



First Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. Andy Anstett
Constituency of Springfield



MG-8048

VOL. XXX No. 3 - 10:00 a.m., TUESDAY, 17 AUGUST, 1982.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert's Island	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Tuesday, 17 August, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN — Mr. A. Anstett

MS C. DEPAPE: Committee come to order. There are two items of business to be taken care of before the meeting starts. The first one is that Mr. Pawley has resigned as a member of the committee and also Mr. Mercier. Are there any nominations to replace these two members?

MR. P. FOX: At the moment I don't think we can because we haven't discussed it. I wasn't aware of either Mr. Mercier's or Pawley's resignation, so I think we can just leave it in abeyance. I think this first meeting is only going to be to draw up the guidelines. I don't believe we are going to do very much more than advertise for the positions. So I think we could proceed with what we have on the committee at the moment.

MS C. DEPAPE: Is that what other members . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Perhaps we should elect a Chairperson first and then proceed to deal with the question of committee membership.

MS C. DEPAPE: The reason why I dealt with the resignations first is because I thought maybe someone that you wanted to put as a member would be elected as Chairman. That's the reason why I was dealing with the resignations first, but fine.

Are there any nominations for a Chairman for the committee?

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Anstett.

MS C. DEPAPE: Mr. Anstett. Are there any further nominations. Seeing none, Mr. Anstett, would you please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: With regard to the matter the Clerk raised of the resignations, we have two resignations from the committee. What is your will and pleasure?

MR. C. SANTOS: If Mr. Mercier has already resigned, then one of the members can be elected to replace him as a permanent member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would nominate Mr. Graham to replace Mr. Mercier on the committee. We can't proceed with the other position on the committee from our side at this juncture, so I would want to withhold any motion on that until I discuss it further with Mr. Banman and Mr. Nordman. I think we can proceed with nominating Mr. Graham to replace Mr. Mercier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman has nominated Mr.

Graham to replace Mr. Mercier. We have Mr. Mercier's willingness to accept that in the form of a memo from him to Mr. Graham. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Okay, dealing with Mr. Pawley's resignation then, are there any nominations to succeed Mr. Pawley? Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Storie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner has moved Mr. Storie be added to the committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

As I believe we're all aware, in the form of a letter we received from the Clerk of the Committee, the matter of the appointment of a Clerk of the Legislative Assembly has been referred to this committee by virtue of Order-in-Council 877, 1982. How do you wish to proceed?

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I suppose maybe we should perhaps proceed in the way that we proceeded with respect to the Ombudsman and that is have a preliminary discussion on the kind of person we're looking for. Out of that would then flow a discussion of how to advertise the position. That seems to come quite logically and then when we begin to talk specifically about the advertisement we will of necessity have to talk about a closing date. I think we would then, from the closing date, obviously want to go into the screening and the interview process and then the concluding stage, just the way in which we did it so recently. The experience is fresh in our minds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: I wonder, is there a copy of the ad around from the previous time when this position was being advertised for? It seemed to me that there should be a copy around someplace which we could maybe use as a guideline.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The position was last advertised in the winter of 1973. I don't know if the Clerk has a copy of the ad, but perhaps, with that date reference, she may be able to locate it.

I should take this opportunity to introduce to the committee Miss Katherine Friesen, who's sitting in the public gallery, who has been offered to the committee as part of the referral by the Premier, a Selection Officer with the Civil Service Commission, to provide any assistance the committee may need in dealing with this matter.

Are there any further comments on the fashion in which we wish to proceed? Mr. Penner has made a suggestion. Mr. Brown has asked for a copy of the previous ad, if possible.

Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: I have a question. My problem is that we have an Acting Assistant Clerk and we have an Assistant Clerk. Our problem will probably be that we may get an application from the Assistant Clerk, which will

almost immediately make another vacancy for us. I am just wondering whether there is any way we can look at the question in the overall manner and make the competition open so that we can make a decision for both positions if it is necessary.

HON. R. PENNER: That's a good point that Peter is raising, but I don't know. If you, in one advertisement, suggest that you don't really look for two persons, you've signalled in a way something that should not be signalled and that is that the results of the competition are a foregone conclusion. It may well be, you see, that you don't really resolve the problem because when we advertise for an Assistant Clerk, if the Assistant Clerk who we now have, who is Acting Clerk, becomes - may I use - the Clerk of the House, then it may be another internal person who is to become the Assistant. I think we're just going to have to take it sequentially.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As your Chairman, perhaps I should point out that the Order-in-Council providing us our terms of reference specifically refers to the Clerk of the House and gives us no jurisdiction, I would think, to go beyond.

Are there any further comments on how we wish to proceed before we start to deal with the matter before us?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Over the years I've heard a lot of comments by various people and various jurisdictions about the qualifications that are desirable in the office of a Clerk. I hope that sometime, before we get around to drafting any proposals for an advertisement or something, that we do get the opportunity to take a look at that aspect of the situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm at your will and pleasure, gentlemen. It's been suggested that we proceed much in the fashion that we did for the Ombudsman, proceeding to draft a job description, from which would flow an advertisement, from which would flow a timetable, a deadline for receipt of applications, a screening process and then interviews.

