

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[10:05 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I welcome you all to this next adventure. The last adventure of this sort, of course, was the search for the Ombudsman, and at that time we had Grant with us, a good friend of all of us. As we know, we and the staff all had not only a very interesting and challenging but a very warm time, as it developed. Ray, we welcome you in terms of the process as well. This is going to be not only a challenge but one that we have to somehow solve rather rapidly. As you know, the Chief Electoral Officer has submitted his resignation, to take effect at the end of July this year. He wants to take advantage of retirement while he still has his health. He has a pretty good pension plan from his occupation before he came to the Chief Electoral Officer position. We certainly wish him well.

Some of us, as members of the Legislative Offices Committee, have put in extra time working with each of the three officers. That was a program that sort of developed, and again Grant was a good supporter of that. That helped build up the relationship between the Legislative Assembly and the officers. Our going to visit their facilities has been very helpful as well. It gives us a better appreciation of the kind of pressures and stress under which they work, and perhaps they have a greater appreciation for some of the pressures and stress over here.

The time line has an additional factor in it. Hopefully, the spring sittings of the Legislature will pass the new legislation increasing from 79 to 83 the number of constituencies in the province. The Chief Electoral Officer needs to be in place for a very even transition before August 1, because the general enumeration of the province is slated to take place in September. So that puts real pressure on the committee as a whole, and I think it also means that we have to do the bulk of this work in session.

In terms of time line we might be able to get away with making an appointment around late June, but we'd have to have a proviso in our advertising that we want someone to be in place for August 1, if that is the decision of the committee. I think we're almost inevitably drawn into that.

That has another [inaudible] in addition to

the tight time line. Of course, gentlemen, we in government are on an economy drive. That means that there will be no payment for your time and expertise while we're in session, but I know all of you realized that in taking on the job.

Today we welcome Ann. She won the draw. She doesn't have to be our secretary all the time. Louise was assigned to the committee, but she's off sick at the moment.

When we had prior notification that the committee was going to be formed, because of the time line I put in the request through the minister of Personnel Administration, as we did in the past, that we second David McNeil. David, I'm sure you've met Ray. I know the rest of the committee, the previous committee, very much appreciated your help and that of your office in helping us select the new Ombudsman. I don't know whether that means you won or lost the draw at your office, but we're glad to have you with us too. We have a few agenda items that we'll have to deal with today. One of them is the matter of the job description discussion, advertising -- how soon we'll be able to get the advertising out, and the whole area of distribution of that advertising. In that regard, again with apologies to the committee, I requested David to pull from the file some of the background information relating to the Ombudsman search committee, to see how that might help us speed up the process here.

Lady and gentlemen, those are the few comments I can make. Would any of you like to make observations?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I think we're very fortunate to have gone through this process before with practically the same people. I think that will help us to speed it up to some degree. Have you had any communication at all with Ken? He's going to be here until August 1. He must be putting in place enumeration machinery and that type of thing. I can understand what you're getting at. If you can have somebody there to get a feel for the job for even a week or two while he's still there, it would be good. I think the committee can work at whatever speed is necessary to get the job done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In reply to your question, I

haven't had any contact with the Chief Electoral Officer. It's a good point, because it may well be that he's eligible for an additional month's holiday and may want to move out a month earlier. If that's the will of the committee, I'll catch up with him and see what his time line really is.

MR. MILLER: We can't do anything on the enumeration until such time as the new electoral divisions go through the Legislature. I guess we could do some planning, but not too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you'll remember that when the Legislative Offices Committee toured the Chief Electoral Officer's facility about a month ago, they were already doing some of the map drawing. They have to have that in place. It may well be that they've even had some of the people in to advise about poll distribution.

MR. MARTIN: My understanding of it, from the party perspective we're all interested in the administration because it's going to mean some changes. We have to bring a resolution into the Legislature to change it to May 1 from March 1. But in talking to the office, it was their understanding that this would all be completed by May 1 so that we would have official boundaries. I don't know if that's true or not, but that's my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be the time line on the legislation, to make sure each proposed constituency is indeed recognized.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Certainly we should start advertising as soon as possible, Mr. Chairman. David, have you any ideas as to how the ad should read?

