

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[10:03 a.m.]

MR. HYLAND: No; was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, ladies and gentlemen. Morning all. We have a number of items to come back to today, but I wonder if perhaps Mr. Clegg would bring us up to date on a couple of things that had to be done yesterday: first about about Members' Services order; then also about bonus points. Another item will be picked up later, the matter of legal costs, and then there was a description of the work of the Members' Services Committee. So, Mr. Clegg, first with the bonus point comments you want to make.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The decision respecting bonus points does not involve the expenditure of money; therefore, it would be my opinion that this could be left as a minute from the committee rather than being put in the form of an order. I think we should only issue orders where it's essential to issue orders, because we're establishing a right of financial disbursement or something. In this case we're putting down guidelines for the use of a nonfiscal benefit, which may vary from time to time because of the airlines' rules anyway. So I suggest it just be recorded as a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The other quickly disposed of item, the Members' Services order from yesterday.

MR. M. CLEGG: That order has now been signed, Mr. Chairman, and that order continues all the remunerations from the effective commencement of Bill 24 so that at present there's a continuation of all the remunerations, all the allowances, salaries, expenses, and deduction rates. The one thing that has been repealed by that Act which the order doesn't deal with is the CPI, the adjustment mechanism. That adjustment mechanism was repealed by Bill 24; therefore, unless and until the committee makes a determination about adjustment, there is no longer any automatic adjustment. So that's the only way in which we have not restored the previous circumstance. There is no way we could do that unless we were already to pass an order.

MS BARRETT: Well, is there not a motion or minute or order that we could approve that would incorporate that CPI clause? There is?

MR. M. CLEGG: That could be done.

MS BARRETT: Okay. So if it's necessary then.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, then it could be done. If the committee is not ready to make any decisions about remuneration before the end of the year, the committee could reinstate a provision relating to CPI.

MR. WICKMAN: Just a question on that, Mr. Chairman, if I could. CPI: could you tell me what that stands for, first of all?

MS BARRETT: Consumer price index.

MR. WICKMAN: Consumer price index. So what you're saying is that there's a formula in place at the present time that . . .

MS BARRETT: There was in the legislation. It's a partial inflation proofing. It's only partial.

MR. WICKMAN: So what's being said is that prior to the passage of Bill 24 there was a formula in place that would have automatically seen remuneration reviewed or adjusted?

MS BARRETT: It was automatic.

MR. WICKMAN: That it would automatically be adjusted?

MS BARRETT: What was it, Mike? If inflation exceeds 5 percent in a year or two years?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the provision is that essentially if the change up or down in the CPI -- the average for Edmonton and Calgary -- is more than 5 percent, then the members' salaries are adjusted by 5 percent. But there's a cap on the adjustment of 5 percent. If it's less than 5 percent, it's carried forward to the next year until it comes up to 5 percent.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could. When did the last 5 percent kick in?

MS BARRETT: Last year, '88 wasn't it? January '88.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, that's . . .

DR. McNEIL: January '88, not January '89.

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's what I said.

DR. McNEIL: There was no adjustment as of December '88.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll hear more about that in due course.

The documentation with regard to the work and scope of this committee.

MR. M. CLEGG: What I have done overnight, Mr. Chairman -- I've generated a first draft, but it hasn't been reviewed yet. I will have the first draft available for your review today. It essentially goes through the statutory duties of the committee and its estimates duties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps later in this day. Thank you.

Okay, we have some other items here. What we've had distributed is a result of Louise's work from yesterday and today as to what we have left to be done. If you'd like to quickly scan over that and see what else needs to be added to the agenda, then I would leave it to the committee to take them in which order. If there's some burning issue you want to deal with first, we'll just work our way back through this.

MS BARRETT: Just work our way back.

MR. McINNIS: The Bill 24 process. Is that on here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, 7(c).

MRS. BLACK: Is it \$320,000, item 6(j)?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll get to there when we come to there. We have the correct figure over here.

MR. BOGLE: I think on item 7(c) I was specifically suggesting we look at provinces like Saskatchewan and Ontario, where their board of internal review or Members' Services Committee or variation thereof has taken on responsibilities following exactly like ours, similar, rather than asking our Clerk to survey nine other governments in time for today's meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, working from this agenda that's here then, first we've had Approval of Agenda.

Business Arising from the Minutes. Mr. Clegg, Parliamentary Counsel, in regard to the question of legal aid costs for MLAs, you were having discussion with Mr. Wickman.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to catch Mr. Wickman before he left yesterday evening. I was going to ask him if he would describe the nature of the litigation that is referenced in some of the memoranda, because the analysis of this really depends on the type of legal issues. There are some matters where members have legal action commenced against them or will have to take some legal action which relates so closely to their duties that they would have to do this. It's quite a complicated matter. Mr. Ritter has been preparing a memorandum on this, I believe. He has been in discussion with Dr. McNeil on a draft memorandum, and I think he is preparing something which will outline the general traditional role of the Assembly and what matters are regarded as touching on the Assembly to such a degree that they are really Assembly matters and what matters are really private matters for a member to be concerned with.

But very, very briefly I'll just mention that where members have been involved in litigation related to matters which arise outside the Legislature, this has generally been their responsibility. Where it comes within the Legislature, then any suit against a member or any right of a member which is infringed also becomes the Assembly's concern, and therefore the Assembly will act in any event. Other matters such as election matters have always been the responsibility of the member, often supported by the party but not necessarily. But we have to analyze this in a generic sense and also show how this analysis could be applied to the various cases which are out there at the moment.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't expect a comprehensive report on this as quickly as this morning. It is going to take, I think, a period of time to sort out. I'm not aware of the specifics with the two cases involved, but I don't think we should be looking at those two particular cases in isolation. My intent was to see us develop guidelines that would fall for those types of scenarios where you have MLAs proceeding with litigation against another MLA. At the present time there is no mechanism that I'm aware of to cover legal costs for opposition members or backbenchers. There is for cabinet ministers, from what I understand.

