

4:07 p.m.

Wednesday, December 1, 1993

[Chairman: Mr. Hierath]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call this meeting to order and ask for approval of the agenda.

MR. BRUSEKER: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour? Carried.

The mandate of the Auditor General search committee is under tab 3. That is the motion that was read and passed on November 9. I would like that read into the record. The ladies from *Hansard* will do that. We will give them this whole document on the motion, tab 3, and they will put that into *Hansard*. Is that acceptable?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Auditor General Search Committee

22. Moved by Mr. Kowalski:

Be it resolved that

- (1) A select special Auditor General search committee of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be appointed consisting of the following members, namely Mr. Ron Hierath, chairman, Mr. Frank Bruseker, Mr. Victor Doerksen, Mrs. Yvonne Fritz, Mr. Gary Friedel, and Dr. Don Massey for the purpose of inviting applications for the position of Auditor General and to recommend to the Assembly the applicant it considers most suitable for appointment to that position.
- (2) The chairman and members of the committee shall be paid in accordance with the schedule of category A committees provided in Members' Services Committee Order 10/89.
- (3) Reasonable disbursements by the committee for advertising, staff assistance, equipment and supplies, rent, travel, and other expenditures necessary for the effective conduct of its responsibilities shall be paid subject to the approval of the chairman.
- (4) In carrying out its responsibilities, the committee may with the concurrence of the head of the department utilize the services of members of the public service employed in that department or of the staff employed by the Assembly.
- (5) The committee may without leave of the Assembly sit during a period when the Assembly is adjourned.
- (6) When its work has been completed, the committee shall report to the Assembly if it is then sitting. During a period when the Assembly is adjourned, the committee may release its report by depositing a copy with the Clerk and forwarding a copy to each member of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fourth on the agenda is Appointment of Deputy Chairman of the committee. Would anyone like to volunteer to be appointed?

DR. MASSEY: I nominate Victor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. DOERKSEN: What do we need a deputy chairman for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If my plane had been late today – I just came in at 3. If it had been a little later, maybe the deputy chairman would have been the chairman.

MR. DOERKSEN: Sure. No skin off my teeth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favour of that? Opposed? Carried.

Now we're down to getting this committee . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: Now how do we get rid of him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's that?

MR. BRUSEKER: The deputy chairman was asking a question, how we get rid of the chairman now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The plotting is already started before we get going here. I may have to keep my back to the wall; right?

Now, under item 5 I will turn the meeting over to Elizabeth Hurley, the manager of executive search. She's going to try to bring us up to some sort of an educated level here on this, what we're going to do over the next couple of months. Elizabeth.

MRS. HURLEY: All right. Thank you very much. What I'd like to do is just briefly go through sort of the steps in the process. There'll be various elements that I'll touch on which later on there will be some further discussion on specifically. Generally, I guess what I'd like to start off with is the steps that the committee is responsible for; that is, to approve the advertisement for the Auditor General and to approve the profile of the Auditor General. You have received draft copies of that. The committee will want to make sure that the profiles accurately reflect the committee's perception of the job and the type of individual that's needed for that job and, of course, that the advertisement accurately reflects those requirements as well.

After that has been done, the committee will need to approve the media that are going to be used in advertising this position. What you've been provided with is everything under the sun that you could possibly want to use or that is available for advertising. That's not to suggest that we're recommending or suggesting that the committee use all of the media noted there. Some of the information in there, just to let you know: the first page has newspapers, *Calgary Herald* through to *Red Deer Advocate*; *Alberta Report*; and then it's got papers across Canada; several CMA, CGA magazines. That was the media used in the last Auditor General competition; however, it's been updated at today's costs. That just gives you an idea of what was used eight years ago. When the committee will discuss media selection, I can provide you with some information on what sort of response was received and where the applicants actually came from. That may help you then decide on what might be some of the appropriate media.

Again, once the media are decided upon, advertising dates and a closing date need to be established. Once that's done, the recruiter would deal with the advertising agency to make sure that the advertisement appears as needed in all of the appropriate media. The applications would then be received by the administrative assistant or the chairman. Actually, they would be received in the administrative assistant's office, and she would acknowledge all of the applicants, that the application has been received, and provide them with a copy of the profile if they haven't received

one as yet. Then the applications are forwarded to the recruiter, and they're screened and a screening report is prepared.

Now, what the screening is. These applications would be categorized into generally three groups. Their qualifications and backgrounds are assessed against the criteria that the committee establishes in the profile. They're grouped into three categories, as I said. Those that appear to meet all of the requirements are recommended for interview. There is generally a second category where some of the applicants have some of the elements but might be lacking in others. Some of those people the committee may feel should be interviewed; some the committee may feel don't warrant further consideration. Then there's generally a third category of applications: those people who don't meet the qualifications at all. So that report is prepared, and it's provided to the committee.

There is a meeting then. Everybody would review all of the applicants, and the committee determines a list of candidates for further assessment. The recruiter - executive search, for example - would then spend a considerable amount of time with each of these individuals interviewing them, assessing their skills and abilities, getting further information on their background, their experience, their overall qualifications, and would be preparing reports again for the committee's review. In those reports we would then make some recommendations in terms of who we feel meets the criteria that the committee had established, what their strengths and weaknesses are. At that meeting the committee would establish a list of finalists, those people that they wish to interview. Then final interviews would be set up. The timing of that of course really depends on the number of applicants we get.

There are various other administrative steps throughout the process. Applicants are regretted at various stages if they don't pass certain screening steps.

DR. MASSEY: Could I just ask: when they're regretted, is any reason given?

MRS. HURLEY: Well, it depends if they're done verbally or by letter. By letter there's usually a general sort of statement as to why they have not gone further. Essentially, their qualifications were not as close as maybe other individuals'. If people are calling, then you can get into some more specific reasons.

After the final interviews the committee determines who they feel is the most appropriate, or there may be a couple of candidates who seem to be very close. References would be checked on those individuals. If necessary, another meeting would be required then for the committee to decide who they feel is the best candidate and would recommend to the Assembly. Then there are the other administrative steps of reporting to the Assembly, preparing the appropriate documentation, a press release, and so on.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just a couple of questions. It says "recruiter." Is that yourself that we're referring to in this tentative outline here?

MRS. HURLEY: Well, it could be myself, or it could be an external consultant if that's what the committee chose to go with.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay.

I haven't researched the hiring of our current Auditor General. Do you have any idea of how many applicants we received at that time for that position? Does this timetable that you outlined reflect a similar kind of process, then, that was done for the last Auditor General?

4:17

MRS. HURLEY: Essentially, yes. The process is very similar for all of the positions that we've recruited or that have been recruited to . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, I guess process, but I'm also thinking of time lines.

MRS. HURLEY: In terms of time lines, generally yes. Is there a concern about the length?

MR. BRUSEKER: No, no. I'm just trying to get a handle on what we're up against here, I guess. I know we had in excess of a hundred or so applicants for the Ethics Commissioner position, didn't we?

MRS. HURLEY: Much more than a hundred. It was several hundred.

MR. BRUSEKER: Several hundred.

MRS. HURLEY: Yeah. I can't remember the exact number right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under a thousand; right?

MRS. HURLEY: If I recall, it was some 300-odd. The Ethics Commissioner took longer because of the sheer volume of applicants. We had a very large number of preliminary interviews conducted.

MR. BRUSEKER: Do you recall how many applicants we had the last time we hired an Auditor General?

MRS. HURLEY: Thirty-one.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thirty-one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Gary, do you have a question?

MR. FRIEDEL: Yeah, just a general question. When I read just the advertising budget, I was a little bit amazed. Also, you know, having looked through it, it would be very difficult to go through this process and not cover the entire area of the province. I think we have the responsibility to make sure that everybody that's interested . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we talk about our advertising media, we will discuss that later.

MR. FRIEDEL: That wasn't the one. I'm just looking at that as sort of a preamble to what I was going to say.

Have we in government ever considered the possibility of having a professional headhunter? My understanding is that for something considerably less than this, even the advertising budget, some of the people that are professional recruiters might be able to do a lot of the work we were just talking about, bringing it up to final interviews by the committee. Just throwing it out as an idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe this is the ideal time to have that kind of a discussion, if it's fine with the committee, about the pros

and cons of professional consultants versus the executive search committee of government, maybe open it up to some thoughts on that. Anyone else have some thoughts?

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, Elizabeth, what do you know about, quote, unquote, headhunters and what they charge? I haven't a clue.

MRS. HURLEY: It will vary, but I would say on average for a search of this sort you're probably looking at \$20,000-odd.

MR. DOERKSEN: Do they pay for the advertising?

MRS. HURLEY: No. The committee would have to pay for the advertising.

MR. DOERKSEN: That's just their fee.

MRS. HURLEY: That is their fee.

DR. MASSEY: Can I ask who Parallel Strategies is? Is that a search firm?

MRS. HURLEY: That's the advertising agency that the government uses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hired the last time or uses all the time?

MRS. HURLEY: It's the one we use all the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it a Crown corporation or a private company?

MRS. HURLEY: No, it's a private company.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you have a question, Frank?

MR. BRUSEKER: No. I was just sort of responding to Elizabeth's estimate of the \$20,000. We've got this draft budget, and just doing a quick sum, that's probably not quite \$20,000. There's not, unfortunately, a total at the bottom, but I would guess it's probably pretty close. This is behind tab 7. I don't know if everybody had a chance to quickly peruse it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's without advertising?

MR. BRUSEKER: That's without advertising, yeah. So it seems to me we're in a similar kind of ballpark then, Elizabeth. Am I correct in making that assumption that if it's \$20,000 with a headhunter, and this - I haven't added it up, but off the top of my head it looks like it's probably pretty close to \$20,000 again, perhaps slightly over.

MRS. HURLEY: I don't have a copy of the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're not going to eliminate that under tab 7, though, Frank.

MR. BRUSEKER: No. That's what I'm saying.

Getting back to Gary's point, it seems to me that from a cost standpoint it's almost six of one and half a dozen of the other.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, I'm wondering though. I've had a little, but very limited I might add, experience with the professional

recruiters. Because of their scope of background they don't have to do the extensive advertising. They literally go out and recruit qualified people. Is it possible that they may be able to reduce the advertising component substantially?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had a discussion with a CA firm that was interested in doing this. In the past their partners have done some headhunting or consulting or finding people to fill the criteria for governments and for private business too. I talked for a while to these people in private business, and they said that in their mind - and I don't know whether it's legitimate or not legitimate - the advertising that would be done in the papers and so on wouldn't always necessarily attract maybe the top people. It might only attract the people that are looking for the job at that time rather than the private guy going and saying to them, "Well, you look like you fill the qualifications of the criteria," that our committee has set out. They actively go try to find someone. Now, I'm just pointing out that that statement was made to me with regards to one of these guys.

Elizabeth, you had something to say on this.

MRS. HURLEY: I was just going to add that government has used headhunters in the past, and they can be used in various parts of the process. For example, if the committee feels that some direct sourcing needs to be done, then a consultant could be hired to do just that portion. A headhunting firm could be hired to do just that portion. Some of these firms have broad networks and are able to do that through their contacts across Canada, so that is an option. Or there is the option of using a consulting firm from step one through to the end. Again, that's an option that's available.

DR. MASSEY: May I ask how those consulting firms are hired?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there are a wide variety of different ways.

DR. MASSEY: Is there a public call?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bidding, you mean?

DR. MASSEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's probably a process that would be the fairest. If you look at our schedule of the first of April marching up, we may be limited in being able to do that process. That may end up being one of the criteria. Really, I look at the schedule that we have, you know, with Christmas in the middle of this thing. I thought we were blessed with quite a bit of time, but it doesn't look like it now.

