

8:07 a.m.

Tuesday, April 26, 1994

[Chairman: Mr. Hierath]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think maybe we'll get started here. We're missing a couple of members. I think they'll be in.

We have a copy of the agenda, so I would like to have approval of accepting some of the agenda, please.

DR. MASSEY: I so move.

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

The minutes of the April 19 meeting are under tab 3. I'm sure you've all read those, so if I could have approval for those April 19 minutes.

MR. DOERKSEN: I so move.

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

Maybe what I'll do now is – the subcommittee met yesterday. Harry and I and Gary Dickson went over the four proposals from private consultants. We reached the conclusion that Davies, Park, the proposal under tab 4, was the one we would like to engage as our consultant firm in this search for a Chief Electoral Officer.

One of the motions in the April 19 meeting was that the advertising be paid for and run by the consultants. At the subcommittee meeting we were at yesterday, there were a couple of reasons why the subcommittee decided to separate the advertising from having the consultants do it. One was that the government has a contract with a private advertising firm, and our advertising has to go through them anyway. We would pay for that, at least developing the ad, with this private advertising firm. The other reason was that if we pay for the advertising directly, we won't have to pay GST, whereas the private consulting firm of Davies, Park would have to pay GST and would have to bill us for that, of course. So for a few reasons like that, we the subcommittee decided differently from what the motion was at the April 19 meeting: to not include advertising in the consultant's job description.

Is there any discussion on that from any of the committee members?

DR. MASSEY: It just seems to make sense that we don't pay twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suspect we should probably have a motion to nullify the motion of April 19 just so we do it properly.

DR. MASSEY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don.

Your motion would then have Diane do the advertising rather than the consulting firm?

DR. MASSEY: Correct.

MRS. HURLEY: Elizabeth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me; Elizabeth. Sorry.

Any further discussion on that motion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The bid Davies, Park gave us originally did separate the professional fees from advertising and other fees. Maybe I'll turn

this over to Elizabeth, to kind of go over the breakdown of what we did with Davies, Park.

MRS. HURLEY: Okay. In terms of the assignment they're going to have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. HURLEY: Since we will be doing the advertising on behalf of the committee, that's going to be removed from part of their responsibility. Davies, Park also included a note that they would do a direct mail-out to other provincial chief electoral offices. We've asked them to still do that, so that would be part of their assignment.

They would then conduct the screening, a comprehensive assessment of candidates that are applying for the job, so they can put forward to the committee some qualified and interested candidates. They will prepare a screening report for the committee's review along with their recommendations for a personal interview. Once the committee has reviewed that and agreed on a number – and we were sort of ballparking 20 as a target figure. It could be less; it could be more. The consultant then would conduct in-depth interviews and assess candidates on various factors, their leadership skills and so on, and prepare reports for presentation to the committee. They'd come and discuss those reports with you. The committee would select those that they want for final interviews. The consultant would assist in those final interviews. They would also do any background checks, reference checks, credential checks that would be required throughout the process.

The other aspect the subcommittee decided to take out of the consultant's responsibility was the actual receipt and acknowledgement of the applications. Diane would be doing that on behalf of the chairman of the selection committee. That was another factor.

As a result, the proposal that was put forward and his estimates – his total professional fees would be reduced by \$2,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that goes from \$19,500 to \$17,500. You know, the basic reason for the applications coming to us rather than to the consultant is just to hold on to some form of control so an application doesn't get lost or whatever. That's the general reason for wanting to have the applicants mail their applications to us.

Is there any discussion on that point?

MR. DOERKSEN: Does that figure vary depending on how many candidates we ask them to interview?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The \$17,500?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MRS. HURLEY: I talked to the consultant about what happens if it's less, a few more. The dollar is set. However, if there's a significant reduction in the number of candidates, for example – we based this on 20 preliminary interviews – if there's 10 or 12, then at that point in time they would be prepared to reopen the discussions and talk about a more appropriate rate.

MR. BRASSARD: Conversely, then, if there's a flood of applications, would they anticipate renegotiating as well?

MRS. HURLEY: He indicated that if there were a few more he wasn't going to come back. But I think if the committee wanted him to interview 40 applications, it would be fair to take a look at whether the professional fees are still appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In their original proposal to us there was some cost on interviews. Did you talk to them yesterday about telephone interviews rather than face-to-face interviews?

MRS. HURLEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that was fine with them; was it?

MRS. HURLEY: Yeah. I indicated that the committee would likely want him to conduct any preliminary interviews with individuals outside the city by telephone, and certainly that's okay. He expected that.

MR. DOERKSEN: In terms of the other people you talked to, is \$17,500 a reasonable figure?

MRS. HURLEY: Very reasonable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very reasonable. We went over the other three proposals and Davies, Park is the lowest.

MR. DOERKSEN: It seems like a lot of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was one there that was twice that just for professional fees.

MR. DOERKSEN: Was there? Wow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Harry and I and Gary went over those quite extensively yesterday.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's see now. On the agenda here we also have the advertising to be used, also under tab 4, behind the Davies, Park proposal. This was what the subcommittee decided to do yesterday. It works out to \$8,842. It's just at the back of that, Don. No. It's still under tab 4 but . . .

