I last had occasion to consult Mr. Elliott. I have left word for Mr. Harford to call me. If I don't hear from him today, I'll be onto him again in the morning as a sort of double check on what Mr. Elliott has told me. If it is only a matter of -- and I don't see where it would be any major problem. If the committee resolves to do this, I would say that was perfectly in order.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, if I recollect our past discussion correctly, it seemed as though the disparity between the Deputy Provincial Treasurer's salary and the Auditor General's salary would be somewhat resolved if we reconciled those anniversary dates. I was hoping that we could work out the figures in that regard and, therefore, use that as a base in determining what the salary of the Auditor General should be, keeping in mind the suggestions that have been made and the difficulty that there is in terms of those extra months in between.

I, too, hesitate to recommend delay, but we haven't got those figures at this point. I would like to suggest that we withhold a final decision on this topic until we see what reconciling the anniversary dates would do. I think we need to reach that conclusion and move in that direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comment on that?

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, as well, we should probably also be cognizant of -- effective August 1, 1983, when the new order in council comes forward to establish the pay salary schedule range seven right down to the bottom for all deputy ministers and assistant deputy ministers, so we know where we're at for the Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Basically what we're saying, then, is that we'll delay any further discussion on the Auditor General's salary until after Mr. Blain is able to bring those numbers to us, and we're talking about some time later in August.

MR. BLAIN: I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. Because of, as I said before, the sort of unwritten policy of keeping the two salaries together, I don't know how the committee could really arrive at one for the Auditor General until they know what the new one is for the Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, can I just suggest that Mr. Blain be asked to make a recommendation, too, as to how, if we do decide to reconcile the two dates, we would achieve doing that with some sort of equity in terms of those interim months.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That was my purpose in consulting Mr. Harford as quickly as I can.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know that we can hold off until this August thing is before us. Part of the difficulty at this stage of the game as we are trying to ascertain figures is the fact that the present Deputy Provincial Treasurer is on a contract basis, interrelated to his semi-retirement or whatever. That's going to throw this mechanism out of kilter.

I'd still like to see something done with my earlier suggestion that tomorrow, after we've met with the Auditor General, you have some discussion with him, and perhaps John Thompson, because he has this concern about the base salary figure. Perhaps the two of you could meet with him on that matter and get some type of feel for where we're going. Granted, Mr. Blain can do the follow-up with this new contact person in the next two days, and then we can examine the matter again on Monday. We might not resolve it on Monday, but I would hate to see us as a committee tie ourselves up and say, oh, we're not going to decide this until the end of August. The Auditor General has been waiting since the first of the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, David. Any other comment on that?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would support the notion that you approach the Auditor General, one on one, and just see what the notions are, and reassess on Monday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How does that sound?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BLAIN: If I might make a suggestion, with respect, on that point. In the course of this discussion, in my opinion it might be in order to discuss the question of changing anniversary dates, just to let him know what the committee is thinking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. BLAIN: This would be a good step forward. It would clean things up and would also be something to be done in advance of the appointment of a new Auditor General, which I realize isn't for two or three years yet. But the anniversary date would then be established from this time forward, so to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our Auditor General's eight-year term expires March 31, 1986.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, three years. I suspect the next appointment will probably be for five years. As you recall, Mr. Rogers' age determined the eight-year appointment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Rogers would be prepared to discuss this in terms of future appointments, too, and guidance that we'll require for that.

Very well. We'll leave it at that. It doesn't require a motion; I'll act on that recommendation. We'll be meeting again on Monday afternoon. We're meeting tomorrow morning at nine o'clock at the Auditor General's.

Could I introduce a new topic now?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to refer to a list of follow-up items that has been left here for my consideration. Mr. Blain, would you like to guide us through this and see where we are and what has to be done? Item number one, from April 22, from the Auditor General: we have a request for information we don't have yet.

DR. CARTER: So we'll ask him tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Items number two, three, four, five, six, seven, and eight.

MRS. EMPSON: Those are all the orders for approval.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What more do we have to have before we can approve those things and sign them? Would somebody please refresh my memory?

DR. CARTER: You'll recall, Mr. Chairman, that most of these would come to things like the Olympic Games Committee, as well as, I believe, some of the irrigation districts. Are the irrigation districts on that list?

MRS. EMPSON: Yes. I have all the orders here.

DR. CARTER: We wanted to have some time to go back and do some study of this because, in the case of whatever organization, surely some of them are able to carry the fees. So we're still waiting for some further information from Treasury as to what is what with this. You and I had a brief discussion with the Provincial Treasurer on this, and he seemed to be somewhat surprised that it was happening. So I think we need to have some more information before we can clear this off our agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess my question, David, is: is there some responsibility at this end of the table that I haven't looked after with respect to these topics, or is it all Louise's problem? What action is being taken and by whom to proceed with this? I'm just nervous about unfinished business lingering on and on; that's all. I need to have my memory refreshed as to what is happening.