DR. MASSEY: Just one further question. Because it is a public position and such a high profile, do we have a different obligation than if you were hiring an executive for, say, a private firm? In terms of being very open and very public and having to advertise widely, I just think there might be a different obligation on us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we do. Of course, most of the deliberations that we do here are public, unless we go in camera on certain private issues, maybe wages or something like that. I think you're right, Don, but don't forget that the executive search committee is also public.

DR. MASSEY: That was the third one I was going to ask. It could all be done by executive search?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS. HURLEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's just kind of weighing it out.
Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: Could you explain for us what executive search is and what its qualifications are?

MRS. HURLEY: What do we do?

MR. DOERKSEN: I mean, is it the same as what we're talking about?

MRS. HURLEY: Okay. Basically it's a very small group in the personnel administration office reporting to the Public Service Commissioner. That's the department that's responsible for recruitment policies within government. At the executive level recruitment has been kept centralized, so our area recruits all executive managers throughout government at the executive manager 1 and 2 levels. In addition, we provide assistance to Executive Council in the recruitment of senior officials. So we've provided that other assistance as well to Executive Council and have provided assistance in similar competitions, like the previous Auditors General or the Ethics Commissioner.

My personal background. I have a long history in the human resources field. Within executive search it's coming on six years, so I've done a fair bit of recruitment within government, both internal recruitment as well as going externally.

4:27

MR. DOERKSEN: When you say executive 1 or 2, what is that? Deputy ministers?

MRS. HURLEY: That is the executive level, ADM level. When we provide assistance to Executive Council, that's at the deputy level.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay.

Where does the Auditor General fit in terms of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wages?

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, wages or in terms of would he be comparable to a deputy minister.

MRS. HURLEY: Essentially, yes, but they're not within the same category.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a guideline.

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah, I know, but I'm just trying to figure out where this fits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your presentation, Elizabeth, is about finished. If we go to item 6 on the agenda and start working through it - or have you still got some things that you wanted to . . .

MRS. HURLEY: Well, we could proceed there. Of course, I've just very briefly sort of skimmed through the media, but I can talk more specifically when we get to that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under item 6, tab A, is the schedule that we're going to try to meet. I don't think there's going to be much discussion with that, because at the end we are just barely going to have a new Auditor General about the time that our existing one vacates the position. So it's kind of a guideline that we want to keep. Elizabeth, did you have a comment?

MRS. HURLEY: Yes. Just that I have a new copy. I've tried to make it a little clearer. I've added a couple of different steps that weren't in there before just so that the committee is aware.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just for process here, I'm looking at the second page, March 1 and 2, and there are a couple things there with Legislative Assembly. I guess to finalize the process, ultimately there has to be a report received and concurred in by the Legislative Assembly, and there has to be a vote saying that, yes, we want to hire Joe Smith as our new Auditor General, words to that effect sort of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so. I'm new to this process too.

MR. BRUSEKER: I was in the House when you hired the Ethics Commissioner, but I must confess I really don't recall.

MR. DOERKSEN: You weren't paying attention?

MR. BRUSEKER: No. There have been so many interesting things that have happened since then that it has filled my mind with new information. How is that for a response?

DR. MASSEY: In the schedule is there any consideration for overlap of the old Auditor General and the new?

MRS. HURLEY: It will really depend on who the committee selects as the successful candidate. It will also depend on what sort of closing date is chosen, because if a sooner closing date is picked - I use January 14 as an example and then base the schedule that way. If it's an external person, they're likely going to have to give approximately a month's notice, and I would suggest that there wouldn't be any time for overlap. However, if the process goes quicker, there might be some opportunity for overlap. I don't know if that's what the committee would like.

MR. BRUSEKER: If I may go to my original question?

MRS. HURLEY: Sure.

MR. BRUSEKER: This new December 1 search committee tentative schedule suggests that the appointment is simply passed by an order in council as opposed to having to be agreed upon in the Legislature as a report. Is that your understanding of it, Elizabeth?

MRS. HURLEY: What has happened in the past is that the committee will make their decision. I'm going by the minutes where it says that the committee makes a recommendation to the Assembly on the selected candidate. So that's basically the report which is tabled. I assume the Assembly then agrees, and at that point there is an order done. It's the Lieutenant Governor in council. It's his authority.

MR. BRUSEKER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the time frame there is that the Assembly approves our recommendation and then the Lieutenant Governor and an order in council after that, right?

This schedule as presented is a guideline for us. We won't try to stray very far from it, but it's just there as a guideline to keep us marching along at a clip so that at April 1 we'll have an Auditor General.

Now I think we'll move into some of the meat of the meeting here, which is the position profile which you all have under tab B, I think. We need to have some discussions about the profile that we want for our next Auditor General. The one that you have in front of you here was drafted by the existing Auditor General, basically. Maybe we should kind of go page by page on this. I assume all of you have read it and made notes and all those things.

DR. MASSEY: What are we going to do if God doesn't apply?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a good question.

So if we would just like to kind of do — I guess the position summary and the relationship with the Legislative Assembly are both fairly obvious.

MR. FRIEDEL: Ron, I was just wondering: is there available a copy of the existing Auditor General's terms of reference or profile, or is this it as it presently stands?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The mandate, of course, of the Auditor General is laid out in the Act. I mean, that's his Bible. That's what he runs by, Gary. The profile that was used eight years ago when he was hired, you mean? Is that what you're talking about?

MR. FRIEDEL: I gathered that this is a profile that is done by the incumbent as he sees his job descriptions. It certainly gives generous latitude and authority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, but don't forget that the Act doesn't do that. The Act is very specific, as all legislation is. I mean, he must audit all of the departments. He must do this, and he must do that. Right? I mean, when we are looking at a profile, Gary, we're looking at something that is general, what we want to have as the next Auditor General in some general terms. I mean, there are some specifics here too, but correct me if you think I'm wrong in that regard.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, I was just curious if there was a profile done earlier that we could compare it to: what the incumbent applied for and what has been the change in the direction, the change in the attitude to the job, what is expected of the job.

MRS. HURLEY: I do have a copy of the old profile. Unfortunately, I don't have it here. It was the one that was developed eight years ago when the recruitment action was undertaken.

4:37

MRS. SHUMYLA: Excuse me. I have one, but it's in my office.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, in any event, it would probably be difficult to compare it in the short time we have here now, but it would have been interesting to see how the job has maybe changed over the eight years: what the expectations are and what the input and output would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The major responsibilities of the Auditor General are in the Act. I mean, you're right. I understand what

you're saying, and those will be some of the questions as we march through this thing, that when we get down to interviewing the shortlist of applicants, we will certainly be thinking of different things that Auditors General of today may want to do as compared to years gone by. Then we would go and debate in the House about changing the Act; right?

MR. FRIEDEL: I have no problems with this being in place as it is, and I don't have a whole lot of problems with it as a concept anyway. I would just not like to think that in using this we endorse this as what the authority of the Auditor General would be. I realize this committee doesn't have the authority to set that mandate, but if there is going to be a significant change in those duties and responsibilities, that it would be considered as such at the right time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Victor, did you have something that you wanted . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: I just wanted to make one. The Auditor General position profile looks fairly comprehensive. I would just suggest one change, which would be on page 4, where it says Contacts at the bottom.

The Auditor General maintains an active role in professional accounting organizations including the Alberta and Canadian Institutes of Chartered Accountants.

They ignore the Certified General Accountants' Association and probably also CMA. Maybe we'd be better off just to leave it to "maintains an active role in professional accounting organizations" period.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, it says "including," but it doesn't necessarily mean it's exclusive.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, by saying it, though, you're excluding the other ones, or else we'd have to name them all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're not drafting legislation here, don't forget.

MR. DOERKSEN: I know that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're trying to set up some guidelines for hiring people.

MR. DOERKSEN: I have a vested interest. Well, I shouldn't say vested interest, but I am a . . .

DR. MASSEY: I think it's a conflict of interest, Mr. Chairman. Do you want a motion that this be approved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what I was thinking was that if someone like Victor had anything he wanted to add or subtract — you see, we need to have criteria for what we're going to do when we get down to interviewing, and we also of course need to have something so that when people are applying, they know what some of the criteria that we're . . .

MR. FRIEDEL: I have one more general question on it. I realize it's in the Act, and it might not be logical for us to change it, but I noticed that this term is for eight years. Are all the terms, such as the Ethics Commissioner and similar jobs, for eight years, or are they not mostly for five years?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, they are terms, but it doesn't mean to say - most of the times these guys have extensions after eight years. They have another year, another extension. It's not terminated after eight years.

MRS. HURLEY: I believe it says up to eight years. So there is some flexibility in terms.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, in Terms and Conditions it says "for a term not exceeding eight years, with provision for reappointment." Does that mean that you could conceivably reappoint someone for a second eight-year term . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Uh huh.

MR. BRUSEKER: . . . and so on and so on? Didn't the Auditor General tell us that we had one Auditor General for 30-some years, 32 years or something?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm just wondering if, you know, a five-year option with renewable term might not be a little more appropriate. This definitely would have to be in the terms of reference, because the people applying for it would have to know the term they're looking at.

It says the same thing in the Act. It could not exceed eight years. As a matter of fact, I have a copy with me. My personal preference would be to make the term five years with the option of renewal.

MR. BRUSEKER: We would then have to change the legislation, would we not?

MR. FRIEDEL: No, because the legislation says "not exceeding."

MR. BRUSEKER: Oh, I see your point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this committee could set out that part of the position profile would be five years.

Is that what you're thinking, Gary? Personally, if you're going to hire someone for this important a position, I think eight years is plenty soon.

MR. BRUSEKER: Elizabeth, can you shed any light on this, as to why it has in the past been an eight-year term as opposed to five or four or two or whatever?

MRS. HURLEY: I'm sorry; I have no idea why that was set up that way.

MR. DOERKSEN: Is that not part of the negotiations of the salary and the benefits and the term and everything else? We can deal with that issue then, can we not?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm not sure I agree with you, Victor, because if someone applying for it happens to be the chairman of a board of some corporation or if he's a partner in a major chartered accountant firm, he's going to want to know the terms that he's applying for before he even goes to the commitment of making the application.

MR. BRUSEKER: Particularly if that individual is close to retirement age anyway and says, "Well, this might be a nice way

to round off a career; I'm now 50 years old or 52 years old and want to retire when I'm 60," as opposed to whatever. Yeah, I think that's a good point.

MR. FRIEDEL: I think we do have to recognize that even though we go through a pretty extensive procedure to make sure we have the right people, this is a long term to give someone a contract if there are problems developing in between. Even five years is a lengthy time. If there's any dissatisfaction in the term of one of these contracts, the chance of breaking a contract or dismissing the individual involved is pretty remote, and if you do accomplish it, it's very, very costly.

MR. DOERKSEN: My question to Elizabeth would be: in the existing contract that we have with the existing Auditor General, are there provisions for early termination?

MRS. HURLEY: I don't have firsthand knowledge of looking at his contract, but I would suggest that in the past, from my experience, there is always something noted in the contract. In this particular case there is right in the legislation:

On the recommendation of the Assembly, the Lieutenant Government in Council may, at any time, suspend or remove the Auditor General from office.

So I would think that would have been built in.

MR. FRIEDEL: Thank you. If I might add, I would expect that that would be a fairly costly buy-out procedure, would it not?

MRS. HURLEY: Probably.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll just read out the section that talks about eight years.

The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint the Auditor General, on the recommendation of the Assembly, for a term not exceeding 8 years.

DR. MASSEY: I was going to ask: what was the reason originally for the eight years? Was it to overlap political terms? There must have been some original reason for eight.

MR. BRUSEKER: I asked that question too.

MR. FRIEDEL: Even the terms have never consistently been four years.

DR. MASSEY: It takes a long time for an Auditor to get in place and to take up information. I mean, it's a long-term proposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yvonne.