Mr. Graham has made a suggestion which would appear to require us to look at that first and that's, very specifically, the details of qualifications. There was a draft - I've forgotten what it's called - I guess, a draft advertisement which included a position description and qualifications which was circulated with the notice of the committee meeting. May I suggest, to meet Mr. Graham's request, that we can proceed to discuss that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I didn't think that it had to be done right away. It was just something that I wanted discussed some time before this meeting is over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm at your will and pleasure. If that's a logical place to begin, perhaps we should do that now. I'm not sure what else would come before that.

Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: I think we should discuss what are

the necessary qualifications; and what are the desirable qualifications that we expect the Clerk to possess. Times have changed since the last time we hired a Clerk. Maybe there are some qualifications that we want to discuss.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: We have the sheet that is now circulated. Where does this come from, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was forwarded to me in the Letter of Referral that I received from the Premier with the Order-in-Council and I asked the Clerk to include it, along with a copy of that letter, to everyone involved. That letter, I should add, parenthetically also suggested, and I carried forward that suggestion in my discussion with Mr. Sherman and in the notice that went out from the Clerk of Committees, that Mr. Speaker, because of his important role in relation to the Clerk of the House, should also be included in our committee deliberations.

Does everyone now have a copy of that draft advertisement? Is there any discussion?

Mr. Storie.

MR. J. STORIE: Perhaps we should begin by just looking over the first paragraph on the duties of the Clerk and see if we can agree on that initial paragraph and then move on to discuss some qualifications.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion on the first paragraph in the proposed advertisement?

Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I suppose, in order to answer that question, one has to be sure of the job description of the Clerk of the House. Speaking for myself, I'm not sure that I am fully familiar with the entire job description of the Clerk of the House. Does this proposed advertisement cover that area in full? I think that's something that the committee would want to be reassured on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Storie.

MR. J. STORIE: Would it be possible to check with the representative from the Commission to see if she has a previous job description?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been suggested that we ask Miss Friesen if this description confirms with what the Civil Service Commission has as a job description for the Clerk of the House. Miss Friesen, would you come to the table to address the committee please, so that your remarks would be on record?

MISS K. FRIESEN: I don't know if you have a copy of the draft class specification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We only have something which appears to be an advertisement because it has an insertion date blank on it and refers to a distribution.

MISS K. FRIESEN: Did you want me to read what the class specification does say?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, please.

MISS K. FRIESEN: This is what the classification is defined as.

"The Clerk of the Legislative Assembly - Reporting to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Clerk is responsible for the general administration of the House, supervision of the staff during Legislative Sessions, provision of services to the members of the Assembly and Caucus offices and the production of Hansard.

"An incumbent is also responsible for all administration and secretarial services relating to committees of the Legislature, custody of the records and binding and distribution of Journals of the House and any other matters related to the House.

"The qualifications, knowledge and abilities are several years administrative experience with a minimum of two years as an Assistant Clerk in a provincial Legislature, thorough knowledge of parliamentary rules, procedures and customs."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing in there that does cause me concern, and that is: "is responsible for the general administration of the House and supervision of the staff during the Legislative Sessions." I would think that the Clerk is responsible for the administration of the staff at all times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments upon the classification description Miss Friesen has provided us?

Mr. Storie.

MR. J. STORIE: I think Mr. Graham has made a good point and perhaps that wording should be changed.

MR. C. SANTOS: Especially during Legislative Sessions.

MR. J. STORIE: Or just "is responsible." There's no need for specifying during the Legislative Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's suggested then that we strike out the words "during Legislative Sessions." Is that the suggestion? Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Are there any further suggestions?

Mr. Storie.

MR. J. STORIE: I notice the difference between what Miss Friesen was saying and what we have in our copy in that there is no reference made to the minimum of two years requirement as an Assistant Clerk. In what she read, there was. There is none in our copy and I would suggest that would be a good provision, given that there are few of us on the committee that are familiar enough with the rules and procedures and the duties of the Clerk to insure that someone with less experience has the fundamental knowledge that is needed; where two years experience or more would certainly be not only an asset but fundamental.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: I may concur with Mr. Storie about that, but the only problem is that when you do that you limit yourself to only those who have been in that field. That doesn't give you, sometimes, the necessary qualifications, maybe almost but not enough. Whereas, if you open it up you can get people who are probably more qualified, even though they haven't had the experience. Functioning in a job is not necessarily the experience or the qualifications we want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think, in reply to what Mr. Fox has said, very definitely we want to limit this to a pretty narrow field. I would be very alarmed about hiring a person as the Chief Clerk of this House who has had no experience whatsoever in Legislative process. I would be very concerned if we left it that wide open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we should distinguish between necessary and desirable qualifications. Necessary qualifications are those qualifications without which the Clerk cannot function; desirable are those that will add, if they can be obtained. So the fact that the prospective applicant may have been Assistant Clerk may be very desirable, but there might be other experiences on procedural matters as being, let's say, a parliamentarian in an international organization which will supply the same kind of technical knowledge, not necessarily being an Assistant Clerk in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the point Mr. Storie is making is that the specifications that were provided the committee a few moments ago clearly indicate that two years service as an Assistant Clerk is required. In fact, the qualifications listed in the proposed draft in front of us do specify that he/she has to have been an Assistant Clerk in a Legislature. They specify several years administrative and supervisory experience and as an Assistant Clerk in a Legislature. So we're really only arguing over whether that is sufficient or whether it should be specifically required that this person had a minimum of two years as Assistant Clerk. I think that might be left open to discussion and speculation. The fact that there is a requirement in the qualifications in front of us for some experience as an Assistant Clerk might satisfy Mr. Storie's point and Mr. Santos' point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I think I'm going along with what Mr. Sherman is saying and agreeing with Mr. Santos, and that is that the qualification as an Assistant Clerk is one that might be highly desirable and I'm sure that's something that this committee would give a great deal of weight to. Obviously, this committee is going to look for the very best person it can get in terms of experience with the running of the House.

