

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[10:50 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. The first thing we can do is have some motions to deal with the minutes of the previous meetings. [Inaudible] In terms of the process, when we get to names I'll entertain a motion to go in camera.

I know you received your minutes of March 4 and read them diligently. There are no difficulties there. March 4 was the organizational day, where we agreed to the ads. May I have a motion to adopt the minutes of March 4 as circulated?

MR. HIEBERT: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Agreed unanimously. Thank you.

With respect to March 27, a number of issues came up that we'll address in the next little while. We reviewed the cost of the ad, gave final approval to the publication of the ad, and asked for some information with respect to the Chief Electoral Officer position in other provinces. We have some information on that. We made a request with regard to the salary range, and we have that. We also raised the matter of whether a contract might be entered into with respect to the Chief Electoral Officer. That pretty well highlights what is in the set of minutes of the 27th. Any questions with respect to the printing of the minutes? Would someone move the adoption as circulated?

MR. MARTIN: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ray. All those in favour, please signify. Carried unanimously. Thank you.

There's the information that was sent to us by the Chief Electoral Officer regarding positions in other provinces. Does everyone have a copy in front of them? Unless you determine otherwise, I think we'll just take this as information so we have a chance to scan it for one of our next meetings to see how that really relates to ours. David, did you have a chance to look through this?

DR. McNEIL: No, I just received it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The documentation behind is some additional material sent over with respect to the financial aspects. The summary page is the bare bones of all the jurisdictions. We'll come back to that another day. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is the salary range. Do you wish to make some comments in regard to that, David, since you've looked at it?

DR. McNEIL: The only observation I could make is that the ranges are all over the map. I haven't made any relationship between the salaries and the size or anything since we just have this data, but I suspect there must be some. Mr. Wark's salary is now about \$65,000, so you can see where that fits in here. He would be within Ontario's range and in Canada's and Quebec's range, but outside the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You certainly can see why we have an applicant from British Columbia. In searching for this information, did you determine whether they were full-time or part-time? I think that's where the watershed lies as to these salary ranges.

DR. McNEIL: It would be a good idea do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You could probably get back to Ken Wark with respect to that. You're right; it is all over the place. It's interesting that la belle province . . .

MR. HIEBERT: Quebec has its usual status.

DR. McNEIL: If you look at the number of staff in Quebec . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Consider the MNAs.

MR. THOMPSON: They're more than double anybody else -- triple.

DR. McNEIL: 163 staff in Quebec, 50 in the federal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sounds like we should go to Quebec City to investigate the operation. Isn't it something.

MR. HIEBERT: And probably paid by Ottawa.

DR. McNEIL: We talked off the tops of our heads last time about the salary ranges for deputy ministers and senior officials. The Chief Electoral Officer might fit into salary range 3 or 4 in the deputy ministers' and senior officials' grid. Salary range 3 is \$52,000 to \$66,000 and does not include a car. Salary range 4 is \$57,000 to \$71,600 and does include a car.

MR. MARTIN: Does Mr. Wark have a car now?

DR. McNEIL: Yes, Mr. Wark does have a car now. For example, the chairman of the Alberta Dairy Control Board, members of the Liquor Control Board, the chairman of the Alberta Racing Commission, the chairman of the Motor Transport Board, members of the Public Utilities Board, and the managing director of Alberta Disaster Services are in salary range 3. The Agent General, the chairman of the Ag Development Corporation, the executive director of AADAC, the chairman of Alberta Oil Sands Equity, the deputy minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and the deputy minister of Culture are in salary range 4. That gives a feel for the level, the kinds of positions that are in those levels.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we give that to Louise and have it copied for all members?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, to David. When I look at B.C., I notice that it's October '81 and Saskatchewan is April '83, so there's a chance that those have been increased since.

DR. McNEIL: Those are the existing salaries. This is when they were last adjusted. B.C. has been at that since.

MR. MILLER: What are you telling people if they inquire what the job pays? How do you respond?

DR. McNEIL: I haven't dealt with any questions to that effect to this point. Maybe you've had a few, Louise.

MRS. EMPSON: I told them that it's in the executive salary range 1, from \$47,000 to \$62,000, and that it's under review. I've had a couple of calls on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Along that line, I mentioned it to Lou Hyndman, and he thinks we could have a bit of room to manoeuvre if we felt we needed it.

MR. MARTIN: Are you suggesting that we sort of leave it flexible, or should we try to nail down a range, following some sort of logic? I always get a little nervous when you don't know where to begin. It seems to me that we should be trying to put the person into one of those categories we already have in government. Don't you think so?