MRS. FRITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have two questions. One is: who drafted this? Did you draft this?

MRS. HURLEY: This was drafted by the current Auditor General, Don Salmon.

MRS. FRITZ: So he drafted it. Thank you.

Also, I would support a five-year term, and the reason I would support that is because the large municipalities as well as other boards and commissions throughout the province have their positions for their Auditors based on a five-year term. I think that as well overlaps the change in government. I would support what Mr. Friedel has put forward, but my question would be: is that

something that we need to approach in a legal manner based on the Act? Does something need to be changed based on what you had read out?

4:47

MR. CHAIRMAN: It didn't necessarily look like it to me, but I'm not a lawyer, so I don't know.

MRS. FRITZ: But when it says "not exceeding," and if we have an applicant asking the question, "What is the term of the position" . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Historically it's probably been what it says in the Act: not to exceed eight years.

Diane, then Victor.

MRS. SHUMYLA: I would just suggest that we could check with our Parliamentary Counsel and then get back to the committee.

MRS. FRITZ: I'd certainly look forward to receiving other information in that regard.

MR. DOERKSEN: Just a brief comment. When you go that way, if they're good for five years, they're good for eight years.

MR. BRUSEKER: Could I ask a question about our other officers that we have, what terms they work under? I'm speaking of the Chief Electoral Officer, the Ethics Commissioner, and the Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's a year after each election. Is that correct? My understanding of the Chief Electoral Officer is that his term is up a year after each election.

MR. BRUSEKER: That's a maximum of six years then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever it is. Yeah, a maximum of six years. Historically these guys are always reappointed, if they're competent.

MR. BRUSEKER: What about the Ethics Commissioner and the Ombudsman?

MRS. HURLEY: I believe the Ethics Commissioner was appointed for a five-year term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it acceptable to everyone that we will look into that five-year term thing with Parliamentary Counsel? It's one of the things in the profile that we're seeing to maybe change.

MRS. FRITZ: Also I would be interested in the information from other government boards as to why their term of position is a five-year term. They are generally with hospital boards, with municipalities, and they may have worthwhile reasons that we could review.

MRS. HURLEY: Is that something you would like me to check into?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Would you please?

MR. BRUSEKER: Are you looking for further comment on the position description?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly am.

MR. BRUSEKER: On the very first page, where the description actually starts, there's a section entitled (b), Relationship to the Legislative Assembly. The first line says, "The Auditor General is an officer of the Legislature, who must be, and be seen to be, independent." I agree with that statement wholeheartedly, which is why I have difficulty in the position summary above where it says, "The mission of the . . . Auditor General of Alberta is to add credibility to the [government]." It seems to me to be a clear contradiction in terms. I must say that I've had some concern with that position description as outlined on previous occasions. While I understand that the Auditor General has written this, I must say that I disagree with the use of the phrase "add credibility" in two places in the position summary. I would not interpret his description as being that way, and it seems to me to be a clear contradiction of the independent nature as described in the earlier position. I guess what I'm saying is that I'd like to see different words used than "add credibility to the government" and "add credibility to the assertions of management."

MR. FRIEDEL: Does it not say "add credibility to the government's financial reporting"?

MR. BRUSEKER: That's semantics in my opinion.

MR. FRIEDEL: Actually there is a major difference, because if you're talking about government, you know, generally you're talking about the cabinet. If you're talking about government reporting, you're talking about the reporting of the accounts of the Legislature.

MR. BRUSEKER: I don't see much difference. I think adding credibility to the government's financial reporting is adding credibility to the government. I don't think that's appropriate.

MRS. FRITZ: Are you looking for another term rather than "credibility"?

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes. I don't know what that term would be. I know that his task is to report the dollars and cents. I guess I have difficulties even when he says he signs the opinion. Maybe that's just accountingese, language that accountants use. Quite frankly, it makes me uncomfortable. When you're talking about dollars and cents it doesn't seem to me you should be talking opinions; you should be talking in facts and figures. To say, "This is my opinion as to what I think happened," about things like dollars and cents . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah. When he refers to "opinion," he's referring to the Auditor's opinion which appears on the first page of every audited statement, and that is an accounting term.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes.

MR. DOERKSEN: So he's either giving an unqualified opinion or a qualified opinion depending on what he finds in his audit.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah, I guess what I'm saying is that I find those terms discomfoting.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, if you were applying for the job, you would know what that meant.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes, that's true. I guess my concern is: are we really concerned about addressing the needs and the concerns of the individual who is applying for the position or are we concerned about addressing the needs and concerns of Alberta taxpayers, who are paying this man's position? I think this is a critical position in terms of the way the responsibility falls on the shoulders of the Auditor General to clearly outline what's happening and how. I understand that what you're saying is that it's usual accounting language.

MR. DOERKSEN: Where is "opinion" used?

MR. BRUSEKER: The word "opinion" is something that came up from an earlier discussion. I'm sorry. I didn't see it in here, although that's not to say it's not in here. I didn't highlight it. So I guess I'm not sure how widely distributed this is going to be, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, this is for our use I think in trying to find someone.

MR. BRUSEKER: If it's just going to be for our use, I guess that's fine. I guess what I'm saying is that I wouldn't like to see an advertisement going out that has the phrase "add credibility" in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Elizabeth.

MRS. HURLEY: The profile would be given to anyone who was interested in applying for the job and wanted further information on the job.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yvonne.

MRS. FRITZ: Thank you. So this isn't then taken out of the Act, the adding credibility? This isn't a statement out of the Act. I'm trying to tie together how this comes about. Is the mission statement . . .

MRS. HURLEY: The mission statement is something that the current Auditor General has developed.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yvonne, if I could just draw your attention to that position summary statement. The third line says, "The Office of the Auditor General has translated the Act's mandate into the following mission statement."

MRS. FRITZ: I read that.

MR. BRUSEKER: What I am saying is that I object to his translation.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, let me suggest a phrase that may work I think and solve your concerns. You could say: the mission of the office of the Auditor General of Alberta is to report on the credibility of the government's financial reporting.

MR. FRIEDEL: For what it's worth, anybody who has this copy of the mission statement - it seems to be an integral part of what's already in there somewhere. It's on the back here, so it's a direct quote from this thing.

MR. BRUSEKER: Which is also a translation.

MR. FRIEDEL: I don't know where it got its authorization.

MR. BRUSEKER: I don't know either. I didn't like it there either, by the way, when we had our tour of the Auditor General's office, but I didn't think it was important to raise it at that time because it was a done deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're not going to reword their mission statement. We may exclude it from this position summary.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I don't think we have the ability to reword the Auditor General's mission statement in this committee.

MR. BRUSEKER: I look at this mission statement, and I see that "the Office of the Auditor General has translated the Act's mandate into the following mission statement." I guess the way I see it is that that's the mission statement of the current Auditor General. We are looking at hiring a new Auditor General, and I'm not sure that the mission statement is going to be translated - using that word - in the same fashion by the new Auditor General. If it comes to that, I would recommend that we simply . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exclude it?

MR. BRUSEKER: . . . exclude it altogether, in both cases where that phrase is used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Is that acceptable to the committee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

4:57

MRS. HURLEY: To clarify then, the position summary would just include the first two paragraphs. The rest of section A would be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BRUSEKER: That would be my preference.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, if I may disagree, because the position summary summarizes what the fellow or gal is supposed to do in this job, and the role of an auditor is to report on the credibility of the financial report. That is the mandate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, but this is going to be said further on many times through this profile, don't forget.
Don.

DR. MASSEY: I guess I read it differently. I read it that if he or she criticizes the government's reporting, that is adding credibility to it. It's saying that the reporting is open. The Auditor General can say that, yes, the systems are in place or, no, they aren't. Whatever he or she says adds some credibility to the government's reporting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, my recollection of before I entered into politics is that the Auditor General quite often is critical of some of the financial reporting or the way that government has done their business. I'm trying not to get hung up on this, and I think there are some other things on further pages here that are fairly important to giving some guidelines for hiring a new Auditor General. I was just trying to expedite the process here a little bit.

MR. FRIEDEL: I personally am not going to get hung up a lot on the semantics, but in adding to what Don has said, I suppose the word "add" in there might be critical if you assumed that there might be some lack of -- depending which position a person was to take, the work that the Auditor General does adds to whatever level you might perceive it to have had at the start. I personally am not overly concerned whether or not this stays in for the advertisement purposes, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's your wish? What's the committee's wish? Yvonne.

MRS. FRITZ: Whoever applies for the position will contact the Auditor General's office and be sent the mission statement; right? So they're going to read this in that anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MRS. FRITZ: It's just a clarification. So if we take this out, we're not changing the mission statement, saying that it can't be in place any longer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MRS. FRITZ: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to make a motion? Just put in the first two paragraphs of the position summary?

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes. I'll move, then, that
the position summary, section (a), be the first two paragraphs only as distributed to applicants for the position.

MRS. FRITZ: Do you want to debate as to why?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's what we've been doing.

MRS. FRITZ: Well, I wouldn't mind hearing it with your motion. Why would you take it out when we've learnt since you originally brought it forward that it's part of the mission statement and the person can apply and have the mission statement anyway?

MR. BRUSEKER: The chances of the person writing to the department and saying, "Can you please send me a copy of your mission statement?" I think are probably pretty slim. If someone writes and says, "I'm interested in the position," they're going to write to the recruiter, whoever that is. I think when the recruiter mails out information, the package that should go out should be this package, as written by, I guess, the department. Whether it's the Auditor General in particular or the department in general, I don't know.

Quite frankly, I don't like the current mission statement as it's worded, and I'm not sure that we want the new Auditor General to walk in -- similarly, when we had the tour of the Auditor General's office a couple of weeks ago, he said that the first thing he did was came in and rearranged things. So to try and saddle a

new Auditor General with the old Auditor General's way of doing things to me seems to be highly inappropriate, which includes the mission statement. That's why I suggest: let's delete it.

MRS. FRITZ: Well, I'm going to speak against the motion, and the reason I do is that I believe people that are interested in this type of position will contact the Auditor General's office. I think an awful lot of thought went into the mission statement. If the mission statement needs to be revisited after we hire the new Auditor General, then so be it. The fact is that there is a mission statement in place. It's very clear, and I would think that people reading about this position are interested in the mission statement. I think it should be left as part of this document, but I'd certainly be more than willing to look at it at that time. As far as Position Summary, I think it fits nicely under that, and it leads into the rest of the document. So I would speak against the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the vote? All in favour of Frank's motion? Opposed? Defeated.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, can I ask you just a question about process? I don't want to have to go through a motion on every line when we want to change something, including the one that I wanted changed. Can we not leave this up to the people that are handling this for us, if in fact we decide that Elizabeth and her group are going to handle it for us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the search committee has set out a criteria for hiring a new Auditor General. It's fairly important. The majority of the wishes of this committee is what will, of course, take place. You know, there is no doubt that if we want to, we can make changes on each paragraph or page here. I was thinking that we would go through some of the criteria that we would like to see in a new Auditor General. That's supposed to be the purpose.

MR. FRIEDEL: My comment earlier was, you know, having some concern about what weight this position profile carried relative to designating duties to the Auditor General. If it is only for the purposes of advertising and in general covers the scope of what the individual is supposed to do -- and I have no doubt that the applicants will have their own ideas of if there are things that they are not completely happy with how they might change them once they become the incumbent in that position. That's going to happen anyway. If that's all it is, for the purpose of identifying basically what happens now and to give the applicant a good overview of what's expected, then I don't have nearly the hang-ups with this as if it had become the doctrine of what the job description was going to be after they were hired.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're probably hitting the nail right on the head there, Gary. It's a document that the applicants are going to receive to tell them a little more about the job.

Elizabeth, would you like to make a comment in that regard?