It's possible, not very likely, that someone who has

never been an Assistant Clerk somehow or another meets the bill in terms of knowing how a Legislative Assembly functions. I think that we should err on the side of broadening the base of application so that the committee's work is easier, that our pool of resource is enriched and, therefore, the wording that we should use is something to the effect that experience as a Clerk or Assistant Clerk in a Legislature is highly desirable or desirable - I wouldn't cavil at which set of words are used - rather than saying, it is a qualification for the job that you must have been an Assistant Clerk for two years. Again, the two years, if we were even to go that narrow a way, narrows it even further. What if somebody's had 23 months?

So that in an ad of this type we should make it quite clear, with respect to the kind of person we're looking for and the highly desirable qualifications, without making it appear that without that you shouldn't even bother to apply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our current Acting Clerk hasn't been here two years.

HON. R. PENNER: I was going to ask that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: That is the point that bothered me then, because it states exactly two years. Was that in one of our laws regarding the position? It's just a recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Miss Friesen.

MISS K. FRIESEN: Mr. Chairman, it's a recommendation, but does not mean that you have to have the two years; it's flexible.

MR. C. SANTOS: So, it's just a desirable qualification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been recommended that the reference under Qualifications to being an Assistant Clerk in a Legislature be made such that it is referred to as a desirable qualification, rather than a specific requirement. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Is there any further discussion of qualifications?
Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just from the point of view of a grammarian, any grammarian, I would like to see the sentence, "Good oral and written communication skills are a must." I think that should read, "Good oral and written communication skills are essential."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Fluency in both French and English would be an asset. I would say that fluency in one of them is absolutely necessary; otherwise you could have a third, fourth, fifth language in there. Certainly some fluency in French and English would be an asset to the person, but that's incorrectly worded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a suggested rewording, Mr. Sherman?

MR. L. SHERMAN: I think that fluency in one of the country's two official languages and a working capability in the other is essential, or at least fluency in one of the country's two official languages, but it's more than an asset.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a suggested rewording then by the members of the committee?
Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: Under Qualifications, the second sentence already says, "Good oral and written communications skills are a must." What was intended here was to indicate something that Mr. Sherman used, a formulation which he used, with which I would concur if this is the intent of Mr. Sherman; namely, that it should say that working competence in French would be an asset because we assume - I mean the predominant language of this Legislature is English and there is no question about that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I would agree. I don't know what the Human Rights Legislation says but I would agree it should be basically English with working knowledge of French, if possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we say, "fluency in the other official language?" A recommendation as to wording.
Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, the Attorney-General may be absolutely right, Mr. Chairman. He is right in what he's saying and he may be right that we can say it in an ad. I would think we'd have to check that point. Whether it could be worded in such a way that it was specified that the primary language was English and there had to be some working capability in French is uncertain to me. I don't know whether you can do that under existing legislation, but the Attorney-General would be able to ascertain that. If so, that is the way we should proceed because certainly the working language of our Legislature is, and will be for some time I would think, basically English.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Is there any particular reason why we want to mention that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Storie.

MR. J. STORIE: I think Mr. Graham has a good point. I think that the discretion of the committee is, in effect, what's going to make the decision and it will be our judgment at that time whether the individual is fluent in English sufficiently to accomplish the task. If he can speak another language, that's beneficial. If he can speak French, of course, that would be a highly desirable asset, but we will have to decide whether he's fluent in English, so I don't think it needs to be mentioned at all.

HON. R. PENNER: Why don't we have a footnote saying that this position is open to persons of any political persuasion, any religion; strange sexual orientations are no bar.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a problem if we hope to proceed, gentlemen, to the development of an advertisement at this meeting if we don't settle upon some wording for these qualifications. I don't feel it's my role to suggest that wording, but I would appreciate some assistance from the committee.