DR. McNEIL: I have a proposal here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First, any other general comments?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would make one suggestion, that we move as quickly as possible regardless of August 1. If we can complete it in June, great. The time line is such that we can't hedge on that deadline. We

must move as quickly as we can. If we do get things in place, fine; it's to our advantage. If we don't, we're going to be pressed for time in the summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that regard, I think we may well discover that we're going to have to have evening meetings or -- who knows? -- even breakfast meetings. I think we're going to find ourselves having to take some time out of the House, and as in the previous committee that makes it difficult for you in terms of your membership. We'll set our times to accommodate you.

MR. MARTIN: Can I just get an idea? I would think what takes the bulk of the time is after you start to get the applications. After we start advertising, from your experience with the Ombudsman, when did it start to get more demanding? I remember Grant spent a fair amount of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, do you want to pick up on that?

DR. McNEIL: There are two phases. The last time around, in the screening phase my assistant and I went through the applications and screened them into three categories: those that really seemed to fit the bill, those who were on the margin, and those who were outright not suitable. The committee got together two or three times in that period when the applications were coming in and spent a couple of hours in each instance reviewing those applications.

MR. MARTIN: So they got a copy of them ahead?

DR. McNEIL: They got a copy of them ahead and had the opportunity to review them and come to the meeting and say, "Yes, we agree with these people being considered further, and we think we should add this person." That probably took two or three meetings.

MR. MARTIN: That would have been how long after advertising?

DR. McNEIL: That started about two or three weeks after the advertising started.

MR. THOMPSON: Are we going to do what we did with the Ombudsman, advertise all across Canada on this, or are we going to restrict it to some degree? We had oodles of time the other time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of our problems last time was that we got messed up waiting for the advertising agency to get a proper ad in. Again, I guess we can shorten that process.

DR. McNEIL: We could have an ad in, probably not this weekend but next weekend.

MR. MARTIN: I would think, John, that there may be people in other governments that we'd want to take a look at, because they may have some great experience in New Brunswick or wherever. To limit it -- this is an extremely important job. As long as it's not creating problems . . .

DR. McNEIL: I guess there's another approach, and that would be to contact the electoral offices in each province and send them the information that this opportunity is available -- then you could focus in -- rather than advertising, for example, in the Globe and Mail. Again, it's just a question of how broad a scope you want to have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is perhaps part of your information, David. Last time, we ran the ad once in every major newspaper in Canada. Then we also put it in every major newspaper and weekly in the province. I think we also gave a longer time line to apply, and that's one of the things we might have to shorten.

DR. McNEIL: I think there were about six weeks over which we accepted applications, which is a fairly long period of time. Typically, for executive-level jobs we're usually talking about three weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did we also send spot information to various interested parties across the country, as you had mentioned with the chief electoral offices?

DR. McNEIL: Yes, we did that. We also contacted some women's groups and sent the information to them because there was a special focus to see if there were women

interested in the role.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Keeping those things in mind, could we hear what you have outlined?

DR. McNEIL: It's just a proposal in terms of the recruitment phase, recruitment advertising, and direct source. My recommendation would be, given the short time lines, to restrict the advertising to the major Alberta dailies. There is a question of whether you want to hit the weeklies.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the only reason you're suggesting limiting it to Albertans is the time line?

DR. McNEIL: It's not strictly that. I think it's a question, too, of whether or not a non-Albertan would have a sense of provincial politics to assist him in this kind of role.

MR. MILLER: Ken Wark wasn't an Albertan.

DR. McNEIL: No, but he had been living in the province.

MR. MARTIN: Frankly, I think that might be one of the considerations when we get down to a narrow list, but there's a lot of expertise around, perhaps in some other areas. Maybe we don't have to do it in every major daily because of the cost. These types of people might generally look at the Globe and Mail, for example, as the most national newspaper. Maybe we don't have to do it in every paper. I would not want to make that a criterion before we start.

MR. MILLER: It could be one of the things that we look at when we get down to the short list.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I support the notion of expanding the advertising somewhat, on a limited basis. If you haven't done it, there's always that feeling, what if? The suggestion here puts a focus on it. That focus should come at the next stage when we're actually dealing with the candidates and making a selection. I think we should pick some truly national papers that could highlight the advertising. Coupled with the direct sourcing of candidates through chief electoral officers in other provinces, I think we as a committee

would feel much more assured that we'd given the broad perspective to the recruitment and could then move on quickly with the deadline so that we can get the job done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. John, how do you feel about that?

MR. THOMPSON: To some degree, but we were in Newfoundland and New Brunswick last time, and with due respect, I don't know if we got too much response. To me it really was an exercise that we were just doing, but I don't know if it paid off that much. I think we should do some extraprovincial advertising, but I'm not prepared to say how far to go along those lines.

