

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

9:40 a.m.

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for coming today, ladies and gentlemen. As chairman I also appreciate the co-operation of various people and your understanding in having the meeting yesterday postponed, obviously for reasons dealing with the Constitution. We will work through as much of the agenda as we can today. Hopefully we might be able to get through all of it.

The first thing I would like to do is introduce our new administrative assistant to committees, Mrs. Diane Shumyla. Thank goodness she's been around the place for at least a couple of weeks; that helps her to break in. She confides in me that she greets all of you with great fear and trepidation. I told her that she's the one in the whole group who is least likely to have to worry.

Again, we have our agenda before us. You'll notice we have some representatives from the television media on the floor of the Chamber. They advise me they're breaking in a new television camera today, so there might be a few extra little clicks over in that direction. With respect to our own in-house audio system, it supposedly is in its final stages of fine-tuning. I see Doug up there flashing his hands with his fingers crossed, so we'll see how that goes.

We have the agenda before you in your binders. Is there a motion to approve the agenda, or do we have any other items you want to bring up?

MR. McINNIS: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edmonton-Jasper Place moves approval. A call for the question. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Item 3, Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes for May 13, 1992, as enclosed in your binder. Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Motion for approval as circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion to approve as circulated. Call for the question. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Business Arising from the Minutes: item 4(a), Report on Historical Biographical Sketch of Members. The Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Blake has just distributed a memo dated August 19, 1992, addressed to myself, with a progress report attached. I wonder if at this time I might turn it over to Blake so he can verbally lead us through the work that's been done to date.

MR. McDOUGALL: Okay. Mr. Chairman, first of all, as you note, in the first paragraph I indicate the dates the committee has met and then go on to indicate that at the first meeting of the committee they determined generally what the content of this publication should be and asked for some price estimates related to the cost of publication. Those are noted at the end of the second paragraph. Then at the December 17, 1991, meeting Mr. Bogle presented the attached

recommended table of contents, and members of the staff have completed the items marked with checkmarks. You'll note that the major outstanding items are the biographical entries for each member and the election results. The other items are minor items that aren't completed yet. The two major items still outstanding are the actual entries for each member and the election results.

It was also determined by the committee that they wished to have photographs of all the members included in the publication, so we're presently in the process of getting those photographs. Up to '71 there are only group photographs available. They were taken on the front steps of the Legislature Building. We've identified those and ordered them from the Provincial Archives. Since '71 we have the montage of separate photographs of members. I've secured copies of those and we're having them copied now. I expect, as I note in the last paragraph of the report, that by the end of the first week in September we should have all the photographs of the members as well.

So at this point, in summary, staff have completed all the items checked on the detailed table of contents. Some of those are major items, like all the cabinets, for instance, and all the legislative committees. Outstanding major items are the actual entries for the members and the election results.

If there are any questions, I'd be pleased to answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further comments? Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: The only thing I would add to what Blake has said is that election results, of course, are all contained in the publication put out by the Chief Electoral Officer a few years ago, where he went back to 1905. We do need to address the question of individual members of the various caucuses and the caucus committees. That's something the subcommittee needs to put its mind to at this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's fair to say at this stage that all this is just initial research and future decisions will come in due course. Thank you very much, assistant deputy.

MR. McINNIS: A question for Bob. I thought you said that you were compiling caucus committees. Do you mean House committees or caucus committees?

MR. BOGLE: No. I think the intent under 5 was that we have standing and select committees, which Blake has done. We were also looking at caucus committees. Now, we realize we're only going to be able to go back a few terms in order to do this. We know there are fairly good records back to 1971. Beyond that it gets hazy in a hurry.

MR. McINNIS: For all caucuses?

MR. BOGLE: It seems to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, I think we see this as the accumulation of the material, and the decision comes later as to how you're really going to handle it. Is that correct?

MR. BOGLE: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Other questions or comments? Thank you.

Before we go on to the next item, the Chair was remiss. I apologize. For the record we did receive regrets for today's meeting

from the Member for Edmonton-Highlands and the Member for Red Deer-North.