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: If they were living at the same time, Picasso and Turner, to draw an elephant, they never would have come up with anything recognizable. Maybe what we should do is agree on what we want in the ad without attempting to word it finally and delegate to one or two people the job of the final wording, because we'll never get it done this way. I can think of five different formulations for the last sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Miss Friesen has been taking notes. Perhaps, with her assistance and the comments that we've had from members of the committee, it may be possible to come up with a more satisfactory description of the qualifications.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I just wanted to know why it was necessary that we have to put that in the ad?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: I think that if you're going to check back where this position has been advertised previously that you will find that clause, or something similar to that clause, has been in these ads. That's why I was asking to see if there was a copy of any of the previous ads, when we were advertising for positions such as this. I don't know if "fluency" should be in there. Maybe we could change that word "fluency" and have "knowledge of both French and English would be an asset."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: What about "a working knowledge of both official languages would be an asset."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I still have difficulty with that, Mr. Chairman. My point, I think, centres around the term "both." Obviously, the Clerk has to have total competence in one of those languages, either French or English. In other words, it's more than an asset where one of them is concerned. It is the construction of the sentence that bothers me. I think we have to look at that. What we want to say is that a working capability in the other official language would be an asset; that's the point that has to be got across.

HON. R. PENNER: What about "fluency in one of the official languages and a working ability in the other would be an asset."

MR. L. SHERMAN: Required. It's more than an asset.

HON. R. PENNER: Required, something like that. If

we agree on what we're after, then we can word it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the import of what the committee is agreeing here that we wish to say that "a full working capability in one official language is required and a working knowledge of the other would be an asset."

HON. R. PENNER: Right.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's essentially what we want to say.

HON. R. PENNER: Write it down quickly, before we forget it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Something to that effect.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Good oral and written communication skills are essential.

MR. J. STORIE: That's what it says.

MR. H. GRAHAM: We've already said that.

MR. J. STORIE: Then, the bottom line says "working knowledge."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further items in the Qualifications that we wish to discuss?

Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The point that Miss Friesen cited in the specifications that she read out that doesn't appear in our proposed ad, that had to do with the requirement for a thorough knowledge of parliamentary rules, customs and procedures. I would think that should be in there, even though it's implicit in several years of administrative and supervisory experience. I think that it's a valuable requirement to spell out, a thorough knowledge of parliamentary rules, customs and procedures or something to that effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, we could ask Miss Friesen to read again that particular sentence to see if its present construction is suitable for insertion.

Miss Friesen.

MISS K. FRIESEN: "A thorough knowledge of parliamentary rules, procedures and customs."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is required or is there anything?

MISS K. FRIESEN: It's just stated as a sentence. Could be required or essential.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your will and pleasure? Do you wish to say that would be an asset or is required?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I think it's essential.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed) That sentence will now be inserted.

Are there any further discussions on the qualifications?

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm moving beyond the qualifications, strictly speaking. Is the salary range set out in this sheet that was circulated, the prevailing salary range?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would have to ask Miss Friesen. Miss Friesen.

MISS K. FRIESEN: This is the salary range of the Senior Officer 1. Mr. Reeves was being paid at a different level, but I believe there were other duties added to his job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you explain that a bit further, Miss Friesen?

MISS K. FRIESEN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Reeves was being paid at a different level of salary. This has been suggested to me. I guess Mr. Decker was the one that suggested this salary range in consultation with the Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: In what range was Mr. Reeves being paid?

MISS K. FRIESEN: Senior Officer 3 and this is Senior Officer 1 level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Senior Officer 3, is that the equivalent of Assistant Deputy Minister?

MISS K. FRIESEN: Yes, it is.

HON. R. PENNER: Senior Officer 3.

MISS K. FRIESEN: I'm sorry I don't have that with me.

MR. R. PENNER: But that's higher, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner, the Clerk of Committees is going to get that for us. Mr. Penner, just for the information of the committee, when the salary changes were made approximately two years ago, I believe that the changes that were made, from my personal recollection, were such that the salary for the Clerk of the House and the Chief Electoral Officer were made identical in the Senior Officer 3 range so that there would be no difference. The present proposal would make a difference, a lower salary for the Clerk of the House than for the Chief Electoral Officer, but I have not been privy to any discussions about the salary. I was not aware until it was mentioned now that there was a difference.

HON. R. PENNER: May I speak to that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I don't agree that we should deviate from the decision that was previously made, that they should both be at the same level and paid at the Senior Officer 3 level. If one looks at the impor-

tance of the Clerk of the House to the whole machinery of government, I don't think at this time it should be downplayed. Now we know it's a time of restraint, but we're talking about a few thousand dollars a year with respect to a very, very important position. I think that we should state the salary range in line with the previous decision that they should both be, that is, the Chief Electoral Officer and the Clerk of the House, at the Senior Officer 3 level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the committee, the Senior Officer 3 range is \$47,062 to \$56,873.00. You may recall that was also the range for the Ombudsman. It was the range we advertised for that position.

Miss Friesen was shaking her head. I may have improperly advised the committee, so I should allow her to correct if my information was wrong.

Miss Friesen.