My intent, Mr. Chairman, was to allow Parliamentary Counsel the opportunity to research it fully. Other than the memos I gave him yesterday, I really don't have anything to add. I think

you'd have to go to the members specifically and question them if there is a need for that, but I'm not sure there is. Again I say that I'm not talking just about those two situations. It's just that there has to be a policy developed on it that members know they fall within.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll take that as a motion and table that. Those in favour of the motion to table? Carried. Opposed? Sorry; such an overwhelming majority. Thank you.

All right, the next item is the matter of dealing with the funding request on behalf of the Liberal caucus. The request is made by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. The Clerk has some information here that is being distributed. Perhaps we could have that before we start taking the order.

Okay, Clerk, speaking to the document first.

DR. McNEIL: The information in front of you, the present Liberal caucus budget, is based on \$32,000 per member plus a leader's budget of \$192,880. If you use the 1989-90 caucus formula that was applied to the NDs that was not taken by the Liberals -- they applied last year's formula instead of this year's formula -- we come out to \$36,000 per member times eight members, a leader's budget of \$198,666, which is 3 percent on top of the \$192,880, to come to a total of \$486,666. So the difference between the one formula and the other comes to \$37,786.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the bottom line. All right; so we have a motion before us. The motion was to table. Oh, here we are. Edmonton-Whitemud. We do not have a motion before us.

MR. WICKMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman; I didn't get the last comment.

MS BARRETT: He said we don't have a motion before us. Do we?

MR. BOGLE: We haven't tabled it yet.

MS BARRETT: We tabled it. We had a tabled motion, yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had a tabled motion to today. That was carried. So I believe we are now at -- was there a motion by Wickman to increase it? The amount was at that stage what, \$32,000? So this makes it specific.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, there was a motion, Mr. Chairman, to restore it, with the understanding that the Clerk would plug in the appropriate figure, which I thought was somewhere between \$32,000 and \$36,000. I see it's a little more than I had anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to give this one another try. It's very, very important to me, to the members of the Liberal caucus. I pleaded yesterday, I groveled, I did whatever, and again I ask for a sense of what I feel is fair play. What's happened in the past has happened in the past. Those types of situations do occur, where I believe the former member representing our caucus was trying to demonstrate a principle, a principle of restraint. His principle of restraint, from what I understand, was to ask all three caucuses to hold the line, to freeze. Then that would have been fair because everybody would have had to adjust and live under that same restraint. It can happen that people do kind of back themselves into a corner and then they can't get

out of that corner, and I have to suspect that's what's happened in this particular case. But it has hurt us severely within the caucus; \$37,786 means another one and a half researchers. To put the Liberal caucus on par with the other caucuses, I have to again recommend that this committee show what I feel is a sense of fair play and restore it to its original level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Red Deer-North, followed by Calgary-Glenmore, Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I wanted just to take some issue with Mr. Wickman's comments about groveling. I feel that would suggest that there's some kind of a master/servant relationship around this table. I think that demeans every member, that we would be considered to give some kind of advance if somebody grovels sufficiently. I think around this table we are equals. We present our concerns and the merits of the case, and upon reasoned consideration a decision is made. If the member could take that into consideration as he makes any future comments, I don't think that's an aspect of the deliberations around this table whatsoever.

If we are talking about fair play, there's some very clear fair play considerations here. I think it's amply demonstrated in the past that fairness in terms of caucus distributions has been very evident. In fact, unfortunately in this particularly case a particular caucus arguably was able to make some political hay -- if I can use that expression -- based on a decision, and after reaping the harvest of what they sowed, they now want to retract on that. I have empathy for the concerns of the other opposition members with that particular request. I'm open to hear other considerations on this as we deliberate from a point of view of reasoned consideration and not from the point of view of groveling.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if we could pull a copy of *Hansard* for the hon. member to read so that he could get the word-by-word communication that we had. I was on the committee when the hon. member from the Liberal Party was talking about our increases, and he came there with the understanding that he was representing the whole Liberal caucus. It wasn't just an individual who was trying to show fiscal restraint, but he came there representing the full caucus. It was our belief that all those caucus members of that party were very aware of what he was doing at the time. There were four of them. I feel that for the member's reference we should pull the *Hansard* so he can read it exactly.

MR. WICKMAN: I've read it, Mr. Chairman.

MS BARRETT: I'd like to correct something else that Percy referred to regarding this hold-the-line posture and the uniformity of its application. Percy, we were attempting to recover cuts that amounted to, for instance, in our caucus 18 percent. Those cuts were never fully recovered by that motion last year. In fact, the original formula that we had determined in 1986 on a per member basis would have been -- correct me if I'm wrong; I don't know who'd remember precisely. Was it \$40,000 to begin with? That's right. So, in fact, when we approved the motion to raise it because we had been cut back by \$8,000 per member, then last year's motion was to increase that per member component to \$36,000 from \$32,000. So any assumption about holding the line would be incorrect. In fact, we were only attempt-

ing to recover what we had lost, and we have yet to do that, by the way.

MR. McINNIS: Then it came to my mind as well that that was shortly after I commenced employment with the Official Opposition, and we had to lay off two staff as a result of that.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. McINNIS: Particularly painful.

Anyway, I would like to support the request to this extent. I think we need to get back to the formula of financing. We're off the formula because of the action that was taken. I would support that in terms of next year's budget. For this year it's already been established, and a special warrant would be required to make up the difference. I think this puts the member, unfortunately, in the same position as Mr. Aalborg was yesterday: seeking an action from the Provincial Treasurer. The committee took the action to essentially refer Mr. Aalborg to the Provincial Treasurer. I think that's pretty much the position that we have to take on this matter in respect of the current fiscal year. The Liberal caucus should approach the Provincial Treasurer to seek a special warrant for additional funding and then look at the question of restoring the formula in terms of next year's estimates. That's my position.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, we have in our budgeting process the ability to move money from a constituency office into -- what is it, maximum 25 percent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We rescinded that.