The next item on our agenda is 4(b), Report -- Subcommittee on Members' Salaries and Benefits. I understand the Member for Cypress-Redcliff is speaking to this matter in the absence of the chairman.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I can get someone to circulate them, I have copies of the minutes of the subcommittee for the two days we met. If it's acceptable to members present, because we had motions day by day in the two committee meetings we held, I would prefer to review the minutes of that day. Perhaps we can take action if the committee so desires on that day, and then we'll move on to the second day. That way we'll at least keep our thoughts on the line the subcommittee did.

The first meeting we held was on May 20. That day we talked about the motion establishing the committee. We talked about the scope of an external review, and we had a motion related to an external review. It was moved by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands that the review be done by an external, independent body. When that motion was put, it was passed unanimously.

9:50

We had discussion on an external review body. What I should say here, Mr. Chairman, is that we used the words "external review" in a couple of references, one being an independent group to go out and look at the salaries, benefits, et cetera, and one of a group of people. As we go through the minutes, we clarify that. At this stage of the minutes we perhaps should have been more careful. We were thinking in two different veins, but the same word was used for both.

The composition of the external review body was put. Ms Barrett put that motion, and I moved to table it so that one wasn't dealt with until the following day. Then we had some discussion and a motion relating to the time period of report which is long gone, so I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, that we need to do much related to that part. I think the part we can act on here, if the Members' Services Committee so wishes, is that relating to the review done by the external, independent body.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee to proceed on that matter at the moment? The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess just three of us are here from the subcommittee. In the minutes Mr. Hyland refers to, the date of the next meeting, the subcommittee agreed to leave it to the chairman's discretion as to whether or not a final meeting needed to be held to finalize decisions made and discuss the manner of the submission of their recommendations to the Members' Services Committee. I did some follow-up on that particular item and spoke to the chairman of the subcommittee on a number of occasions requesting that another meeting be held. That was not done. He then suggested to me that he would do a report with recommendations for me and for the Member for Edmonton-Highlands to review, and if acceptable to the two of us, he would then forward that report with recommendations directly to this particular body. That, Mr. Chairman, never happened. I don't see that included in any of this documentation.

My concern is that we've gone through a process that has taken a fairly lengthy period of time. We've established some very, very important principles. We established by agreement of, I believe, the five of us, if I recall correctly, that it would be external. We established the organizations that would be represented. We established that the committee that would be set up would be all encompassing in its review of all aspects of MLA pay perks,

pensions, and whatever. At that particular point I was feeling rather good about the accomplishments we were making. That takes us to about the middle of June. From that point on it fell apart. Nothing happened. No communication. Now, at this particular point, I don't know what the intent is. I thought in one more meeting we could have sat down, we could have finalized, we could have got very specific recommendations to this committee for consideration with input from all members of the subcommittee, and of course that did not occur after June 15.

So I'm in a kind of limbo as to where we now sit on this matter. I would like to see it proceed. I think there's enough information here so we could pass about three appropriate motions: to strike the external committee as proposed, go along with the membership that we deem should be on there, and thirdly, give direction to that committee to bring on board the outside resource they see as necessary to help them see through the process. Finally, Mr. Chairman, give a deadline to that committee to report back in time for the fall session so this committee can review it again and the matter can then go to the entire Legislative Assembly for consideration to change appropriate legislation that would have to occur. I would like to see that initiative taken. I hope the Member for Cypress-Redcliff will follow through on that and propose those types of recommendations in the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member, for the comments. A few moments ago, though, in process in the committee there was no objection to the fact that the Member for Cypress-Redcliff would go forward dealing first with the minutes of May 20 and has already indicated that the committee would be dealing with the matter of the external review, and then moving on from there, this committee as a whole would be dealing with the minutes of the meeting of June 15. Now, I've not seen these before, but I look quickly to the end of the minutes of June 15 and you will see there item 6:

The sub-committee agreed to leave it to the Chairman's discretion as to whether or not a final meeting needed to be held to finalize the decisions made and to discuss the manner of the submission of their recommendations to the Members' Services Committee.

So that would be dealt with in due course when we come to that item.

Now, dealing with the minutes of May 20, first Edmonton-Jasper Place and then the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I haven't seen these minutes before either, but I came here prepared to deal with this matter today. I don't think we need another subcommittee meeting; that's my feeling. We should hear the report and take what action we consider appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place just clarified my first question. The question was going to be: have we as members of this committee ever seen these minutes before this morning? These were not even in the briefing binder that usually is so well put together by your staff, Mr. Chairman. They were not in. I didn't have a chance last night when I went through this binder to check to see where we were at for any of this material. So a clarification: the first time members of this committee saw these minutes was this morning when we just got them a few minutes ago?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's my understanding.