MRS. HURLEY: The only comment that I would add, I guess, is under the Major Responsibilities. What the current Auditor General has done compared to the previous description is organized it a little differently and added the management elements which are included in that, the first section where he talks about orchestrating an effective organization. There are three bullets under that point. The rest, the statutory responsibilities, are basically taken right out of the legislation. So that really is the

person's job there, and then he's added the management component of that job.

DR. MASSEY: Just a question, Mr. Chairman. How does the mission statement get in place?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, each department in the government develops that within their department.

MRS. FRITZ: Then we review it as a committee if desired, if you want to bring it back? Is that what you mean?

DR. MASSEY: Yes. Because, you know, the reason I voted for this is that I think the mission statement should be in here.

MRS. FRITZ: Right.

DR. MASSEY: I also thought it should be in the ad, and it's not. The phrase that's being picked out, that he "is an officer of the Legislature" who is "independent," I think should be in the mission statement. So my question is: how do we get back to that? You know, I'm willing to go with this now, but I would like to see us straighten out the mission statement so it does reflect what the committee . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, Don, that that's not our role, to decide what the mission statement is.

DR. MASSEY: That was my question. How do you get input into the mission statement?

MR. DOERKSEN: I don't think we get involved in that at all.

5:07

MR. FRIEDEL: Can I make a suggestion here? I'm not sure if this is within the mandate of the committee, but I'd like to consider it. When we've gone through the process and actually a new Auditor General has been hired, might it be desirable for this committee to sit down with the new Auditor General and in conjunction with him review and revise if necessary this kind of a document?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that's in order. I don't think it's in our mandate to do that, but I think there are . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, I disagree completely.

MR. BRUSEKER: I do too.

MR. DOERKSEN: If the Auditor General is independent of government, why are we trying to tell him what to do? He has a mandate under the Act. He is supposed to give an unbiased and independent approach, and we have to basically let him run his function the way he or she sees fit.

MR. FRIEDEL: What I'm suggesting though, Victor – and I guess this is not the complete committee. I'm talking about the Legislative Offices Committee, of which we're a part, that would sit down with the new Auditor General.

MR. DOERKSEN: The same thing applies though, the same comment, in my view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we supervise these offices.

MR. FRIEDEL: Not how to do his job, but the general responsibilities and the terms of reference of the job I think are our responsibility. I don't see anything wrong with us sitting down with the new individual. He would have some input as well – or she, as it could be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're all in agreement that the search committee doesn't have it, so let's bring this up at another date with the full committee.

MRS. FRITZ: Exactly.

MR. FRIEDEL: My intent was that it was the full committee and not just the search committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're all in agreement that the search committee doesn't have the mandate to change the mission statement; are we not? Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, just on that, I don't think the full committee has either, because as I read the document, it says, "The Office of the Auditor General has translated the Act's mandate into the following mission statement." It makes no reference whatsoever to any committee. It seems as I interpret it that the current Auditor General has looked at the Auditor General Act and said, "I interpret it this way, and this is what I'm going to do," and has crafted the mission statement in his own words. I guess my problem is that to put it forward now as a mission statement I guess might constrain the new Auditor General who is going to take over the position on April 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the motion was defeated. If we want to debate this in the select committee here for a long time, we certainly can do that, but I'm not sure where it's going to take us.

MR. BRUSEKER: Probably nowhere. Let's go on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Any other concerns about the position profile?

MR. BRUSEKER: Under Major Responsibilities again, I know that the statutory responsibilities outlined by Elizabeth are pretty much taken from the legislation, just kind of reworded. I guess as I was reading through the major responsibilities I at times found it difficult to distinguish between the responsibilities of the department of the Auditor General as opposed to the individual called the Auditor General. I'm just wondering if they could be reworded in some fashion. For example, "statutory responsibilities . . . to audit on a regular basis every department" and so on: well, the Auditor General told us that he himself physically can't do that. That's a department function, and his job as the manager of the department called the department of the Auditor General is to oversee that and to ensure that those audits are performed by someone in the department. As I read through them, I felt that some of them were clearly talking about the Auditor General as an individual, what that person does, and others talked about the department. I just thought maybe that could be clarified slightly so that it's clearer which are the department's responsibilities and what is the responsibility of the Auditor General as the head of that department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments? Anything else? Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, let me ask Elizabeth. When the last Auditor General was hired and we had a similar type of statement that was handed out to applicants . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: Was there a similar kind of statement?

MR. DOERKSEN: Maybe that's the better question. Was there a similar kind of statement?

MRS. HURLEY: A profile?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah.

MRS. HURLEY: Yes.

MR. DOERKSEN: Did it create any problems?

MRS. HURLEY: I wasn't around at the time. That was eight years ago. I don't imagine so.

MR. DOERKSEN: Then I would make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that we accept the Auditor General's position profile to be given out to prospective candidates indicating that this is the existing Auditor General's description of the job as he saw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you implying that we're not accepting it? Or you're just leaving it open? When we come to interview people, we will use this as part of it if we wish and part our own questions and criteria as we develop things?

MR. DOERKSEN: Precisely. If I was an applicant, this is handed out as information for what the existing Auditor General defined his role and responsibilities as.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on Victor's motion? Elizabeth.

MRS. HURLEY: If I could just make a comment. As an applicant I would hope that the information being given to me was going to accurately reflect what I was getting myself into and that not after I have been hired does it change.

MR. DOERKSEN: Then let me ask this question, Elizabeth. What normally is handed out to applicants when they apply for a job such as this? This is a senior position. You expect that the people applying are going to use some intelligent decision-making and do their homework in terms of reading through the Act and reading every other bit of information they can get their hands on so they know what they're getting into. That's the kind of person we need to have for this job.

MRS. HURLEY: That's right; I don't disagree with you. The way you had presented it left it open, meaning that there might be some changes to this. I guess I'd like to know as an applicant what those changes are.

MRS. FRITZ: But don't job descriptions change all the time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don had his hand up.

DR. MASSEY: I was just going to agree. This is the Auditor General's view. Can it not be given to them with that, that this is what the current Auditor General believes is the position? As long as we're open about it.

MRS. FRITZ: I think, too, it's like any position that somebody applies for. This is simply a job description; is it not?

MRS. HURLEY: Yes. It's a description of the statutory responsibilities, the organization as it currently exists.

MRS. FRITZ: So when somebody applies for a position, they ask for the job description, and this is given to them through your area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From our committee; right.

MRS. FRITZ: And this is the job description.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, in general terms. Right.

MRS. FRITZ: And job descriptions change.

MRS. HURLEY: Certainly.

MRS. FRITZ: Do they? Yeah. So I'm okay with the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further comments? What we'll do here, if the committee is in agreement, is either adopt this or we will leave it for another meeting. The timetable here on this thing is a little bit important in that we get some advertising out in the next week for sure. We're trying to start the advertising process like tomorrow, but, you know, this is up to the committee.

MRS. FRITZ: Could I just ask that you read the motion back then?

MRS. SHUMYLA: Moved by Mr. Doerksen:
to accept the Auditor General position profile to be given out to prospective candidates as the position as the existing Auditor General saw it.

MR. BRUSEKER: Can I ask a question then? In the distribution then, Victor, are you suggesting - and I'm looking at the very front cover. In your motion you're implying that this is his viewpoint, not necessarily our viewpoint. Would we then delete the Legislative Assembly of Alberta crest on the front and otherwise leave it as is?

DR. MASSEY: Put his name on it.

MR. BRUSEKER: Sure.

5:17

MR. DOERKSEN: In the letters going out, it would be identified that enclosed is some information as follows, and you'd list them off: number one, the Auditor General's position profile as outlined by the existing Auditor General, the Auditor General Act would be number two, and so on and so forth.

MR. BRUSEKER: Could I add a friendly amendment, then, to your motion?

That we remove the crest from the front.
And we say: given the legislation, given the position as described by the current Auditor General. That would be part of the information package.

MR. DOERKSEN: Sure; I'm happy with that.

MRS. FRITZ: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm having difficulties with what is happening here with this motion. Now we're into a

friendly amendment that we not have anything to do with the Alberta government because this is the previous Auditor General's job description or whatever. I think we have a responsibility as a committee to accept the job description as outlined here, which is why you are reviewing it. So given that in mind, I would have to vote against the motion as it stands.

MR. FRIEDEL: I think, Yvonne, that all the amendment is saying is that we don't believe that this has been officially endorsed by the Legislature, and as such it might alleviate any misunderstanding and certainly get us out of the predicament we're in where we seem to be getting hung up on semantics.

MR. BRUSEKER: In fact, it's dated – at least I presume that's the date at the bottom – November 25. So clearly it hasn't been endorsed by the Legislative Assembly as a body.

MR. FRIEDEL: Right. If it gets us on to the next step of what we're doing, I have no problems with it.

MRS. FRITZ: My understanding was that as we're appointed as a committee through the Legislature, one of our responsibilities is to draft a job description to give to prospective candidates. We do that as a committee. We don't leave the buck passed back to the previous Auditor General. "Oh, this is what the previous Auditor General thought. This is what we're going to give you because he thought that." I think we as a committee have a responsibility to be giving a job description to a candidate. I mean, we've called it a position profile, but this is simply what it is when they ask, "What does this job entail?" That's what this is. I think that's the responsibility of this committee. That's why we were appointed as a committee. I'm having difficulties with: we're going to leave it and not take any responsibilities here as a committee. Also removing the crest, I have difficulties with that. This is a government committee. This committee was appointed through the Legislature.

MR. DOERKSEN: If I may be so bold as to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the job description, if you want to call it that, of the Auditor General is the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's very true.

MRS. FRITZ: So what is this in front of us? Why are we even doing this? Why don't we just send them the Act?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that we do that too.

MRS. FRITZ: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I mean, this one puts things a little more in laymen's terms. We may not particularly like one sentence or one point that the Auditor General's putting in here, but in general terms it tells you what he does. When I read it the first time, I was more aware of what the Auditor General did. When I read it over the second time to study it, there were some things in there that I marked up and circled and so on. Still, the Act is the Bible that the Auditor has to follow. This committee is going to be interviewing a shortlist of people. If they don't like something that we are saying, I would assume that they would say: "Well, if that's the job of this thing, then I'm out of here. I'm not applying for that."

MR. FRIEDEL: I think Victor's motion says it. This is in fact a document that is drafted by the existing Auditor General, and it's no use calling it anything but that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. I don't find anything wrong with that. He's just pointing out that that's what we should call it.

MR. FRIEDEL: If leaving off the crest for this purpose only is clarifying that it has not been approved or sanctioned by the Legislature, I think the clarification is in order for this purpose only.

MRS. FRITZ: Is that what the crest means, that the Legislature approved of this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know what the crest means.

MRS. FRITZ: I just think this so silly. I'm really having difficulties, Mr. Chairman, with what we're doing here. This document has been put together. It's come before this committee. We have a responsibility as a committee that we approve of what we're sending to potential candidates. I see us abdicating our responsibility. I didn't hear the motion saying that, but the debate is saying that.

MR. FRIEDEL: There was an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it was a friendly amendment. It was a change of words. Now, you don't consider it friendly, but Victor did. We changed a few words on the motion. Those Victor agreed on. You know, if you're opposed to it that way, that's fine. We're going to vote on the motion here eventually.

MRS. FRITZ: So we'll vote on the amendment and then the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. There's no amendment. It's changing the wording of the motion; right? Isn't that what you agreed to?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah. I'll change it to include his statement.

MRS. FRITZ: What is the motion then, please?

MRS. SHUMYLA: Moved by Mr. Doerksen
to accept the Auditor General position profile to be given out to prospective candidates and is the existing Auditor General position as he saw it.

The friendly amendment: Mr. Bruseker moved
to remove the crest from the front of the position description.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, then, I guess it is an amendment.