MR. HIEBERT: The proviso I wanted on there, Mr. Chairman, is that we don't want to set up some false expectations by blanketing the rest of Canada, but we need to do some.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As Ray suggested, the Globe and Mail, for example, seems to turn up in nearly every office across the country, and we could certainly put an ad in there. We may decide to do that on a one-time occasion. We could do a one-time occasion for all these Alberta papers, plus the Globe and Mail. Would that do it?

MR. MILLER: Maybe a paper in British Columbia and in Ottawa.

MR. THOMPSON: And possibly in Manitoba and Saskatchewan too.

MR. MILLER: The western provinces.

DR. McNEIL: So the major dailies in western Canada.

MR. MARTIN: I guess the Ottawa Journal is the main one, and the Globe. Could I suggest -- you're doing it to the electoral offices, but I imagine you'd send it to all the government personnel administration offices too. There might be somebody outside the electoral area with some talent. Or is that a common procedure?

DR. McNEIL: That's not a common procedure. We could send it to the public service commissions in each province.

MR. MARTIN: I don't think we could lose by that. It wouldn't cost any money.

DR. McNEIL: We could request that they distribute it as appropriate and leave it up to them to decide where.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I take this as a consensus? Hopefully someone will make a motion to the effect that we agree to send the ad to the Alberta papers listed, and in addition, outside the province we'll deal with the Globe and Mail, the paper in British Columbia that has the largest circulation, the same in Ottawa and Manitoba, and in Saskatchewan we could probably deal with both Saskatoon and Regina.

DR. McNEIL: You might want to put it in both Victoria and Vancouver.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I move that we move with a three-tiered advertising campaign: first, the dailies in Alberta; secondly, the western Canada dailies; and thirdly, the national scope, through Ottawa and, let's say, a paper such as the Globe and Mail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A seconder to that? Ray.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Lloydminster Times is a daily newspaper. I don't know of any others.

MR. MARTIN: I was trying to think of that myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll add Lloydminster. All those in favor? The motion is carried unanimously. Thank you.

In addition to that, the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition in respect of the public service commissions across the country and the offices of the chief electoral officers, including the federal electoral officer. Are you agreed on that one?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's sort of taking us off into the next section, but carry on, sir.

DR. McNEIL: I was wondering if there was any other direct sourcing.

MR. MARTIN: The other one we talked about was the weeklies.

DR. McNEIL: Was there a question as to whether or not we wanted to hit the weeklies?

MR. THOMPSON: I personally think that the type of person we want for this job, if he's in Alberta, is going to read some kind of daily paper. I'm saying this as a rural man. If a person doesn't read a daily paper in Alberta -- I just don't think we should bother with the weeklies, unless you think, from a political point of view, that they'll feel discriminated against.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One other place we did was the Alberta Report.

MR. THOMPSON: Did we do that last time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That might be the way. Does that deal with the rural . .

MR. THOMPSON: I can assure you then that we'll be spread across the Cardston constituency. That's their Bible.

MR. MARTIN: And spread across Spirit River-Fairview and other areas too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I take it that the consensus is that we do the Alberta Report, and that looks after the matter? Okay. Moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Miller. All in favor? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Direct sourcing.

DR. McNEIL: You've suggested the chief electoral offices, the public service commissions. As last time, individual members may have individuals they want to contact. I think the last time it was suggested that if that is the case, we can hand those individuals a copy of the position profile and the advertisement, rather than sending out formal letters of any type, so as not to create any false expectations among the individuals.

The question of female candidates: my thought was that it may be useful to go through the Women's Secretariat for their suggestions or to provide them with some information on the position, and they can decide what they want to do with that information.

MR. THOMPSON: David, how did we handle that last time?

DR. McNEIL: Last time, we had a list of women's groups, and we just sent a letter with a number of copies of the profile to each of those groups, saying, "Here's an opportunity you may wish to make your members aware of." My analysis of the information suggested that there were very few. I thought the secretariat might be a useful vehicle to use this time; it wasn't in place the last time.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the only point I make on that is that because the two selections are being made so close together, I think we should use the same process. If we don't, we're going to have somebody say: "Hey, last time you contacted us; this time you didn't. Why not?" If it had been three, four, or five years, then change it. But this is within a year, and I'm sure some people will notice that you're going a different route. Probably it's just as well to go the same route. That's my feeling.