MR. KOWALSKI: There are two sets of minutes, one dated Wednesday, May 20, and on the ones for June 15 there's the word "draft." I'm not sure if you want to skip ahead. I'd just like to know what that word "draft" means. What does that mean compared to the other minutes? Are we talking about authentic minutes here, or are we going to have another debate in this committee about what these minutes mean? Just for clarification, I'd like to know before I go on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk has support staff to that subcommittee.

DR. McNEIL: My understanding is that the first set of minutes, May 20, was approved by the committee in the next meeting, but since there was not a meeting subsequent to the June 15 meeting, they have never been officially approved by that subcommittee, although they were reviewed by the chairman. He indicated that he believed they reflected the decisions of the committee on that day, but they have yet to be reviewed by the subcommittee.

MR. KOWALSKI: The minutes of May 20 have been endorsed by the subcommittee to be authentic, if that's the correct word, but there could be a question mark about the minutes of June 15.

DR. McNEIL: Correct.

MR. KOWALSKI: Could I then, Mr. Chairman, ask for clarification on item 4 of the minutes of May 20? Not being a member of this subcommittee but noting there were five members there, there was a motion moved "that the external review body be allowed to look at all existing guidelines." Can someone here please explain to me what this external review body is, who they might be, what is envisioned, and what would be the so-called guidelines allocated to them? I don't know. This was put forward by Ms Barrett, who unfortunately is unable to be here today, but perhaps some other member of the committee might be able to explain what this external review body is, what is envisaged, who's involved, and what it's all about.

10:00

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
The Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The external review body in that motion I think is explained a little better in the comments made in the minutes of the following meeting. An external review body at that stage was a group of management consultants -- I guess that's as good a word as any -- that has expertise in reviewing matters such as salaries, benefits, hours of work, the time you put at it, the responsibilities, and all these kinds of things. If you look at some of the comments made in the minutes of the following meeting, I think it was clarified there.

Ms Barrett questioned whether the intent of the sub-committee was, in fact, to have the management consultant firm gather the data now, and then strike the sub-committee after the process was completed. She indicated her preference was to hire the management consultant immediately, and establish the external review body before the management firm completed its research.

So at that stage, at least in my mind and apparently in hers -- others in the committee would have to speak for themselves -- the external review body in that motion is related to a management consultant firm of some type.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
The Member for Barrhead.

MR. KOWALSKI: Then I take it Ms Barrett had along with her motion a report or a document that outlined all the aspects that are part of an addendum or an attachment that would go to these minutes outlining the 15 or 20 or 25 or 30 things they would be looking at. There must be a report. Obviously Ms Barrett moved this. She must have had an attachment that went with this, and I'm wondering why it would not have been provided here as well, this list of all the things we're going to be doing.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, there should be attached a list that was used at that meeting as appendix 2 on the minutes of June 15. Now, that was added, and I'm not sure if that's the updated list or the list Ms Barrett started out with at the meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the last page of the June 15 minutes we have an outline of the tasks, I see here.

MR. KOWALSKI: Clarified that's the report that Mr. Wickman was talking about is not here or what? Ms Barrett moves a motion and I see the wording of the motion and everything else. I just want to know what it is we're going to be reviewing, who's involved, what's involved, and what we're going to be doing. Surely at the meetings that subcommittee had, it must have had that ready here for review or somebody to speak to.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to try and address the point the Member for Barrhead is raising, that was the report I referred to that Stock, the chairman of the subcommittee, told me he would prepare towards the end of the session, which would have been towards the end of June, and would allow myself and the Member for Edmonton-Highlands to go through it and discuss it with him to seek our approval. That's the report that never came. It wasn't the responsibility of the Member for Edmonton-Highlands to prepare it; it was the responsibility of the chairman. Now, it was made very, very clear in the subcommittee, though, that all the items that would be looked at were all those items clearly spelled out in the Members' Guide that list every little perk, every little benefit MLAs receive. The composition of the proposed committee is very, very clear between the two sets of minutes, particularly in the minutes of June 15. It's there, Mr. Chairman, all there. There is sufficient information to proceed with, as pointed out by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to be pedantic, but it is important in looking at a motion to try and understand. I mean, we didn't see this until a few minutes ago, and I want to make sure that what we're doing is the right thing. That motion -- and again, perhaps somebody can help me by explaining what this means -- says

that the external review body be allowed to look at all . . .
The operative word there is "all."