MRS. FRITZ: Right. I'd ask that you call that an amendment, because I could vote for the motion but not the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? It's carried.

[For the motion: Mr. Bruseker, Mr. Doerksen, Mr. Friedel, Dr. Massey]

[Against the motion: Mrs. Fritz]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amended motion? Opposed? Carried.

[For the motion: Mr. Bruseker, Mr. Doerksen, Mr. Friedel, Dr. Massey]

[Against the motion: Mrs. Fritz]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we can move on to the draft advertisement that we want to send out, and that is under tab – what is it? – (c).

Yes, Elizabeth.

MRS. HURLEY: I also have prepared another draft, because what was missing on the one that you had received was just some additional sort of administrative detail. The body of the ad hasn't been changed, just some administrative detail as to where the résumé should be sent, the correct address, and the fact that then there's a selection committee. All the members are listed, the chair, the vice-chair. Then there's the logo that appears. So I've got this far. The logo would appear in the advertisement at the bottom of the ad.

MR. BRUSEKER: So we can pull this one out again.

MRS. HURLEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we will have a discussion on the ad. Frank.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just a question on the salary thing. From a clarity standpoint is there not a standard range of salary within which the Auditor General would normally follow, and could we not throw that range in the ad? I think it gives people a clearer indication. Just from a personal standpoint, if I'm going to buy something or apply for something or whatever, I'd like to see the dollar units. Even if we just put the salary range, from this to that, whatever the figures are.

MRS. HURLEY: The salary range right at this point in time is of course subject to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A 5 percent rollback.

MRS. HURLEY: Which hasn't been decided on. So if we put in a salary range, it will have to be the current salary range, but we'll have to make some note that that's under review or some indication that that's going to be less.

5:27

MR. BRUSEKER: That's fairly common – isn't it? – salary range of such and such subject to review.

MRS. FRITZ: Do you normally put the salary range in?

MRS. HURLEY: No, we don't normally put the salary range in.

MR. DOERKSEN: I would suggest not having the salary range in there. I think the Auditor General of Alberta profile is fairly high and would attract the right candidates. They would have a pretty good idea in terms of whether they should be applying or not. In fact, we'd like them to volunteer for the position.

MR. FRIEDEL: Actually, I would have a different purpose for putting it in there, and I would think it would be for the informa-

tion of the general public that reads it, rather than the individual who will very likely know what the range is if he's interested. You know, the general public acceptance level would improve.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, let's find out. What is the salary range now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: About \$106,000 a year, somewhere in there.

MRS. HURLEY: What has happened in the past is that this position or similar positions would normally have followed the schedules that have been established for the senior officials, the deputy minister level positions in government, and that is the D range. The maximum for the D range is \$115,900. So that is the maximum for that particular . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: What's the lower end? Do you know that figure?

MRS. HURLEY: Seventy-eight thousand, five hundred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But Elizabeth's point is that if the 5 percent rollback is implemented, that knocks more than five grand off that wage scale. So that's why, you know, maybe it's a little iffy to put the figures in. They're not going to be accurate.

MR. FRIEDEL: If you put the proviso that it's under review. Maybe put in there: remember, this is Alberta.

MR. BRUSEKER: Do you want a formal motion then, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would think that, you know, it's up to the committee. I'm open to whatever the committee members . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, my preference would be to have it in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to make a motion that we put the wage scale in, the range?

MR. BRUSEKER: I'll make a motion
that we put the range in subject to a review, proviso,
or somehow appropriate wording. I'll make that as a motion then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any further discussion on that?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah. I think by having it in there we're inviting several different things. I would think we're inviting applications from anybody who is slightly below that category.

DR. MASSEY: We'll get them anyhow.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, rather than somebody who is really interested in the position and doing what they consider to be public service. Plus I think we invite discussion in the media, and I'm not sure we want that for this position.

MRS. FRITZ: I'm going to speak against the motion, and it's because of what was brought to the committee in regards to the 5 percent rollback. I think that's valid. We know that that's ongoing at the present time, and by what I've seen in the literature that we're advertising, I think we could be misleading the

applicants that would be coming forward. So I won't support the motion.

DR. MASSEY: I'm going to support it. It seems to be consistent with what the government's been saying about senior management salaries being made public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are we ready for the vote?

MR. DOERKSEN: Can we just get Elizabeth's comment in terms of a human resource perspective in advertising. I think there is usually a reason for putting a salary range or not putting a salary range in; is there not?

MRS. HURLEY: You give us more credit. At the more senior levels both are done. Sometimes salaries are advertised; sometimes salaries are not advertised. The rationale can vary. Sometimes they're not advertised because the salaries may be seen as too low and therefore will discourage individuals from applying. That would be generally why one wouldn't advertise the range. Of course, the salary is negotiable. I mean, there is a very large range there, and where the person actually falls will really depend on their experience and their qualifications and their background and what they're currently making and so on.

MR. DOERKSEN: In your opinion would this salary range discourage the senior people that we're looking for from applying? Because senior people certainly in large accounting firms would be making in excess of that figure.

MRS. HURLEY: I would have to agree that advertising the salary range would likely discourage some of the very senior people in private practice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A person is not going to apply for this until he knows what the range is. I mean, let's be real about it.

MR. FRIEDEL: I think the first thing he would do if it wasn't in the advertisement is phone and find out what it is.

MR. DOERKSEN: I disagree. I don't think everybody's motivated by money. I think in this case we're looking for somebody who is motivated to help out the province of Alberta in terms of its financial report. That's the kind of candidate that I would hope would come forward.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, it would be nice if that would be one of his primary objectives. Personally, I would suspect that the most likely candidate would be the one that's making a heck of a lot more money than this now and maybe wants a change in direction, somebody that wants to maybe wind down from a partnership, a private enterprise. I think that's what happened with the current incumbent. You know, various different reasons. That was actually the reason why I was suggesting the headhunter routine, because they might go out and convince someone who is making \$150,000 now as a partner in a private practice why they would want to have this job at a loss in salary rather than the person who reads the paper and says, "Well, obviously the salary is too low, so I'm not too interested."

MRS. FRITZ: Well, why would you lay all your cards out on the table? That happens - doesn't it? - by putting the salary range in. Are there not negotiations that take place?

MRS. HURLEY: Yes, negotiations would take place through the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Either way they will take place of course. Do you want the motion read, or do you all know what it is?

MR. FRIEDEL: We know what it is.

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

[For the motion: Mr. Bruseker, Mr. Friedel, Dr. Massey]

[Against the motion: Mr. Doerksen, Mrs. Fritz]

MRS. HURLEY: Just in terms of wording, under salary we would then include the range: \$78,500 to \$115,900, currently under review?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That sounds straightforward.

MRS. HURLEY: Okay. The benefits package should also be included then?

MR. FRIEDEL: Do you want to itemize the benefits package or just say standard benefits package?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. That's a given. I think you put the wage range, under review, and that's it.

MR. FRIEDEL: Ron, might I go back to the item I mentioned earlier about the eight-year versus five-year contract. Depending on the comments we hear from the legal department, if five years causes no legal problem, then we would consider . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If Parliamentary Counsel says that five years causes no problem, is it the wish of this committee to put in the advertisement that it's five years? Is that the general agreement, or do we need a motion and a debate on that?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'll make it a motion, Ron. Providing that Parliamentary Counsel has no legal reasons why it could not be done, could we amend the advertisement to read:
not exceeding five years?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're going to have a debate on that now. Go ahead, Victor.

5:37

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, I disagree. The Act says "a term not exceeding 8 years." I think we're just being consistent with the Act when we say a term not exceeding eight years. That does not commit us to an eight-year term. It would just be consistent with the Act.

MR. FRIEDEL: But I think that would be misleading in the advertisement if our intent is five years, and unless the committee says it wants eight years, then I'll back off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, maybe that's we're voting on then: eight years versus five years. Frank.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm kind of in a quandary about this one. I don't have any strong feelings one way or another. I guess I'm kind of leaning towards the eight-year thing simply from a

standpoint of again dollars and cents. Doing a quick accounting, it seems to me that this selection procedure could run into the \$100,000 price range very quickly, and, shoot, if we can get a person for eight as opposed to five years, I guess I'm kind of leaning towards that. You know, eight years, five years: it's kind of a toss-up. Because it's in the Act, unless the Act were changed, I guess I'd kind of like to see us stick to the eight.

MR. FRIEDEL: Probably the main reason I'm suggesting five – and assuming that whomever you hire is qualified enough at the time of the interview and hiring that you would be as happy with them at that point for eight years as you would at five years – is that only with a certain amount of experience you decide whether he is the right person or if you made the right selection. I would suggest that in normal cases it's not unusual for the individual to have his contract renewed at least once, and the process for renewing the contract would not be anywhere nearly as costly, probably a couple of meetings of the committee. If you're making the assumption that they're very likely and certainly would be eligible and would likely be renewed at least once, it would be a 16-year possible term versus a 10-year term, and even a second renewal could be made too. It gives you a review process during the term.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, then, let me ask Elizabeth about this again. In the contract is there not an annual review or something of the performance of the Auditor General from somebody?

MR. FRIEDEL: It's different though, Victor, if you don't mind me interrupting, because the purpose of a review, you know, might be to just discuss and say, "Okay, well, here's a few things you might want," if there is such a review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our committee as a whole is the one that supervises this guy, not anybody else.

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm looking at the alternative where the worst could happen. Hopefully not, but the worst could be that you're unhappy with the individual. The review process, even if there was such a thing, or if this committee or if the Legislature somehow or another felt that the job was being done poorly enough that you wanted to look at termination – if you terminate during a contract, I don't care how well it's written, there is usually a buy-out clause. You know, there's the golden handshake or whatever it's going to be. If the term expires in five years, it gives you the option at that time to say, "Well, okay, we are unhappy enough that we're not intending to renew the contract." It would cost you nothing, because it has expired. If you like the job, then you renew it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yvonne, do you have some comments?

MRS. FRITZ: It was just to say that I don't think we can be doing this, because I think the Act has to be amended before you can change the eight years, doesn't it? I'm asking for clarification about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It says: not to exceed eight years.

MRS. FRITZ: Right. But if we advertise for a five-year term, we're not in keeping with the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to get Parliamentary Counsel's interpretation. If they say no, then if Gary's motion is passed, it's out the window.

MR. FRIEDEL: It's subject to the approval of Parliamentary Counsel. In other words, if Frank Work says that it doesn't work, then this motion is null and void.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we can turn down the motion here too, and then that's it too.

MRS. FRITZ: Well, I agree with the five-year term. It's just that quite frankly I don't think we can do that when it's written in the Act. If we're simply voting on the motion in principle until you see, Mr. Chairman, whether or not we need to change the Act so we're not doing false advertising, then . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We won't be doing false advertising. We'll check with Parliamentary Counsel that we can do it without changing the Act.

MRS. FRITZ: Okay. Well, then, I'll support the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for the vote?

MR. BRUSEKER: I was just going to review the mandate of our committee and see if there's any mention of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There isn't.
All in favour of the motion? Opposed? Tie vote.

MR. BRUSEKER: I didn't vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if it's a tie, then I vote. If you don't want to vote, then I'll vote.

MR. BRUSEKER: I guess I have to vote. I'll vote against the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's defeated.
We're going to move on here.

DR. MASSEY: Procedurally, Mr. Chairman, how far are we going this evening? Are we meeting again on December 6?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess that's up to the committee. If we're off to not holding this too late, then we may adjourn until next week. There are a couple of other things that we have to do very soon here, aren't there? Where we're going to advertise in the media – it's absolutely crucial that we do it or of course we can't . . .

MRS. FRITZ: Well, perhaps by then we'll have the information back on the previous motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've defeated that. I mean, we can bring it up again.