MR. MILLER: I'm not too sure that we aren't putting out an air of expectation when we contact these special ladies' groups. From our experience last time we did it, I think it would be fair to say that we bent over backwards to make sure that the ladies were given every consideration. When you're asking for a person to fill this position, regardless of whether they're male or female, I think they're going to be looking at the same papers. I'm not sure we should be selecting them out as a group.

MR. MARTIN: Maybe we can tie a couple of things in. Your suggestion of the Women's Secretariat is appropriate. Their problem is that I don't think they have that big a budget. So maybe if we wanted to do it through them, that they make a special -- it's probably part of their mandate to women's groups to know about it. Perhaps we could leave them some of the advertising budget money you were talking about that we spent last time and have them do it. Then it's up to the Women's Secretariat to counter your point about high expectations, but those groups are still getting the information, as last time. It's just coming from a different source. I suggest that as a compromise.

MR. HIEBERT: I favour Bud's position. I don't

think we should be highlighting a special group. I realize we have the difficulty of the inconsistency, but it's a job and it's available to all. That's how I view it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we look for a moment at the suggested advertisement, as built upon the Ombudsman ad that went out, maybe it gets dealt with there in paragraph four, "The CEO carries out his/her duties through the management . . . If we agree with that wording, which I think is probably a good way to go, then the message is going to be out there with the advertisement. Again, in respect to whichever women's groups we contacted previously, it may well be that we could have David or the secretary pick up the phone and let them know that ad is going to be there and that we've opted this time round to do it this way, or whatever you decide.

This is off the record now. [Not recorded]

. . . a little sexual bias when you stop to think that most of the electoral officers in the province are female. With Ken Wark leaving, the word will be out through the system. In fact, I've already had feedback along that line.

What's the pleasure of the committee? Are you going to move now, or do you want to think about it a little longer?

MR. MARTIN: Rather than have a stalemate over this, why don't we let the secretariat know, as he says, and I'm sure they will do their job.

DR. McNEIL: I could send just a copy of the profile and the ad, saying, "You may wish to advise "

MR. THOMPSON: I would like to do it for two reasons: one, we did it last time, which is a very poor reason but it makes sense under the circumstances; secondly, some of these ladies that read the paper won't think about applying, just from a mind-set, whereas if something comes through their own organizations, they may very well give it another thought. From that point of view, I really think we should communicate some way. What you're saying here is fine by me, but because we did it last time, I do think we are obligated to some degree. If not, some of us are sure going to be making explanations of why we didn't.

DR. McNEIL: One thing I should note is that last time, we got the names and addresses of these groups from the Women's Bureau. So in terms of their contacting them versus our contacting them, I think it would be the same set of groups.

MR. THOMPSON: It may very well be, David, but it gives them a little more clout if they're the ones who pushed it out instead of the committee.

MR. MARTIN: I move that we give the information to the secretariat and they handle it appropriately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secunder? John Thompson. All those in favor? Opposed? There being none opposed, it is carried. Thank you.

Let's take a few minutes to read this.

DR. McNEIL: This ad is based on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; I need a couple more minutes. I'm a speed reader but not that fast.

MR. MARTIN: There's only one thing. I take it that we would tighten that up.

DR. McNEIL: That should be "early summer", or we could put in a specific date if we want to have a closing date on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If you want to give the background on it, David, then we'll start picking at it.

DR. McNEIL: This ad is based on the ad the last time around, plus looking at how we wrote the ad for the Ombudsman. So it's sort of a combination of the two. That was the ad the last time, if you remember. The thing that was highlighted the last time around was establishing the office under the new legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was 1977?

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. HIEBERT: May I suggest that the use of CEO be bracketed somewhere when you have the full thing written out? Whether it's in the

title or the first paragraph really doesn't matter. So that it doesn't stand off all of a sudden by itself, let it follow after you first identify.

MR. THOMPSON: That fifth paragraph sounds to me to be pretty restrictive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, may we do it one paragraph at a time.

MR. THOMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we go through it once, that means we can come back again later. Let's just go quickly through it one paragraph at a time. We've picked up Al's comment to fit into that first paragraph rather than in the title.

Paragraph 2. And reports annually to the Legislature: does that need to show up anywhere? Note that as a question for later.

Does anything leap out at you from paragraph 3? It might be there or later that we pick up that thing about the annual report, and we might put in a phrase about having a relationship with Legislative Offices Committee. They assume it's full-time, don't they? One should assume it's full-time. Some provinces don't.