MS BARRETT: We rescinded that, but we could certainly entertain another motion that would allow that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We went through that fight not once but twice, but I'm sure we could do it a third time. We could do it a third time, I suppose.

MS BARRETT: I mean, I'd be prepared to sponsor that type of motion after this one is dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion?

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to conclude debate. The reference made about support for bringing it up to the level next year: I would have just assumed that that was a given. God, you know, a person makes an error. How long are you expected to pay for it?

MS BARRETT: That was not an error.

MRS. MIROSH: There was no error there.

MR. WICKMAN: From my point of view an error was made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order in the committee, please.

MR. WICKMAN: I'm not pleading for next year; I'm pleading for this year. This committee is in the position that they can in fact make a recommendation to the cabinet to issue a special spending warrant, and that's what my motion would entail.

That's basically what the request is. I guess the cards fall where the cards fall.

MR. HYLAND: Can someone read the motion?

MS BARRETT: It says to give them \$320,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The understanding of the Chair is that the motion is to request a special warrant to obtain funding of \$37,786 for the Liberal caucus for the 1989-90 fiscal year. Perhaps since there are a number of requests here around the table that people want to hear what's in the record, if people want to read the record, let's do that.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, there are some new members here that wouldn't have had that opportunity to hear the debate of the day.

MRS. BLACK: Could you read them?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I could. I just need a moment to decide where to start here. Okay. When we went to section 7, the Liberal opposition: "MR. TAYLOR: . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: First just identify the page.

MS BARRETT: Yup, 154, February 13, 1989. The Official Opposition budget had been dealt with at this point.

MR. TAYLOR: My approach is no different than it was last year. I think on February 9th I said that the budget as submitted by all parties seemed reasonable. It's in line and actually a little better than in line. So I feel that we've learned to cut our cloth to fit what's there. In view of the fact that we've increased the constituency allowances by a little over 30 percent, we've doubled our pensions, we've increased our salaries by between 8 percent and 10 percent, we've got a severance allowance, a re-establishment allowance -- you're looking puzzled -- a resettlement or whatever it is: all these things have been voted in. So the life of an MLA or its support system has not been bad. So, Mr. Chairman, I just see no need . . .

That's really weird.

. . . whatsoever for any increase. [I've] got to stop somewhere, and this is where I'd want to stop.

That's the substance of his argument. I'll just see if I can find a reference. I believe he does refer to discussions with his caucus. I don't see it at this point. This is fairly lengthy. What we could do is pass it around. We all made comments. I mean, there were a whole bunch of us. There was Bogle, Barrett, Wright, Mirosh, I think Kowalski as well in on the debate. It's quite lengthy, so you don't want me to read forever. I'll tell you what I will do is look quietly for a moment while we carry on, and I'll see if I can find the reference to him having consulted his caucus and leader.

MR. BOGLE: If I may be permitted to direct a question to Percy: are you suggesting, Percy, that the three members of the caucus prior to the election other than Mr. Taylor did not approve the action taken by Mr. Taylor at this meeting?

MR. WICKMAN: I can't, Mr. Chairman, reflect back on what happened in the previous caucus, but by my reading of the *Hansard* report, that member, when he made references, used the

terminology "I," which leads me to the impression he was speaking on his own behalf. If you want to cut his budget by \$4,000, maybe he deserves it, but in the meanwhile there are seven others being impacted, plus four new people who weren't even around for that decision.

MR. BOGLE: Because we're dealing with an issue where most of us who were sitting around the table know the cautions that were given to Mr. Taylor at the time, my natural inclination is to say that you live with what's there. To be completely fair to you and your caucus, Percy, it seems to me that the committee should really be tabling this matter so that you can go back and ascertain from the three members -- and I'm talking about the three members of the caucus prior to the last election -- whether or not they were involved in that process and whether they agreed with it and come back with something in a written form to this committee.

MR. WICKMAN: In response, Mr. Chairman, what difference is that going to make to this committee? I've explained all that. Nick Taylor as the representative did a certain thing just like myself as the representative now taking on certain obligations. Even if the committee were to say they can understand that impact being felt by those four former members, to have the impact to all eight . . . Even if the committee were to say that a fair compromise may be restoring half of it, considering that there are four new members who did not participate in any fashion, even that I could see as a sign of fairness. If somebody wanted to make an amendment to restore half of it, I would support that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, unless the Chair hears otherwise on this . . .

DR. ELLIOTT: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I want to make sure that it's acceptable for me to get into the debate at this time. If accepted, I'll speak to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't have an amendment, but I was hearing that we were getting precious close to a request to table. But Grande Prairie, continue.

DR. ELLIOTT: Well, I made the motion yesterday to table this. I'll make the motion again today, until we get further information on it. I say that because I'm deeply concerned about the way the discussion is going. I was at that meeting. I was a member of the committee. I witnessed the discussion. I recall it very clearly. The representative of that caucus knew exactly what he was doing, and I feel, for the first time in my life, I'm being asked to be part of rewriting history to accommodate a particular situation because somebody feels a mistake was made. You might say that we could go back to the March 1989 election and say that certain mistakes were made, somebody forgot to vote, and they want to rerun the election. Maybe it would change the outcome or something; I don't know. So I'm recommending we table it, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is tabled. Those in favour of the tabling motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

The matter of the interns. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Oh, gee. I don't know what to do at this point.

I mean, my motion was defeated. I guess the issue . . . What happens now? Does it go back to chiefs of staff? I don't have any idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Well, we dealt with a motion that we go to the draw, and that motion was defeated. It seems to me that the first thing we should look at is a representative from each of the caucuses meeting, and I'm talking about elected representatives, to see if some accommodation can be made that is satisfactory to all. If that's possible, then we move ahead. And if it's not, we continue to sit at a stalemate.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: One alternative that occurred to me is that if we can't agree to a draw on the selection, how about a draw for the order of choice?

