

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[1:13 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, folks. Welcome back. Do we have any regrets from any of the other members that we know of? If they're not here, they're not here. Okay.

MR. HYLAND: I think Stockwell Day is just late in coming. He's late, I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; thank you.

Because of the time line and people on holidays and staff difficulties and so forth we do not have all of the minutes done for the two meeting days of last week. However, in front of you you do have draft minutes for day two of last week, which relates especially to our subcommittee. So that will all be dealt with in due course. If we really need them, the transcripts are here, but we don't have the minutes.

The proposed agenda is there. Does everyone have one of those? Of the one that's before you, the thing to omit is item 4(a)(ii), temporary residence allowance. That one does not need to be dealt with. Are there items of business that you may wish to add to this, or does it look okay to get started with? Okay.

We're on item 3(a), report of the subcommittee. Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the subcommittee had an opportunity to meet twice since the last meeting of the committee, and I know it goes without saying that members will be aware that much work has been done on comparisons between remuneration and benefits provided to members in Alberta with other jurisdictions. That's been done by caucuses; it's been done by the Assembly. Some of us have worked on and off on this issue for up to two years, so the committee was able to look at some base statistics immediately. Rod has been kind enough to distribute for you — and if I could just briefly take you through this document, and that then will be a basis upon which we can go to the next stage of discussion, which will deal with the recommendations.

If you look, first of all, on the right-hand side of the folder which has been distributed, you'll see Ranking of Remuneration for Elected Members. Now, we have the jurisdictions ranging from the highest to the lowest, including the House of Commons, 10 provinces, and two territories. The jurisdiction is indicated in the second column. The third column gives you the total; that is, the combined indemnity and expense allowance. Of course, the indemnities and the expense allowances are broken out in the fourth and fifth columns. You'll note by that chart that Alberta currently ranks eighth in Canada. In other words, our combined indemnity and expense allowance gives us a remuneration of \$44,322, which puts Alberta behind Saskatchewan but ahead of Newfoundland and in eighth position in Canada.

Are there any questions on the first page?

MR. KOWALSKI: How current is this?

MR. BOGLE: The information was gathered about a week to 10 days ago. So we believe it is current. Okay?

Page 2 -- actually, page 2 and page 3 give a historical overview of the members' indemnity and expense allowance in Alberta from 1971 to the present time. You can see the various rates, the percentage changes, the indemnity, the expense al-

lowance, and the total. I think it's interesting to note how far we have come and also to note some of the changes that occur. In 1973 we had an 88 percent increase in the total as well as the individual indemnity and expense allowance, so there was a very significant jump in that year; in '75 a 10 percent increase, followed by three successive years of smaller increases, then a 29 percent increase in 1979. From 1979 to the present time we followed the Tevie Miller formula, which set the indemnity.

Members will recall that there were two years that while we were entitled to take a 5 percent increase, the Act was amended so that the increase was not taken. In one year we did not take it because of inflation; we wanted to set a good example. That was, I believe, in 1980. Then again in 1984 we chose not to take the increase, and again we were trying to set an example. It wasn't for inflation; it was because we were in a recession, so again members did not take the increase. You'll note in 1986 we did have a 10 percent increase in our indemnity, and that's when we amended the legislation so we could catch up those two years. That worked out to a total increase of 8 percent, as we didn't get any increase on the expense allowance that year.

You'll recall that at the same time, 1986, we transferred the responsibility from the Assembly to Members' Services Committee for setting the expense allowance. We made that move last year, 1988, so we almost doubled the expense allowance portion, which resulted in a 24 percent increase in our total remuneration. Then, of course, in the current fiscal year there's been no increase to date. Are there any questions on either of those pages?

Okay, the last page is Remuneration for Ministers with Portfolio. You will note that in Alberta currently our ministers receive a salary of \$40,841, which puts them fourth in Canada in terms of ministerial salary. Now, while we go to great pains to separate out the ministerial salary from the indemnity and expense allowance, the matter's often lumped together by the media and those who are examining salaries, but we've separated them to show a breakdown of what that would be. Members are aware that the Speaker and the Leader of the Official Opposition have a salary equal to that of a minister with portfolio. Any questions on that page?

Okay, turning back, then, to the left-hand column in the folder, we've got on page 1 Remuneration for House Leaders across Canada, and you will see that two jurisdictions provide some remuneration for government House leaders; they are Nova Scotia and Quebec. No government provides remuneration for Deputy Government House Leader. However, when you come to both the Opposition House Leader and third party House leader, the figures change again. We have eight jurisdictions providing remuneration for the Official Opposition party House leader, and two jurisdictions that provide it for a third party House leader. Any questions on that page for House leaders? Yes.

MRS. MIROSH: Has the date '87-88 changed?

MR. BOGLE: Well, we don't think so. Normally the *Canadian Legislatures* publication comes out early in a calendar year. The publication which should be out for 1988-89 has not yet appeared. Therefore, we've been checking with various provinces to verify figures. As far as we know, the figures are correct.

Page 2, Remuneration for Whips. Again, you'll note that many jurisdictions provide remuneration for chief government Whips, assistant government Whips, chief opposition Whips,

assistant opposition Whips, and third party Whips. Alberta traditionally has not provided any assistance for these positions, so what's tended to happen in the past is that if because of the heavy workload of both House leaders and Whips any additional remuneration is provided, it comes from the party, and that's unfair in a number of ways. Members can quickly see the injustice in the system. Any questions on the page regarding remuneration for Whips?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. As far as we know, this is it as of March 1 of this year. These are the figures, as far as Rod knows. Okay?

MR. BOGLE: Good.

Then the final page deals with Remuneration for Third Party Leader and Standing Committee Chairman. Again you can see a breakdown. Many provinces provide some remuneration for both the third party leader and the chairmen of standing committees. In Alberta, according to the legislation, the legislation which we've just amended had set the third party leader's salary at 25 percent of the salary of a minister without portfolio. We amended the legislation. We've kept in the base 25 percent, but we've given the ability to raise that figure to the Members' Services Committee.

MR. HYLAND: So, in other words, you're saying that the legislation says "a minimum of."

MR. BOGLE: Yeah, that's right. The legislation states that the leader of a third party -- and to be a recognized party in Alberta, you need at least four members. You are guaranteed at least 25 percent of the salary paid to a minister without portfolio. We've recently amended that to allow this committee to adjust the figure upwards but not to reduce it below 25 percent.

Any questions on the final page? Okay. Very briefly, then, to share with you some of things that the committee looked at. I very much appreciate the work of Pam and Percy and Alan. A lot of very helpful questions came forward so that additional information could be gathered. We've looked at everything from the provincial budgets of various provinces across Canada, recognizing that when you're looking at remuneration, you should look at population; you should look at budgets; you should look at some other interesting factors. You should know what the government pays its deputy ministers and assistant deputy ministers. You should know what the judges receive for remuneration. Those are all factors that come into play. It's interesting to note that in Alberta currently the highest salary range for a deputy minister takes that individual to \$107,100; that's the top of the range. It's also interesting to note that in terms of judges a provincial judge's salary in Alberta is \$104,556. I'm not sure how many members of the committee were aware -- if someone had asked me prior to a week or so ago how many provincial judges there were in the province, I probably would have said somewhere between 30 and 50. There are 101 provincial judges in the province of Alberta.

Basically, what our committee agreed to do -- and I think it's important for all members of this committee to understand that the three parties are not all operating in exactly the same way. Percy felt that he wished to go back and consult with the other seven members of his caucus and get a clear indication of their feelings. Pam indicated that while she had a mandate from her caucus, John McInnis, the other member of the Members' Serv-

ices Committee, is someone whom she was working with very closely, and she wanted to consult with him. Alan and I indicated that in terms of ministerial salaries we would want some indication from our colleague on the committee, Ken, who is a member of Executive Council, and possibly we'd want to discuss it with one or more members of the Executive Council for input, but clearly recognizing that the final decision will be made at this table, as prescribed by the legislation.

We do have some recommendations we're going to put forward. We're going to recommend that for the first time, at least as far back as we're aware, there be remuneration provided to House leaders, to Whips. We're going to recommend that the standing committees be divided into two categories, recognizing that some of the committees are extremely active and others meet very, very infrequently. We're going to recommend that some automobiles be provided to several individuals whom we believe would otherwise have them were it not for an oversight. We're also going to address the question of the Executive Council and leaders and MLA indemnity.

I'd like to pause at that point to see if Pam, Percy, or Alan have any comments they want to make either to supplement -- or if there's something I haven't explained quite correctly, please do so at this time. Pam?

MS BARRETT: No. I'll have comments on the individuals.

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

Percy.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, I'll have comments on the individual ones as well. However, now that I think about it, when we addressed certain things, I'm not sure that we addressed specifically the Deputy Speaker, or is there a formula that whatever happens ...

MR. BOGLE: Yes, there's a formula. It's all tied.

MR. WICKMAN: And the same with the Deputy Chairman of Committees?

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay.

MR. BOGLE: Alan?

MR. HYLAND: All I was going to say is that those two -- I thought about that, too, and then realized that they're automatically tied by legislation as a percentage of it.

MR. BOGLE: We will. We'll call a debate first to make sure. Okay. Are there any other questions, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems fine. I don't see any other hands going up.

MR. BOGLE: All right. If we can proceed then, I'd like to put the first formal motion forward, and that is that we would establish remuneration for the Opposition House Leader at the rate of \$10,000 per year.

MS BARRETT: As this subject directly affects me, I'm going

to please leave the room until the decision is made. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to make sure we have enough quorum at all of the stages. When we get to the one on MLAs, you've all got to stay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Let it be seen to be unanimous. Thank you. Tell her not to light up another cigarette.