MR. MARTIN: Is that right? Well, we'd better put it in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we should think about that being inserted at some stage.

John Thompson, paragraph 5.

MR. THOMPSON: I made my pitch. It may be that it's preferable, but I think it is restrictive. In addition to a background in general management or law or accounting, we start listing things down here: proven managerial and administrative skills. Mr. Chairman, do you feel that it is necessary that the Chief Electoral Officer have a background in law or accounting?

MR. MARTIN: Law and accounting are so different.

MR. THOMPSON: It's either/or.

MR. MILLER: Following up on John's point, suppose the fellow that's assistant to Ken Wark

right now makes application, and he hasn't got a background in this. He would be a strong candidate for the position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't preclude them because they don't have law or accounting or whatever.

DR. McNEIL: I think "general management" might capture a lot of other people.

MR. MILLER: Yes, I guess you're right.

DR. McNEIL: This first part was in the last ad; that's why it's here. We may be talking about a little different focus now. It was sort of developing the systems last time: the accounting, the financial contributions system, and all that stuff. There was a focus on the accounting aspect last time, which may not need to be there this time.

MR. MARTIN: I was involved as the provincial secretary of the NDP at the time it went through. Bob Giffin was there, and [inaudible] the Social Credit. Of course a whole process was developed afterwards with the administrative part of the party. It seems to me that it is different; he has a staff now. I expect the staff has certain expertise; that's why he hired them. Of course we all agree with the general management, but when you say "or law or accounting," law and accounting are so dead different that it doesn't make much sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see what you're driving at, but I know too many lawyers who seem to be accountants first and lawyers second.

MR. HIEBERT: I think we know what we're saying when we say some background in law or accounting. We're not necessarily looking for law degrees or chartered accountants.

MR. MARTIN: That's right.

MR. HIEBERT: I think the job really entails a person that has good managerial and organizational skills and, secondly, is reliable in following through, because there is a lot of detail, deadline, and that type of thing. How many people can have tremendous background in law or accounting and never meet a deadline or never come through? So there are some very

definite human characteristics required, and I think that's why we're having difficulty with the description.

MR. MARTIN: I guess what I'm saying is that it might look like you should have some law and some accounting courses, and there are not very many people who have both.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, one point is that this is an ad that we're putting out. When it comes right down to it, I think people will be discouraged if you have in there that you either have to be a lawyer or an accountant or have a background in that. I wouldn't want some good candidates not to bother to apply just over the wording of the ad.

MR. MARTIN: We can do all the things you're talking about later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. You have the details. The specific focus happens after that colon.

DR. McNEIL: So you could take out "or law or accounting," knock off that whole first part of paragraph 5, and just say, "It is desirable that candidates possess . . ." General management is really included under "proven managerial and administrative skills and experience."

MR. MARTIN: The law or accounting may give them an advantage when we start to go through it.

MR. MILLER: That's further down the road.

DR. McNEIL: One of the reasons for that appearing there last time was the fact that we were appealing to lawyers and accountants, especially accountants, given the state of the office at the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My reading of our consensus is that we're taking off that first sentence and putting in a capital I: "It is desirable that candidates possess . . ." and then we're going to deal with the next seven points.

MR. MARTIN: We cover the law and accounting in a general sense later, because we put "knowledge of financial practices and procedures" and for the law experience

"interpreting legislation". So we're covering that in a general sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do any of you feel you qualify for "a firm grasp of provincial politics"? It's so elusive; it's like mercury.

MR. HIEBERT: Wanagas might apply.

MR. MILLER: What about knowledge of Alberta, the geography aspect?

DR. McNEIL: For the Ombudsman we had "knowledge of Alberta and its people."

MR. CHAIRMAN: It could be a former Alberta resident living in Timbuktu who applies for the job, as long as he has the knowledge. If they get down to our short-list procedure, it's one of the things we weigh at that time.

MR. MARTIN: It's not entirely a firm grasp of provincial politics; it's not precisely what you're talking about, but it relates.

MR. MILLER: What I'm thinking about is rural Alberta.

MR. MARTIN: Where you put a boundary.

MR. MILLER: Yes, or where is -- I was going to use Kitscoty, but everybody knows where Kitscoty is.

MR. MARTIN: Not many Albertans know the province either.

MR. MILLER: They have a general idea, though. They say, "Well, it's 20 miles from such and such a place."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that instead of "a firm grasp of provincial politics," we're really looking more in the direction of a phrase like we used for the previous Ombudsman ad?