MR. BOGLE: Well, I don't think we need to take the time of this table to go into a process. We've found in the past three years that there are times when representatives from each of the caucuses can meet and can work out the circumstances.

MS BARRETT: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since it's also under the direction of the Speaker's office, I assume somebody from my office will be present when you finally decide what you're going to do.

MR. BOGLE: In fairness, we'll have a private discussion, and then we'll notify the Speaker's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And then the representatives from each of your parties are to know who they are, besides the one from the Liberal caucus?

MR. BOGLE: Okay. We can work that out.

MS BARRETT: Well, we can go ahead and put it on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, we will put it under the action column of our agenda. We will hear back from the vice-chairman.

MS BARRETT: By the next meeting, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly hope so, since they all start here on September 1, which is fast approaching. Okay, that's been taken as a general agreement, that one.

Seven (c). Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, since yesterday and listening to some of the comments today, possibly we should have done more research on this prior to coming to the meeting yesterday. I wasn't aware that you were talking in terms of a formula that had been there prior to the Bill. I did see an increase in 1988. I was under the impression that the last time there was any increase in remuneration and when the matter was reviewed was, in fact, 1986. There were comments read by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, references to Nick Taylor talking about

increases of 8 to 10 percent. Maybe I've been under the wrong impression about things being in place since 1986. My motion is on the floor, and it will stand, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, hon. member. Your motion is on the floor, but we are speaking to an amendment at this stage moved by Public Works, Supply and Services that the membership of the committee be two government members and one each from the two opposition parties, just for clarification. Please continue.

MR. WICKMAN: I have no problems with the amendment, Mr. Chairman. Now, do you want me to restrict comments to the amendment till we get to the motion? I have no further comments on the amendment, but I do wish to speak on the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, no, I think . . . I'm sorry; I'm, like the rest of you, just so recently out of the House. No, we don't restrict it in quite the same way in the committee. So you can range wherever you wish to, committee members.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to continue, I think a review is always healthy; I think there's no question about it. But I don't think we can make the assumption that the review is going to mean an increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Forgive me, hon. member. We do need to pick up the information that was gleaned overnight from the other provinces. Do you all want to hear that now, or do you want to wait until after the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud finishes his comments?

MS BARRETT: I'd rather hear the report first, if that's all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Agreed?

MR. SCARLETT: We were able to contact two out of the three jurisdictions. In Ontario the management board of cabinet makes salary recommendations directly to the Assembly, so it's an internal cabinet government decision.

In Saskatchewan the last time, which was in 1988, a three-person commission was appointed on the agreement of government and opposition. That commission was made up of Justice Malone, a member of the Wheat Pool, and a businessman. They reported directly to the Board of Internal Economy, which is the equivalent of the Members' Services board, who in turn could alter the recommendations of that commissioned report, and then the report went into the Assembly. That commission was appointed by an order in council.

MS BARRETT: If I can, I think in British Columbia their Board of Internal Economy was given the responsibility of dealing with this matter as well. I know someone who sits on that committee, so that's how I'm aware of that. They don't go back to the Assembly with their recommendations; their motion is the motion that sets the benefits and indemnities. But I don't know if they hired or contracted a third party or an independent party to report to them initial findings. I don't have that information.

MR. KOWALSKI: That would be, Ms Barrett, their Members' Services Committee, the equivalent of that.

MS BARRETT: Correct. Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: They don't have to get the approval of the Assembly.

MS BARRETT: That's right. That I know for sure, yes.

MR. WICKMAN: Just to continue, Mr. Chairman, I see a review, looking at the whole scenario. Yesterday I pointed out some of the injustices that I saw; for example, the 25 percent additional honorarium paid the leader of the Liberal caucus in comparison to the leader of the New Democrat caucus. Even though the membership is 50 percent, yet the additional dollars are 25 percent. That's one area that I feel has to be adjusted.

But a review means exactly what it states, Mr. Chairman. A review means that you look at it; you look at the whole picture. And a review could very well mean that in comparison to other provinces, maybe it shouldn't go up; maybe it should go down -- maybe we should be showing some leadership. I don't know that. We don't know that until the review takes place.

Now, after my motion was made, I heard comments that I felt were a little disturbing. I don't think one can make the assumption that it's going to mean increases. The Member for Edmonton-Highlands stated that MLAs probably deserve an increase. Maybe we do; at this point I don't know. The Member for Barrhead claims MLAs are paid too little. I don't know. That's the purpose of a review. We're making certain assumptions, and we send a flag to the public which is very, very bad.

Mr. Chairman, I will support the motion that had been placed to establish the subcommittee, and I will support the amendment to make it four members to accommodate two members from the Tory caucus because that to me is fair; they have the largest number of people here. But before I agree on behalf of the Liberal caucus to participate in that committee, I'm going to take it back to our caucus to get their okay. I'm learning by what's happened in the past, and I'm not going to get caught with my pants down. I just want the blessing of our caucus that, yes, we as the Liberal caucus want to participate in this all-party committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With due respect, hon. member, you bring forth the motion to establish that committee, and the initial motion was one, one, and one. One would have thought that you had a full understanding that as the representative of your caucus on this committee you would then be the one who would have to participate. So I find it a bit curious that you now raise this, but perhaps you can communicate to your caucus so that this whole process doesn't just get frozen here in time.

MR. WICKMAN: That's my intention, Mr. Chairman, to report back to the caucus. We have seen references to statements that have been made at the meeting yesterday or after the meeting yesterday, and I just want to be totally certain that I have the support of our caucus.

MR. McINNIS: I'd like to state a couple of things. One is that of the three models that were surveyed overnight, I think Saskatchewan is the one that comes closest to my view of how we should proceed with this new responsibility. It seems to me we're in a position now to look at the base and establish whether it's fair or not and deal with the question of indexing as well. We've now scrapped the indexing, with some expectation that

there would be a review. I know some members feel there isn't a lot of difference appointing a committee and being on the committee. I simply say: would you rather have the integrity of the committee you appointed attacked or your own integrity attacked? I don't think there's too much question around that, so I like the Saskatchewan model.