MR. THOMPSON: They're an officer of the Legislature, not a civil servant.

MR. MARTIN: I recognize that.

MR. THOMPSON: We can use it as a guide or measurement, but I certainly wouldn't want to be . . .

MR. MARTIN: I'm not saying that, but some sort of guide to salary because it's so open-ended. Where do you start and where do you stop? It makes our job harder too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest to members that if we can get this zeroxed this morning so you have it to take away with you, it would be one of our agenda items when we meet next Wednesday. In the meantime, we're not going to . . . Have you started to do your [inaudible]. Wednesday gives us sufficient time past the deadline to decide that's when we're going to cut it off. If we take this document with us, we can add that to the agenda. You can also find out if they're full- or part-time positions or if they do other jobs in addition. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the bill for advertising that came in, did you total that figure?

DR. McNEIL: \$12,935.48, which is about \$3,000 under the estimate we had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that will pay for your lunch today.

DR. McNEIL: They made an error in the estimate. They didn't take account of the special the Globe and Mail has for advertising, so that knocked it down by a fairly significant amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, would you like to refresh our memories by reading the names of the cities or papers where it was carried?

DR. McNEIL: The Alberta Report, the Calgary Herald, the Calgary Sun, the Edmonton Journal, the Edmonton Sun, Fort McMurray Today, the Grande Prairie Herald Tribune, the Lethbridge Herald, the Lloydminster Times, the Medicine Hat News, the Ottawa Citizen, the Red Deer Advocate, the Regina Leader Post, the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, the Globe and Mail twice, the Vancouver Sun and the Province, the Victoria Times, and the Winnipeg Free Press.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's great to save money. A number of the letters I've scanned referred to the Globe and Mail.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, to David. Do we have a better cross section from across the country than we did for our Ombudsman? We had some outside, but the majority were from inside the province of Alberta. Just off the top of your head, David, would you say they're still about the same ratio?

DR. McNEIL: Off the top of my head, I would. We have 125 applications this time, and 78 are from Alberta. I guess that's about 80 percent.

MR. THOMPSON: It's probably about the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to give the breakdown as to the number of female applicants?

DR. McNEIL: We've got eight female applicants to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So 125, 78 from within the province, and eight females.

One item I should seek the advice of the committee on. As I recollect from our previous committee to search for an Ombudsman, we agreed that any comments with respect to the search committee would be channelled through the chairman. Is that what you wish to do this

time, in the hope that the chairman will keep his mouth shut until there's an announcement?

MR. MARTIN: You mean with the media and that? That makes sense.

MR. HIEBERT: I concur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't really see this being such a hot news item, not as long as they keep spilling PCBs all over.

MR. MARTIN: David, I promise that anything that comes to me, I'll gladly turn over to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That leads to one other thing. While we have said that the effective deadline is the 26th of the month and we keep pushing people in that regard, what do we think we want to see as our cutoff date? What have you been saying to anybody who phones in?

MRS. EMPSON: No one has inquired about the deadline.

MR. MARTIN: We're meeting next Wednesday. Can we make a decision then? We'll see if the stream is still on or if it has dwindled down.

DR. McNEIL: Typically there's a rush in the last week, so I would expect that next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday we'll get a fair volume of applications.

MR. MARTIN: So anything that comes in up to next Wednesday, and then we'll make a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But in the meantime, if there are any inquiries we'll tell them that as long as it's postmarked the 26th . . .

DR. McNEIL: Generally we're pretty easygoing as far as dates on competitions.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think it's something that we have to -- like income tax, that you're obliged to . . . If somebody comes in a couple of days over, I think we should give them consideration.

MR. MILLER: I think we did last time.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm sure we did last time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As mentioned, the next meeting has been circulated with that by Louise. As soon as the House is out on May 1, over at the Discovery for supper. At that stage of the game we'll be working our way through applicants. I hate to sound niggardly, but I don't think we'll need Hansard at the Discovery.

MR. THOMPSON: Doug, you can take my place. I have to be in Pincher Creek that night.

MR. HIEBERT: We'll make the decision that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did John Thompson apply?

DR. McNEIL: We've also handed out our proposed final interview plan and a preliminary interview plan. I suggest that they are for information today, and if there are any concerns with those plans, we'll discuss them next week at the meeting. They basically follow the structure of the two plans that were developed for the Ombudsman, with some variations in terms of questions that are more specific to this position. We outline a guideline to follow in interviewing candidates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could take a few moments to quickly scan the proposed preliminary interview plan, especially since John is not likely to be with us on Wednesday. If you have any questions on this one . . .