MRS. FRITZ: But you're still going to bring back the information as to whether or not it could be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

DR. MASSEY: Wasn't the task for the 6th to approve the advertisement and the media profiles?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Uh huh.
Gary.

MR. FRIEDEL: I have a problem with the 6th. I'm flying back from Peace River, and the earliest I could arrive here would be close to 7 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got two other items. One is the advertising in the media. The other one is the budget for this committee. Now, if we can get together in the first three days of next week - Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday - well, then, maybe we can hold off. I would really like to get where we want to go in the advertising media done today so that we can unleash the executive search people to get the ads out, but I'll wait, if the committee wants to wait, until Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week.

MR. FRIEDEL: If I could suggest, I would prefer to stay here for another half or three-quarters of an hour and get this done, and then if I can't come back, you don't have to change the meeting date for me.

MR. BRUSEKER: I agree. I think it's a better use of time too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. MASSEY: May I be excused for a few minutes to make a phone call?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Diane has got something to say.

MRS. SHUMYLA: I only have this room booked till 6:30, so I'm hoping that it's not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're going to be out of here before then.
Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: Are we done with the draft Auditor General ad?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DOERKSEN: I wasn't done with it. Can I come back to that, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure can.

MR. DOERKSEN: On the second paragraph it says, "To supplement staff resources, you will interact with a large number of firms of chartered accountants in Alberta." I would make a motion

to change that to "interact with a large number of professional accounting firms in Alberta."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the motion?

MR. DOERKSEN: That's the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Shall we accommodate Victor's vanity on this one?

MRS. FRITZ: What was it, Victor?

MR. DOERKSEN: You see where it says "you will interact with a large number of": to change that to "professional accounting firms in Alberta."

MR. BRUSEKER: Can you tell us why you would like that change?

MR. DOERKSEN: It just implies that there are only chartered accountants in Alberta that do accounting and auditing work, whereas certified general accountants have the same ability as chartered accountants do.

MR. BRUSEKER: When we met with the Auditor General, I think somebody asked that question.

MR. DOERKSEN: It was me.

MR. BRUSEKER: What was his response?

MR. DOERKSEN: His response was that at this point in time they don't deal with any CA firms or CMA firms but they could. At the present time, the present experience does not include them.

5:47

MR. FRIEDEL: I'll vote for this one, but you owe me one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So do you want a vote? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay. Now, are we going to make a motion to accept this ad?

MR. FRIEDEL: So moved as amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Gary.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just a question, then, about once it's drafted up and camera ready. How large will it be physically? Or is that on to the next item? Is that related to budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Well, we need to have different sized ads in different papers.

MR. BRUSEKER: I think it's got to be big enough to be eye catching and small enough to be fiscally responsible. We've got to find that balance somehow.

MRS. HURLEY: Unfortunately, I didn't bring the old ad, but we asked them to do costs based on the previous ad size. Generally, it's a fairly large ad, so it would be probably two columns, three columns wide, depending on what paper or media we go into.

MR. DOERKSEN: On the ad, is there any reason to include the selection committee in the ad?

MRS. HURLEY: Past practice.

MR. DOERKSEN: I don't need a bunch of phone calls from people asking me . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Asking you what?

MR. DOERKSEN: . . . about the position, and how many are applying, and who is qualified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Diane, can you answer that?

MRS. SHUMYLA: I was just going to comment that the phone number is my phone number, so I would be getting the general information calls.

MR. DOERKSEN: I would be getting calls from local people and people who know me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will anyway.

MR. DOERKSEN: Not necessarily. If they know I'm on the selection committee, it makes a difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They don't know, though, do they?

MR. DOERKSEN: They would if it's printed in this ad on the second page, which is suggested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's one of the hazards.

MR. DOERKSEN: What's the point? What are we advertising? Are we advertising who's on the committee or for the job?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Both. I mean, it's public knowledge.

MRS. HURLEY: The alternative could be to just note who the chairman of the selection committee is. That has been done as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's noted on the top. "Please send resume to: Mr. Ron Hierath, Chairman." I would say after the "Selection Committee" part we can take out.
Don.

DR. MASSEY: Well, there won't be any accountants call me. I would argue that the names should be on there in terms of who's making the decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. BRUSEKER: I guess it comes down to an accountability issue again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless you want to make a motion to change something, then we're going to leave this in.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, I'll make a motion to move it out of there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any debate on that motion, or do we just want to vote on it?

MR. DOERKSEN: You could also make smaller ads, then, or bigger print.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour? Opposed? Defeated.
Okay. Are we finished with the ad now?

MRS. HURLEY: Just a question about the closing date. I put in a January 14 closing date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine.

Okay. We'll move on to advertising in the media under tab D. This has the background of where they advertised in the last advertisement for the Auditor General. Personally, I think some of this could be cut out. Advertising in both the *Calgary Sun* and *Calgary Herald* seems to be some duplication, and I think we can be a little leaner, starting with that general approach. Maybe we can just kind of go through it.

Go ahead, Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the \$37,915.85 what we spent the previous time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's today's prices with the last time's places where we advertised, but today's prices.

MR. DOERKSEN: I'm not sure. I look on the left page, and I see it's \$61,000. Is that not today's prices?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. That's weeklies put in there; right?
Go ahead, Elizabeth.

MRS. HURLEY: If I could just make a comment. What we asked the advertising agency to do was to pull together what the costs would be today if we use the same media. That's what this one page is with the total of \$37,000. That's based on the last competition for the Auditor General.

The rest that is provided – and it's summarized on that budget summary – we asked them to list for the benefit of the committee all of the other weekly papers in Alberta and an estimate of the cost of advertising the ad in that paper. It's basically information for the committee. So what they've done is they've added all of the costs in that front summary, the \$61,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we can get to some order here, what I would like to do at this time – I mean, we can talk about weeklies; then we'll talk about the *Vancouver Sun* or whatever – is stay on this first page for now and talk about the weeklies later. Is that okay?
Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: May I make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman? Rather, that we set a budget figure and then figure out where we can spend it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that will take up an hour.

MR. BRUSEKER: That would make it kind of difficult, I think, in all honesty, Mr. Chairman. If we set a budget figure, then we're going to get into arguments about is it a realistic figure. Now, we can set a budget figure of \$5 – I mean, it would be absurd – and then say, "Well, that really resolves the whole issue pretty quickly about what we spend."

MR. FRIEDEL: Can I ask a general question? In these dailies, how many insertions does this include, or is that one?

MRS. HURLEY: For all of the papers noted, except for the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, it's one insertion. The *Toronto Globe and Mail* is three days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It says there, Gary, "Insertion Date," and just the one date; right?

MR. FRIEDEL: Okay. It just says Saturday. In other words, one Saturday, one ad, in each of these papers.

MRS. HURLEY: The Toronto *Globe and Mail* only advertises on a three-insertion basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My personal feeling, to set in another little interjection here, is that some of the out-of-province stuff I would find to be fiscally irresponsible: spending in Halifax \$1,300. I think a lot of the coverage that the *Globe and Mail* has – whether you agree with their political stripe or not, they are kind of a widely read paper.

Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, let me pose another question to Elizabeth then. In the advertising that you would do for a deputy minister, is this a schedule that you would follow and the amount of money you would spend? It seems exorbitant even to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They would never spend that much money, I hope.

MRS. HURLEY: No.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, if the deputy ministers are at the same level as the Auditor General, then there should be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but this is a different job though, Victor. This is a completely different, high-profile job.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm really concerned about the dollars we're going to spend on advertising.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're trying to cut down here. Do you want to give us your opinion on what ones we should cut?

DR. MASSEY: Can we ask Elizabeth where they would advertise for a deputy, one where you're advertising nationally?

MRS. HURLEY: It would really depend on the position. I guess if I could just make some suggestions in terms of this particular position, you may have some alternatives. The committee first of all needs to decide whether they want to go outside the province, if they feel that they have to test the market elsewhere. If that's the case, I would suggest that probably, because of the circulation of the *Globe and Mail*, that's a fairly reasonable choice. There is another alternative, and that's the *Financial Post*, which isn't noted in here because it wasn't used. It has a smaller readership. The cost is less; it's about \$4,100. There are six insertions that can be received with that if the committee chooses to go that way. Then I would suggest that it might be reasonable to go with just some of the major dailies within the province.

5:57

MR. FRIEDEL: Just to start the debate on it, my personal opinion would be that if we include all the newspapers in Alberta, since we have one ad only, and the three professional magazines and delete all the out-of-province ones, the word is going to get out regardless.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I find duplication between the *Calgary Sun* and the *Calgary Herald* myself.

MR. FRIEDEL: If we were putting more than one ad in, if we were putting in multiple days, then I would say pick one; one's an alternate. But if there's one ad per paper, I have no problems with covering each of them once. My point is to blanket delete all the out-of-province ones for probably \$25,000 worth, or maybe not quite that much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the CA magazines down there? What're your thoughts on those?

MR. FRIEDEL: The professional ones I think it should be in.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah, I think just the CA magazine and eliminate the other two over there.

MR. FRIEDEL: That's how you're going to get the professional people out of the province for a lot less money, and you're going to get the ones that are going to read it. Quite frankly, that's who we're looking for. It's got to be somebody with a professional accounting degree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. FRIEDEL: Okay; I'll make it a motion, if you don't mind, that we take the ones on the first page and delete that third block.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's from the Victoria *Times-Colonist* down to the Charlottetown *Guardian*?

MR. FRIEDEL: The Victoria *Times-Colonist* to the Charlottetown *Guardian* inclusive, that we delete that.

DR. MASSEY: The Toronto . . .

MR. FRIEDEL: Including that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's your motion, Gary?

MR. FRIEDEL: That's my motion. I feel that the three in the professional magazines at the bottom are going to cover every professional outside of the province anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What are some of your thoughts on that motion?

MR. DOERKSEN: Now, let's just make sure I'm clear on your motion. You want to include the three professional magazines?

MR. FRIEDEL: Yeah. Just delete from Victoria to Charlottetown.

DR. MASSEY: *Alberta Report*?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's from Victoria to Charlottetown. That's what he wants to delete.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to keep coming back to this. I don't mean to be a pain in the neck, but can I not get an answer in terms of how much we would normally spend for a deputy minister in terms of advertising? I'm not used to advertising for positions other than spending 20 bucks for an ad. What is a normal budget when you're advertising for a senior position?

MRS. HURLEY: I'd have to get back to you on that. I'd have to check. I'd hate to give you a wrong figure.

MR. BRUSEKER: Would we advertise outside of the province for a deputy minister of agriculture, for argument's sake?

MRS. HURLEY: Recently we're just concluding the competition for the Deputy Minister of Energy, and we advertised in the *Globe and Mail*.

MR. BRUSEKER: Was it the only out-of-province newspaper?

MRS. HURLEY: That was the only out-of-province newspaper.

MR. BRUSEKER: If I could then, Mr. Chairman, I agree with Gary's intent that the *Globe and Mail* is in I think a different league from some of the other newspapers in that it's much more widely distributed than, for example, the *Regina Leader Post*, I would hazard a guess. So if we were to delete a good number of these, I would like to see us at least retain out of that list, although I see it as the most expensive of the bunch, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* because it does have such a wide readership, wide in terms of, I think, number of people and wide in terms of geographic distribution.

DR. MASSEY: I would support that, and I would also wonder why we would include *Alberta Report*.

MR. FRIEDEL: I specifically left it in because it's an Alberta magazine.

Speaking to Frank's suggestion, when I first looked at it, that was going to be the first one I was going to suggest we delete, only because of their price and they're forcing us into three ads. I quite frankly think that the three professional magazines are themselves going to cover all the people we want to attract. I think if you did no other advertising at all, you'd probably get them. You know, for almost half the price of the *Globe and Mail* alone, you've covered all three of those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yvonne, did you have a comment here? And then I'll go to Elizabeth. No, you didn't have your hand up?