MR. WICKMAN: Incidentally, in these various positions there's none I have to abstain from. Even though you all would assume I do the most work in our caucus, I don't have any status.

MRS. BLACK: Aw, Percy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want to negotiate for some?

MR. WICKMAN: For status?

MS BARRETT: Oh, before we go to another vote, eh?

MRS. MIROSH: You don't have to leave the room. What happens when you vote for MLAs' salaries?

MS BARRETT: I think it's different.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. With that one, everybody stays.

MS BARRETT: For me it's important. Other ones affect all of us; that one affected me.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the third party House leader in the Assembly receive \$8,000 per annum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion?

MS BARRETT: I'd just like to go on the record supporting that. I can tell you that I found out long after I was elected and given this job that it is an extra job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of this motion, please signify. Opposed? Let it be seen to be carried unanimously.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, there is no accident to the way things are proceeding here. We've talked about this in the subcommittee and had basically agreed to a recommendation for a series of, I guess, job salaries attached to particular positions that are of service not just in the House but also to caucuses themselves on a year-round basis. I think all four of us were of the same mind on every one of these recommendations, so I would like now to move that the chief government Whip be entitled to an \$8,000 a year remuneration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of this motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll move a \$6,000 additional remuneration for the assistant government Whip.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: I have to leave on this one. Can the minutes show it, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Hyland absents himself. Call for the question.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously, Mr. Hyland outside of the room. Okay. It's great value having subcommittees. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, could I move that the chief opposition Whip's -- what do you call it? Per diem?

MS BARRETT: Just annual remuneration.

MR. HYLAND: Annual remuneration be \$6,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call for the question.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: I move that the assistant opposition Whip's remuneration be set at \$5,000 per annum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That applies to each caucus or is this to the Official Opposition?

MR. BOGLE: This is the assistant opposition Whip, one position.

MS BARRETT: Right. The Official Opposition Whip.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, the assistant to the Official Opposition Whip. Thank you. Moved by Taber-Warner.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I would move that the third party Whip's remuneration be set at \$5,000 per annum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call for the question.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

Who is that person?

AN HON. MEMBER: Betty Hewes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the assistant.

MR. WICKMAN: We'll be sorting that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it hasn't yet been selected.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, well, there is, but we have to do some jiggling because it's not appropriate, in my opinion, for one person to hold two positions, and there is no assistant third party opposition Whip.

MS BARRETT: Okay. May I?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, well one question that has been . . .

MS BARRETT: Did you find out who that person was?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, well, we leave that for them to determine, and then we'll go from there.

MR. WICKMAN: Oh, do you need that determined?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Let us know, because of the payment. That's all.

MS BARRETT: Yes. I'll have to let you know about the assistant Official Opposition Whip as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we come to the end of this, are we going to have an effective date of implementation?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the end. Okay, thank you.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, we had lengthy discussions about the status of our House committees and by consensus agreed to refer to them, by way of motion in a moment, to A and B categories. A categories are the ones that meet routinely. They are charged with certain tasks annually, and the record will show that they meet routinely. The B categories are those that are called into a life only upon special circumstances.

So, because we will be making motions hereafter regarding these committees, I would like to now move that for the purposes of subsequent motions and for the purposes of remuneration, et cetera, the following committees be identified as A category: Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Private Bills, Legislative Offices, Public Accounts, Members' Services — that's us, gang — and in this instance the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries, which is a temporary one but nonetheless one that will meet regularly, and the Select Special Ombudsman Search Committee; and that B category committees be Law and Regulations and Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, then; I have a motion to delineate

the committees into two categories. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move that there be an additional monthly per diem for the chairman of the A category committees, which of course would include the two standing committees, of \$350 a month. Speaking to that very briefly, that's to recognize that the chairmen of those committees do have additional work over and above what committee members have. For example, the chairman of any committee has to be involved in preparation, guidance, and so on. It's an understanding that that person, of course, in addition to the \$350 per month would also receive the rate that will be established for committees.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll excuse myself from the discussion.

MS BARRETT: Before you go, can I ask a question first?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, ask a question, because I'll be leaving too.

MS BARRETT: Good-bye. Do you want me to chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You keep signing all these expense claims as chairman, so it's about time you became the chairman.

MS BARRETT: All right. Barrett wins.

[Ms Barrett in the Chair]

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right; this meeting is called to order. I have a question . . .

MRS. MIROSH: You can't ask a question as chairman.

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to. I'm going to be both. Let me ask a question. Is it assumed in this motion that the Chair of these select special committees — that the minute those committees report to the Assembly, the committees are dissolved? Is it understood? Is that a legal understanding?

MR. RITTER: Not the dissolution of the committees, no, because a committee can report to the Assembly any number of times during its life. The committee is automatically dissolved upon the Legislature being dissolved, unless by a resolution of the House a committee is dissolved.

MR. HYLAND: We're talking about the select special committees like the boundaries committee?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. The two that were struck for specific purposes.

MR. RITTER: Oh, I see. Okay; that would be included in the instructions of the committee, yes. Once it reports, it's dissolved.

MR. WICKMAN: Throughout my motion, if you could, Madam Chairman: "active committees." I think "active" makes

it quite clear that it implies that those committees are still functioning. If they're not functioning, then of course you can't pay a monthly per diem.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think it's inherent in the understanding that when the Electoral Boundaries Committee and the Ombudsman Search Committee file their report to the Legislative Assembly, in essence that's when their term of office would have expired. The other ones -- I think inherent again in the understanding as well.

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Right. So if you don't mind, one more question to legal counsel here. Do we need the particular reference to the life of the select special committees?

MR. RITTER: I think that would be advisable, yes. Otherwise, there'll be confusion.

MR. HYLAND: Will Percy's comment about an active committee cover it?

MR. RITTER: I think so.

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So is your motion then amended?

MR. WICKMAN: Well, no. I just included in my motion "active."

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Further?

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Question?

MR. KOWALSKI: Sorry; the question on the motion is that it's for \$350 a month for the chairmen. Is this correct?

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. On the standing committees of the House identified as A category and active select special committees. Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favour? Opposed? Carried unanimously.

Tell David I had fun. He can stay out there. Why would he have to be? Oh, he chairs this committee.

[Dr. Carter in the Chair]

MRS. MIROSH: Why did Bob leave?

MS BARRETT: He chairs Electoral Boundaries and Leg. Offices.

MRS. MIROSH: So we all should leave because we're on Members' Services Committee.

MS BARRETT: No, we were voting on the Chairs. Don't worry; we'll get to divisions eventually.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. So where are we off to now?

MR. BOGLE: Have you done the hourly rates?

MS BARRETT: No. I can do that now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Again, following discussion in the subcommittee, I would like to move a change regarding the per diems that are allowed for members of standing committees and select special committees, those which I identified as A committees. It would be as follows. Currently the rate, by the way, as you probably know, is \$100 a day regardless of how long you sit. Because travel time is important to, I would think, the majority of members, seeing as how the majority of MLAs do not live in Edmonton or the immediate vicinity, a move -- again, this is by consensus -- to the following schedule is appropriate: meetings up to four hours, and that includes the travel time, be paid at a rate of \$100 per diem; meetings from between four and eight hours be paid at a rate of \$165 per diem; and meetings lasting longer than eight hours, including travel time, be paid \$260 per diem.

Now, if I can just speak to this for a moment, Mr. Chairman, obviously what this means is not an automatic assumption that each meeting is going to last for as long as it can to maximize the income per MLA. For instance, in Members' Services we tend to meet two days in a row, so if you've got a short meeting plus a bit of travel time, it may not add up in many instances to the full \$260 maximum. So that's the understanding behind this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the other members of the subcommittee, on this particular item the Liberal caucus agreed there is a need to increase it, and they could have accepted \$150, possibly even \$175 per meeting, but not the escalating rate geared towards time. So I do have to oppose this one.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't understand that before, Percy. I wouldn't have reported it as a consensus otherwise.

MR. WICKMAN: I thought I made that quite clear, Pam, that I was prepared to move the \$350 a month, prepared to support a per diem on a...

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a fixed figure?

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah. Right.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'm assuming, then, that the numbers the Member for Edmonton-Highlands used include the chairman, because the extra that the chairman is paid is because of his extra responsibilities. He also gets paid that amount in this category per meeting.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I made clear in my motion that this \$350 would be over and above what he would receive as a committee member.

MR. BOGLE: I want to speak to the question of adding travel time and note that that is consistent with an order in council and the practice of the government, and has been for many, many years. Some of us have served on committees where we are in fact paid for travel time to a meeting, including the meeting time itself. As mentioned by Pam in her opening comments, often the meetings are held back to back, and those of us who travel some distance like to book other meetings on the same day so that we're not traveling into Edmonton every week when the House is not sitting. I think many have tried very hard to work schedules around a system where we're in Edmonton for a week and then spending time in our constituencies doing other things for the other week and so on. So I think it's merely a recognition of what has been done by government through the appointment of its committees for a good number of years. Very clearly, if we sense there is a problem with it, that can be reviewed when we're going through our annual budget process and we look at the numbers.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question then. The motion is that one about four hours, \$100; four to eight hours, \$165; eight hours plus, \$260. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Thank you. Carried, but not unanimously.

Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: I'd like to move a motion dealing with group B. They are the two . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, I wonder -- Mr. Wickman, in this case do you want your vote recorded in the negative, or will we just take it from the minutes?

MR. WICKMAN: No. It can be taken from the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  
Taber-Warner.

MR. WICKMAN: You only have it recorded if you are really, really strong on it. Like, from my point of view, I don't have a problem with the motion. I want to make that clear. My caucus, the Liberal caucus, did, however.