MISS K. FRIESEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Reeves was paid the Senior Officer 3 level when he had both the duties. At one point, he had both duties of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Graham can enlighten the committee on this matter since I don't know how to do it. Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to state as a fact, but when I was Speaker of the House, I believe it was in that period of time that the change to Senior Officer 3 level took place in Mr. Reeve's salary and it was to place it - that was why I asked you the question - it was to give it the equivalent status to an Assistant Deputy Minister. That had nothing to do, as far as I can recall, with whether he was Chief Electoral Officer. As a matter of fact, he was not Chief Electoral Officer at that time. I believe that to be the case, I would want to go back and check the record to be sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham, I can confirm that. It was only after the appointment of a new Chief Electoral Officer and the separation of the office that Mr. Reeve's classification was moved from ASO 7 to Senior Officer 3. When he held both positions, he held them at a much lower salary. It was only after the separation that the increase went through.

Is there any further discussion on salary? It's been suggested by Mr. Penner that it should be Senior Officer 3. Is there any further discussion on that?

MR. L. SHERMAN: How does that compare, just for our information, with other provinces, other Legislatures? Do you know, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Historically, Manitoba was one of the lowest. The move to Senior Officer 3 brought it into line as of about two years ago. Now my information is, of course, about two years out of date because of personal circumstance. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker may be more familiar with current salaries in other jurisdictions.

MR. J. WALDING: I regret I cannot help you,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: If we go with Senior Officer 3, how does this compare with the salary range of the present Ombudsman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned earlier, it would be identical to the current Ombudsman salary and the current range for the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. Storie.

MR. J. STORIE: Could I ask for the salary range of the Assistant Clerk at present?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Miss Friesen, do you know.

MISS K. FRIESEN: Yes, he's being paid at the Administrative Services Officer 3 level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I think I have that here, which is \$28,365 to \$34,631.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?
Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. WALDING: For the information of the committee, Mr. Chairman, the classification for the Assistant Clerk is presently under review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been for 10 years. Any further discussion on salary?
Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I would like to suggest, not hearing any contrary voices, that there appears to be a consensus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed the salary will be Senior Officer 3, which is the range of \$47,062 - 56,873.00? Agreed? (Agreed)

Is there any further discussion then about the duties, qualifications or salary, the first matter that we placed on our agenda today? Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have attended various legislative seminars and what not and I've heard arguments that have been put forward by both proponents. Some feel that a degree in Law is almost a must and others consider it not important at all. It depends on who you're talking to how much importance is placed on the qualifications or the fact that a degree in Law should or should not be a desirable qualification. I would like to hear other people's views on that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I think our society has a lot of myths, as does every society, and one of the greatest myths is the somehow superior qualifications of somebody with a Law degree. Let me be the first, and by no means the last, to say that is a myth.

I think it is sufficient to say that it is desirable because it makes it possible for someone in that position to assist the Speaker in rulings which sometimes

depend on interpretation. You do pick up some skills or some of those who get a Law degree pick up some skills in Legislative interpretation, not all of them by any means and there are others who haven't got Law degrees who may have even superior skills in doing that. I think it is sufficient to say that it's desirable, as is the degree in Social Sciences. I certainly would not suggest that it be placed as a qualification, as a must. It's sufficient to say it's desirable. I wouldn't even say highly desirable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: I wonder whether we should farther broaden social sciences. That means that if your background is physical science, you are at a disadvantage already. I wonder whether we could insert the words "social and behavioural sciences or law?" This includes psychology and psychiatry and whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?
Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: The only comment I have, Mr. Chairman, is that I would like to see our process become less legalise because there are so many people that do not follow the parliamentary system and politics simply because they have the myth, as Mr. Penner has pointed out, that it is strictly for the legal minds. The more we can make it appealing to the public, the better off we'll be. Consequently, I would suggest that we not emphasize the legal aspects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I was just going to comment briefly on the point that Mr. Santos made. I think the term "social sciences" is fairly encompassing. If you get to the so-called behavioural sciences, I don't know - it may be, in a sense, that someone who has a degree in psychology is going to better understand the peculiarities of individual legislators, but maybe that's not a desirable asset at all, but a liability. I wouldn't want him to fully understand Sherman when he's talking.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Nor would I want you to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: I understand that Law is a social science. Why specify it separately from the social sciences?

HON. R. PENNER: To indicate the other social sciences, because a lot of people don't think of Law as a social science, although strictly speaking it is encompassed under that generic term, but the social sciences include Sociology and Political Studies. Both of those, I think, would be an asset, but I would take out the word "highly" and just put in "desirable."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the point about stressing the high desirability is well taken. I would like to see that. I think if that one term, one

phrase, were changed it would be satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed we strike out the word "highly?"

MR. L. SHERMAN: Or even substitute something like "valuable" for the two words. For one thing, the term "desirable" is likely to be overworked by the time we get through rewording the ad. Secondly, I think it puts a little too strong an emphasis on the requirement when you say that such and such is desirable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested by Mr. Sherman that we strike out the words "is highly desirable" and substitute therefor "would be valuable." Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Any further discussion?