MR. THOMPSON: I would prefer it.

MR. MILLER: I think you need both.

MR. HIEBERT: I agree. We should change that, because it seems to taint it as being a highly political matter. While the person should have that background, know what's going on, I don't

think we should highlight it in that way.

MR. MARTIN: Knowledge of Alberta's geography and history: I suppose history ties into politics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, would you like to reread what that other one was from the Ombudsman?

DR. McNEIL: Yes. We had "knowledge of Alberta and its people."

MR. HIEBERT: Do you want this back?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next meeting is at the call of the Chair, fairly soon.

MR. HIEBERT: Yes, but I have this appointment; I'm going to have to run upstairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for changing that for us.

MR. MARTIN: I suggest that we replace "a firm grasp of provincial politics" with what you had in the Ombudsman ad.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We seem to have agreement on the "proven managerial and administrative skills and experience."

DR. McNEIL: Maybe we can take "experience" out of there, since having "proven" there makes "experience" redundant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Knowledge of financial practices and procedures," then our Alberta insert. "Experience in interpreting legislation."

MR. MARTIN: How about changing "experience", because that has certain connotations to ability. That way, somebody doesn't have to have the experience, but it's still an important thing.

DR. McNEIL: Ability to interpret?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Agreed?
Ability to conduct an inquiry.

MR. MARTIN: Common sense — that lets most everybody out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Strong communication and interpersonal skills. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next thing is where we ask all things of all people.

MR. MARTIN: A superperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any additional ones? That probably tells it all.

DR. McNEIL: In our definition of managerial and administrative skills, we have about 18 dimensions that we assess people against. You want to make it concise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we want to prioritize any of those? Are you happy with that, or do you want to put common sense, or anything else, at the top?

MR. MARTIN: They're fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're happy with the way they are? I see the nodding up and down. I assume we have a consensus. We'll take the list the way it is.

We'll move on to "term".

MR. MARTIN: Is there a minimum? That might scare people. If they get the job and then it comes [inaudible].

DR. McNEIL: The way the legislation reads, they're subject to reappointment one year after the election.

MR. MARTIN: Which is different from . . .

DR. McNEIL: With people anticipating an election, I don't think you want to put that in

your ad. That's what we put in last time, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Subject to reappointment by the Legislature."

DR. McNEIL: The Act reads:

The Chief Electoral Officer is subject to reappointment by the legislature. The appointment expires 12 months after polling day for a general election unless he/she is reappointed prior to that date by a Special Committee of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This may be all right, because remember that in addition to this ad anyone who wants to apply immediately gets sent a package from the Clerk's office.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. I don't think most people would be that nervous about it that they [inaudible] two month job.

MR. McNEIL: I think you can point to Ken Wark too. He was appointed in '77, and he's retiring in '85. There have been two or three elections since then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay on the term portion? Salary. Presently he's being paid what?

MR. THOMPSON: It's \$64,000, isn't it?

MR. MARTIN: There's probably a minimum. Is there no guide at all, like a minimum and maximum?

DR. McNEIL: I don't think you've placed those positions into any particular salary grid, have you? It's not mapped on the senior officials' grid or anything like that, at least from my understanding the last time around.

MR. MILLER: I think that's right, but I can't remember just how his salary was arrived at.

DR. McNEIL: For the Ombudsman it was a question of equity with the Chief Electoral Officer more than anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a contract basis?

DR. McNEIL: That was an issue there. We went to a contract to handle Brian Sawyer's

expectations.

MR. MARTIN: There's nothing else you can put.

MR. MILLER: That statement is all right.

MR. MARTIN: But for our own purposes, if a person asks us the question . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll do some follow-up checking.

MR. THOMPSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, but I honestly think that if we're going to get quite a few answers, we have to be a little more specific in this area. Somebody doesn't want a job for \$30,000 a year if he . . .

DR. McNEIL: If somebody phoned and asked me, I'd say we're talking in the \$50,000 to \$60,000 range.

MR. MARTIN: May I make a suggestion? We don't have to decide today. David, you said you were going to follow up. Between the two of you, maybe you can come back to the next meeting with recommendations, after you've found out the history on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a pretty spotty history. Nevertheless, we'll figure out where it is and what the comparable position is.

DR. McNEIL: My recommendation would be not to put a specific salary in the ad anyway, but in terms of the committee, I appreciate that . . .

MR. MARTIN: Oh, no. But before we start interviewing, we'd better have an idea because that's one . . .