MR. BOGLE: We have two standing committees that fall under group B: Law and Regulations; Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing. While I recognize the committee has dealt with the monthly per diem rate for a chairman of committee A and rates for committee A, I think those individuals who serve as chairmen of those two committees I've just mentioned should have a rate higher than that of a member of the committee. Therefore, I'd like to move that for a meeting lasting up to four hours, while the member would receive the same \$100 rate, a chairman would receive \$135; for four to eight hours, while the member would continue to receive \$165, a chairman would receive \$230; and for more than eight hours a member would continue to receive \$260 and the chairman would receive \$365.

Those rates are consistent with rates taken from order in council rates used by government for some of its committees. Travel time would be included, as is the case with group A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion?

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Thank you. Carried.

Clerk, then Cypress-Redcliff.

DR. McNEIL: An administrative question. My assumption with travel time is that it's travel to and from. Correct?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, that's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that when committees sit while the Legislature is in session -- I think that's the right term -- those committee members can get paid for those committee days of sitting. Is that plain enough, or did I muddy it with my last comment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For example, that would mean that when Public Accounts meets on Wednesdays and the House is sitting, then you're going to be getting paid.

MR. BOGLE: But there'd be no travel time.

MR. HYLAND: There's no travel time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no travel time, but they're getting paid.

MR. BOGLE: If they meet for two hours, they get paid for the up-to-four-hours category.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to briefly speak against the motion, the reason being that when the House sits, we're all here in any event. I think it has been the convention before that when committees meet while the House is sitting, no additional income is accrued. That's all I needed to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Additional comments?

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Two, four, two -- one abstention. It's carried. Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move . . . I'll move the motion and then speak to it.

I'll move that all chairmen of category A committees, which include the ones under Pam Barrett's motion, and the Deputy Chairman of Committees and the leader of the third party and the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud . . . [laughter] Strike that one out.

MR. HYLAND: You were going okay to that point.

MR. WICKMAN: . . . be allocated cars, which would fall under

the category or be equivalent to that provided at the deputy minister level.

Just speaking to that, Mr. Chairman, most chairmen of committees in this particular category already receive cars, with the exception of two. Because of the extra work of the Deputy Chairman of Committees, it's felt appropriate. Of course, the Leader of the Official Opposition does receive a class A car — you know, a higher ranking car — and it was felt it's appropriate that the third party get a lower sized car which is equivalent to, you know, an Olds-type Delta.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the minister responsible can tell us what the right term is. Executive level . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Oh, he can't. But I think the motion is self-explanatory: deputy minister level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the record show for the first time ever the Member for Barrhead is speechless.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think the limit today is to the value of \$20,500. Well, I think the motion is self-explanatory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call for the question?

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour, please signify. Opposed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four to two, but it still carries. Thank you.  
You want to summon Mr. Bogle back? At this stage, how are we for a five-minute break? Just for a moment, I need a . . .

MS BARRETT: Half the people have left anyway.

[The committee recessed from 1:55 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're now entertaining a motion from Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, can we scrap that other motion, or do we need a rescinding?

MS BARRETT: No, just qualifying.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. I'll move that the chairman of the select special committees . . . Or what do you call them? Temporary committees?

MS BARRETT: No, just select special committees.

MR. WICKMAN: . . . that the select special committees not be included in the above motion. Just to explain that, that refers specifically to the two special committees that are now in place, one to study the distribution and the other to look at selecting the Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That'll be specified in the minutes. Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think it's good that the member designates that it's special select standing committees rather than by naming them, because if there is another one formed, then it won't kick in. We could have to handle that at a different time.

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those in favour please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Well, it is assumed in our administration . . . Or do you need a motion?

DR. McNEIL: Maybe we can have a discussion, because I was going to ask the question. My assumption would be that if the chairman ended it in the middle of the month, that \$350 would be prorated. It's done with the indemnity. For example, when the election was called, the amount was prorated. And it's not working days; it's calendar days.

MR. BOGLE: The reason we went to a monthly rate even though most other provinces that have it are based on the yearly rate: we thought it would be easier to administer a monthly rate.

MS BARRETT: So do we need a motion to that effect, or is it just understood?

DR. McNEIL: No. It's administrative.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. BOGLE: Are we ready for our next set of motions?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. WICKMAN: I just want Pam to be aware that in voting against Laurence Decore getting the car, she also voted against one of her members getting a car.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. In fact, if you really want to know, I had understood that this question might come to us as long ago as six weeks. I approached Barry, and he said, "No, I don't need a car." Then it occurred to me that, you know, some of the other committees might not as well. So that's . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Well, I agree with you. He doesn't deserve one, but I had to include him.

MR. BOGLE: The committee, as can be expected, spent considerable time, as I indicated in my opening comments about our work, looking at not only other provinces but top public servants in the province of Alberta. I mentioned earlier that the highest range for a deputy minister in Alberta is \$107,000. I mentioned that a provincial judge in Alberta currently earns \$104,000. What we were really looking for is some kind of benchmark, and we examined a series of ranges and finally settled on provincial judges. The benchmark we're looking at for an MLA — and we're looking at the combined remuneration, including both the indemnity and the expense allowance, of coming up to a percentage of a provincial judge's salary.

I've got some additional paper to hand out, Rod, which covers MLAs, the Premier, a minister with portfolio, the Speaker,

the Leader of the Official Opposition, and then the final category, minister without portfolio and leader of the third party. I'm going to deal with the concept first and then come back to a specific motion dealing with MLAs.

Basically, what is before you is a recommendation that an MLA's combined remuneration equal 55 percent of a provincial judge's salary. For the Premier of the province of Alberta, we equated that to the provincial Chief Judge's salary in the province of Alberta; for the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Speaker of the Assembly, and minister with portfolio, equal to a provincial judge's salary; and minister without portfolio and leader of the third party, 75 percent of a judge's salary.

I'll back up now to the specific portion dealing with MLAs' remuneration. Members recognize that we have set the expense allowance at 50 percent of the basic indemnity. Therefore, to reach a benchmark of 55 percent of a provincial judge's salary -- and it's important to distinguish: we are not tying this to a judge's salary; we are merely using the judge's salary as a benchmark today. So this is a matter which, regardless of actions taken by the cabinet or others re judges' salaries, will come back to this committee if and when any adjustments are deemed necessary in the years to come. So in order to reach the 55 percent of a provincial judge's salary -- and that total figure would be \$57,505 -- we would see the indemnity move up to a new base of \$38,335.

MS BARRETT: So you'd increase thirty-eight . . .

MR. BOGLE: Thirty-eight thousand, three hundred and thirty-five dollars. That is two-thirds of \$57,505. So the figure we need to address today is the new base rate of \$38,335, which is a 29.7 percent increase over the current base rate of \$29,548.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MS BARRETT: No, no. Not the question yet.  
What's our current base rate?

MR. BOGLE: The current is \$29,548.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands and Edmonton-Whitemud.

MS BARRETT: Okay. It will not surprise anybody at this table or anybody else in the world that this is where our committee did not come to a real consensus. Now, I really feel strongly about having indemnities tied to a certain benchmark or position elsewhere in the real world in lieu of an external committee setting our salaries. I really feel strongly about it because there is no way we can avoid the inherent conflict of interest, and that's what this amounts to. But if we can't avoid it, if we do tie ourselves to other occupations, then we only need one vote and thereafter what happens to that occupation happens to us. I notice the city of Calgary has done that, for instance. They just decided that it was too awkward doing the reviews by themselves. I don't know why they didn't ship the issue out to an independent committee, but in any event, it's a really good principle.

My perspective on it, in fact, is that it would be great if we could tie our indemnities to something, say, within the private service or public service that goes with a particular category -- say deputy minister or assistant deputy minister -- and a portion

thereof. That way, those people, when they're engaged in collective bargaining or whatever it might be, the voluntary recognition -- they've actually done some bargaining with their employers, and if we tag onto that, then it's very reasonable. But I guess I lost that vote too. I lost the outside committee vote and I lost this one.

One of the issues is that it is inevitable that salary increases will occur. They do in all walks of life, and it's going to happen right here. But it boils down to: is this increase too much? I believe it is. On the other hand, I am also responsible for part of this, because I'm the one who came up with the idea of tying ourselves to somebody. So it's a very awkward position. Let's hope that we don't have to deal with this again. If we can use this benchmark and stick with this benchmark and never have to decide it again, all the better as far as I'm concerned.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a difficult issue. Having been involved in political life before and having faced this particular situation, I know there's no magical solution. Some people may advocate an external review. I don't believe in an external review, and our caucus doesn't believe in an external review. Only members themselves can really determine that. I've seen external reviews in the past that simply haven't worked. The other problem I have, too, is that . . . I would have wished that a member of the media would have been here so we could have had comments recorded. I assume they're recorded in any case. The other difficulty I have: if politicians, be they members of whatever party -- this is an area that I don't think anyone should attempt to make political hay out of, because any increases that are given are given to all members. So I think it is unfair, and I go on record as stating it's unfair, for a member to take an increase and attempt to make political hay out of it at the same time.

When I took this to our caucus -- and I did this morning; we had a very lengthy two-hour discussion on the whole topic -- the caucus did agree that there was a need for a salary adjustment. They recognize that periodically it has to be done no matter how messy it is, and there are certain portions of what we have in front of us that we did support. In fact, some of the earlier motions -- I moved the motion that set up the all-party committee, which, you know, highlights my position that I don't believe in an external review. However, it was the feeling of our caucus that the figures being proposed here were simply too high. While they could accept an increase or while they could support an increase -- and there's the difference: accept or support -- they couldn't support an increase of this nature. So, Mr. Chairman, I must vote against this recommendation dealing with the base level. I'll go on record as stating that I have no intention of trying to milk the situation, whatever happens here, for political purposes. I recognize and sympathize with the situation we're all in, and I don't think it's a thing one tries to milk.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, perhaps one of the most sensitive decisions elected representatives have to make periodically is dealing with this question of value or fairness in terms of what is an acceptable remuneration. I think that as long as there has been a situation where elected people ultimately must make the decision irrespective of whether or not there is an outside recommendation, an outside committee, some other group, it still comes back to: this court of law rests with the elected people. They are the ones who ultimately will and must make that decision. One can go out and get an outside recom-



mentation; it still has to come here, where a vote must be taken irrespective. It is on the shoulders of the individuals who have been elected to ultimately make that decision.