. . . existing guidelines respecting Members' allowances, benefits and remuneration, without restriction . . .

I have no problem at all with that.

. . . in as broad a spectrum as possible, including those appearing in the *Members' Guide*.

Well, are there other existing guidelines over and above those that appear in the *Members' Guide*, and would someone please kindly show me what this other stuff is? If the committee has a motion, obviously they must have looked at something, and all I want to know is what they looked at. That's all. I mean, it's totally incomplete for this discussion this morning. We only got it a few minutes ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any member of that subcommittee care to respond?

DR. ELLIOTT: I'm referring to the minutes of June 15, and in the absence this morning of a final report and our chairman, I would like to relate to those minutes and where I felt we left the discussion of the subcommittee. In the first place, my position on the subcommittee was that we were to consider issues to bring back to this full Members' Services Committee, the committee chaired by yourself, for consideration. The discussion in the minutes of June 15 will show that we focused on the suggestion that we recommend to you and this committee today, sir, the hiring of a professional consultant to give us guidance in the evaluation of issues that were in the mandate of the Premier's letter with respect to salaries, et cetera, et cetera. That we agreed on, and we instructed the member from your office to indicate some suggested names of management consultants that we might bring forward. These are attached as appendix 1 to the June 15 minutes.

You'll notice that there were doubts raised in the minutes of June 15, and S7.92 is the page I'm looking at. As the discussion went into the next phase of identifying a citizens' committee or an external review committee, doubts were raised as to whether we could proceed that far with any clarity until we had the response back from a professional management consultant that could tell us the general scope of the types of things we would be dealing with. Nonetheless, having agreed on the management consultant idea of bringing forth a group that was identified by your staff for purposes of consideration here today, discussion in our subcommittee did go into the Member for Edmonton-Highland's suggestion on what might be considered as an external review committee. The minutes would reflect that there was some discussion in that area. I emphasize from my point that these were things we talked about to bring back to this committee here.

Now, my position on this meeting of June 15 is that we must, through your position in the Chair, consider whether or not we accept the recommendation or suggestion from the committee that we take a look at the professional consultants that would be available to us to choose somebody, if we think that's the way to go, to guide us through the next step. Then having seen the scope and the general nature of the data that he or she or this consulting firm provides to us, I think we can focus on how we go from there with an external review committee made up of Alberta citizens, should that be the way we want to go, and then discuss the scope.

10:10

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair recognizes the next two speakers, Edmonton-Jasper Place and Taber-Warner, and then perhaps the committee might give consideration to taking about a seven-minute reading break so we can read the minutes of this subcommittee. Then we'll know what the total package is that we're going to come back and deal with.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: I think the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services is correct that it would be nice if we could have these kinds of documents in advance if possible. Also I think I have to go along with the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud in suggesting that perhaps the committee might have brought these things together in the form of a report or recommendation or something that the committee could get its mind around, but I understand that two recommendations have come out of this. One is to structure an independent review body, and there's a somewhat lengthy list of types of people who are supposed to be part of that review to discuss. The second is a recommendation in terms of reference for

a management study which is to be brought back to the Members' Services Committee. Now, I think these are two quite different tracks. I'm not sure how the committee got off onto a two-track process. I thought we sent them to do one thing, which was to structure an independent review.

So I think that when we come back to this issue after the reading break, perhaps these recommendations could be put forward by someone in the committee in whichever order they want them. I think probably since the independent review is what we struck them to do, perhaps that one should come first, and it does seem to go logically that way. But anyway, I'd like to suggest that when we come back, some recommendations be put on the table from a member of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to follow up on the comments of both Bob and John and draw members' attention to the minutes of the June 15, 1992, meeting and the last two pages, appendix 1 and appendix 2. I believe we have an excellent starting point in appendix 1 where we have a list of management consultants from Calgary and Edmonton who have been identified. Obviously terms of reference would need to be developed and a tender let; that's something that we should spend some time considering. I think appendix 2, Purpose and Objectives -- Minister and MLA Job Evaluation Study, is something that we can certainly focus on today as a committee.