DR. McNEIL: The Career aspect focusses on the technical requirements of the position as they were outlined in the profile: managerial/administrative knowledge and experience, financial knowledge, legal knowledge, and political knowledge. Section C talks about the individual's management accomplishments and what they've been in a managerial role. Section D deals with skills, and those questions are basically the same as were in the Ombudsman's interview plan, talking about their management skills and trying to get a handle on their skills from the responses they give in that area. We don't ask every question. The last section, Suitability: why they are interested, how it fits into their career plans, some questions about how the candidates perceive their role and how they would enter into the role, discussion of the relationship between the individual and the

select standing committee, and so on. The overall objective for us is to be able to develop a summary of the individual's technical background, their management background, their skills, how they appear to fit the position, so the committee can make a more informed decision as to who they want to bring back to the committee for further interview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two questions. One is on page 4. You say, "Do you use any type of MBO system . . .?"

DR. McNEIL: Management by objectives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We keep getting reminded not to use initials, so hopefully we will not throw them a curve ball just because they're there.

The other one is: is it legitimate for us to ask them their age if they're being a little coy?

MISS PREVISICH: Not really.

DR. McNEIL: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that just for the female applicants, Terri?

MISS PREVISICH: No, it cuts across boundaries this time. It's not a standard interview question. It's not supposed to make a difference. We tend to focus on length and breadth of experience.

DR. McNEIL: We can make an estimate from when they graduated from university or high school and how long they've been employed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some people take longer than others to . . .

MR. HIEBERT: What if you add 24 to that?

DR. McNEIL: There was one resume where I wondered how close to 65 the individual was. Last time we had one guy who was 75 or 76.

MR. HIEBERT: It's like the chairman; you really can't tell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tell what? You notice that you get those comments from people who are safely younger than yourself.

You have this to look over. If you see anything that's sadly out of whack, make a note of it for Wednesday.

DR. McNEIL: Did everybody get a copy of this? I assume they did.

MRS. EMPSON: No, they didn't.

DR. McNEIL: That's the document that's going out to every applicant. This is what it looks like when it's jazzed up a bit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's pause here for a minute. Did the printing people give you some problem on this?

MRS. EMPSON: No, they didn't. I guess they're swamped with work and didn't do it as fast -- like overnight or a matter of a couple of days. It took two weeks. I sent it through Dan, who is part of Administration, on the Friday two weeks before Easter, and I got it the week after Easter, late Friday afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a phone call or two, did somebody give you some kind of jab in the ribs about how come the thing wasn't ready?

MRS. EMPSON: One person called the week before Easter, asking how come the profile wasn't ready before the ad went in.

MR. HIEBERT: One of the applicants?

MRS. EMPSON: I never did receive an application from him.

MR. MARTIN: He mustn't want the job if he's bitching about the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd be interested to know that for future reference, similar types of committees. This looks very good.

DR. McNEIL: I'm very pleased with how it has turned out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What kind of price did this come in at? Do we know?

MRS. EMPSON: About \$500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other handout on the

table is for insertion under the acknowledgement tab of your binder; that is, the original binder. Only the first two letters have been going out. How soon do we propose that number 3 goes? Do you remember what we did last time, David? Was it two to three weeks after the deadline?

DR. McNEIL: I think we waited about three weeks last time, so there's a reasonable period between the deadline date.

MR. MARTIN: What are we talking about now?

DR. McNEIL: This is a response letter to people who are categorized as not fitting the bill. The question is when to send that letter to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll leave about three or four weeks before we send that letter of thank you. Was there another letter we sent after that to the last 25 or so?

DR. McNEIL: Yes, there was. We sent a different letter to the people who had been interviewed on a preliminary basis and another letter to people who were interviewed by the committee and another letter to the last half dozen, I think.

MRS. EMPSON: Do you call the ones you're going to interview by telephone ahead of time?

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MRS. EMPSON: I've found a letter setting that up.

DR. McNEIL: We phone to find out when they're available.

MR. HIEBERT: I notice in the one letter where you talk about the resumes coming in, you indicate the actual numbers with regard to the national campaign. Is there a danger in that? It's fine when you have 497 or 500, but when you have 38, are you going to cause some false expectations on the part of a person saying, "Hey, we're down to a very narrow field; therefore, my chances look pretty good." Ought we to get into that?