How one arrives at it is a classic, age-old discussion in every parliament anywhere where there are parliaments in the world. I have a great fear that if elected representatives are not careful about how they deal with this matter, ultimately they will see the democratic system we're all so very used to turn into a plutocracy. I cannot think of anything more negative than that in a parliamentary democracy, which should have an opportunity given to every individual in that society to seek elected office and to recognize that they can at least allow themselves to be maintained in a modest way once they have arrived at elected office. I don't know what is fair, and I don't know what is not fair, but it seems to me that when one looks at the existence in our society of a certain group of people, and then if we have a subcommittee and the subcommittee comes back with a recommendation that we can arrive at a certain percentage of that as a benchmark -- and only a benchmark, or a guideline -- that we deal with it, it's something we have to look at very, very seriously.

I want to conclude by saying one thing. Democracy must allow every citizen within the environment to participate and seek an opportunity in public life. If we're not careful, ultimately democracy would become captured by plutocrats, people who are sufficiently wealthy unto themselves in order to serve. I think that would be negative; I think that would be retrogressive. It seems to me that it's difficult, but still that decision has to be made. The recommendation put forward here this afternoon is one that I certainly can live with and it's one that I feel that I can defend. I want to echo what Mr. Wickman has said: that this is not a matter where politics should be made to be a benchmark for the ultimate decision.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, technically we don't have a motion, but I'm interpreting that we have the motion that it's the recommendation with regard to the base for the MLA's salary to \$57,505.

MR. BOGLE: I thought you did have a motion, Mr. Chairman. If there's some question, we'll clarify that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there was moving across, so we didn't quite . . . Do you have one there?

MR. BOGLE: Well, I move that the base indemnity for MLAs move from \$29,548 to \$38,335.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that's what we've been having our general discussion related to.  
Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: This is a really hard one for me; harder for me than just about anybody else at this table, I suspect. I haven't had a chance to deal with our caucus on it, so I'm on my own. The problem I have is that it's not like dealing with a Bill in the Assembly. Then we get to deal with it, second reading on principle, committee reading on detail, and then third reading on it, amended if it came back in amended form. So very often I find myself in the position of supporting a principle of a Bill and

then fighting it in committee because I don't like the details -- right? -- and sometimes then voting against it in third reading because the details that I didn't like didn't get fixed even though I adhere to the principle.

I want to be on the record -- and I will never change my mind on this -- that I'm the one who brought the idea of a tied salary to this subcommittee. I just dreamt it up out of nowhere. But the principle, it seems to me, is very important so that we never have to do it again. On the other hand, the detail of it is something I disagree with, but I'm going to bite the bullet and vote in favour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question. All those in favour, please say signify. Opposed? Carried.

MR. BOGLE: Could we have a recorded vote, please?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Those in favour: Edmonton-Highlands, Taber-Warner, Cypress-Redcliff -- somebody flagging smoke -- Calgary-Glenmore, Calgary-Foothills, and Barhead. Opposed: Red Deer-North and Edmonton-Whitemud. Thank you. That's the first section.

Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move, as per the discussion and the outline the Member for Taber-Warner gave relating to the salary of the Premier, that the Premier's base rate be \$59,858.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Clerk.

DR. McNEIL: Just for clarification then: the Premier would receive the MLA base rate and on top of that his Premier's indemnity.

MR. BOGLE: It goes without saying that all 83 MLAs will receive the MLA base rate.

MR. HYLAND: Then this figure is automatically on top of it.

MR. BOGLE: This is the Premier's rate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there a question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

MR. BOGLE: Recorded?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everyone was in favour except Edmonton-Whitemud.

MS BARRETT: As I was not able to negotiate the details that I

wished before, in recognition of the increase of \$9,701 per year to the Premier's base rate I would move that ministers with portfolio, the Leader of the Official Opposition, and the Speaker be entitled to a similar type of increase, although not as hefty. It would then equal what a provincial judge makes, which is -- \$104,556 or \$104,566? Big deal; 10 bucks. For 10 bucks difference, I could . . . Which is it? Oh, just a moment. If you'll just give me one moment, I do have this original information.

MR. WICKMAN: It's a total of \$104,556, Pam.

MS BARRETT: Yes, it is \$104,556.

That ministers with portfolio, the Speaker, and the Leader of the Official Opposition then enjoy an increase of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: \$47,051, according to this document, to make this motion parallel to the others. Is that . . .

MS BARRETT: No. The total increase for the ministerial base.

MR. BOGLE: What he was doing -- may I, Mr. Chairman? We started a process accepting that all MLAs, all 83, will receive the base. When Alan made his motion for the Premier, he dealt with the Premier's salary separate from the MLA's because we've already dealt with the MLA's. So to be consistent, if we can deal with the salary for the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Speaker of the Assembly, and a minister with portfolio, on this line, Pam . . .

MR. WICKMAN: And the total will be \$104,556.

MR. BOGLE: Yeah; that's the end result.

MR. WICKMAN: There's a typo or something there on the sheet that was distributed.

MS BARRETT: I can get the exact figure in a moment.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, you see, Pam, under Recommendation it says \$104,566, but under Overall Total Increase it says \$104,556. The correct figure is \$104,556.

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

MS BARRETT: So is that an increase of \$6,200 or an increase of \$6,210?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see what you mean now: the increase.

MR. WICKMAN: It's an increase of \$6,210.

MS BARRETT: It is an increase of \$6,210? Okay; that's my motion then.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to exempt myself from this vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, while you're at it, slow down.

MR. BOGLE: Okay; I'll take the Chair.

[Mr. Bogle in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Are we ready for the question? All those in favour? Opposed? Okay. Let the vote show that Edmonton-Whitemud was opposed.

[Dr. Carter in the Chair]

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move . . .

MRS. MIROSH: You want it both ways.

MR. WICKMAN: No, Dianne, you're wrong. I'm going to move that the ministers without portfolio, which are Tories incidentally . . .

MRS. BLACK: We don't have any.

MR. WICKMAN: I know, but you could have some. You could be one. I would recommend you, and help you.

MR. BOGLE: All right. Go ahead with your motion. Go ahead, Percy.

MR. WICKMAN: . . . and the leader of the third party be given an additional \$13,669, which would bring their overall total to \$78,417.

Mr. Chairman, speaking to that, the thing we attempted to address here -- and if you notice, the benefit is really not to the minister without portfolio; the benefit is to the leader of third party, Laurence Decore. No question about it. I don't like the figure of 188.7 because that illustrates the increase just in that portion over and above his base. If you look at the total increase to him, the benefits are more like about 52 percent, which is still high. But what it's doing is recognizing that we now have a caucus that has eight seats whereas the New Democrats have 16; in other words, 50 percent. Previously it was pegged at 25 percent of a minister without portfolio. That has now been increased to 50 percent in recognition of the doubling of the Liberal caucus. That still does not bring it to 50 percent of what Ray Martin receives, however. It brings it to 45 percent of what Ray Martin receives. The Leader of the Official Opposition, you can see, is \$47,051, whereas this is \$20,912.

Now, I know it may sound like I'm not making sense, on the one hand opposing those and moving these, but if this is going to be done, I think we have to recognize what is fairer to those persons in that particular position. I don't think it's realistic of me to sit here, vote against the others, and ask Pam Barrett or Bob Bogle to move the motion. If I don't move the motion, the motion isn't made, and then we have an unfair situation for the leader of the third party. In other words, I'm boxed in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we look forward to seeing how you vote then, totally.

Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been very consistent in my vote, and I intend to keep my vote that way. But it bothers me that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud sits and votes against all the other increases and now when it comes time

to vote for his leader at 52 percent, he then speaks in favour of such a motion. I'm just wondering why an increase like this would be favourable for his leader. You're not in favour of an increase for anyone else, just the leader of the third party. So I'm asking a question to the member who made the motion.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, my response, Mr. Chairman, is that because you've already accepted or acknowledged the fact that there are going to be increases for the ministers and for the Leader of the Opposition, in fairness to the person in that particular position you have to have that increase, and in addition, in recognition that we're talking in terms of a different scenario: where previously the Liberal caucus had four members, it now has eight; it is now 50 percent. When we approved Bill 24 in the House, it was very, very clear in there that the leader of the third party would be set by the Members' Services Committee, but it would be at a minimum of that 25 percent figure. That was done for a reason, recognizing that the situation had changed. And the situation could very well change next time around. Maybe Pam Barrett, for example, will have to support, you know, a different situation on behalf of her caucus. Things change, and there is that change. I go for the increase from four to eight members as being the rationale. This I think I can rationalize to myself, to the media, to whomever.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the motion because I feel that it is part of the overall package which the committee looked at. Pam is quite correct in that when we were grappling with this problem -- and it's already been pointed out that in dealing with salaries, MLAs are dealing with something that's so sensitive and so difficult -- we keep looking around at other jurisdictions to see if somebody has finally found the right formula to use, and no one seems to be able to do that because no matter who you turn to for help or advice, the buck stops here; we ultimately have to deal with it as a committee.