I'd like to get further explanation from the subcommittee members as to the intent of the various sections, have a full discussion. There may be some amendments necessary, but by the time we conclude our meeting today I would like to see some firm action that can be taken based both on the invitations to tender to various management consultants -- I believe we had earlier discussed the possibility of doing that, Mr. Chairman, through your office, through the Clerk -- and very definitely the terms of reference for the study. Those are two positive things that we can focus on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The committee stands adjourned until 10:20. That should allow us all time to have a quiet moment or two to read through what those two sets of minutes did indeed convey.

[The committee adjourned from 10:14 a.m. to 10:27 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, maybe perhaps to start discussion in the committee, as I seem to have had the job of reporting the subcommittee findings and I think that even though we haven't gone through the June 15 meeting minutes, we've referred to them enough that we've covered all the information in them, I would like to recommend that we make a motion, if it's necessary, that we put our efforts to work and that we look at appendix 1 and appendix 2 and concentrate on those two appendices, being the list of management consultants, maybe some discussion on their abilities, and the purpose and objectives of an evaluation study. Perhaps that would centralize our thoughts, and we could get on with some discussion on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will see that as being a procedural motion, that that's where the focus of the discussion will go. So discussion for the next while will be with regard to that procedure, because to refer back to our own committee minutes of Wednesday,

May 13, as other members have pointed out, at item 92.108 these words occur:

Moved by [the Member for Taber-Warner] that the subcommittee charged with the task of considering the scope, composition and mandate of the proposed external review of Members' salaries, allowances and benefits be made up of [the following members].

That was the motion setting it all into effect from this committee, which has, of course, the overriding responsibility.

The minutes that have come to us today from the subcommittee carrying the dates of May 20 and also of June 15 have come to us simply as information. Therefore, the procedural motion is the one now to be discussed, and we'll go on from there.

The Chair first recognizes Edmonton-Jasper Place, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was glad that you referred to the original minutes of May 13, because I think we have to go back to our original objective to figure where to proceed from here.

The subcommittee was clearly "charged with the task of considering the scope, composition and mandate of the proposed external review," and I think that's what we should be addressing our minds to immediately. Unfortunately, the two appendices don't quite get to that matter. The first is a list of Alberta-based management consultants, and I'm sure they're all good and well qualified in their field of endeavour. The second appendix is terms of reference for a consultant study dealing with the matter. Now, the third item in the terms of reference is to provide a summary report back to the Members' Services Committee.

So in effect what this proposition is is that we as a committee hire consultants to report back to us about certain comparisons that we set up in the first place. That's not an external review. That's an internal review. Now, there may be argument for doing such a study, but it certainly isn't a part of what this committee asked the subcommittee to do, and I think at the very least we should address item 5 in the committee minutes of June 15, 1992, in which the composition of the committee is addressed. Once we have a committee composed, an external review body, then I think we can think about what tools should be provided to that committee, whether it's consulting reports or ability to hold hearings or whatever. I think that's a more logical way to proceed than to hire consultants and start doing reports and then think about the external review later on.

So I guess I'd like to suggest that we not proceed in the way suggested by the hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff, but rather we proceed by looking at the composition of the commission, which is what we asked this body to do in the first place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Taber-Warner.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if the motion I drafted has been circulated to all members.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the comments made by the previous speaker. My third approach would be to defeat the motion that we're now dealing with and look instead at a four-part motion similar to what I've drafted that would determine the external body, that would determine the composition of that body and would allow that committee to appoint its own management consultants or outside resources and, secondly, would impose a reasonable time line to have that body or committee report to the Legislative Assembly in the fall session or, failing that, report to yourself as Speaker of the Assembly at the appropriate time. I think the intent of what I'm trying to accomplish fulfills the discussions of the subcommittee and

gives clear direction to move on with this and sets up that framework that I think the five of us on the committee were attempting to achieve.