MRS. FRITZ: Well, I'm going to support the motion. I think it's already been well stated. I think, though, philosophically we go back to what was brought to us earlier, and that is: would we be looking for somebody from Alberta or somebody outside of Alberta? For me, I would be looking for an Albertan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Elizabeth, do you have some comments?

MRS. HURLEY: I just wanted to mention that with the magazines the lead time tends to be a little longer, so the committee may want to take a look at the closing date again. For example, for the CMA magazine it would be the February issue that this ad would appear in. What has been suggested was a January 14 closing date, so in fact the ad might appear in that particular magazine after the competition has closed.

MR. BRUSEKER: Maybe I missed something there. Gary, you raised a point and said that we would be forced into three ads. Is there no choice in that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's with the *Globe and Mail*.

MRS. HURLEY: There is no choice.

MR. BRUSEKER: There's no choice? They say three ads, take it or leave it?

MRS. HURLEY: That's right. We could put it in once, but it's still going to cost us \$7,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a dirty trick; I'll have to admit that. That made Gary mad. That is a dirty trick, those devils. Victor.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, again we're looking at a certain size of ad here. Is there a smaller ad? I think the ad we've got here is about an eight and a half by 11; okay? Can we not go with half that size?

MRS. HURLEY: This is just in a draft format. It's actually smaller than that. It's narrower.

MR. DOERKSEN: How big is two columns by 155 lines?

MRS. HURLEY: I wish I had brought examples that I could have shown you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, about, Elizabeth. It's about an eighth of a page?

MRS. SHUMYLA: About this size, I think.

MRS. HURLEY: Yeah, that would be about the size.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay. Now, aren't most of the ads in the career pages smaller than that? Usually when you look through the career pages, there seems to be a standard size, and then any provincial ones or government ones tend to be bigger.

MRS. HURLEY: To make it smaller, we would probably have to take a look at making the ad shorter.

MR. DOERKSEN: People who are looking through the careers diligently will find it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a pretty wordy ad, though, Victor.

MR. FRIEDEL: It's the content.

MRS. HURLEY: It is the content; that's right.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, we can take out that one section that I suggested.

MR. BRUSEKER: We've already had that vote.

MR. DOERKSEN: You may want to change your mind, though, after seeing that we can save some taxpayers' money by reducing the size of the ad. I think we have to look at that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good comment, Victor.

MRS. HURLEY: Just another comment. You can take a look at what the actual lines cost. So if you reduced the ad by a few lines, we're talking about anywhere from 75 cents a line for the *Lloydminster Times* to almost \$7 for the *Calgary Herald*.

MR. DOERKSEN: We'll make it a full-page ad in the Red Deer *Advocate* instead of just a small one.

MRS. FRITZ: Are you going to call the question? Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The question's been called on this motion of Gary's. All those in favour? Opposed? If you don't vote, I'm going to.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, I'll oppose it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; now we know it's defeated.

MR. DOERKSEN: Let me add that for the most part I was happy with the motion, but I wanted to amend the size of the ads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that what you're going to do?

MR. DOERKSEN: Right. I'd like to make them smaller than what we're suggesting here. Again, I'm sorry that I don't have a good sized one in front of me to know for sure what I'm talking about. I know, in seeing many career ads in my lifetime, that they usually run in the career pages about this size, and a government one they usually double. So this size of an ad on a career page in my opinion is clearly sufficient.

MR. FRIEDEL: In other words, what you're saying is a big headline with a lot of small print under it. If they like the job, they'll get their glasses on and read the small print.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, sure they will.

MR. BRUSEKER: I think that if we just put, "Phone such and such for the magnifying glass," we can make a few bucks on that too.

MR. DOERKSEN: All they're going to see is "Auditor General for Alberta," and those who are interested will then read it.

6:07

MRS. FRITZ: Are you making that a motion?

MR. DOERKSEN: How do you describe a motion to fit this size of paper?

MRS. FRITZ: I don't know, Victor, but we have other commitments. So if you have a motion on the size of the ad, I'd like to hear it and let's get on with it. Like, you defeated the last motion based on the size of the ad when the motion before you was on location. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get back to the agenda. Are you making a motion that it's going to be a certain size?

MR. DOERKSEN: Reduce it by 20 percent.

MR. BRUSEKER: Even reducing it to 100 lines from 155 is a one-third reduction.

MR. DOERKSEN: I wish we had some concept in terms of how big that is, because you don't want to be ridiculously small or ridiculously large.

MRS. FRITZ: Well, I think they gave you - I saw somebody hold up a piece of paper that is about four or five inches by about 10 inches. It's a five by eight and a half.

MR. DOERKSEN: So this would probably be about an eighth of a page; right?

MR. BRUSEKER: It depends on whether you're talking the *Herald* or the *Sun*. I'm not trying to be difficult.

MR. DOERKSEN: I'm not either. I'm just trying to say that we've got to preserve some dollars here. This is what I'm trying to say.

MRS. HURLEY: Can I make a suggestion? Given the wording of the ad right now and what the committee has agreed to, I can speak to the advertising agency tomorrow. They can do up a mock-up of the ad, and I can have that faxed to each of you. That will give you a better sense.

MR. DOERKSEN: Then how do we vote on it though?

MR. BRUSEKER: How about if I put a motion on the table that says we reduce it to 100 lines from 155?

MR. DOERKSEN: But if it doesn't fit, then it just doesn't make any sense either.

MR. BRUSEKER: You can make it fit. You need a different size font.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. We've changed our focus here from what we were talking about: where we were going to advertise.

MR. DOERKSEN: Then let me make a motion in this regard. I would make a motion that we advertise in the three professional magazines as suggested.

MR. FRIEDEL: Can I interrupt you right there? It sounded like the CMA magazine would not be printed on time.

MR. DOERKSEN: Oh, okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: For the February issue, there doesn't seem to be any point, so, yeah.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay. We'll advertise in the CA magazine, in the CGA magazine.

MR. BRUSEKER: Could I suggest you stop there, and we'll have a vote on that and then go on and maybe do it in a piecemeal fashion. It might be easier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favour of that motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay. I would then make a motion that we advertise in the *Calgary Herald*, *Calgary Sun*, *Edmonton Journal*, *Edmonton Sun*, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Lethbridge, Lloydminster, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, and *Alberta Report*. However, the ads should be of an approximate size of six inches by four inches.

MRS. FRITZ: Mr. Chairman, I'd like you to call that motion in two parts. I see them, quite frankly, as very different, and I think a motion on the size of the ad and the number of lines, et cetera, could be made at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think I agree with you, because you didn't make that motion on the CA magazine and the other one. So let's just go down to wherever you want to stop.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay. Well, let me change that motion, then, to read that we will advertise in those newspapers . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: From the *Calgary Herald* through to the *Red Deer Advocate*.

MR. DOERKSEN: . . . through to *Alberta Report*.

MRS. FRITZ: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour?

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, I'd like to delete *Alberta Report*, personally.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to vote on it?

DR. MASSEY: Yeah, that's \$1,100.

MR. BRUSEKER: It's \$1,100 for the *Alberta Report*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't talked about size yet; that's coming. That's a different vote.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, it's still \$1,100. I'd like to amend the motion, then - can I do that, Mr. Chairman? - to delete *Alberta Report* and then leave in all the other newspapers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You're amending that motion?

MR. BRUSEKER: *Calgary Herald* through to and including the *Red Deer Advocate*, as on our list here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? Defeated.

All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried.

Now what are we going to talk about? Size?

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay. Then I'll just carry on, since I'm going. I would then make a motion to say that the size of the ads should be a reasonable size, and I'm suggesting that they should be no bigger than approximately five inches by three and a half inches.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the newspapers?

MR. DOERKSEN: In the newspapers, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Elizabeth.

MRS. HURLEY: Just a comment. They have certain column widths.

MR. DOERKSEN: I know that.

MRS. HURLEY: Each paper is different.

MR. DOERKSEN: That's why I'm saying approximately.

MRS. HURLEY: Approximately, okay. So no bigger than five inches high and three and a half inches approximately?

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, if the columns work out to six by four, then that's fine. Then I'll change it to six by four as opposed to five by three and a half.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just in speaking to that, I appreciate the intent, but I'm not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, would it be acceptable with this committee to make it very clear to Elizabeth and the executive search people that we are not rolling in the money that we were rolling in eight years ago and to try to make the ads as small as possible or downsize the ads in comparison to what they were seven years or eight years ago when we had money? Is that too vague for this committee?

DR. MASSEY: Well, I think we have to do something. I think we're foolish to sit here and try to pretend what an ad is going to look like by holding up pieces of paper every time.

MRS. FRITZ: Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, importantly, we just saved \$22,000 off this budget, which was the intent. We're talking about dollars and cents here by line, so I feel comfortable leaving it in your hands to look at the size along with Elizabeth and invite Victor to look at it so you all feel comfortable in the size.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And try to downsize it somewhat. Is that okay? Does that seem legitimate?

MR. BRUSEKER: I think we all are on the same wavelength that let's save some money on the size. I think that intent is pretty clear. I would like to put a motion on, though, that we do an ad however reduced it can be in the *Globe and Mail*. I say that because I differ, I guess, with Yvonne a little bit. I think we need to look beyond just Alberta's borders. I can certainly agree that we don't need that extensive long list elsewhere. Victor made mention of a small two inch by column width ad. Even if it's just: position; apply for the Auditor General; contact the Auditor General of Alberta. Even if it's just titled and a phone number at the bottom, I would like to see even a small ad. So when I'm saying ad, it can be substantially reduced.

MRS. FRITZ: Okay.

MR. DOERKSEN: Look; here are some sizes of ads. I think we only need one approximately . . .

MRS. FRITZ: Victor, we already said we'll agree with what you decided.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, is this six by four, roughly?

MRS. FRITZ: Well, there are different numbers of lines. We're going to do a mock ad, and we'll agree with what you and the chairman decide on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The intent we've all agreed upon, Victor, is that we're saying let's downsize.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: Victor, I put a motion on the table just while you were out. I think I would feel much more comfortable if we put an ad in the *Globe and Mail*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Hold on, Frank. The truth is that I think Diane recorded a motion that Victor was making even though he didn't quite finish it, and I kind of interrupted him. Now, if you want to withdraw that, that's fine.

MR. DOERKSEN: If we have general agreement, then let's just go with it and scrap the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: Respecting size, you were talking about?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll go ahead. Sorry to interrupt you.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'd like to see an ad go into the *Globe and Mail* simply because of the broad readership that it has both, as I say, in terms of numbers of people and in terms of geographic area. I'm quickly trying to find something in here. Even if we just put the title "Auditor General" - I'm not quite sure. I think we probably do need to draft another ad, but I think even just a small ad, even if it has to go in three days. It's a national paper that is in a different league from others. I'm not at all suggesting we spend \$7,000, but I think an ad of some type in the *Globe and Mail* is appropriate.

DR. MASSEY: I would like to support that. I can't believe that we would spend \$1,200 or \$1,100 on *Alberta Report* given its readership and not feel obligated somehow or other to get it into a national daily, whether it's the *Financial Post* or the *Toronto Globe and Mail*.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest we defer this till December 6? Is there an urgency to get these in before December 6, other than the professional magazines?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, no, there isn't. If the truth be known, there isn't for the dailies.

MR. DOERKSEN: I'll make a suggestion that we . . .

6:17

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute here. I don't want you making a date that won't work. If you're going to make a motion of December 6, it may not work, the whole submotion. That's all.

MRS. FRITZ: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe because Mr. Friedel cannot be here on the 6th, perhaps the motion could be back to principle: will we or will we not advertise in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*? Do you want to make that the motion?