I'm so pleased with the concept of using a judge's salary as a benchmark. And that's what it is: a benchmark. We're not tying it to the salary, but we are using it as a benchmark. We're taking the Premier, who has the highest position in the land, and we're using a benchmark of the chief provincial judge's salary. We're looking at the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Speaker of the Assembly, and a minister with portfolio, and using a benchmark of a provincial judge's salary. We're looking at an MLA's salary and using a benchmark of 55 percent of the judge's salary, a percentage of the judge's salary.

I think it stands to reason, then, in looking at the leader of the third party, and remember that to be recognized as a party in Alberta you need at least four members, using that and a minister without portfolio's position -- and we don't currently have any ministers without portfolio -- and tying that in at 75 percent of a judge's salary. So based on our overall approach at using the benchmark approach with judges' salaries, I'm in support of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question?

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you for your understanding.

MRS. MIROSH: You don't have my understanding. You guys are hypocrites.

MR. WICKMAN: If I refused to move the motion, then it would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of additional motions that need to be put forward. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BOGLE: One is the effective date. I would like to move that for all of the above motions dealing with salaries, remuneration, and benefits, the effective date be April 1, 1989, unless the appointment was made after that date. In an instance such as that the date of appointment would be the effective date. I'll use a specific example. Obviously, then, MLAs would be effective April 1. The other categories we've just gone through -- the Leader of the Official Opposition, minister with portfolio, Speaker -- would be April 1. The leader of the third party would be April 1. What would not be April 1 would be the chairmen of the standing and select committees. That would be based on the date they were approved by the Assembly. So I think I've covered that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Calgary-Foothills.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an ordeal for me. I hope I never have another day like this in my life, and to try and make myself feel better, I have to speak against this motion.

No. The reason I speak against it is because I think most other increases in the real world are effective the day they're agreed or, you know, the following month. I know you're going to disagree; you're going to prove to me otherwise for this committee, and you'd be right. But given the size of it and everything else, I just want to speak against any retroactivity.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I think in fairness to the Liberal caucus, could we add onto your motion that those in the Liberal caucus who don't wish to participate could . . .

MR. BOGLE: There's another motion.

MRS. BLACK: Oh, is there? All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, just speaking to the principle of this being retroactive to April 1. Speaking to the principle of it being retroactive and not the actual figures and that, I have no problem with that. There are many, many agreements that, in fact, when they are settled are retroactive to even January 1, sometimes retroactive for 12 months. I disagree with Ms Barrett on them normally going into place when they're agreed. Normally there is provision in any type of agreement to

make it retroactive. So I'll support it being retroactive, or the principle of it being retroactive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I was remiss in not giving an important precedent for my motion that it be retroactive, in that we went back and looked at both the Prowse report, which was a result of the review done in 1975, and the Miller report, the review done in 1979. They were the last two major reviews commissioned by the Assembly which resulted in significant increases, and in both cases the recommendations were retroactive to January 1 of the calendar year; not to April 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, but January 1. I also mention, members, that when we dealt with our expense allowances a year ago, we made them retroactive to January 1 of the calendar year.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question. All those in favour of April 1, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

MR. BOGLE: Could we have it recorded, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote. Two opposed: Edmonton-Highlands and Calgary-Foothills. Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that those Members of the Legislative Assembly who do not wish to take the increases we've set today write to you and express their intention of not taking it, and that commitment will last for the duration of, I believe, the 22nd Legislature. Is it not the 22nd we're in?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 22nd.

MS BARRETT: Well, I'd like to speak against this. I understand why it's on the table, and I believe I've been an author of something like this before, if I'm not mistaken. But, I mean, there's a real pleasure in seeing that fairness is done here, and the principal issue at play here is — you know, if you vote one way, and take the money, then you're hypocritical. Quite frankly, that's why I voted in favour of the first motion, the MLA indemnity motion. I didn't agree with the total amount, but I agreed in principle to tying, and you can't be a hypocrite. There's nothing I dislike more than hypocrisy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hold it, folks. There's a fire alarm for the building. There's no point sitting here. You might as well grab your purses and your valuables and let's go, just in case.

[The committee recessed from 2:38 p.m. to 2:46 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is everybody back here? All right. Now, where were we?

MS BARRETT: I was speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Yes. I was talking on my favourite subject since I first saw this movie, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Burl Ives

played this crotchety old man, and he kept talking about mendacity and how he despised mendacity. Do you remember that?

AN HON. MEMBER: We're not that old.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, you're not.

Anyway, I really don't like to see hypocrisy. In fact, it was because of that sense of not agreeing with hypocrisy that I voted for the motion to expand the MLA indemnities. I didn't agree in detail, but I did in the principle of tagging. Therefore, you can't get around it; you have to — you know, you're either going to lie publicly or lie to yourself, and I don't like either of them.

But the issue on the table now is how to prevent, really, people from saying one thing and then doing another. And I agree; I don't want that provision. I don't like that. But the reason I speak against this motion is because if, in fact, you say one thing and do another, it's true it will force you into becoming clear about your intentions, but it has the effect of establishing a two-tier system for MLAs. The idea is that we all work hard. If there's anybody in the building that doesn't, let me know who they are, because they can take some of my workload; I certainly have more than enough. Once you have that precedent, then you can really start to fall apart at the seams. I mean, I could start running around comparing hour-by-hour my effort versus your effort, and I don't think that's right. Presumably we're giving all that we can to the job, and so we should be entitled to the same rate of pay for the job.

This motion allows an opting out for up to a three-year period. That means you'd be going into the next election with some MLAs earning some income . . . [interjection] You bet. . . and some MLAs earning another income. And by the way, you can have a variation, as well, within that. You can write to the Speaker and you can say, "No, I'm not taking the full increase," or "I'm only going to take part of the increase, the part that I think is justified." You could have one heck of a nightmare.

Now, I'm experienced enough in this committee to know that usually I don't get my way, but I would certainly like to encourage, at the very minimum, that this motion be amended so that it expires — the right to opt out for the increase expires on April 1, 1990. That's a very minimum, and actually I'd like to see the whole thing overturned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: No, I'm not on the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Edmonton-Whitemud on the amendment.

MR. WICKMAN: No, I'm not on the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Okay. On the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call for the question on the amendment to make it April 1, 1990. Those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? Defeated. Thank you.

Back to the main motion.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I want to speak in favour of the motion, and I'm doing so for this reason. In 1986 the Members' Services Committee worked very hard at the eleventh and a half hour on the question of a 10 percent increase. One member of the Assembly, Mr. Mitchell, took great pleasure in speaking against the motion and indicated to members in the Assembly that he would take his increase and donate it to charity. Well, whether he did or not -- whatever he did with it is immaterial. He tried to have it both ways, and it's awfully nice if you can do that. One of the beauties of the motion put forward a year ago by Alan Hyland when we dealt with the expense allowance -- Alan tagged on the motion that any member who felt that he or she did not wish to take that increase could opt out by writing the Speaker. That clearly signaled all 83 members of the Assembly to do one of two things: either put up or shut up. I'm tired of people who want it both ways, who want the benefit of the increase...

MS BARRETT: No problem; I agree.

MR. BOGLE: And certainly I'm not reflecting on the comments made by Pam a few moments ago. Not at all.

MS BARRETT: Good, because I do agree with that.

MR. BOGLE: But I think we did something last year. It worked. It's interesting to note that all 83 members took the increase. In my view, by not accepting this motion we would be making it easy for the Grant Mitchells of this world to have it both ways, and I don't want to be part of any process that would do that.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to refer specifically to individuals, but I have to agree with the comments made by Bob Bogle. If one wants to sit back and attempt to make political hay out of this type of situation, and then on the other hand they're going to take additional money, there's something wrong. All this does is allow the individual to state that he is that determined or opposed to it that he's going to turn it back. Of course, some are going to say that they're going to give it to charity, I guess, which is their right, and some will. There's no question in my mind that in our caucus I would expect you're going to see some refusals. But this is a situation that it allows.

If you're doing members a favour by allowing them to go on record and say, "I'm so opposed that I'm turning it back to government," the difficulty that I have, and I'm sure Pam Barrett would have as well -- or at least I do; Pam handles things differently, I guess, with her caucus. I took this back to caucus. You know, what happens in our caucus, our discussion is our business, and one can't assume that all eight members of the caucus are opposed to this package or how many may be inclined to speak in favour of it, speak violently opposed to it, or whatever. So even my vote is a vote for the Liberal caucus; it's not a vote by Percy Wickman type thing. I just want that on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I assume I'm closing debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In committee we tend not to do that, but I

don't see anybody wanting to get in, so fire away.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I should say I purposely made the motion reflective on this Legislature as per the motion that was made when we dealt with the expense allowance last year. I had a motion that had left it open ended. Gordon Wright, rightfully so, suggested that it should be for the effect of that Legislature, so when there is another Legislature, one candidate cannot use that against the other, and would he take it and would he not. This motion is meant to be for those that are sitting here in this Legislature now, and when this Legislature ceases, obviously the ability to opt out -- that decision is left to another Members' Services Committee, if they wish to do so.

MS BARRETT: May I ask a question? Is the implication of this motion that if you write to the Speaker, (a) when you want to opt out, you opt out completely, and (b) you have no right of opting back in? What is the real implication here?

MR. HYLAND: To me that would be the implication of the motion, that when you make the decision, you make the decision. That's a decision for whatever the period of the Legislature is. You can't come in and out every month or every year or whatever. You do it once and that's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or until such time as this committee -- if it felt it wanted to deal with it before another election, that would open up another door.

MS BARRETT: I have a supplementary question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not that we're too likely to be doing that, I guess.

MR. HYLAND: This committee can make a motion at the next meeting one way or the other.

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's true.

Could I have a supplementary question? Then if you decide to opt out, is there a range of opting out, or are you either in or out, period?

MRS. BLACK: In or out, period.

