

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[12:51 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the meeting to order. I think all of you have copies of the minutes of our last meeting of Thursday, December 22. First off, are there any errors or omissions? Would someone be good enough to move the adoption of the minutes as circulated, please?

MR. NOTLEY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Notley. All those in favor, please signify. Carried. Thank you. Business arising from the minutes.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we discussed the cost of advertising, and I understand that might be a little higher than was initially thought. David, would you like to comment on that aspect?

DR. McNEIL: Yes. What happened was that I received the first draft of the ad and wasn't happy with it in terms of the way it was structured and the size of it. So in discussion with Dr. Carter, I sent it back for a redraft. That resulted in a slight increase in the size of the ad, plus the additional papers that we added in our last meeting. So instead of \$27,600, the estimate is now \$32,600, about a \$5,000 increase in the cost. That bought us a little bigger ad plus four additional papers that we hadn't originally estimated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The four additional papers, once again, were two in the Territories . . .

DR. McNEIL: Whitehorse and Yellowknife, and Charlottetown and St. John's in the maritimes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that was at the direction of our last meeting. Well, that's good. Thank you. I think any business arising will just be picked up from what we have to deal with today. The ads obviously hit the major dailies across Canada, given the number of phone calls that have come in from places like Saskatoon and Ottawa. I assume the weeklies in Alberta occur this week.

DR. McNEIL: This week, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there anything else we ought to know about the ad?

MR. HIEBERT: Are the calls coming to you as chairman, and are you able handle them in terms of volume?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's probably one of the defects in our ad. We should have added the phone number of your office so you could get the phone calls. But I think we're going to be all right. What we've adopted is that Susan — because not all of them are identifying that they're calling about the Ombudsman, we're setting it up that my secretary is going to ask them if that's what it's about. Then they'll go on to your office so we can then send out the resume material.

MR. NOTLEY: Do you know if we have many applications so far?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Peggy, what's the number on your list?

MRS. DAVIDSON: I've answered seven replies so far, just telephone inquiries, and we've received two written applications, but that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then there are at least two others out of Calgary that I have phone calls pending on. The interesting part is that there was at least one from Saskatoon and two from Ottawa. I think we'll get more. Since the ad ran just on Saturday, that's probably a fairly speedy reply.

MR. HIEBERT: I've had two calls within Edmonton.

MR. NOTLEY: I guess I've had three, one of which I directed to you. I think the individual was attempting to lobby me, so he is totally annoyed at me because I indicated that I'm not in that line of business at the moment. So you may get a call, along with a fairly definite view of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview's lack of interest in public affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, those of you that had inquiries, if you make note of the name and telephone number, if not the address as well, and then contact Peggy to make sure that we're not having names drop through cracks.

DR. McNEIL: The other thing to mention is that the letter in response to an inquiry gives my name and phone number if they want further details, so there's that opportunity for them to get further information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. John?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, let's get this straightened out now. Do you feel that we should be responsible? I think we should just stay as far as arm's length as we can. I would prefer, if somebody got in touch with me . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Bill, this is the search committee for Ombudsman.

MR. PURDY: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I mean if you have time to have a cup of coffee and get out of a meeting, you're welcome.

MR. PURDY: There's lots of work upstairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, 1:30 is the leg. offices one.

MR. PURDY: I thought it was one o'clock. I just thought I'd come in and see. Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. THOMPSON: What I was trying to say is that personally I would prefer not even getting involved to the point of noting the names; just refer it to either Peggy or Dave. I think maybe we should just pick one of the two; it doesn't matter to me. I personally don't want to start saying: well, I'll pass your name on, kind of thing. I'll say: look, I'm not involved in this area at all, and I would rather give Peggy's phone

number.

DR. McNEIL: I think it's probably best to give Peggy's name.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, but I'd just give one.

DR. McNEIL: If they have further questions when they get the profile . . .

MR. THOMPSON: She can send them on.

DR. McNEIL: Well, my name and number are on the letter.

MR. MILLER: What number, Peggy?

MRS. DAVIDSON: 427-2580.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other thing that happened this morning was that CBC TV came around and did an interview with me just in general about the search committee. That will be aired either tonight or tomorrow night in Edmonton and Calgary. So that will probably stir up some more action. Then there were two stories last week, one in the Journal and one in the Sun. I think one of the stories was carried in the Calgary Herald, so it's all unpaid advertising on behalf of the Ombudsman search. Okay, I think that's where we are on that. We just now wait for our staff people to deal with the avalanche, or maybe there isn't an avalanche. David, would you like to discuss this?

MR. HIEBERT: Just one question. When does the competition close? It doesn't state it in the ad, does it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it doesn't. David, would you like to speak to that, as you did at our last meeting?

DR. McNEIL: We intentionally did not put a closing date on it just in case somebody a month from now found out about it and sent in an application, and the committee felt that that individual should be considered. That eliminates the kind of problem that can come up with people saying: well, you said a certain closing date, yet you accepted somebody after the closing date.