I don't know what to do about the problem of the Liberals not being sure whether or not to participate in the committee. I think if the committee's inclined, we should set it up with the invitation to the Liberals to join it if and when they get around to deciding that they want to. Whoever's involved in deciding that, they can join at that time or not, as the case may be. I guess that's the only way I see around that problem.

MR. WICKMAN: That's fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question on the amendment.

MS BARRETT: I have a concern, if I may express it, and that is that if we approve this amendment and then the motion itself, what it means is that participation in the subcommittee is then voluntary, and I don't like that, quite frankly. I mean, I think I made a good case yesterday for setting up an independent committee. Now, that was defeated and I can live with that, but by cracky, if we're going to deal with this, we're going to deal with it fairly. I thought that my recommendation was the better product. It's not on the shelf anymore, so I have a very strong feeling that either this subcommittee involves at least one member from every caucus or we scrap the deal and go back to the bargaining table. I'm not going to play that game; no chancy.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I'm of the view that if we approve the amendment -- and I've not heard anyone speak against the principle of the amendment -- and then approve the amended motion, each caucus is then able to nominate its members to the committee. Now, if I follow the argument, Pam, that you've just made, you could go through that process and then one caucus could decide not to participate, and the whole thing would come to an end. I don't agree with that; I don't agree with it at all. We're dealing with a process at this table, and the committee will proceed as long as there's a quorum, because all the subcommittee of this committee can do is recommend back to the table. That's all. It isn't a decision-making committee. It's not holding public hearings. It's not traveling around the province. It's not holding press conferences. It's meeting to review statistics, hard, cold facts, looking at what benefits are provided to elected members here in comparison with nine other provincial governments, two territorial governments, and with the House of Commons in Ottawa.

And then the recommendation comes back to this table. That's where you get into the crunch. That's where you have to decide whether you support, in total or in part, the recommendations. We set an example when we dealt with the expense allowances when we added on a clause that any member who did not wish to accept the proposed increase could write the Speaker, and for the duration of the session the member then would not receive that increase. That's the way we dealt with it. It seemed to be a good process. It worked well. It gave every member an opportunity to stand up if his or her conscience felt that it was an error to move in that direction. They could -- par-

don the slang -- put their money where their mouth is, and we proceed on.

As John indicated yesterday and, I believe, in the Assembly, some of the most difficult things that any elected people have to deal with, whether they're federal, provincial, or municipal, relate around salary. Whether you go to some outside body, a nonpartisan group or not, it doesn't matter. It comes back to the body that has made the appointment. They have to make the decision. So we strike a subcommittee. Their recommendations come back here; that's when it gets tough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Foothills, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Basically, what Mr. Bogle has said I agree with. I think surely to goodness, Mr. Wickman, you have come here with the wishes of your caucus already in hand. I think representation on this committee is something that we've been entrusted with from our various caucuses, and surely to goodness this motion allows for participation by all caucuses. I would think that you would already have consulted with your caucus as to whether your group would participate in this. I find it amazing that it would be a questionable thing as to whether you would participate when the motion has come forward from yourself. Surely you checked with your own caucus prior to that.

I think we were talking earlier about a questionable thing that happened last year, and I hope lessons have been learned. What we talked about earlier about the previous members from your caucus -- possibly they didn't check with their people, but surely you have. I think to hold up the process is a little bit ludicrous, because when the final analysis comes down, whether there is an outside group -- which I think would be a waste of money and time, personally -- the buck stops right here at this table as to what's decided. We've been given that mandate in the Legislature, and I think we have to stand up to the task and face it head-on. I think that, surely, if you're not in consultation with your caucus, then you should be very quickly.

MR. McINNIS: I apologize for speaking twice on this, but I happened to run across this before, where one caucus proposes an all-party process and then decides not to become involved immediately. It's sort of keeping your options open. I think we either have an all-party process every step of the way or we don't. For my part, the more I think about it, the more I'd like to keep my options open as long as the Liberals are keeping their options open, which is to say that I think we should table this thing until they make up their minds whether they want to play or not. So I'm moving to table this.

DR. ELLIOTT: Until when?

MR. McINNIS: Until they make up their minds whether they want to be involved in it or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to table. Those in favour of tabling, please signify. Opposed? Thank you. The member's motion is still up for debate.

Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. BOGLE: Could I just recommend a short coffee break?

[The committee recessed from 10:52 a.m. to 11:02 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. At last report we had defeated a motion to table. We're still dealing with the amendment on the motion, whereby the makeup of a subcommittee would be two, one, and one.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to propose a subamendment that the makeup would be three, one, and one, the reason being it more reflects the membership around this table in the same proportions as exist in the whole committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then we're on the subamendment.

MR. McINNIS: Well, I had a very different understanding about how this was going to operate when it was proposed that this legislation would come to put the matter before the committee. I'm fearful that a move to increase the government membership on the committee indicates that the committee won't operate by consensus, which means we could be into some heavy weather ahead. I have a deep concern that that's the effect of all this, to allow the government to do things unilaterally. I supported the initiative of the Liberals in setting up an all-party process to try and keep it on a consensus basis, and I just think the direction is wrong.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, now we're really going to start going round and round and round. First of all, I want to address a point raised by Pat Black. No, I did not have confirmation by my caucus. As the representative of that caucus I feel I have the right to make certain decisions, or I felt I did, on their behalf. But I'm a little more cautious now because it appears that one can lock themselves in here, and it becomes totally inflexible. But beside that point, putting all that aside, now with the change where you have, let's say, a Tory subcommittee in terms of numbers, it's a whole different concept. I think even the New Democrat members may wish to reassess their position and take it back to their caucus, because even if you had discussed an all-party subcommittee, I assume there would have been an assumption made that the representation would have been somewhat different. You know, in view of this amendment, I guess it just adds to the fact that it should be tabled. I would have hoped the motion that was made by, I believe, Mr. McInnis to table would have been an appropriate motion. Then I could have gone to the caucus and come back.