8:17

Before we get into the advertising, can I have a motion to accept Davies, Park as the consultants for the search for a Chief Electoral Officer? Harry. Any discussion on that motion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

In general terms our guideline for the advertising was that we do the major daily papers in the province and the *Globe and Mail*. That's the kind of guideline the subcommittee is recommending to the search committee. You know, we have cut down almost in half what we did with the Auditor General on dollars. I think close; maybe not quite. I think we were \$12,000 or something.

MRS. SHUMYLA: We spent around \$9,000 or \$10,000, I think, on advertising for the Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was that all it was? Okay.

I don't know if we should probably have a motion for agreement to that too. Gary, would you . . .

MR. DICKSON: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there any discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The next item is receipt and acknowledgement of applications. That's just something that . . . Oh, the advertising. What tab is that under?

MRS. SHUMYLA: It's right after that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. On the next page after the advertising column of dollars, that would be the ad. The subcommittee yesterday kind of hacked away at it a little bit. We had the search committee members' names in there, and in order to save dollars, in the discussion yesterday between Harry, Gary, and me, we were wondering why we would need to have all the committee members' names listed.

Maybe I'll just give you a few minutes to look that over. There was some discussion yesterday about . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: Which one are we looking at, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tab 4, just after the advertising page.

MR. DOERKSEN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We didn't put the salary range in this ad. Roy.

MR. BRASSARD: Regarding the committee members' names being there, I like it only from the standpoint of accountability. I think it shows it's a party mix of sorts. So many things today are criticized because they are done somewhere out of sight and out of mind, and I think it holds these people accountable. I like the names. As much as I dislike having my particular name there, I think it's a good thing to have on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further comments on this subject? You know, we were doing it particularly, I suspect, for the *Globe and Mail* ad, which is almost half our budget. It was going to end up being - maybe either Diane or Elizabeth could give us a ballpark figure of how much more that would cost. It just added another few inches to the ad on that expensive newspaper. That was the logic behind it, Roy.

MR. BRASSARD: I understand, and I'd bow to the wishes of the committee. As I said, it seems so many things are done without accountability or without that level of accountability that it doesn't hurt. Anyway, I've made my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we do is strictly up to the search committee, so don't . . .

Gary.

MR. DICKSON: I appreciate the point Roy makes. No question there's value in it being clear to people that a number of people have to share responsibility for this important process. But in some respects I think it's also addressed by the fact that we have the Leg. Assembly seal and stamp on our name. I think it's clear to people this isn't a government or an executive function. Although I share some of Roy's concern about accountability, I just think the cost thing outweighs it, and in the balance I'd sooner go with the less expensive ad if we could shave some dollars off it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Any further discussion? Then I would accept a motion to accept this ad. Gary. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Receipt and acknowledgment of applications. I guess we've already kind of covered that.

I think we'll move on to tab 5, which is the proposed budget draft for the search committee. It seems straightforward at this point. We know what the advertising costs are going to be and we know what the consultants' costs are going to be, so we should be - I hesitate saying this - fairly accurate with this budget. Because we did have some experience in the Auditor General's search committee that was a little unforeseen at the last, mostly on time more than the expenses but . . . I guess maybe I should have a motion for acceptance of the budget estimates.

MR. BRASSARD: I move the budget estimates as proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.
Now I'm open for other business. Gary.

MR. DICKSON: I guess the one thing that doesn't appear on the budget . . . We talked yesterday about our concern that much of the prescreening be done by telephone and that sort of thing. Now, that's not reflected in the budget, so . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did talk about that before you got here.

MR. DICKSON: Oh. Okay. Sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Elizabeth. You can report to Gary what Davies, Park said.

MRS. HURLEY: In my discussions yesterday with the consultant, he understands that at least at the initial stage any interviews that are going to be conducted with people outside the immediate area would be done by telephone. So there would just be long-distance charges that would then come forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any other business?

Well, I think we'll be able to get this on the road and rolling. That being said, the cutoff date for applications is May 20, and we will need to schedule a meeting soon after that. I'm suggesting the morning of May 31 if that would be suitable to committee members. It's a Tuesday. How does that sound to everyone?

MR. BRASSARD: Again, I didn't bring my agenda, but tentatively it sounds great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BRASSARD: It gives us enough time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suspect at that meeting we won't be doing any interviews. We won't be doing any interviews that day. We will just take a look at the applications and so on. So maybe we could schedule a meeting for 8:30 in the morning. How would that suit everyone? Okay?

8:27

One of the things I was going to bring up was that the consultant would like to meet with someone on the committee or the committee regarding a flavour of what we're looking for as a person, you know, to get an idea. I suggest that I could meet with

him, or the subcommittee of Harry, Gary, and me - whatever the wishes of the committee are.

MR. DICKSON: I'd go for option B, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERKSEN: I agree, Mr. Chairman. You read my mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If that's the wish, I'll set up an informal meeting with Davies, Park so we can get things rolling with them as soon as possible.

Is there any other business?

Gary.

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Chairman, just help me with this. We've approved the budget of \$49,000, but the \$49,000 really doesn't . . . Okay. I take it the \$17,500 is the new and revised . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DICKSON: Okay. Fine. Thanks very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if we are done, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. DOERKSEN: I so move.

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

Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 8:29 a.m.]