At the appropriate time I'm prepared to move the motions, once we deal with the motion currently on the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, the motion put forward by Alan in my view fully meets the intent of the motion I made at our meeting which established the subcommittee and called for the subcommittee to go out and do some basic work and report back to the full committee. I note by the minutes of the subcommittee -- looking at the Monday, June 15, 1992, minutes as an example, and if I may read into the record one short section.

Ms Barrett questioned whether the intent of the sub-committee was, in fact, to have the management consultant firm gather the data now, and then strike the sub-committee after that process was completed. She indicated her preference was to hire the management consultant immediately, and establish the external review body before the management firm completed its research.

Mr. Hyland thought it would be a good idea if the management consultant firm completed its work first, and then report its findings to Members' Services Committee, prior to the establishment of the external review body.

All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we can spend a lot of time today reinventing the wheel. We have a motion before us: that we begin to focus on some work done by the subcommittee, work contained in appendix 1 and appendix 2 of the minutes of the Monday, June 15, 1992 meeting. That doesn't preclude other matters being discussed. Percy has brought forward an intent or a motion that can certainly be dealt with in due course, but we do need a starting point. The subcommittee has given us that starting point, but I want members of the subcommittee to be aware that when we get into the actual wording -- assuming the motion passes -- that's an area I believe this committee needs to go through on a line-by-line basis. The purpose and objectives for instance. There are some questions I have. I want more clarification. There are some ideas on refinement that I think we might want to consider. So what the Member for Cypress-Redcliff has put forward is a starting point, and I think we should get on with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments?

MRS. BLACK: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question.

MR. WICKMAN: Could I have it reread, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The procedural motion that we have from Cypress-Redcliff, please. You'll have to shout it out because there's no PA by you.

MRS. SHUMYLA: That we look at appendix 1 and appendix 2, management consultants and objectives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The motion is that we look at appendix 1 and appendix 2 of the June 15 minutes of the subcommittee. On the procedural motion before us, those in favour that that be the focus of our discussion, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Now we're in a situation to deal with management consultants, appendix 1, if there's a motion to flow. The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

10:37

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to get some discussion going, I'm going to move the motion. It should be appropriate now in that the other motion has been dealt with. I realize my writing here could be a bit difficult, so I'll read my motion.

MR. BOGLE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: We just passed a procedural motion to deal with appendix 1 and appendix 2. Those are the matters that are before the committee at this time.

MR. WICKMAN: Mine relates specifically to those minutes.

MR. BOGLE: To the motion just passed, the procedural motion, Mr. Chairman? If they do, then fine. We should be focusing our attention now on appendix 1 and appendix 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order. We're having to deal with the hypothetical, and that's why I have to listen to what the motion is, but if the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud intends to move all four sections of this handwritten motion, that will indeed give some problems because parts of it are in conflict with the procedural motion that just passed. However, there is one there . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Yes, and that's what I was going to move at this time, in conjunction with the appendix that we're referring to. Under the circumstances that would then now have to read:

that the committee as established by this Members' Services Committee be instructed to appoint its own management consultants or outside resource persons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the new motion?

MR. WICKMAN: And speaking to it, Mr. Chairman, it's an . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Hold it, please, hon. member. The Chair at least has to get the motion down here so I can keep the focus, please. Could you repeat it again, please?

MR. WICKMAN:

That the committee as established by the Members' Services Committee be instructed to obtain its own management consultants or resource persons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the subcommittee be instructed to obtain its own management consultants or . . . What was the last word?

MR. WICKMAN: Resource persons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resource persons. There we are. Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Speaking to it, Mr. Chairman, I realize there's a preferable way of doing it, but in view of the previous motion being approved, I guess one has to start someplace.

The reason for my moving this particular motion is to make it very, very clear that to go out there now and hire management consultants or outside resource persons without first having a

committee and the composition of that committee in place and giving that committee the option of being part of that process, doesn't make sense to me. Before we even establish that committee or commission, we're imposing restrictions upon them, and I don't think that's the proper way to go. I'm moving this motion on the assumption that this committee is going to eventually -- today, sometime -- approve the concept of the external review and the composition and such. This motion, of course, would already have been passed, and it would allow that body to then go out and seek its own management consultants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

From the Chair, first a clarification, Edmonton-Whitemud. When you say subcommittee in your motion as proposed, you're referring to the external review committee. Is that correct?

MR. WICKMAN: A committee. I attempted to use the term "committee."