MRS. EMPSON: You should probably ask the Auditor General for what information you need on these orders, so he can provide it for you. But you'll have to tell him what you're looking for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether I can do that, but I'd sure like to try. Maybe tomorrow -- how about that, David?

DR. CARTER: It would be after the meeting. If Louise would supply us with two copies of these orders, we'll take them with us tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The record will show that we reviewed that, and that was the decision that was made. Nobody objects to that position?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll confront the Auditor General with that and dispose of those items.

What else do we have on this little list? Let's go to item number nine, cost of office space for the Ombudsman's office. Was somebody going to bring us information there?

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Wyatt had undertaken to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number 10, information on the Stockholm conference. Did we ever get that information?

MRS. EMPSON: I think the information is in the red binder.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number 11, discussion of the expiry of the term of office of the Ombudsman.

DR. CARTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think members have probably scanned that one again today. In the normal course of events, the Ombudsman's present term is to April 30, 1984, and I would assume that this is a matter for us to discuss later in the fall. It doesn't necessarily carry over as a list of follow-up items here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recall that we flagged it as something that was going to be coming up again, and that's why it's on the list here now and we have it before us. You're right; we'll come back to it later.

MR. BLAIN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. As this is a standing committee, the selection of a new Ombudsman is a matter which of course would normally be referred to the committee as a task to perform.

MR. NOTLEY: By resolution of the Legislature.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. NOTLEY: So what you're saying is that we should not be taking it upon ourselves until there's a resolution directing us to do so.

MR. BLAIN: That is the normal proceeding on things of that nature.

DR. CARTER: Is it?

MR. BLAIN: Yes, the standing committee can't work unless it's directed to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We sure don't want to start going out and borrowing trouble and looking for it. Who was it who said: if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

DR. CARTER: So carrying that to its logical conclusion, if the Chief Electoral Officer resigns and the Auditor General drops dead, we of our own selves cannot start to fill the roles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can bring it to the attention of the Legislature.

MR. MILLER: What if they aren't sitting?

MR. BLAIN: That's a very good point.

DR. CARTER: The reason I raise my question at this stage is the fact that there was no Legislative Offices Committee in existence when the Auditor General was selected and appointed; the same thing also with regard to the current Ombudsman and, I assume, with the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. BLAIN: They were searched for and appointed by select special committees.

DR. CARTER: Now that we exist, I think we need to do a little more checking.

MR. NOTLEY: Perhaps we should ask the Legislature to modify our mandate. That would make the most sense, rather than attempt to enlarge our role.

MR. BLAIN: If the committee would like me to, I'll follow up on these items.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we continue down the list and at least refresh your memory on each of them.

Renew the term of the office of the Chief Electoral Officer: the same thing applies there, does it not? The list of headquarters for irrigation districts. Are you looking at your list, John? Do you see where -- I would just point out item number 13 where it says that a request came from Mr. Thompson.

MRS. EMPSON: Dr. Carter asked Mr. Thompson.

DR. CARTER: And John was going to look into it.

MR. THOMPSON: The list of headquarters for the irrigation districts: I didn't do that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. As long as we know it hasn't happened.

DR. CARTER: Oh heck, John. And I was going to go there this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll leave it on the list as it is then, John.

MR. THOMPSON: Raymond's in Raymond, Leavitt's in Leavitt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item number 14: discussion of Auditor General being appointed as auditor to CODA.

DR. CARTER: Olympic Development Association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where does that responsibility lie?

MR. NOTLEY: We are going to have to give him more than a 5 per cent increase if he's going to do that.

DR. CARTER: That's in the same relationship as the discussion on page 1. I don't think we've had the opportunity to discuss this issue with the Treasurer. I think that was one of the things that was a bit of a surprise to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item number 15: approval of minutes of June 14, 1983. Well, I think we can look after that one without too much trouble; it's been done.

Item number 16: to supply eight copies of the binder. That's been looked after.

Item number 17: we have all that information.

Item number 18: comparison with auditors general from Ontario, British Columbia, and Quebec. We got that from the -- that came through.

MRS. EMPSON: I didn't get a copy. I'll get it from your office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you're lucky, you'll find it in my office. I'm not even sure I have one. Did you say you have one, Grant?

MR. NOTLEY: No. I've mistaken the Auditor General for the Ombudsman. I don't have that.

DR. CARTER: I haven't seen it in any of the mess on my desk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There seems to be a gap there. The report from Ontario, British Columbia, and Quebec: I don't think we've got that information. I don't recall seeing it.

Item number 19: the figures for bringing the salaries of the Ombudsman, the Chief Electoral Officer, and Auditor General in line insofar as dates are concerned?

Does anybody feel there's anything unfinished or that we haven't reviewed yet on that page?