MS BARRETT: You know, there's this old theory about meetings, if you don't mind an illustration here. I've learned a few things about how to get certain things through an agenda. For instance, what you do -- this is an old trick -- if you want to get a difficult item through the agenda is you put a real complicated, boring, tedious one on first. You deal with that to the nth degree. You get so sick of it, you just want to get out of the meeting. It finally gets approved or denied or whatever, and then you go to the real tough one, and it's amazing how quickly you can make the decision. Now, the same sort of theory applies here. You know, one rep from each caucus was okay, but the two, one, and one was not so good. The three, one, and one is so unpalatable that now the two, one, and one formula looks attractive. And I'll tell you why I love this view: it's because if you have a group of four, it is much easier to arrive at a consensus, partly because of the potential for the hung jury, and that

potential usually forces a group of equal numbers to come to a consensus. Therefore, I would really urge that we go for the two, one, and one formula and get this thing over with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner, Calgary-Glenmore.

MR. BOGLE: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I put my hand up after John spoke, because he made reference to the best approach being one of consensus building. I certainly concur with that. I think anyone who's had an opportunity to follow Members' Services over the last three years, either by studying *Hansard* or by attending the meetings, would see that has been proven out time and time again.

We've had instances where urban members, including representatives from the Official Opposition as well as the -- well, the Liberal's former member was a rural member. I'll use the ND caucus as an example. They have supported increased benefits for rural members in terms of travel and out-of-town living expenses. That showed a great deal of compassion and understanding and was greatly appreciated. We had other examples where rural members looked at some of the challenges that face urban members, and it's been done on a basis of consensus and trying to take the partisanship out of the committee.

Now, I'm going to ask members to reflect back on what's happened today, and that, in my view, reflects the basis for this subamendment. First, we had the mover of the motion suggesting that before he participates in the committee, a committee that he initially recommended to us, he would need to go back to his caucus. That's the first point. John, you followed that by saying, well, if it's good for the Liberals, then you'd want to reserve whether or not the NDP should be part of the committee. So suddenly we're seeing the two opposition parties begin to manoeuvre and jockey with one another. We're sitting back and we're saying, first of all, this is a committee that can only recommend. And we're saying that if we get left without a quorum on the committee, it cannot come back and report in the proper way. I think it's important to reflect back on how we got to the point where the Member for Cypress-Redcliff put forward his subamendment to the motion. It's because we're not sure that one or both of the opposition parties are going to participate.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reflect on what the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud indicated with regard to going back to his caucus. I'm just wondering; every time there's a motion on the table, he has to keep going back to his caucus. I'm wondering whether or not he is -- what he's doing. Because, as the Member for Calgary-Foothills indicated, we're all here as representatives of our caucus, and if he has to keep going back every time there's a motion, I don't know that the Liberal Party can really partake properly in this procedure. That bothers me. I really feel, to reiterate, his motion -- it was his motion originally on this table. He had yesterday to go back to his caucus with regard to this motion and the amendment on this motion. He had lots of time to do it. That's the end of my statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Jasper Place. This is the subamendment.

MR. McINNIS: I just want to clarify a small point. My suggestion about keeping options open related to the proposal to table

the matter, not to whether or not we would participate in the committee. I was proposing to table the question until the Liberals made up their minds so we would know what we were into, not that we would refuse to participate in the process.

MR. DAY: Just on the point from Mrs. Mirosh, and maybe to encourage the Liberal member, Mr. Wickman, and give some allowance for his newness. But, really, to go back to your caucus on every point, the delays in this committee are going to be insufferable. We have a caucus of 59 which, though not easy, we're able to get some kind of consensus and find ways and means of getting back to them. The NDs have a caucus of 16, and they seem to have some degree of success in being able to communicate and get consensus. With a caucus of 8 I would suggest that getting that consensus beforehand is a service to all members of this committee, and I would encourage the member to think along those lines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud, and then I think we'll call the question on the subamendment.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, as to how this committee functions, it's becoming more difficult to comprehend. There were some astounded looks that I had not gotten confirmation of my caucus prior. I got the impression, well, that's just something you do; you get that permission from the caucus before you come here so you don't have to refer matters back. On that basis I assumed the other caucuses, the other two parties here, also had their confirmation by their caucuses. That would have originally been on a committee of one, one, one. Now, when you talk in terms of three, one, one, that's totally different. That's a whole different concept than the original concept. Even with two, one, one there was a safeguard in that myself and the New Democrat member could always discuss things and not be dominated by three Tory members. So if we're to first go to our caucuses, get their understanding, I would say that hasn't occurred in this particular process with this latest proposal with the subamendment. Again, that just makes it that much more important for all of us to go back to our respective caucuses. And yes, there is going to be... [interjection] Well, it's a whole new concept. It's a whole new concept when you talk in terms of three, one, one. Is it an all-party subcommittee? No, it's not.

MRS. MIROSH: You said that on the amendment on the last one too.

MR. WICKMAN: It's not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. This is not a discussion back and forth between two members.

MS BARRETT: I'd just like to point out one other thing on Ken's amendment compared to the subamendment, and that is that the quorum on Ken's amendment could be set at two, just as it could be set at two or three on Al's amendment. But given that and given the relationship between the parties and also given what I really believe has been overall an honourable attempt to work on the consensus basis, I really urge people to defeat the subamendment and agree to the amendment on the appreciation of the fact that you can set quorum at two. If gamesmanship is to be played, it can be played in any of the

formulae, but very best that it be minimized and the opportunities be minimized. So that's what I'd like to suggest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Grande Prairie, and then I'm calling the question on the subamendment.