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're not referring to the subcommittee of which you were a member?

MR. WICKMAN: No. The external committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

Now, the other thing is that as in the House we have to have the motions written out as soon as you present them so we can then circulate them to all members, or else we're just going to have to keep adjourning so that we can deal with the matters.

All right. The motion that we have before us still -- and the next speaker is Edmonton-Jasper Place -- that the subcommittee, external review committee per se . . .

MR. McINNIS: So I can take it that the motion is amended to refer to the external review committee rather than this.

I know why my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Highlands suggested that consultants be hired more or less immediately and that the external review committee be established while that's undertaken. I think she's interested in getting the matter resolved, and I think probably that would be the most expeditious way to do it.

I think the more important amendment to make in this context is the one that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud made in the subcommittee, according to my reading, where he suggested that the management consultants report to the external review committee rather than back to the Members' Services Committee. I think that's the more important amendment that needs to be made because, you know, I think we've got this thing backwards. Referring things to a committee before you set up the committee is not usually the best way to proceed. That's my comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Additional? Grande Prairie, followed by Calgary-Foothills.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you. I'd ask your guidance since I wish to refer to the minutes of our subcommittee on Monday, June 15, the top of page S8.92. I'd point out that the discussion I'm hearing from Mr. Wickman was put before the committee. It was a motion that was defeated. He moved then

that the discussion of management consultants be tabled until the item dealing with the composition of the commission had been dealt with, and that discussion was defeated in our subcommittee. So we're replotting old ground, if you'll pardon the term, Mr. Chairman, and I think we've already covered that issue. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The matters discussed in the subcommittee can again be discussed here.

Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would speak against the motion from the standpoint that I think we've come to a point now where the subcommittee has prepared two appendices: one on the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, and one on the listing of potential evaluators from professional management consulting firms. At this point to look to another committee to review that again I really think is a terrible delaying tactic. I would be most opposed to that in that I think we have a starting point here, and surely we can go through this and ratify or expand or amend or whatever we have to do with the purposes and objectives as laid out by the subcommittee. Then I think there's a logical flow that must occur. Once you find out what you want this body or bodies to do, then you look at who is able to do it outside through professional consulting groups, if that be the course, who may be available, who would be prepared to do it in a time frame that is compatible with our requirements, and then you structure some other form of review again to the results by these professional consultants. So I don't think to run off and put together another committee to review a subcommittee to report back to this committee is the way to go. I think the time has come to get on with the job and deal with the information that has been provided, whether complete or not, from the subcommittee.

I would therefore speak against the motion from Mr. Wickman and hope that we will get on with the procedural motion that was just passed by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Additional comments? Edmonton-Whitemud, summation.

10:47

MR. WICKMAN: Well, just to clear up the last point made. I thought I made it very specific that I'm talking about the external body that I would hope this committee would establish, agree upon today, that would be given the mandate to review all aspects and that the composition of that committee would be named prior to us adjourning today. It's not another committee to do this and that; it's the committee that we want to set up. It's very clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? The matter is defeated.

The Chair awaits a motion.

MR. WICKMAN: Do we have a motion on the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, hon. member, we do not have a motion on the floor.

Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: So we dealt with that. Now can I go on to other motions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you're a committee member. Go right ahead.

MR. WICKMAN: Unless you're going to say that I'm restricted to talking about those two appendices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We carried the procedural motion.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, then one of the those should be moving a motion so that we can get on with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps we could begin from where we are now by focusing on what we agree on rather than what we disagree on. I would like to move the motion which was carried unanimously at the first meeting of the subcommittee that the review be done by an external, independent body. Since that was agreed unanimously, I think perhaps we might all agree unanimously in this committee to proceed in that fashion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The motion?

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I could rephrase my motion. I'd like to move

that this committee accept the recommendation of the subcommittee that the review be done by an external, independent body.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The motion is -- if you'd like to refer to the minutes of the subcommittee of May 20, and it's my understanding that this is indeed the motion of May 20 as moved by Edmonton-Highlands -- that the review be done by an external, independent body. So now we're going to confirm that motion as passed in the subcommittee. Is that correct?

MR. McINNIS: Accept that recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Accept that recommendation. Thank you. That's the motion that is before us at the moment.