MS BARRETT: That's the understanding, in or out? Okay.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, that would be my understanding, but there's another aspect that one has to deal with with respect to this matter. If an hon. member would choose to opt out, at some point in time we have to deal with the overall budget with respect to this. If it were to come to pass that somebody would then come along three or four months later and say, "Well, hey, I've changed my mind; I now want to opt in," at that point in time this committee would have set the budget, which meant it made for one heck of a difficult administrative problem, because those funds would not have been built into the budget.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MR. KOWALSKI: So it seems to me the interpretation is very clear with the motion. If you opt out, you opt out. The only

way that one could opt back in, presumably, is that they would have to come back to this committee, and there would have to be a motion of the committee to accept that opting in.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like that further clarified because of our meetings last week, that if a member decided to opt out, they were out, period, that they could not revisit this when we reconvene our session or down the road. I would think that they would be out, period, until the next election.

MR. HYLAND: That's why I used "the 22nd Legislature" and not "a session of the 22nd Legislature." Using the phrase "22nd Legislature" means for the life till the next election is called, which I think answers your concern.

MRS. BLACK: So that is clear, then, in the intent.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, call for the question then.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Let the record show it unanimous.

MR. BOGLE: Can we have just a five-minute break? We need to consult with the chairman on one matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

[The committee recessed from 2:59 p.m. to 3:03 p.m.]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure there's some clarification that the Table officers will require, and one thing that's been brought to our attention relative to my motion on retroactivity deals with the committees that are working, because it was not the intent that that be retroactive. But as the chairman's amount is swept into it, I think the simplest way to deal with it is to make a motion that committee work -- that includes the chairman's allowance as well as the amounts for the meeting, which includes traveling time -- be effective today, in that it not be misunderstood. That was not intended to be retroactive.

MR. WICKMAN: And the cars too, Bob, if you could throw that in.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the cars goes without saying. Do you want it all swept into one, if that's possible?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And the date of effect for those appropriate motions as previously passed: today. Those in favour?

MR. WICKMAN: Can I ask, Bob, as to the Whips and the House leaders, how does that apply?

MR. BOGLE: That's retroactive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Date of appointment.

MR. BOGLE: That's April 1 or date of appointment.

MS BARRETT: I also have a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS BARRETT: In the middle of a vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's all right.

MS BARRETT: The committee meetings -- for instance, I'm going to go to another committee meeting this afternoon at 5:30. So I assume that the old rule that you only charge for one meeting a day -- does that mean that if I met from, say, 1 to 5 and then from 5:30 to 7:30, that I charge in the medium category? Is that the way I do it?

MR. BOGLE: You charge for both, but you obviously can't charge travel for both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair interprets that as a separate issue, and what's happened is that you're going to be allowed to charge for both committees if they both meet on the same day. We'll come to that next.

MS BARRETT: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

DR. McNEIL: Mr. Chairman, just to add to that, we're going to have to redesign the forms so that it's straightforward as to what you're allowed and what you're not.

MS BARRETT: Good point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then the motion before us is with regard to the allowances, the special ones for chairmen and the new rates for committees to come into effect on this day, which will rearrange what our own expenses are on this day.

MS BARRETT: And that includes autos.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

Now, with regard to the matter that Edmonton-Highlands has raised. Taber-Warner -- and Parliamentary Counsel -- do we need a special motion to allow members serving on two committees which meet on the same day to collect for each committee?

MR. RITTER: Yes, I would think so, simply because we've got an escalating amount relative to each committee, and there was a former term in the previous items which said no. So I think if we had a special motion which said you're allowed to collect for each committee, that would clarify things an awful lot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Before a motion hits the floor, I think the fair or obvious thing to do is to fill in a form. If you've got more than one committee meeting on one day, you add up the cumulative hours. I don't know which committee gets charged against then, but I would think that's the fair way to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MS BARRETT: No? How come?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because in our budget process each committee has to bring a separate budget to the committee. So if you go to one committee meeting for two and a half hours, you get paid the full amounts, and then you go to another meeting for another hour and a half, you get paid the full amounts for that one as well.

Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that when members attend committee meetings, they receive remuneration on a per-meeting basis. I think that's as good a wording as any.

In speaking to it, obviously -- let's take myself, for example. Or let's take the Member for Taber-Warner today, because I know he has two meetings. Obviously, one is at one rate, and the second one will be at the flat minimum rate. Or one of them receives full remuneration for travel both ways, and one doesn't. You wouldn't be able, by any stretch of the imagination, to collect the maximum on two meetings. Obviously, the one meeting would be the minimum. I think that fills in the concern that the Member for Edmonton-Highlands has, because if you started adding the hours up, I think they'd almost break the same way that breaks out anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there a call for the question then?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour, please say aye, or raise your hand, rather, because it's easier to see. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have another motion, and that deals with the residence allowance. I would move that the residence allowance be increased from \$75 to \$100 a day.

Mr. Chairman, I may need some guidance on this, but my definition of residence allowance, you know, would include even during the session when people come up here and they have to stay. The \$75 a day is no longer sufficient because of increased costs and that. Also, during the nonsession when you come up for meetings, it should be allowed to \$100. So rather than use Temporary Residence Allowance, Nonsessional, I would just simply use -- I think the proper phrase would be residence allowance -- in the intent that this would not be retroactive. This would go into place . . .

MR. HYLAND: September 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that effective September 1?

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, September 1 is good enough.

MRS. BLACK: Does that mean the \$1,000 capital allowance?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I would assume. That should be specified though, Percy. The rule currently was to a maximum of 10 days' worth, \$750, so you'd have to specify to a maximum of \$1,000 per month.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, right; 10 days still, though.

DR. McNEIL: Just to make it clear there, there's a sessional allowance, which is presently \$75 a day. Outside of session there are two alternatives: a nonsessional allowance, \$75 a day for each day up to a maximum of 30 days within a three-month period, or the capital residence allowance, which is \$750 per month, or in the case of apartments, \$75 per day up to a maximum of \$750.

MS BARRETT: So which one are we affecting by this motion?

DR. McNEIL: It seems to me you're affecting all of them, so the \$100 a day should apply in each one of those instances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's both the sessional allowance and the nonsessional allowance, for the sake of Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah. Your \$75 becomes \$100, your \$750 becomes \$1,000, and everything is proportionate.

MR. BOGLE: That's right. The motion doesn't affect the principle of any of the three categories; it just affects the dollar amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Carried unanimously. Effective date, September 1.

Okay, thank you. Other motions?

MR. RITTER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question just for clarification. In the motion of Mr. Wickman that additional per diem for chairmen of class A committees be set at \$350 a month, I need clarification that if a person is a chairman of more than one committee, he receives \$350 for each class A committee that he sits on. Is that the interpretation?

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, that's the intent, because we're not talking individuals here; we're talking positions.

MR. RITTER: Okay, thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: But with the car, though, only the one car, because we don't want somebody with a fleet of cars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that it with item 3(a)? Well, thank you, subcommittee members.

Item 3(b).

MS BARRETT: I'm just having my motion photocopied. Could we go to the next item and then come back to this one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, before we go on, on behalf of the members that weren't on the subcommittee, I'd like to congratulate the subcommittee for the effort and the fairness in keeping with all of the things we've been thinking about over the last few months. I think they've done an excellent job.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Don't thump your table, Calgary-Glenmore.  
Item 3(c). Clerk, 3(c).

DR. McNEIL: On this one, we're still researching the terms of the limits in terms of all the benefits, in terms of the numbers of hours a week that the . . .

MR. WICKMAN: I'm sorry; could you speak up a bit? I can't hear.

DR. McNEIL: We're still researching with the personnel administration office with respect to the hours that individuals would have to work to be eligible for each set of benefits that is received. It's not clear yet that the same principle would apply to all the benefits and if there's a minimum number of hours of work per week that would apply.

As I indicated last week, I costed out on an approximate basis what the initial cost to put employees on would be. The initial cost, based on \$20,000 a year salary for constituency office staff, is about \$1,700. That's what the initial benefits would cost to the member out of his or her constituency allowance on top of what they pay now, which is around \$2,700. I think it's \$900 a year for CPP and UIC.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, simply, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to see us develop or accept a principle that it's equal to employees within the civil service. In other words, whatever criteria pertain at the present time to part-time provincial employees would also pertain to the constituency office employees, just to make it on par. And we've already accepted the principle that the charges for the government's portion of covering the employer's share would be charged against the constituency office budget. There is no impact whatsoever on the government. Rather than go through a great deal of rigmarole, I'd just like that principle adopted so that if I or Dianne or whatever the case may be choose to do that with our staff, we have the freedom to do it, and it has to be on the same basis as any other provincial employee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, three years ago when I first joined this committee, I made a number of arguments in favour of doing this. Some of my arguments were ultimately accepted and some were not, but I think the committee has come to realize that certain options are reasonable for members to exercise. And as one who spent I think it was a full autumn and part of a winter fighting for this, I'd sure speak in favour of it.

MR. BOGLE: Question.

MR. WICKMAN: So, Mr. Chairman, then the motion on the floor would be one that would state that the principle of extending benefits to constituency office staff be approved, and those constituency offices be allowed the option to put it into effect immediately.

MR. BOGLE: Well, my understanding . . .

MR. WICKMAN: With the dollars to be charged back to the constituency budget.

MR. BOGLE: It's coming out of the member's -- that was the point I wanted to ensure there was clarification on: that the employer in this case is not the government of Alberta or the Legislative Assembly; it is the member. So if the member wishes to provide the benefit, the member is the employer, and it comes out of the member's allowance.