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I know this is doing what I said we shouldn't do, it's fine tuning it, but there is a substantive point. Instead of a university degree, what about a background in? Why does it have to be university degree? Again, we overvalue the degree and some people may have a significant background.

MR. J. STORIE: Community College certificate or something else.

HON. R. PENNER: Just a background, yes, in the social sciences or Law.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested by Mr. Penner that the words "a university degree" be struck out and be replaced by the phrase "a background in." Is that agreed? (Agreed)

HON. R. PENNER: Two years ago, when I was president of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, you never would have heard me speaking like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on the qualifications, duties, etc.?

MR. C. SANTOS: If we retain Law there as a special category it is emphasizing that particular branch of social science and I am afraid we will be deluged with applications from lawyers. If it is really included in the rubric, social sciences, we might as well take out "or Law" because it is putting a special emphasis on something which we are not really desiring. I would so move that we remove "or Law."

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Santos that we remove the phrase "or Law." Is there any discussion?

Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I don't like to quarrel with my friend, Mr. Santos, but I see nothing wrong with the specific reference to Law. We're dealing with legal procedures; we're dealing with legislation; we're dealing here with a position that is immured in legalities and legislative fine points. I think that, on balance, a knowledge of the law and some background in the law

is a valuable asset to have in this job and I see no harm in specifying it.

MR. P. FOX: You're making it difficult for me to apply, Bud.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion on the motion of Mr. Santos? All those in favour of the motion, please say aye. All those opposed, please say nay. The nays have it, so the words "or Law" stay in.

Any further discussion?

The next item suggested to us was that we move from the question of duties and qualifications to an advertisement and then an advertising schedule. Is this, as we drafted it, completely suitable as an advertisement? Would you like to approve the changes that we made, in principle, subject to final drafting and then circulation to members of the committee before insertion?

Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Obviously, somewhere here, Mr. Chairman, we're speaking about the Province of Manitoba. I assume that goes without saying, although the ad does not say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our Clerk has suggested that the advertisement could be done in the same style as the one that was done for the Ombudsman with the Provincial Crest, Clerk of the House, and then the descriptive material. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

May I make the suggestion that, in consultation with Miss Friesen and the Clerk of Committees, I'll come up with a draft ad which can be then shown to members on both sides before insertion is made. Is that agreed? (Agreed) Thank you.

Next, Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Where did we get to on this fluency business?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I tried to take the consensus, Mr. Graham, that what we wanted was a phrase which provided that a full working capability in English was required and a working knowledge of the other official language would be an asset and that would be incorporated somehow, perhaps not exactly in those words, but that general . . .

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: In order to get us off of any hook in terms of advertisement, I thought we agreed "a full working knowledge in one of the official languages and a working competence," or whatever your phrase is, "in the other."

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would avoid using the words "English" or "French?"

HON. R. PENNER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was also agreed, yes.

MR. R. PENNER: We want to leave it open for Ukrainians and Mennonites to apply as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it would be clear that a full working knowledge of one language was required, or working capability, and a working knowledge of the other would be an asset.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, the term "fluency" is all right in that first instance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the asset?

MR. L. SHERMAN: No, fluency . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fluency in one official language is required, working knowledge of the other would be an asset, with perhaps some articles added.
Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I was going to get on to the advertisement.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just on that same point, if the Attorney-General can clear it for us, insofar as Human Rights legislation is concerned, I would . . .

HON. R. PENNER: There is no problem; that formulation is a good one.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But I would be prepared to go to the specification of English as the one in which a person should be fluent. I don't think there should be any doubt left in people's minds, whether they're applying for this job from the Gaspé or from the Yukon, that the fluency they've got to have is in English, if that will jibe with the Human Rights legislation.

HON. R. PENNER: I think, practically speaking, we'll have no problem. Clearly, as a committee, we're going to choose someone who we think has good oral and written communication skills which clearly have to be with members of our Legislature, all of whom are fluent in the one language. Some have fluency in the other, but not many — (Interjection) — This would just avoid both legal and political problems seeming to prefer one language over the other in terms of the public advertisement of the position.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Will this ad be translated into French and run in French language publications, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that would be one of the items we would discuss under Insertion and the Advertising Schedule that we wish to conduct. I don't know what the will of the committee is in that regard.
Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: On that first paragraph, the Clerk advises the Speaker on matters of procedure and Rules of the House. "he advises." Now should we make that "he/she" or else we could have a problem there?

HON. R. PENNER: Just "the Clerk advises," yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been suggested that we substituted the word "the Clerk" for "he" to avoid any sexist

connotation. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Any further discussion? Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: On the ad, if I recall, with respect to the Ombudsman ad, we advertised once or twice in the national edition of The Globe and we then advertised in the Winnipeg papers and I think a cross-section . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I can be of assistance, Mr. Penner, the advertising schedule was two insertions in the Free Press and Brandon Sun, two insertions in the Winnipeg Sun, two insertions in The Globe and Mail and one insertion in all Manitoba weekly newspapers. The cost of that was \$1,600.00.
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think that each province also has its own system of communication and I would hope that any advertisement that we would place would also go to every provincial jurisdiction for inclusion in their information packages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know if that's possible, Mr. Graham, but we can certainly check it out. The Clerk advises that there is an annual Association of Clerks at the Table Conference in Alberta at the end of this month and copies of the advertisement could be circulated at that meeting, August 31st to September 4th. Would that satisfy your requirement, Mr. Graham?