MR. DOERKSEN: I would like to make that decision when I know what the costs are going to be of these ads at the reduced size.

MR. BRUSEKER: In speaking to that, if I could just address it really quickly, I would suggest that the ad that we put in the *Globe and Mail* be one column as opposed to two. I mean, we're

looking at a huge cost here, so by making it one column instead of two, we've cut down the cost in half. I think if we shorten it considerably so that instead of being 155 lines, it would be something less. Is this the *Globe and Mail* here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So half the width and half the length should be half the price.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah, I would go with that. There's an ad here, for example. I mean, an ad of this type of size, and I'm holding up one that's one column wide and ballpark it's four inches - I don't know how many centimetres it is - would be approximately a quarter of the price. So a quarter of \$7,000 is - what? - \$1,500, \$1,700 for the *Globe and Mail*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're making that a motion?

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm making that a motion.

MR. FRIEDEL: Including that the price be approximately \$1,500?

MR. BRUSEKER: Including that the price be a quarter of \$7,000, whatever that is.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, you'd never get that into that size of an ad. I'm suggesting it would look ridiculous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, he's saying readjust the ad, Victor.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm suggesting we readjust the ad. We may have to ask Elizabeth, then, to redraft an ad. They can perhaps fax it out and say: here's the title, maybe a two-line job description, and an address and phone number, please contact for more information. If someone's keen on it, they'll see it. If they're not keen on it, that's fine too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on that motion? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay. One last thing on the advertising, and that is the weeklies. I think the general feeling is no. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BRUSEKER: How much cost is that, \$1,700 or \$2,100?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would personally feel embarrassed if it was advertised in my home paper in a small town. I really will balk at wasting money on weeklies. I mean - I don't have two votes here, but . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: I certainly agree with the sentiment. I guess I'm just a little bit wondering if we're missing any geographic area of the province. Are the dailies that we've selected representative enough of a broad enough cross section of the province that most people would read them?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm going back to my original comment. I would bet that if we advertise in the CA magazine and the CGA magazine, you're going to hit every prospective applicant.

MRS. HURLEY: For clarification, the deadline for insertion for the CA magazine for the January-February issue is today. So I will have to deal with them. Hopefully I can negotiate something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it certainly is going to come out after the deadline, then we can't do it. There's no doubt about that. We don't want to do that.

MR. BRUSEKER: We give them two choices: take it or leave it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, and a lot of times the deadline is acceptable for a day.

MR. FRIEDEL: Something special like this is going to be a unique ad for them anyways.

MR. DOERKSEN: Elizabeth, if you run into some negotiating problems with the CA magazine, for instance, how are you going to -- we want to give you some flexibility.

DR. MASSEY: She's going to talk to the chairman.

MR. BRUSEKER: So I guess what you're saying then, Elizabeth, is that if you phone them up tomorrow morning and they say, "Sorry, you're too late," then obviously we don't run the ad in the February issue because there's not any point. In fact, that would be the March-April issue, presumably, if they run bimonthly. There's certainly no point in running it in the March-April issue.

MRS. HURLEY: Okay.

MR. DOERKSEN: I guess the other question to ask now that we're talking about it: if it's the January-February issue, when is it released? When will the members get it in their mailboxes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: She's certainly going to check that; that's why she's bringing it up.

MRS. HURLEY: Yeah, I will check it. I would imagine that it doesn't get out until January 1.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, if it's January 15, we've got a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think what we'll do is close down here.

I think there are a few other things we needed to discuss, and one of course is our budget estimate. I think we'll leave that and have a meeting next week.

Diane.

MRS. SHUMYLA: Just a comment also on the budget estimates. Once we know how much we're spending on advertising, I'll put that in for the next meeting, and that will make it easier for us to approve the budget estimates as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. DOERKSEN: In view of the problem we have here with the closing date, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if we shouldn't revisit the closing date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah, because if she puts the ad in for January 14 but if they don't get the magazine until the 15th . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine to do that, Victor. If you remember our schedule, we're going to be putting ourselves under the gun at the end of this process.

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah, but we can't be silly about it either. We've still have to get good, qualified candidates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not assuming that we are silly about it. I mean, the only one we're pushing is the CA magazine. If that's absolutely crucial, well then . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: They have a closing date for their advertising which I'm sure they will extend to tomorrow, but the real question is: when does it hit the doorstep of the CA? If it doesn't hit their doorstep until January 15 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we're not going to advertise it.

MR. DOERKSEN: So you're not prepared to extend the date. This, Mr. Chairman, is where I'd like you to have some flexibility. If, for instance, it hits their doorsteps on January 15, is there a big problem with changing the closing date to the 20th?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm sort of inclined to agree with Vic in spite of the fact you voted against me before.

MRS. FRITZ: It's only five days. Make it a motion, Victor. We'll vote for it.

MR. FRIEDEL: The reason for it is that that probably will be still the bulk of the people that we are intending to attract. If it means delaying our procedure by one week, is it going to screw up our schedule that badly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you want a motion?

MR. DOERKSEN: I'll make a motion
that we give the chairman the flexibility to extend the closing date for one week, depending on when the professional magazines hit the doorsteps.

MR. BRUSEKER: Are we then changing the ad that's going to go in all of the publications we're advertising in to January 4 to 21?

MRS. FRITZ: That's up to the chairman for the flexibility. So, yeah, I agree.

MR. FRIEDEL: We'll just up the closing date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By one week if necessary. Is that your motion?

MR. DOERKSEN: Right. Then all ads would reflect the same date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried.

Okay. Is it the wish of this committee, then, to meet next week on Tuesday?

MR. BRUSEKER: I can't make Tuesday.

MRS. FRITZ: I can't either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about Wednesday? What's Wednesday like?

MR. BRUSEKER: I can't make Tuesday or Wednesday. Thursday afternoon . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about Monday evening?

MR. FRIEDEL: It would have to be sometime after 7 o'clock.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it's fairly important we meet fairly quickly because we've had a lot of discussion today, and I think there's a large part we haven't covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Okay, but we're going to pick a date here.

MRS. FRITZ: How about Monday morning? Standing policies don't start until 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not for me, that distance. I mean, I can be up here by . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: I'm here Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday next week. That's all you need.

MR. FRIEDEL: What are we going to be dealing with, just the approval of the final ad?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're going to be dealing with our budget.

MR. BRUSEKER: Is the budget the only thing really left on the agenda that we have to deal with, Mr. Chairman? It seems kind of pointless to come back just to deal with budget.

6:27

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we've got to give up this room right now.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, not only that, Frank, we also don't have a fix on the cost of the advertising, which we will have by the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some more things. We could fill an hour or an hour and a half without any trouble talking about some of the . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: That's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So let's pick a date.

DR. MASSEY: On Monday I have a townhall meeting in the evening, but during the day . . .

MRS. FRITZ: Standing policies are over Monday between 5 and 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is what over?

MRS. FRITZ: I think it's between 5 and 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What kind of time can you make it down Monday?

MR. FRIEDEL: I can't physically get here till almost 7 o'clock.

MR. BRUSEKER: How about Thursday?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I can't do it Thursday.

MR. FRIEDEL: Next week . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

MR. FRIEDEL: . . . other than Monday night it's literally a wipeout for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, can you do it at 10 o'clock on Monday morning?

MRS. FRITZ: Yup.

MR. FRIEDEL: No, I can't be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At all Monday?

MR. FRIEDEL: I have a Peace River commitment during the day Monday. The best I can do is get on a 5 o'clock plane and be here in this building by close to 7 o'clock.

MR. BRUSEKER: Tuesday and Wednesday I'm not here.

MR. FRIEDEL: What I was going to suggest, if we're not going to waste a whole bunch of time on this budget, which seems to be reasonably cut and dried, if we could do this in another 10 minutes – it's just a matter of refining the advertisement.

MR. BRUSEKER: Is someone coming in here?

MRS. SHUMYLA: I don't know. I had it booked till 6:30, but I don't see anybody coming in, so it's probably not booked.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm just as inclined to try and finish it off. If there's no one beating down the door . . .

MRS. FRITZ: Well, then I'm going to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, and put it on the table:

that the budget be approved as is.
Then you can make amendments. Okay? So let's go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: I didn't have any specific amendments that I wanted to put forward. The only question I guess that I had was with respect to the travel by committee. That, I take it, is for back and forth between Calgary and so on. You want us to keep this travel cost separate from other travel that we do back and forth; is that correct?

MRS. SHUMYLA: There is a provision for travel by the committee. We always base it on 100 percent attendance and on that in the event that you don't travel to attend something else. If you're traveling only to attend this committee meeting, there is a provision there to pay for it.

MR. BRUSEKER: I guess the point I'm getting at is that when it's recorded in Public Accounts a year from now, it just gets lumped under Bruseker travel in one year. It doesn't say travel for this committee or that committee or regular Legislature travel. I'm

just wondering why it's even here, because we can all travel back and forth anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, no. Some of us only have airfare once a week.

MR. BRUSEKER: And some of us only have 52 trips per year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, which is once a week.

MR. BRUSEKER: Then let's adopt the budget, and we're off.

MR. DOERKSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm sorry.

MR. DOERKSEN: . . . I think that the approval of the budget can wait. It doesn't have to be within a week. I think we can approve the budget at our next meeting. The more important budget, as far as I'm concerned, is the advertising budget. Is there any reason why it can't wait?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Diane agrees it can wait.

MRS. FRITZ: But there's a motion on the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, there is.

MRS. FRITZ: We said we would deal with it. The motion says that the budget be approved as is. If we're simply waiting for the advertising costs, we've approved that. I mean, that's in principle, so I would think we should move the budget as is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion we have to deal with.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay. Then I will debate the motion. I beg to differ. I hate being rushed through a decision because we have meetings to attend. I'd rather deal with it properly, and if it can wait, then let's let it wait. That's my suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion?

MR. FRIEDEL: Speaking to it, I think that all it is is a budget. The two main items are travel and the pay, which are basically automatic anyway. We're only going to use the amount of travel that is required, and the meeting attendance is as required anyway.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. Just a question again, if I may, on the travel expenses, the second line that says travel expenses, candidate interview expenses. Am I to infer from that that we would pay for candidates to fly from wherever they are to come here to be interviewed, or do they incur their own expenses?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's a question that Diane wanted to address.

MRS. SHUMYLA: Elizabeth may want to speak to that, but my understanding is that if we advertise for a candidate in the *Globe and Mail* and if a candidate from Toronto applies, we may be obligated to pay their interview expenses. You may wish to add to that.

MRS. HURLEY: In the preliminary interviews we would do telephone interviews rather than bring someone in. However, I

think if the committee is interested in one of the finalists, they would want to bring that individual in and pay the expenses associated with bringing them in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But that would be a committee decision when it comes; right?

MRS. HURLEY: At the time. That's right.

MR. BRUSEKER: We have no way of pinning that down until we get the actual résumés and the shortlist done, so there's no way of putting a figure in there anyway.

MR. FRIEDEL: That question mark will stay there, and no matter what we put in, it's going to be unknown.

MR. DOERKSEN: Mr. Chairman, the last time I ever approved a budget with question marks in it - I can't remember. I'm not sure why we would approve a budget with question marks in it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what do you suggest?

MR. DOERKSEN: . . . because then the sky's the limit, sir.

I'm suggesting that we leave it until we have some time to discuss it and talk about it thoroughly. Diane has said that there's no rush to approve the budget tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's okay.

MR. DOERKSEN: So let's leave it for the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've still got a motion here.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

Okay. What we'll try to do here is schedule the meeting for sometime before Christmas, probably not next week but the week after; okay?

Thank you, gentlemen and ladies.

[The meeting adjourned at 6:33 p.m.]