MR. THOMPSON: I'm sure we will.

MR. MILLER: What did we have on the Ombudsman in that regard?

DR. McNEIL: I think we negotiated. "Salary is dependent on qualifications and experience."

MR. THOMPSON: Well, that's good enough. We got 450 applications with that, so I guess that's plenty to work with. Really, Mr. Chairman, we keep horsing around with this thing, and we could be here a couple more weeks deciding

what the ad is going to be. Speed is essential.

DR. McNEIL: Yes, you're right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That part is cleared. Early applications: let's give ourselves a deadline.

MR. MARTIN: I suggest going back to what he said was usual executive procedures in the private sector: three weeks after the ad has hit.

MR. MILLER: That would be approximately May 15.

DR. McNEIL: If we got the ad in sooner than that . . . I would say the end of April if we get the ad in next weekend.

MR. MILLER: Next weekend is the first of April.

DR. McNEIL: You had probably best put May 1 or April 30, or whatever is the last Friday of April.

MR. MILLER: That's if we can do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's figure the time line for a moment.

MR. MARTIN: The key is when the advertising can be out. Would you say that it can all be done by April 1? That's a Monday. It would be completed that weekend. Is that right?

DR. McNEIL: I think we have to get it in then, because I don't think we want to advertise Easter weekend, which is the next weekend and which would put us two weeks from there. So I would say the end of April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three weeks from there is April 21. Then remember the applications. You have to do all that culling before we have at it.

DR. McNEIL: I'd suggest another week after that -- probably April 26.

MR. MARTIN: The 26th is a Friday. Is that the best time?

DR. McNEIL: That's typical.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's going to give us five working weeks to the end of the House.

MR. MARTIN: I move that we set the deadline for April 26.

MR. MILLER: Agreed. I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

DR. McNEIL: We'll put in April 26 as the closing date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion? It is carried unanimously. David, you can put here . . .

DR. McNEIL: "Please address resumes or inquiries to . . .", rather than what I've got there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What have you got there? Don't send them to the chairman. What have we got on the previous ad?

DR. McNEIL: We said, "please address resumes or inquiries to Chairman, Ombudsman Selection Committee, Room 313."

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's all right. That meant that all the mail was opened by Peggy.

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in this case it would be the chairman of the Chief Electoral Officer Selection Committee.

DR. McNEIL: Is that the title of it, Chief Electoral Officer Selection Committee?

MR. MILLER: At the paragraph before, David, we changed "late" to "early" summer. Is that not correct?

DR. McNEIL: Yes. I think we are going to take that whole thing out and just say, "closing date April 26, 1985," so it's very specific.

MR. MILLER: Oh, I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we should put in there -- and we will, after we talk to Ken Wark. The effective date for the new officer taking his

responsibilities is August 1. That should appear, so they all know right up front that we're not going to hire somebody and then have them say: "Gee, I need to have the month of August as a holiday."

DR. McNEEL: Do you want to put, "date of appointment, August 1"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The appointment date might be earlier, but the effective date. That part of the ad is subject to my talking to Ken Wark to make sure he's not going to take a month's holiday ahead of time and leave us with a hung jury.

Then we have the other information at the bottom of the page.

MR. THOMPSON: I would love to delete the bottom of the page. We had all the members of the committee on the ad, and I got telephone calls and everything else. I don't know how the rest of the committee feels, but to me it was probably the only bad thing we did last time around. All these so-called friends were wanting me to give them special consideration and the whole bit. I personally would just love to see that selection committee left off. I don't know how the rest of you feel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bud, you were the other one who was involved last time.

MR. MILLER: I didn't have very many calls, but I know Grant had some calls. I don't know if he discussed it with you or not, Ray.

MR. MARTIN: I knew of some, but I don't know how many.

MR. MILLER: I didn't have too many.

MR. THOMPSON: I probably had a dozen or 15. I'd just as soon not have them. I really don't see that this is an asset, because you have to be very diplomatic. Then when they don't get the job, they're on your back. Mr. Chairman, if you can explain to me why we put that on there, fine; but it caused me trouble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I apologize for your having had trouble. Any guy that lives in spring, summer, fall, and winter coulee doesn't deserve to have any trouble whatsoever.

MR. THOMPSON: He's got enough trouble as it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think what happened last time . . . I know Grant mentioned that he had a couple of calls on that. He just sort of smiled and said, "But it's nice to be able to say that it's the committee that makes the decision." He found that in the previous committee, decisions weren't being made on any narrow, political bias. But it allowed him a chance to put it into the pot.