Before we leave, I wish to take a look at our proposed meetings, tomorrow morning and Monday afternoon. That will be the last piece of business we'll do. We'll do that last. Before then, though, are there other items that we should be looking at? I've ploughed through the list I have on my agenda. Is there anything else? David, you look like you might have something.

DR. CARTER: Just that in discussion with the Chief Electoral Officer, I sought clarification of the matter of when the redistribution of constituencies takes place within the province, and the clarification I received from Executive Council, also with the fact that that is a separate committee of the Legislature and doesn't have any effect in here except for our trying to find a place to run again.

MR. BLAIN: Redistribution comes under the other Act. It's a statutory commission, as you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, at least we have that information. We wondered where it would come, and we found out. So now we know we don't have to worry about it from this table.

Any other item? Can we talk about the next time we meet: where and why? On our notice, it says the meeting tomorrow morning in the Legislative Assembly Chamber at nine o'clock. Do we have a reason to meet there, or can we go straight to the Auditor General and meet at his place at nine o'clock? I told him we would be there at nine or shortly after.

MR. MILLER: Where's it at?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't any idea. We might make it 9:30 -- half an hour to search.

MRS. EMPSON: I have the address in my office.

MR. BLAIN: It's 109th Street.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's right above the Mirabel.

MR. BLAIN: Yes. It's two blocks up the street, but I can't remember the name of the building. It's the same building the Mirabel Restaurant is in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When I said I didn't have any idea, I was thinking of the Ombudsman. I don't know where the Ombudsman is, but I do know where the Auditor General is. I have been in his office, because I was there at the time of his press conference last spring.

DR. CARTER: Well, let's meet there at nine o'clock in the morning so we can be finished by 10:30, because some of us have commitments in Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nine o'clock at his office. I will contact him and confirm that to make sure he knows we'll be there at nine.

The next item then is the Monday afternoon meeting. It says here we'll be at Room 312 at the Legislature Building at 1:30. Any problem with that? By that time we will have had some discussion with the Auditor General on different items, to find out what's missing.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, as I formerly informed you, I'll be missing that meeting. Just if you're looking for a quorum.

MR. NOTLEY: I will not be able to be present Monday, and there's a possibility I may not be present tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I look upon tomorrow as part of the learning process of this committee. We've agreed that we might try to visit each of these offices to find out where these people are, what their files look like, and what their coffee tastes like. Other than my meeting with the Auditor General, there will be no business transactions as such tomorrow. But for Monday afternoon, it would be a case of reviewing any information that Mr. Blain is able to find for us for Monday afternoon and anything I'm able to learn from the Auditor General tomorrow. So that's what the review process is on Monday.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, because we've also promised to visit the Ombudsman and the Chief Electoral Officer, is there any chance we can sort of put the Chief Electoral Officer on standby for later that afternoon? Then we can meet here first and, in the event that we're able to decide on the Auditor General's salary, we can go on over about an hour later to visit the Chief Electoral Officer. It's not all that far away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you know where he is?

DR. CARTER: He's out by the brewery.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, Stony Plain Road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other suggestions? How does that fit, Bill, for Monday afternoon?

MR. PURDY: It sounds all right to me.

MR. NOTLEY: Again, I won't be able to be present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about the other members? What's the recommendation? Should we go ahead as a committee with the visit anyway, would you say, Grant? Or would you like us to . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Oh no. Go ahead by all means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't feel that you're being left out? Do you want us to pick another date?

MR. NOTLEY: No. Please go ahead, by all means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. For the sake of the record, the decision we've made is that tomorrow morning we're meeting at nine o'clock at the Auditor General's office. It's 835 in the building at 9925 - 109 Street, 8th floor. That's above the Mirabel Restaurant.

The other thing we've agreed to, Louise, is that on Monday we will be meeting at 1:30 in 312, as per the schedule here, and we would ask you to put

your preference as the Chief Electoral Officer. We're going to put him on standby, and perhaps by two o'clock we might be all through our business in 312 and will jump into David's station wagon and out to the brewery.

DR. CARTER: And if he's not available, then we could try for the Ombudsman. If neither of them is available, then fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to have a visit to the Law Clerk's office, to complete the tour?

MR. NOTLEY: Most of us see the Law Clerk's office very often.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My last question then is: we have these expense account forms in front of us. Do we make one out for each day, so that I could see them coming back? What about tomorrow?

MRS. EMPSON: Tomorrow all these gentlemen are not here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll fill them out each time.

MRS. EMPSON: I'd prefer tomorrow as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be nice.

MR. THOMPSON: I put the two days on mine.

MR. BLAIN: That's fine. Anyone who is not going to be here tomorrow, just give it to us for today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you should die before you wake . . .

Unless there are any other questions, I declare this meeting adjourned. Is there any problem with that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.