DR. ELLIOTT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I beg your patience, but I have a sudden two-minute need for a bathroom break. Would you consider a two-minute break, sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely, and go for three minutes.

[The committee recessed from 11:14 a.m. to 11:17 a.m.]

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question. On the subamendment, three, one, and one is the composition. Those in favour of the subamendment proposed by Cypress-Redcliff, please raise your hand. Opposed? Thank you. That's defeated.

Now, on the amendment which would make it two, one, and one, as proposed by Public Works . . . [interjection]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the Member for Barrhead. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed. It would be seen to be unanimous. Thank you.

On the main motion, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour, please signify. Opposed. That would be seen as unanimously in favour. Thank you.

Other items: New Business, Members' Services Committee orders amendment. Some documents, actually a vote . . . These are what? One at a time?

DR. McNEIL: One document, yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you.

DR. McNEIL: Basically, what this document does is reflect the Members' Services Committee decision in December to provide certain benefits to former members with respect to return trips. In discussion with Treasury, our initial view on this was that it could exist as a minute alone, but on further discussion with Treasury we came to the conclusion it would be better to have it as an order. So this is . . .

MS BARRETT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Additional comment, Parliamentary Counsel, then Taber-Warner, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any comment further to what Dr. McNeil has said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

Member for Taber-Warner, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I'd like clarification on item 3.1(b): "reasonable costs of accommodation in Edmonton for up to 5 days." Now, my memory of that is that was to be tied to the per diem allowed for out-of-town members. Therefore, it's capped at \$75 a day. Is that not right?

MR. M. CLEGG: That would certainly help, Mr. Chairman. I think that would be . . .

MR. BOGLE: Well, I think that was the intent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The answer is that's the rate at which it has been paid.

MR. BOGLE: Then that needs to be reworded so that it is capped. It is \$75 a day. That's the problem.

DR. McNEIL: We were thinking we could amend it to reflect at the current rates.

MR. BOGLE: Yeah. It was to be at whatever the rate is that members are paid, and it just happens at the present time that's \$75 per day.

DR. McNEIL: So rather than bill it in at \$75, we will bill it in at the rates which currently apply.

MS BARRETT: Yes, maybe what we could do is ask you or Mike to give us the appropriate wording so we can . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what's going at the moment.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I would merely suggest that the order would be amended in proposed section 3.1(b) by adding at the end "at the daily rate currently payable to members at the time."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Per diem rate?

MR. M. CLEGG: I'm sorry; the word the word "currently" isn't necessary. "At the rate payable to members at the time."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that's why everyone's writing down on their . . . Reasonable accommodation "at the rate payable to members at the time."

MR. M. CLEGG: At the moment, Mr. Chairman, there are rates available to members for temporary residence allowance and also for committee attendance. They happen to be the same amount at the moment, but at some time in the future they might be different amounts and we might wish to tie it to committee attendance, which is perhaps closer to sessional attendance. Although whichever the committee does, I would suggest they define one in particular in case those two rates should have a different . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, while you're thinking about that a bit further, I now recognize Edmonton-Jasper Place, then Edmonton-Whitemud, so we have exactly the right wording that's required.

MR. McINNIS: Just on that point, it could be tied to that sec-

tion of Bill 24 that gives this committee authority to set the various allowances. Just pick the one that applies here and reference it that way.

I need a little background on this item. I just don't know what it's about. I take it this is a practice that's been in place for the last year or so to allow former members to travel to Edmonton generally for the purchase of . . . what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The exact wording is coming up here. Vice-chairman, I'll let you give the explanation.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the rationale for it is that in some of the other Commonwealth nations and provinces or states there is some assistance provided to former members of the Assembly so they may come back to the capital. We discussed what parameters should be put around the program, and it was felt that rather than tying it strictly to an event at the Legislature we would monitor the situation for a year and then the Speaker would report back based on usage. Obviously, we didn't want it used by a former member to come in and buy a new car. There's got to be some reason. On the other hand, the member may be coming in to the Assembly when the House is sitting and meeting former colleagues in his party as well as other parties. So we wanted some flexibility with it.

The only other comment I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the order should be clear that it's five days per year. Michael? It's not five days per trip. It was a total of five days in a year. So if a member chose to come in for four days, he's got one day left. If he takes all five days, that's it in a year.

MR. McINNIS: I take it we're still part of the initial period. It's not necessarily the case that it has to be from the individual's place of residence, as I read this. It can be from any point in the province to Edmonton.

MR. BOGLE: And if they reside in Vancouver, it's from the time they cross the Alberta-B.C. border. We're talking about travel within Alberta.

DR. McNEIL: There was an initial motion by Mr. Hyland that former members of the Legislative Assembly be eligible to receive remuneration for accommodation and mileage for travel in Alberta for a maximum of two trips to Edmonton with a maximum duration of five days in a fiscal year. That was amended by Mr. Bogle by inserting after the words "accommodation and mileage," "at the current members rate at the time of travel for travel in Alberta." Then Ms. Barrett proposed a report on the use of this program in one year's time to ascertain the use of the interim visits. That was early December '88.

MR. BOGLE: So we'll review it during our budget review.

DR. McNEIL: That's correct, yes.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this is a matter that was dealt with previously and this is just housecleaning. Like the concept was approved. The dollars have previously been approved or were incorporated in this budget that was dealt with during this session and is concluded.

MR. BOGLE: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the recollection we have at the moment is that it's been used about 20 times thus far in this current year.

Now, Taber-Warner again, or have the comments been made?

Back to Parliamentary Counsel as to the exact wording. The wording that's there on 23.1(a), "currently payable to members" -- is that now what you've incorporated into the next chunk?

MR. BOGLE: I've got to address the process. We talked about this before. We cannot at this table be working out an order. If the order needs some amendment, then it should come back at our next meeting. But I don't think it's right that we take the time of the committee to work with the Parliamentary Counsel to work out the wording. If the counsel requires any more clarification on the motion which was passed, or the intent, let's deal with that right now, Michael. But if you don't, work it out and bring it back at our next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair agrees. The Chair is very unhappy that the thing was dropped on the Chair just before we came into this meeting today.