What it did is show the general public — again, those in Alberta who are knowledgeable — that this is not simply a PC committee, even though it looks like it's a PC committee in one sense. But it shows that there's one member of the opposition on there. I think Grant might have made the comment to me that that then showed that there was a little balancing there. A number of people out there, in their understandable naivety, just assume it's the government, when it's slightly different.

MR. MARTIN: My own assessment is that I can understand John's, because I'm sure I will perhaps get more than some of the others. Well, you did last time because of that. One of the things we've tried to do — and I've said in Public Accounts and other committees that committees are very different from the Legislature. Perhaps that's an educational process for people to begin with, because they think all we do is fight in the Legislature. There are different aspects to MLAs' work. In that sense maybe it's an education, but I can live with it either way.

MR. THOMPSON: I won't dwell on it, because actually you made a very valid point, Mr. Chairman. It is a selection committee; it is nonpolitical. I think that is very important. I learned how to fend them off last time. I suspect I can continue.

MR. MARTIN: Maybe it will be the same people calling . . .

MR. THOMPSON: Oh, it will.

MR. MARTIN: . . . saying, "You screwed me up last time."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only this time you'll

probably have Grant's previous people phoning you as well. He may well have said, "Now, the guy to call is John Thompson." You can do an analysis.

All right, one other thing here. I'd really rather that we just take the position profile away and look at it and come back in a few days on that part of it. We don't have any immediacy about that one.

DR. McNEIL: This is the ad as it appeared last time for the Ombudsman, and I recommend it. I think it had a pretty solid look; it's simple, with the logo at the bottom. I suggest that we go with that.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that regard, we still have to deal with an advertising agency. Does the committee have any preferences there? I'd really like to just pick up and get going with one.

DR. McNEIL: We have a new agency, and we can get turnaround, an approved copy of the ad, tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could leave it to the discretion of the chairman and vice-chairman? Would someone be prepared to move that?

MR. THOMPSON: I will, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thompson, seconded by Mr. Martin. All those in favour? Carried unanimously. All right, then if we get this together, we can make sure it's going to get out there before April 1.

Does that pretty well look after it for today's agenda? We have a couple of questions that need to be asked, as I've noted: the switchover time for Ken Wark, and then follow up on the salary grid, so we know where we're at, even though that does not affect where we are with respect to the ad.

DR. McNEIL: I would like the committee's permission to talk to Ken to get a little better feel for the job, given that we'd probably do preliminary interviews, like we did last time. It would be useful to fill in some blanks in this position profile that we drafted, as well as get a

better feel for the kinds of issues that are to be addressed by the new person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's logical. We might as well make it a motion. Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Miller. All those in favour? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

If you want to wait until I speak to Ken . . . Actually, perhaps you can come over to my office and we can make that call, catch up to him, and pick up on that.

As mentioned earlier, it may well be that we have to meet during supper time, or whatever. Is there one day of the week that's a bit better for you than others? They're all bad.

MR. MARTIN: When are we looking at next meeting? Will it be at the call of the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope . . .

MR. MARTIN: We can't do much now until after April.

DR. McNEIL: The only thing I would like to have completed is this profile, so we can get it printed up and sent out when the applications start to come in, which would be the end of the first week in April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ray, what's happening in Public Accounts? Are you still chairing that?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, but we haven't got the names yet, so I haven't set any meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there's nothing set up for a little while.

MR. MARTIN: No, it would be unlikely . . . Until I get the names, it's hard to set it up. I guess it probably would start on the 27th or the 3rd — a quick meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you weren't going to have Public Accounts on the 27th, maybe we could slot in there. That would give us a chance to get . . .

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'll say I'll start Public Accounts on the 3rd, then, because we'll probably be rushing it by the time I get the names.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we could spend a good chunk of that morning working through this. Hopefully you will have had your meeting with Wark by then, to see whatever differences could take place.

MR. MARTIN: Ten o'clock?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever.

MR. MARTIN: It's convenient for me, because I usually have a meeting with my staff at 9:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, 10 o'clock next Wednesday morning, the 27th, at a location to be determined. Well, that would be great. That works us through most of the preliminary stuff that can be done, and then we probably don't need to meet for some time.

Any other items of business?

MR. MILLER: I move we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please stand. Thank you very much. Thank you, Ann, for supplying the coffee.

[The committee adjourned at 11:12 a.m.]