MR. L. SHERMAN: You could slip it under the doors in the hotel.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, I think that we should - I'm looking up here again and it says, "publications to all provincial capitals, to the Northwest Territories and Yukon." I think that it's a matter of courtesy that we should do this, that this ad should be released to those various jurisdictions. What they do with it is up to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe, Mr. Graham, that the intention here was that it was publications in those locations, newspapers in each of those locations that's being suggested. Perhaps Miss Friesen can clarify the intention because she would be more familiar with advertising for Civil Service posts.
Miss Friesen.

MISS K. FRIESEN: Yes, the intention was that wherever there was a provincial capital that the most widely circulated newspaper would run this ad in connection with Miss Simons from the Advertising Audit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So what is proposed then on this draft is something broader than what we did for the Ombudsman. What is your will and pleasure? Do you wish to have the advertisement placed in the most prominent daily newspaper in every provincial capital and in the Territories or do we wish to restrict it to the level of advertising that we used for the Ombudsman?

HON. R. PENNER: If it weren't for the information which we just received about the meeting of Clerks of the Assemblies at the end of this month, where we can

circulate the ad, maybe there would be some point to the extra expenditure. But, you know, we're really reaching out to a very, very limited constituency, given the qualifications. These are tight times and another thousand bucks is another thousand bucks. Think of all the buffalo pins you can get for a thousand bucks. I would think that The Globe and Mail, National Edition, now is very widely read, particularly by people who have any interest in public administration and public policy and government. I would go that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Penner says, another thousand bucks, Mr. Chairman. I know he's just using the term rhetorically because it would be thousands and thousands of dollars. There is no way you could differentiate between the Edmonton Journal and the St. John, New Brunswick Telegraph. If you did one, you'd have to do them both and it would be thousands and thousands of dollars. I think it would be a waste.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested that we follow an advertising format similar to that used for the Ombudsman advertisements. Do you want me to go over that schedule again? That's the Brandon paper, both Winnipeg papers, the National Edition of The Globe and Mail and all Manitoba weeklies, once; the first four, twice.

MR. P. FOX: And a letter to the Conference of Clerks at the Table informing them of the ad.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And also a letter to all participants at the Association of Clerks at the Table Conference to which is attached a copy of the advertisement.

Mr. Nordman.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Can I just question why we would be going to all the Manitoba weeklies? I don't imagine that we would be getting the calibre of man that we are wanting from the Manitoba weeklies. I don't know how many Manitoba weeklies there are but, boy, it would sure be an additional expense. How do you feel about it, Miss Friesen?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Miss Friesen.

MISS K. FRIESEN: Manitoba weeklies' advertising is very expensive.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Take the little Metro One that is in my area. My gosh, it's more expensive to advertise in it than it is to advertise in The Free Press.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested that we drop the provision for a one-time insertion in the Manitoba weeklies. I realize this was a point of some discussion during the Ombudsman hearing, so I leave it up to the committee to comment any further.

Mr. Santos.

MR. C. SANTOS: We required it in the case of the Ombudsman because there was a desirable requirement to be, as far as possible, familiar with the institutions and practices of government in Manitoba. This is

not a requirement for the Clerk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your will and pleasure? It has been suggested that we drop the provision for the insertion in the weekly newspapers.

Mr. Sherman, did you have a question?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Six minutes after eleven, Bud.

MR. L. SHERMAN: No, I'll waive that question, Mr. Chairman. I'll discuss it with Mr. Graham afterwards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been suggested that we limit advertising to the distribution at the Conference, the Brandon and Winnipeg daily papers and the Toronto Globe and Mail, with a double insertion in each of those four newspapers. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The only further requirements then are: to whom should applications be addressed and what should our closing date be? I think then we can finalize the ad. Suggestions?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it was the second thing that I wanted to address and that is the time frame that we're looking at and how soon we want to have this position finalized. Have we the luxury of, say, another eight weeks? How great is the pressure to reach that final date?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that there would be considerable pressure if there were to be a Session this fall. Then it would be rather imperative that we put this ad in the papers as soon as possible and advertise this position as quickly as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the whole problem can be cleared up if the Attorney-General will take the opportunity to announce the day of the next opening of the next Session of the Legislature.

HON. R. PENNER: I saw you coming a way back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner with his announcement.

MR. R. PENNER: Actually, it's for the middle of September. We're calling the House for the middle of September so there isn't time anyway.

Realistically, I think that advertising nationally, giving reasonable opportunity, given that the next couple of weeks are still to some extent part of the vacation period, that the deadline should be the end of September. Give it time to circulate, to sink in and with the vicissitudes - is that the word? - of the postal service, I am proposing that the application to be received not later than September 30th.

MR. P. FOX: That's giving them six weeks.