DR. McNEIL: We don't normally do that.

MR. HIEBERT: Letter 3, paragraph 2: our national campaign brought forward X number of resumes from individuals. Could the number set up a false expectation, especially if you're dealing with a smaller number?

MR. MILLER: We're up to 125 now.

DR. McNEIL: The other factor is that by the time the individual gets this letter, they will likely have been part of the screening process. If they haven't heard by then, they will probably have figured out that they're not going to be part of it.

MR. HIEBERT: Okay. I just raise it as a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since others haven't joined in, I take it that we'll leave it in. Agreed? I guess we can always revise. It isn't on the machine yet, is it?

MRS. EMPSON: They're on the machine, but it's easy to change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The two volumes we have here. Who wants to give a preliminary . . .

DR. McNEIL: An overview of the process? What has happened is that in receiving the applications, Louise has organized them in alphabetical order this time. Based on the factors defined in the profile, we put together a screening sheet with all those factors that were listed in the profile. Terri and I have reviewed the applications we've received to date and categorized them into three categories: A category, those people who appear to most closely meet the technical and managerial requirements defined in the profile; B category, those who meet some of the requirements; and C category, those who in our view do not appear to meet the requirements.

We've put the resumes for the A and B candidates in the binder. I'm suggesting we go through -- what we have in the duotang is an alphabetical list of all the people. What we did was review the names and resumes of the A and B candidates. For those C candidates you have questions about, I have the resumes here and can comment if you have any further questions as to why they're A or B or C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's hold it there for a moment. First off, the large binder has the complete resumes of the A's and B's.

DR. McNEIL: Correct. In alphabetical order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should find that having it alphabetical is a little more efficient than last time. That's a good move. The other one gives us the summary of A's, B's, and C's. As I recall from previous existence, what we really did at this stage of development was deal with the C's first. So we can do some of the preliminary culling there.

DR. McNEIL: In terms of timing, if you want us to get on to the preliminary interviews we might be better off to deal with the A's, especially if we're not going to regret the C's for a couple of weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many C's are in the duotang?

DR. McNEIL: I'm not sure.

MR. MARTIN: How many do we have here?

MRS. EMPSON: 62.

DR. McNEIL: About 34 or 35 C's, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We need a pause for a moment about overall time frames. The overall time line means that we really want to have the final appointment made by the last week in June.

Very good timing; we're just about to have a break.

What is the pleasure of the committee? Let's stop and think for a moment. In your office, David, what is the time line you people are facing in doing the interviews?

DR. McNEIL: If we identify some this week, we'd probably try to start next week. The sooner we get some identified, the better off we are as far as getting going on the process.

MR. HIEBERT: In view of the time line, I think we should start at the front end and get them under way, get something into the hopper. We can always come back at a subsequent time to re-examine the people we want to move up.

MR. THOMPSON: The only thing I have against that, Al, is that if we have interviews already, there may be expectations out there that we're at the final end of the thing. I don't know how you handle that or if it really means anything.

DR. McNEIL: We can give them an indication of what the process is, that this is a preliminary interview and only a subset of the people we talk to on a preliminary basis will go to see the committee. We'll make that clear right up front.

MR. MARTIN: So it's clear, what you're suggesting is that we would interview the ones you've analyzed as A's in the first batch and look at the B's and C's as we go along. That would mean starting the interview with the A's.

DR. McNEIL: Yes. At this stage it would be a one-on-one interview with Terri or me, not the committee. The first step is to go through the A's and say, yes, we agree that they're A's, or no, this guy doesn't appear to be an A. The next step is to go through the B's and decide where any B's should be moved up to A's. The A's are the ones we're recommending for interview. There are a number of B's that I think — the committee's judgment is very important in terms of whether or not you see that they should be interviewed.

MR. MARTIN: You'll come back from your interviews and make a recommendation, tell us whether they are A or C or X.

DR. McNEIL: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But that first round of interviewing is done strictly by telephone.

DR. McNEIL: No. In the past, if they're in Edmonton we would do it face to face. Last time, in Calgary we did it via telephone. We received some criticism in some instances: if there were a number of candidates in Calgary, why didn't we go down there and interview them face to face?

MR. MARTIN: But obviously outside the province it's a different thing.

DR. McNEIL: Outside the province we would telephone, and outside Edmonton and Calgary,

depending on the numbers, it would be more time-effective to do it via telephone. We're pretty experienced at doing telephone interviews.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One important point is that you really should go to Calgary to interview.