DR. McNEIL: Just a legal point of clarification. In the final analysis, the employer is the Legislative Assembly Office in all of these for anybody who is employed in the constituency office. However, the funding does come from the constituency office allowance of the individual member, and that would not change. The other point I want to make is that the committee's decision on constituency staff contracts last time was to approve two types of standard form contracts.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

DR. McNEIL: Adoption of Mr. Wickman's motion would mean individually tailored contracts for each constituency office. We have the capability to do that; I just want you to be aware that that would be the consequence of that motion.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question on the motion. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Back to item 3(b).

MS BARRETT: When the House was still sitting, we had a meeting to deal with a couple of small sort of housekeeping issues, one of which dealt with the constituency office furniture. The particular need that I was representing at that meeting was permitted and I assume since then met, but I would like to bring back my motion and make it formal at this point. I'll read it out for the record.

Constituency office furniture such as bookshelves, chairs, tables, et cetera, beyond the minimal allocation already assured constituency offices upon request, shall be provided to constituency offices, upon request, provided such requests are reasonable and subject to availability from surplus stock held by the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services.

If the reasonableness of such a request is in doubt, it shall be determined by either the Speaker of the Assembly or the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

Now, I understand that in the -- do you call it EDP or EDP report? You know, whatever that thing is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Electronic data.

MS BARRETT: Anyway, I looked through the report update last week, and I understand that there is consideration for er-



gonomic equipment when it comes to the daily and long-term use of computers. And that's true. Being, I believe, the only one of 83 MLAs that actually uses her own computer, I can assure you that that stuff has become vital; that is, movable trays for the keyboard and also chairs that are useful for seating in the long term. That's not what's at issue here; that's still in that committee.

What's at issue here is that if you're lucky enough to have gotten a larger office and you can put more government documents in them, then if there's a spare bookshelf, you can ask for it. That's the point of this. I expect that it's not going to be a long-term problem for either the Speaker or the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services because, generally speaking, there won't be a lot of requests, and where they are, it's subject to reasonableness; if it isn't obvious, then determined by either the minister or the Speaker.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the only person in the whole system that allocates these surplus materials happens to be the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, and I want to assure the hon. member that the variety of requests has a permutation factor associated with it that will boggle her mind. It is absolutely amazing what people in this province ask for by way of surplus equipment. Just in this last week it has ranged from snowmaking equipment to surplus flagpoles.

MS BARRETT: Surplus which?

MR. KOWALSKI: Flagpoles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know where we need two of them: in your constituency.

MR. KOWALSKI: This is really pedantic, and I just want to share it with you, because there are some words in here that "requests are reasonable and subject to availability." Should an hon. member somewhere, because of proximity to a provincial building and/or something, catch wind of the fact that some pebble stones are being removed from a provincial building in his or her constituency, they would immediately send me a letter saying, "Can we have 473 of these pebble stones for such and such organization?"

MS BARRETT: We talked about furniture though; just furniture.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, I appreciate that, but it has led to members who have been put on this fancy new list for updated computer equipment also sending me letters saying, "Hey, it sure would be great if we could have a second computer in my office."

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're kidding.

MR. KOWALSKI: I would co-operate significantly, bend over backwards to help, but I would only plead for one little thing. If this committee could make up the list, it would just make it so much easier to administer, and whatever the committee says that they want, we'll provide to all hon. members. But if you put me in the position, in essence -- I mean, MLA A wants this because they've had the good fortune of finding out that this has now become surplus. There's only one of them, and then the other

MLA says, "Well, put me in line." Then we're talking about paper here that's going to drive me bananas. You make up the list, and we'll bend over backwards to assist you in the surplus equipment. You need a bookshelf; we'll get you a bookshelf when they come up. You need some chairs; we'll get you some chairs.

MS BARRETT: I give -- I withdraw the motion. I request unanimous consent to withdraw the motion. I'm going to replace it.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next. Do you want to do it right now, or do you want to wait for a few minutes so we can get through a few more things?

MS BARRETT: Do you want me to get it copied again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'll give you a few minutes to deal with it.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, we had set up a subcommittee, and the subcommittee has never met. Could I ask that this be referred to that subcommittee so we can discuss it?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. WICKMAN: We've never had the opportunity, Pam.

MS BARRETT: Because this committee won't meet again for a while, dollink. Why don't we just go on to the next item? I'll have David McNeil's original recommendation photocopied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're going to item 3(d).

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's nothing difficult about this. If two months from now you want to add something else, we'll add it, but as long as it becomes consistent with everybody...

MS BARRETT: Fine. What's the next item?

MR. BOGLE: Percy's; 3(d).

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on item 3(d), I've been giving this consideration. You know, the way it was handled in the past, yeah, I'm the first to admit there were some problems. To penalize the members that were part of that caucus -- or they penalized themselves; let's put it that way -- fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, penalize. I thought I heard "tantalyze." I'm sorry.

MR. WICKMAN: Penalize. But in fairness to the new members of the Liberal caucus, I think we shouldn't have to share the fallout of that decision that was made. I would ask the committee's consideration in reinstating \$4,000 per member, which would be \$16,000 of the \$37,000 that was lost to the Liberal caucus as a result of that earlier motion done before the election by the former member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Further discussion, Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I support what the member's recommending. He has now come back and said to the committee that rather than require a special warrant -- and we were all loath to make that recommendation through our chairman to the Provincial Treasurer and the cabinet -- the motion as originally presented by the former member of the Members' Services Committee representing the Liberal caucus was based on four members of that caucus. We went through a general election; now there are eight members in the Liberal caucus. Therefore, there must have been the increased dollars set aside someplace for the other four members. Why penalize the newer members who are not part of the original caucus? It's a compromise the member's putting forward, and I support it.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Bob.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question. All those in favour? Carried unanimously.

So, item 3(e). Has this been resolved?

MS BARRETT: It has been resolved. I'm sorry to say I do not have the names of the four interns, but somebody within each caucus knows the name or names of the intern they are getting. The chiefs of staff know. I did have the list; I'm sorry I can't find it. Anyway, it's resolved. Is that good enough?

MR. WICKMAN: We've got Shelley. I know that much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're glad you've got it resolved. We would like to have a letter, since we administer the program, so we could know. But that's good. Thank you. Within the next couple of days. The matter is resolved, item 3(e).

MR. WICKMAN: A letter from each caucus, or just from ...

MS BARRETT: Just from Sylvia would be good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Item 3(f) has been circulated to all members somewhere in the pile of paper before you. If you'd like to take that with your reading, to go to Calgary-Foothills in particular to ask ...

MRS. MIROSH: I don't have any of this stuff. I don't have a credenza. I don't have occasional chairs. I don't have a garbage can ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Glenmore, we're dealing with item 3(f).

MS BARRETT: Was that just for information purposes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's there for information. Thank you.

All right. Are we ready to go back to 3(b)? Okay. Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Want me to do it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Our Clerk very kindly did up a motion a long time ago as well for that meeting we had when the House was sitting. I didn't know he was doing one or I wouldn't have bothered doing one. Anyway, I'm not going to read out what is; I'll just read out the recommendation for what should be: that standard furniture to be given by Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services for constituency offices be three desks, one tilter chair, two steno chairs, four filing cabinets, one coat rack, three garbage cans -- oh, that's the one that excited me the most -- one credenza, four occasional chairs, and one coffee table. I'm going to amend it and say two bookcases and one pamphlet rack. I so move.

MRS. BLACK: How big an office do you have?

MS BARRETT: It's actually pretty small.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you can visit each other's constituency office another time.

On this new list we will have tilter chairs instead of what's there.

MS BARRETT: Okay. And the list says one bookcase, but I amended it to say two.

MR. WICKMAN: Can you have two pamphlet racks, Pam? Because those pamphlet racks are very small.

MRS. MIROSH: I've got one you can have.

MS BARRETT: I don't care.

MR. HYLAND: When the meeting's over, I'll tell you guys how to display your pamphlets. It's cheap.

MR. KOWALSKI: And you wanted a picture of the Minister of Public Works ...

MS BARRETT: Twenty-four by 30, nonglare glass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On cork.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. Agreed.

MS BARRETT: Is it two pamphlet racks or one?

MR. WICKMAN: I'm for the two.

MS BARRETT: Two pamphlet racks, two bookcases.

If it's agreed, what I would say is that we can each circulate this to our own constituency offices, and if they want to choose from this list if they're deficient in anything, then they request it. Otherwise, nothing happens and the minister of public works is off the hook.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

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

Item 3(g), Legal Aid Costs for MLAs. Are we ready to com-

ment on this today, or is this to be dealt with at our next meeting?

Clerk.

MR. RITTER: Putting it very briefly, the Clerk asked me to look into the situation. I checked with Michael Clegg, who's been here some 14 years, and I've been here for almost three years now. There has never been on record, at least in our department, the occasion of our having to go to the legal defence of any member involved in litigation, certainly not in a courtroom context. The main reason for that is that in the Legislative Assembly Act there's a section on privileges of the Legislative Assembly, and amongst those privileges the member is immune from any type of civil litigation for anything carried out by that member in his parliamentary capacity.

Now, we have been involved in a legal context with members who have been involved in litigation -- that includes everything from garnishment of wages to service of legal documents and that type of thing -- and in all occasions in the past we have considered these matters a matter of privileges of the Assembly and, as such, not within the jurisdiction of the court. If a court or a lawyer were foolhardy enough to start legal action against a member, the office of Parliamentary Counsel very quickly becomes involved. In all cases these were resolved with negotiations directly with the lawyer or the government department involved or the creditor or what have you, and we have not had to go to any type of litigation on behalf of a member because these were considered within the total jurisdiction of the Assembly as is provided in statute, the Legislative Assembly Act.