This document is just a copy of the position profile that we did up to send to each individual that makes an inquiry. So with any letter that comes in, this will go out to that individual. It really describes the position in more detail and hopefully will answer some of the questions that the ad itself does not answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall this is the result of the draft material that we reworked at our meeting.

MR. HIEBERT: It is not my intent to take the time of the meeting to go over it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, my friend, I didn't mean it as a put-down, and I hope it didn't come out that way.

MR. HIEBERT: No, it didn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We went through and sort of

renumbered the categories as they were listed; we just moved some around. As Peggy points out, the ad itself was added to the back of the document. It looks quite good, David. Thank you for following through. It's less sumptuous packaging.

DR. McNEIL: I was pleased with the result. It looks fairly classy, yet it's fairly reasonable to do.

MR. NOTLEY: Very good, excellent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other items of business to be attended to, ladies and gentlemen?

MR. BLAIN: Yes, sir: money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you have a document there? Can you distribute that to everyone, please?

MRS. DAVIDSON: Everyone has one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Doug, would you like to walk us through this and see if there are any . . .

MR. BLAIN: This is the estimated cost of the operation of this committee, as I discussed with you and Dr. McNeil at the conclusion of our last meeting. We agreed on these figures, and it was your decision that we oughtn't confirm them until next meeting. In the meantime, however, they've been inserted in a special warrant which has gone forward for approval to provide funds until the end of this fiscal year.

There's a possibility that additional clerical help will be required, so we provided for that at the rate of .25 of a man-year. I'm not personally convinced that that's necessary, but I thought it was better to be prepared than to be caught short. So we put in \$5,000 to cover that.

Advertising: it was necessary to increase that by \$5,000. Originally we had set \$30,000 for advertising, which provided for \$27,200 — was it? — with a contingency fund to allow for increases bringing it to \$30,000. But the requirements for a better and larger ad and the additional papers required the extra \$5,000, so it increased to \$35,000.

One thousand dollars for printing, which is to cover such things as this presentation that we've just discussed; \$1,000 for freight and postage, which I think is self-explanatory; \$500 for telephone and telecommunications. I anticipate that the great majority of the telephone calls can be handled over the WATS line, which will involve no charge to us, but it may be necessary to make long-distance calls in the normal way or even become involved in the dispatch of telegrams to applicants.

The daily indemnity is to pay the committee for the days it sits to complete this task. I've allowed a percentage there, \$75 a day for overnight expenses. I haven't computed \$75 a day for each and every day that the committee sits, because I didn't think it was necessary.

Travel: we've allowed \$25,000 to cover travel, and that covers bringing people in for interviews and any travel the committee might feel necessary to take in order to interview candidates. For example, if you have a number of candidates in the east, you might wish to interview them at the Ottawa office.

That totals \$83,500. I repeat that that's gone forward in the application for a special warrant,

because the deadline for that is past. So what I trust the committee will now do is adopt a resolution approving this sum for their operations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But again, we're on the high side here.

MR. BLAIN: I would not feel free to say that, but we could very well be on the high side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If needs be, we can move dollars around from one line to another line.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, we can, from one expenditure code to another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? John?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, as an old school board committee member, we always had in our budget what we called a contingency fund. Doug, I know this is too late for this, and I don't even know whether that's allowed in government. I honestly think that when you make up a budget, you should make what you think is a fairly accurate figure and then have what you call a contingency fund; work that way, instead of putting in 10 per cent over what you think it's going to cost and don't have it. I think it's a more accurate way of putting the figures down. I'm not arguing with this, but I just believe in my own mind that you're far better to come out with a pretty accurate estimate of what it's going to cost and then have a separate item called a contingency fund for those areas that are unforeseen, so to speak.

MR. BLAIN: Well, unfortunately in our budget process there's no mechanism for a contingency fund as such.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. BLAIN: I have tried to be realistic and — if you'll pardon the pun — liberal, with a small L, in these calculations. So I cannot agree that we are on the high side, but we may very well be on the high side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we have our educated guess, which has gone forward.

MR. BLAIN: That's the best approach we can take in any committee operation.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, if you're going to special warrant — as it is — to get the funds, I think you're better off 'guesstimating' on the high side so that in the event that you have to go back, you're not in that kind of a situation. It's better to come under and make that an objective, as opposed to the other way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course that is what we tried to do in terms of the printing of this, and I assume that saved us a fair amount of money — no other reasons. You wouldn't have a bill on that yet?

DR. McNEIL: I have the estimate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which was roughly?

DR. McNEIL: To get the thing printed in the first place so that we could send it to Quick Print was around \$300. I think the paper cost for 500 copies was \$170 and then the cost to Quick Print, so it would be around \$500, \$600.

MR. BLAIN: As I said, I provided for these requirements, some of which may very well not arise. My experience in budgeting obviously is different from Mr. Thompson's with the school board and may be different from you gentlemen's, but it is based on government operations. So I felt it was better to budget for something which may not occur than not to budget for something which may very well occur. For example, as I said earlier, I do not foresee the requirement for additional manpower, but the \$5,000 is there. I have no reason to believe that the special warrant won't be approved, so should we fall short in other areas, we could use that. In any event, I would anticipate that we would come in under this figure. If we do, there is no harm done, because the money will simply revert to the general fund.