DR. McNEIL: That would be my recommendation.

MR. MARTIN: You can ask anybody from southern Alberta if they want a personal or whatever [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. A category.

MR. MARTIN: How many A's are there? There aren't that many, are there?

DR. McNEIL: Seven.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee agrees that they should go down and interview, face to face, those from the Calgary region who end up being A's?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't heard from you two gentlemen as to whether you want to run down the A's today so we have something for the group to start with.

MR. THOMPSON: I feel uneasy about this process. Here we are starting out with the A's before we have all the applicants in and all the material here. So you'd run down to Calgary and interview two A's, and then two weeks later you're running down to Calgary to interview another A. I wonder if we're going about it right — not that I have any real answer to it. When we worked with the Ombudsman, everybody was in before we started getting a feel for the thing. Possibly because of the time frame we have to do it a little differently. I guess Calgary isn't that far away for David. He can slip on the plane and do the interviewing.

DR. McNEIL: In Calgary's case, we might want to wait until we have a significant number.

MR. MARTIN: How many preliminary interviews are you looking at doing?

DR. McNEIL: It's hard to say at this stage. On the Ombudsman we did 50 out of 400 applications. On the Chief Electoral Officer last time, we did 38 or 40 out of 150 applications.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Each of those takes how long?

DR. McNEIL: A couple of hours.

MR. MILLER: So you could do four a day.

MISS PREVISICH: Could we do four preliminary interviews a day? It's really difficult.

DR. McNEIL: It's difficult. It's not fair to the fourth candidate.

MR. THOMPSON: By that stage it's kind of hazy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we're going to stand adjourned for a few moments, load up our plates, and come back to the issue.

[The committee adjourned for seven minutes]

MR. THOMPSON: As I recall, David, with the Ombudsman we really didn't talk salary at the preliminary interview, did you? Or did you at times?

DR. McNEIL: We did at times, but you can talk around that. I think my position would be the \$60,000 range kind of thing.

MR. THOMPSON: I have real problems understanding why one candidate I see here is even applying. I think he'd better be aware that it's only a \$60,000 job. I'm not making a thing out of it, but I think there are people — I know with the Ombudsman there were people at the final end of it who had an unrealistic idea of what the wages were.

DR. McNEIL: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: I think they should know right from the start. If it's going to mean somebody is not interested because they're getting \$80,000, they should know that right away.

MR. THOMPSON: They should know it so they

don't waste their time and we don't waste our time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're satisfied with David's answer.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. As long as they have some feel for it, they aren't going to be really disappointed at the end of thing. I think that's a fair figures to use — around the \$60,000 mark.

DR. McNEIL: In setting up the preliminary interview, I think there are a number of people here that I would like to talk to before making an appointment, so they're aware that the job is probably paying in the \$60,000 range — are you still interested? That may screen some people right off the bat. There are at least a couple here where I can see that being a possibility.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm sorry I mentioned it, David, but it just popped into my head.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comment here, Bud?

MR. MILLER: Not just yet, Mr. Chairman. I'm thinking.

MR. MARTIN: Could I make a suggestion, which you can defeat if you want to, that we go ahead with the A's David decided, making sure that a preliminary phone call indicates the price so you're not wasting your time — I think John is right — and that we start as quickly as we can on the C's and B's, starting at the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable to everybody?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. As long as you don't do — I suggest that first interview be Tuesday, not Monday. The deadline is Friday, That leaves them one extra day.

DR. McNEIL: I can't remember. Last time we may have started even before the deadline. I can't recall specifically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I leave that in your hands. Thank you. I would now like to entertain a motion that the balance of today's meeting be

held in camera, as with the Ombudsman when we were into the matter of names and the fact that the minutes of the committee are public record and the transcript then goes to a different [inaudible].

MRS. EMPSON: We didn't have notes of meetings for the balance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We didn't keep minutes.

DR. McNEIL: Peggy was there and made notes on the process but not in terms of the specifics of the decisions, but there weren't transcripts made when we were discussing the candidates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nevertheless, we still have notes made by you if we move someone from one classification to another. So perhaps bare bones notes like that.

DR. McNEIL: Peggy kept tabs on those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who made the motion to go in camera?

MRS. EMPSON: We didn't have one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Miller. All those in favour please signify? Carried unanimously.

[The committee met in camera at 11:45 a.m.]

[The report of the Select Special Committee to Search For and Select a Chief Electoral Officer is found on page 43 of the 1985 Legislative Offices Committee transcript]