Okay. What's the next item? Temporary residence allowance. Is this another one of these?

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of Treasury again?

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I'm sorry. It's not going to be dealt with. Same thing with the next, if that's another Members' Services order.

Let's talk about distribution of *The Bulletin* to constituency offices, please.

DR. McNEIL: Okay. This is a letter I received from the personnel administration office in relation to a request from the ND caucus to have *The Bulletin* distributed to individual constituency offices. *The Bulletin* is the weekly recruitment publication produced by the personnel administration office that provides information on job opportunities in the public service. My recommendation would be that the personnel administration office provide the Legislative Assembly office with 10 copies for each office and that the Legislative Assembly office would ensure distribution to constituency offices on a weekly basis so all members are apprised of this information in their constituency offices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just take it as generally agreed.

MS BARRETT: Can we hold the next item till I get my calendar, please?

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, while she's getting her calendar, I just have a question on procedure. Normally in committee meetings of any sort decisions don't become final -- I think this is an important point -- until the minutes are actually adopted. In other words, any decisions today, you know, are automati-

cally finalized when the minutes are adopted at the next meeting, so that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if it were done that way, then it gives opportunity for members here to go back to their caucus just to ensure that everything is comfortable. So you're saying decisions made here are binding right at that particular time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. You know, you could follow your own argument along with regard to an MLA making a vote in the House and having to go back to his constituency, I suppose. But no, that's indeed not the practice of the committee. The committee is here to act and has been empowered by the Legislature of the province to act.

MR. WICKMAN: Oh, I realize that, but in many, many committees the decisions aren't final till the minutes are adopted. That's done for a reason: to allow time to reflect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, this is not a committee that meets every week, and the draft minutes are circulated to members as soon as they're available.

Is there any other item of business to be dealt with other than the date of the next meeting? Is there . . .

MR. BOGLE: I think we already had a tentative agreement, did we not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Date of next meeting?

MS BARRETT: Thank you for waiting.

MR. McINNIS: That's what smoking does to you.

MS BARRETT: Aw, jeez, lay off.
What are you suggesting?

MR. BOGLE: We've had some informal discussions. Monday the 28th.

MS BARRETT: Might as well. My Monday is blown already.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's next Monday.

MR. McINNIS: I don't know how other members feel, but I did mention a problem I have to Taber-Warner. I've spent all summer in this place, and I've lost touch with my children. They go back to school on September 1, and I'd like to spend a little time with them, maybe not in the capital city.

MRS. MIROSH: You live in Edmonton, you know. You're complaining and you live in Edmonton. [interjections]

MR. HYLAND: What about us in the country?

MRS. MIROSH: God, we're coming from other cities.

MR. McINNIS: I didn't mean to whine. I just mean . . .

MRS. MIROSH: Yeah, well quit whining. You go home every night.

MS BARRETT: He just wants to book a little holiday time.

MRS. MIROSH: I understand. We all have kids.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. A suggestion for next Monday duly noted.

MS BARRETT: Well, do you have a better . . . Do you have another suggestion?

MR. McINNIS: Any time after that.

MS BARRETT: You're saying after the long weekend then, after the Labour Day weekend?

MR. McINNIS: Well, I don't know that we're going to get a consensus.

MS BARRETT: That week's blown for me too. You see, I'm not going to get a holiday, so I'm flexible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, can the majority . . . How many can make it for next Monday? Cannot?

MS BARRETT: That would leave me as the only opposition member.

MR. WICKMAN: My preference, Mr. Chairman, would be to wait until after the long weekend as well. A couple of our members are gone, and we can't have a full caucus until about that period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to enter into the record that you might be meeting without a chairman, because I haven't had a break and I've got another couple of commitments in terms of September and October. Next week is possible, but after that . . .

MR. HYLAND: Percy, what about Tuesday? Does that help?

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Laurence Decore will not be back by then. If this matter's going to come back with the subcommittee, I would sooner have a discussion with the full caucus, and it won't happen before next Tuesday. If that item's not there to be dealt with, then I have no problems, but if you're meeting . . .

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Okay, so you're saying that next Tuesday you've got a caucus meeting. Is that correct?

MR. WICKMAN: No, no.

MS BARRETT: Oh.

MR. WICKMAN: I'm saying that if there's business to be dealt with next Tuesday other than that. But if the purpose of the meeting is for that reason, I would prefer that it wait. Other than

that, I don't have a problem with next Tuesday.

MS BARRETT: Well, it will automatically come up. It's on the table to the next meeting. But Tuesday isn't soon enough . . . [interjection]. Oh, Tuesday's fine with me. Like I said, I'm not kidding about getting a crying towel.

MRS. BLACK: He said Monday.

MR. BOGLE: Well, we've got four members of this committee on the select committee on electoral boundaries, and we have a meeting on Monday, late afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Monday morning the 28th? Afternoon? I mean, surely to goodness in the course of the week some consultation could take place, hon. member, by telephone. In the Legislative Assembly we do cover a lot of telephone costs around. Well, unless the Chair here is violently opposed, members, it's next Monday afternoon at 1 o'clock.

MS BARRETT: Can you be here, Percy?

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, I can be here, Pam. I've got to do some constituency juggling. I'm not leaving the city or that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other items?
Just a quick update on the usage of former members. Rod.

MR. SCARLETT: So far this fiscal year we've paid for 19 trips and a total of 44 days from, it looks like, approximately 15 members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, we've had lots of letters saying thank you very much. That gives them a chance to come back. I don't see that one will . . . We've got the limits there that it's not going to be abused. Certainly, as I say, very supportive letters and comments.

The committee stands adjourned until next Monday afternoon.

[The committee adjourned at 11:35 a.m.]