I'm sorry about — maybe "sorry" isn't the right word. As I said to you, there was a deadline for the special warrant to go in, and I had no option but to include this. On the basis of our discussions, I felt it was safe for me to include it, and I trust that the committee will see fit to adopt a resolution confirming what I've done.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So moved?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The adoption of the budget. Second? Thank you, Mr. Hiebert. All those in favor of the motion, please signify. Carried unanimously. Thank you.

DR. McNeil, would you just give us a quick overview as to what happens next in the process? I think most of us — let's just firm it up, and then . . .

DR. McNEIL: A couple of things: I think we discussed at the last meeting sending out letters of solicitation to various women's groups in terms of inviting applications. I have the letters here. Dr. Carter, you may want to review the names of the groups they are being sent to, just for your information. So that's done. We'll probably send five copies of the profile along with each letter. So there's the possibility of some distribution by these people to women who may be interested in applying for the opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that regard, can we have a listing of the organizations appended to the minutes, please? That way we all know.

DR. McNEIL: The next step in the process is to receive the applications and immediately send out a copy of the profile with a response letter. Then we will start screening the applications and put together a screening summary, where we'll go over each application and evaluate each application on the five criteria identified in the ad. We will try to rank the resumes into three categories: one, individuals who appear to fit the criteria most closely; two, where

they may and may not fit; and, three, individuals who are obviously not in the ballpark.

Those screening summaries will be provided to each member of the committee. We'll keep all the resumes in the robing room so they're available to every member of the committee. Depending on how many ones and twos there are, we may want to copy those and send them to each committee member. But there is a point at which the amount of copying, just the volume of material, would be onerous. We're just going to have to wait and see how many applications we get.

So that screening process is really a preliminary screening process, which we will have to sit down and go over at the next meeting or the meeting after. The committee will have to cause us to justify why we put individual X in categories one, two, or three. So the committee has the opportunity to review that screening process; there's no question or uncertainty as to why they are placed in a particular category by me. I will probably have one of my staff work with me, depending on how many applications there are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee members, would you like — this relates to when we should meet again — to meet in two weeks' time and see what we have on the initial basis? Or would you rather wait for the call of the Chair? David McNeil; the vice-chairman, Bud; and I can sort of meet to assess when we should call the next meeting — or whatever other permutation and combination you care to exercise.

MR. HIEBERT: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that maybe we look at a tentative date subject to your approval? In other words, you would make the judgment that we have a sufficient amount of information in. That way you don't call the meeting for the sake of calling it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you consult your datebooks for February 7 or 8 as possibles?

MR. NOTLEY: It's unfortunate, but that's a Monday or Tuesday, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday or Wednesday.

MR. NOTLEY: It wouldn't be possible for me that week, I'm sorry to say, but go ahead.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm in the same fix.

MR. NOTLEY: The following week — the 13th would be out, but the 14th or . . .

MR. THOMPSON: How about the 3rd?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid that after that I'm dead the following two weeks on the Senate committee. We'd then be looking at February 27.

MR. NOTLEY: The week before is possible for me.

MR. MILLER: We need a specific date, Grant.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, any time from . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two weeks from now would make it the 31st.

MR. NOTLEY: The 31st through to the Friday of that week would be — what would be that week?

AN HON. MEMBER: The 3rd.

MR. NOTLEY: The 3rd.

AN HON. MEMBER: The 31st.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 31? Any others? Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: The workers' compensation committee is heading out for Halifax on the 28th and is going to be gone till the 10th or something, so that whole area in there is finished for me. But that doesn't mean you can't have a meeting; I'll be happy to miss that one.

MR. HIEBERT: I personally would prefer the beginning of February somewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would later in the day on the 31st be of any use?

MR. NOTLEY: Any time that week is okay, David — whenever it's convenient for other members — I'm quite free in terms of my . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid that's the only day I've got that week.

MR. NOTLEY: The 31st?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Are you around town that day?

MR. HIEBERT: Oh sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about later in the afternoon for you? What time can you get away from your other duties?

MR. HIEBERT: Later in the afternoon would be just fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three, 3:30?

MR. HIEBERT: 3:30 is fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tentatively the 31st at 3:30, but we will call around.

MR. BLAIN: I realize your commitment [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: David, is that a perhaps for you?

DR. McNEIL: No, that's fine. One of the values of meeting in a couple of weeks: we may be able to confirm some number one candidates so we can start moving on the preliminary interviews rather than waiting another couple of weeks. That's a fairly lengthy process.

MR. NOTLEY: You'll get some indication then as to the volume of applications.

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll leave that as tentative; we'll confirm. It's probably a very good tentative, because

that gives us four out of five. Okay, any other business?

Meeting adjourned. Thank you very much.

[The meeting adjourned at 1:18 p.m.]

This page intentionally left blank