So that really is the answer for anything that affects a member in his parliamentary capacity. The Legislative Assembly Office is already involved, and the office of the Parliamentary Counsel becomes involved when members get in any litigious situation. It really gets referred to the Assembly as a whole rather than -- it's taken away from the jurisdiction of the courts.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, when we dealt with it just a few days ago, what I visualized happening I'd still like to see happen. Rather than us trying to jump on it too quickly or deal with it too quickly, I'd like to have our Parliamentary Counsel really research it out and see what happens in other provinces and come forward with a written report for this committee to consider -- the basis that would form some type of policy to make it very, very clear -- and look at the principle of arbitration as well. If two MLAs are involved with litigation, maybe there should be a principle of binding arbitration or at least allowing that option to allow those members to resolve it.

MR. HYLAND: Is that a tabling motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. RITTER: If I may, I'd like to . . . You know, before we go on to any type of research of what happens in the other provinces, perhaps we could get some direction from this committee as to exactly what type of litigation is being contemplated here. Obviously, normal civil litigation between two members as individuals does not affect the Legislative Assembly and the members in their parliamentary capacity. As I say, anything that involves a member directly in this famous quotation of "in his parliamentary capacity" is already provided for in the Legislative Assembly Act, and civil action is strictly forbidden

against a member.

MR. WICKMAN: You see, that's the problem. There are situations where it's not covered even though it could be argued that it is in their parliamentary duties. In other words, if I go outside this building and call Pam a liar, she can turn around and sue me.

MS BARRETT: But I can't if you do it in the House.

MR. WICKMAN: I could be saying that you're a liar and still relate it to my parliamentary duties. In my mind I could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we'll take it . . .

MR. WICKMAN: No, I could, David. You know, I could say . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Folks, I think the earlier discussion is correct. Let's table it, let's have some more to deal with it, because we've got plenty of other things we have to deal with this afternoon. And I hope members are not going to start suing each other.

MR. WICKMAN: I suggested that Michael Clegg could get additional information by talking to those people that are currently involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Agreed? Opposed? Carried. Thank you, Mr. Wickman.

All righty. Item 4(a). Do we have some . . .

DR. McNEIL: Yes, there's a decision item in the package of information at your . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's one that was attached to your agenda, I think.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move the draft order -- I guess there's no number on it -- related to item 4(a)(i), former members' travel. There's been some concern. This is the one we had in the minutes, but it was thought it should be a Members' Services order to correctly cover all angles. So it's no change in anything. It's just putting it into a Members' Services order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. This is a request of Treasury to make it absolutely clear. It's moved by Cypress-Redcliff. All those in favour, please signify once more. Opposed? Carried.

MR. HYLAND: Does that make the effective date as of the day we had the motion?

DR. McNEIL: December 6 of '88.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. This one is just for clarification of something the committee was doing throughout this year.

DR. McNEIL: The next one, 4(a)(iii), is just a housekeeping order. What it does is add to the members' group plan order the fact that members do have public liability coverage through a policy with Treasury. This is the only coverage that isn't mentioned in that group plan's order. So all it is is just saying this is another benefit you already have. We want to make that order comprehensive, so we're adding that public liability coverage in that order.

MS BARRETT: We're self-insured, aren't we?

MRS. MIROSH: Does this mean that if someone slips in front of my constituency office and sues me, I'm covered?

DR. McNEIL: That's correct.

MR. HYLAND: You've just moved it.

MRS. MIROSH: I've just moved it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, you moved. The Member for Calgary-Glenmore did move it. All those in favour of this, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

MRS. MIROSH: Did we miss doing 2?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. WICKMAN: Two was dealt with in my motion.

MS BARRETT: We've just got 4(b) left, and then I'm going to make a request.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on 4(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're about to get . . . Yeah.

MR. WICKMAN: On 4(b), I would move that provision be reinstated to allow the transfer of funds up to 25 percent from constituency members' allowances to caucus. Isn't that the issue in front of us? Yeah, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaking to the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the motion is put, the Chair would refer hon. members to the comments of the Chair in the previous Legislature that I feel it's absolutely wrong. It's on the basis of the number of constituents within a member's constituency. The member is there to be servicing his or her constituents. To have that allowed to be transferred over to the caucus I think is violating the principle of the member and his constituents. But I've said that before; that's all I need to say. There's a call for the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Other business?

MS BARRETT: There are two other items I'd like to bring forward, but I need the vice-chairman here. Could we take a brief break? I'm sorry to do this, but . . .

MR. WICKMAN: I'm going to have to go, Pam. Can you give me an idea what they are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think perhaps Mr. Hyland will see if Mr. Bogle can come right back in here.

MS BARRETT: Well, it'll take only a two- or three-minute break. Is that okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Then you also have before you one of these — does everybody have one? — documents about things that have to be done. We'll make the necessary deletions after today, but you see at least the first two items have been attended to. The one that says "August 21-22, Parliamentary Counsel" is ongoing — and staff contracts or something else here, special warrants.

Okay, we're going to break for five minutes.

[The committee recessed from 3:41 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're back in business.

MS BARRETT: I have two more items, please. Given the expansionary mode of things around here, I'd like to move that MLAs, aside from the flights non-Edmonton resident MLAs are entitled to, be entitled to 12 flights per year within the province of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands for the 12. From the present . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Currently it's five.

MS BARRETT: Yes, the current limit is five, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, in principle what Pam Barrett is saying I can agree with. However, I think we have to look at the overall implications not only for these 12 trips but for the leaders. I, for example, brought a motion that was tabled allowing that when the leaders of the official parties are traveling, they be able to take an assistant with them, because it's very, very important to have that resource. So I'd like to see that whole thing locked up. I don't think we've got to rush it through, Pam. I agree with what you're saying. I agree with the additional knowledge.

MS BARRETT: This doesn't affect -- it's unrelated to the stuff you were talking about.

MR. WICKMAN: But I just feel the bargaining position is better if we deal with it on a comprehensive basis. In other words, if you want something and I want something, it's better we deal with it on that basis, where if you get what you want, it may not be so favourable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, do I cut through all that and find a motion to table, or are we just having a discussion?

MRS. BLACK: Could I so move, Mr. Chairman? And in doing that, could we get a breakdown of who travels where? Just a summary.

MS BARRETT: It would be irrelevant, Pat, because the restriction has been done by the year.

MRS. BLACK: That's for every MLA? Could we table this until the next meeting, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's been a motion to table. Those in favour of the tabling, please signify. Opposed? All right. The next meeting.

Edmonton-Highlands, another item.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I don't know what other caucuses do, but I do know that within our caucus we do a lot of what is called outreach, and that includes driving around the province. I haven't the details about who claims for how much in terms of mileage, but I would like to move that the auto allowance ceilings be unified between urban and rural members to the current maximum of 35,000 a year. Is that right?

MR. BOGLE: Forty-five.

DR. McNEIL: Forty-five thousand kilometres for rural members.

MS BARRETT: Oh, is it 45,000? Then what is it for . . .

DR. McNEIL: Twenty-five.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Okay. All right, to 45,000 kilometres per year, again subject to receipt and proof on the same basis that currently applies for the 45,000. What it basically means is if city MLAs do an awful lot of driving, they're not penalized for doing it. It would not affect rural MLAs. If rural MLAs, in fact, are finding that they're doing a lot of driving beyond which they're entitled to claim, then I'm certainly open to changing that as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's a matter of the number of miles or kilometres rather than the rate for them.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall what our limit is for urban, but from my experience -- and I do a lot of driving in the city of Calgary and a lot of driving between the two cities -- I don't think I've ever reached my limit yet. I just don't understand why we would need any more when we're already given a number of tickets for flying as well. I think we have more than our share. I'm not sure what the ceiling is, but I know I've never reached it, and I do a lot of driving.

MS BARRETT: So do I, and I more than reach it.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move to table the motion. I do that specifically because of the previous motion, because some of the numbers we have in the previous . . . We as-

sume we did like we did before. If you had four air flights, you could have four trips on the ground. They're kind of tied together, and I think to move on one without moving on the other, we'd just be coming back and changing it. That's the only reason I say that we may have to hold on until we decide what we do on the other. Because in previous times we've tied those two together, and they can be interchanged. That's enough said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I am going to table the motion. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.  
Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: It's with some trepidation that I'm going to put forward a motion to the results of the last two. But there is a matter we discussed at our last meeting relating to the ability of a member to transfer up to 25 percent of the . . .

MR. HYLAND: That was done while you were gone.

MR. BOGLE: Did we do that?

MS BARRETT: Percy moved it.

MR. BOGLE: Great. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other items?

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Percy.

MR. WICKMAN: Not talking on the tabling motion but on the nature of the item, can I assume that when that all comes back, Pam, you'll look at the question of supporting travel for the leaders' resources, like executive assistants and that, to allow them to travel? Shouldn't we bring that back as one package?

MS BARRETT: Was there a committee that was supposed to do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The subcommittee did so well that maybe we should send the same subcommittee off to negotiate the rest of it.

Okay, that's for the next meeting. Now, any other items of business?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just to bring the committee up to date on two other matters. The last time we had a meeting we had a discussion with respect to the RITE line connection constituency office installation. I'll have the report back to this committee by the end of September with respect to it in terms of the dollars and the figures and the like.

The Member for Edmonton-Highlands also at the last meeting initiated a discussion with respect to bicycle paths, and within a month I'll have a designated policy with respect to that, showing maps and everything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other items?

MS BARRETT: No. I'm sure that's enough for a day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yes, indeed, a considerable amount. Thank you.

Date of next meeting at the call of the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MS BARRETT: Motion to adjourn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just pending what's happening with your next-door neighbour.

MS BARRETT: He says it's okay. The boss says it's okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're about to. I wanted to make sure there were no other items of business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify and shout hooray.

[The committee adjourned at 3:58 p.m.]