HON. R. PENNER: It's not six weeks, Peter. By the time you get the ad drafted and circulated to the

committee and approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fox.

MR. P. FOX: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I don't know that we need all members of the committee to have a look at the ad again. I think we've fairly well got a consensus and if the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition of this committee approve it, I am prepared to go along with it in order to cut time. Maybe Mr. Graham may want to have a look at it and he can get together with Mr. Sherman at that particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I think the first thing, Mr. Chairman, is we have to have a meeting to decide who's the leader of our group on this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was my question. Who do I show it to?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting how the ball does get bounced around. I think that this was brought up in the Cabinet and they suggested they bounce it off onto this committee and now we've got a member of this committee suggesting we bounce it back again.

I think that there's nothing wrong with the committee doing exactly what we did before. I don't think it will take a long period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been suggested earlier that the showing of the ad to members of the committee could be done. I'm at your will and pleasure. If you wish a representative on each side to approve that the draft of the ad meets with what we've discussed here today, that was basically what was done last time. The ad was circulated to members at the same time that the advertisement went out to the newspaper, simply because of the tight time frame in which we operated. Members did not have a chance to meet again to discuss the final draft, although it was shown to several members on each side, because the House was in Session and members were easily accessible.

I am at your will and pleasure. If the committee wants to meet again to approve the ad, we can do that or we can agree that a representative from each side approve the ad. It's been suggested that it might be Mr. Sherman or Mr. Graham or Mr. Fox or Mr. Penner. I'm at your will and pleasure. I don't know who on either side.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I would think that Bud would be the proper one. He's fairly close, unless he has other personal plans that may take him away from home for a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: No, that's no problem, Mr. Chairman. We can designate somebody. If it's convenient for our committee members for it to be me, I'll be here, I'll be in the city; I can do it any day you want.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm equally accessible, so I would volunteer, rather than have greatness thrust upon me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been suggested that after consultation with Miss Friesen and the Clerk of the Committee. I will show the ad to Mr. Penner and Mr. Sherman, get their approval, and the insertions will proceed. Too, it's been suggested a September 30 deadline. Is there any further discussion on that suggested deadline? Is that agreed then, September 30th? (Agreed)

With the ad, I will also provide . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: It's too much time.

HON. R. PENNER: Working on that time frame, with only two members, I'd be willing to open on it to September 15th, give us more working time to interview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk is suggesting it will take two weeks to have the ads placed after they are approved, which would provide advertisements probably about the first week of September. Would a September 15th deadline then be acceptable?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I guess so. And we're going to be circulating it at that Conference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Conference is August 31st to September 4th, so that would allow ten days for candidates to get their applications in. Is that sufficient time?

MR. L. SHERMAN: I am of the opinion that it isn't, Mr. Chairman. I propose we split the difference and make it September 25th or whatever a convenient day is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a Friday somewhere in there on the calendar? September the 25th is a Friday. It's been suggested that Friday, the 25th of September be the deadline. Is that agreed? (Agreed) —(Interjection)— well, I can't read my calendar then. You're right. September 24th is a Friday. Is it agreed that September 24th should be our deadline? (Agreed) Thank you.

We have one other item, if I can ask Mr. Penner to hold the motion. To whom should the applications be sent? The applications for Ombudsman were sent to the Clerk of the House.

HON. R. PENNER: Can't, in this case. What about Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, yes, R. R. 1, Springfield.

MR. P. FOX: It'll never get there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's for sure. Are there any further items to be discussed as part of setting up the process for this committee?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, if those applications come in on the 24th, could we have a meeting, say, on the 27th, set a date now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: The problem with that is, as we discovered last time, the deadline for submitting is usually accepted as the post date on the letter and it may be another week after that. We can call it very, very early October, at the call of the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the next meeting of the committee will be at the call of the Chair on the understanding that the committee wishes to meet as soon as possible after the deadline, allowing several days for receipt of applications, possibly the Thursday of the following week, which would be the 30th.

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: To facilitate, what I suggest we do, on the assumption that we won't have 192 applications but more likely something about 40, that copies of the resumes be circulated to members of the committee in advance of that meeting, so we come sort of prepared and briefed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, could I just enter one personal caveat. I'll be away on a commitment on the 29th and 30th of September. I would like to participate in this process, so if you could make it . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Shortly after the 30th of September?

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . the Friday, October 1st, it would be more convenient for me, but that may be inconvenient for somebody else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of Mr. Penner's suggestion that copies of all applications and resumes be circulated to all members of the committee, which may take some time in view of the fact that many members are not in the city and that will require some mailing and also an allowance for some time for members to review them, we might well have to go to the following week. Assuming that the Tuesday or Wednesday following the Friday would be our assumed postmark cutoff date, in terms of receiving applications postmarked by the 24th, they could then be distributed late that week. I don't think we could call the meeting much before the middle of the following week which would be into the first week of October. If that's agreeable, I will look to a call some time in that period after consulting with some members. Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

Any further business? I'll entertain a motion to rise. So moved. (Agreed)

Committee is adjourned.