MR. WICKMAN: Just on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. A point of order.

MR. WICKMAN: I agree with the motion, but I'm having some difficulty with your rulings on proceedings because I thought what I was attempting to do initially you said did not pertain to the appendices and now it does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair agrees with you on the point of order. After the committee as a whole dealt with your motion and defeated it, the Chair then sat here waiting for a motion to come to deal with the item that's before the committee. If there's no motion given to the Chair, then the Chair has to sit around here and wait until a motion appears. That's where we now are. I'm quite prepared to rule this one out of order if the committee together would now have a little consultation and decide what they would like to do. So the committee is adjourned until 11 o'clock. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned from 10:52 to 11:02]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

All right. The basic bottom line here is that all of this committee is indeed interested in doing the external review. What we're dealing with here is the problem of mechanics and so forth. Let us then go on to that.

We've passed the procedural motion where we're going to at least have discussion about appendix 1 and appendix 2. Hopefully, there will be some motions to follow up so various things can indeed happen. When we adjourned, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place had a motion before us, and I don't know if that motion is still going to be before us or whether it's going to be put into momentary

hiatus or proceeded with. Then hopefully we will go on to the matters of appendix 1 and appendix 2 and again, hopefully, from the subcommittee we might find ourselves with some motions to deal with that are indeed of a positive nature to be able to implement what the general overall intent of the committee is.

First, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: The reason I moved the motion was because there was a great deal of confusion in my mind at least about who's doing this review, whether it's being done by the Members' Services Committee or by some external body. It seems likely we'll get into a great deal of contract administration if we go down one path about identifying terms of reference for studies and hiring consultants and receiving proposals and all this kind of thing, if indeed we're doing the review. On the other hand, if it's being done by an external, independent body, then I think we'll proceed in a somewhat different fashion. So it's probably appropriate that we make that decision at the outset. Who is it that's doing this review anyway? Is it us, or is it an external, independent body? I appreciate that part of the confusion stems from the fact that there are two different discussions that took place in the subcommittee. One was over the scope, composition, and nature of the external, independent body; the other was over the details of the management study. Just so we don't get lost in those two discussions, I think we should establish first and foremost that what we're trying to do here is get an external, independent body in place to conduct the review and that we, the Members' Services Committee, are not ourselves doing the review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk, who was present at the meetings.

DR. McNEIL: It might be useful to give you my sense of the two directions. The discussion about the external review body was to look at the set of information about salaries and benefits and pensions and so on. I think the purpose in the subcommittee's mind, if I'm reading this correctly, was to develop the base of data for an external review body to look at and that an external review body had to have a set of data, information on salaries and benefits across the country both in terms of the public sector, comparing members' salaries and so on, plus I think the Premier's letter which was discussed in the subcommittee meeting suggested looking at various other private-sector and public-sector positions. So the purpose of the consultant study was to develop that data base for a subsequent review by some external body whatever its composition. It was really not two separate tracks the committee was talking about; it was two phases, one phase to develop the data base, which in the subcommittee's view would be defined by the Members' Services Committee. This is the set of data we want the consultant to look at. Once the consultant brought that information back, then the external review body would take a look at it and say yes, this is good, this is bad, or whatever kind of judgment that review body would make based on a set of objective data the consultant had developed.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment to the motion, unless the member can indicate that he is prepared to see a second motion that would accomplish the same thing, and that is simply to follow up on the direction given by the subcommittee, being that that external body to be established would be established for the purposes of reviewing

all existing guidelines respecting Members' allowances, benefits and remuneration, without restriction.

That was the original motion that was moved in the subcommittee by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, and I don't want to lose sight of the particular end clause "without restriction." With that understanding, I have no problem with the motion. I fully support

it. Possibly it would be a friendly amendment, and I'm glad the Clerk has clarified the two different aspects we dealt with in subcommittee.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the query, I think the logical thing to do would be to deal with each of the motions passed by the subcommittee in more or less the order they dealt with them. That probably would get us through the process as quickly as anything, so I think the one the member referred to would be a good subsequent motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So it's rejected as being a friendly amendment. Does the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud wish to persist with the amendment?

MR. WICKMAN: I'll move a subsequent motion rather than complicate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no amendment.

The Member for Barrhead, speaking to the main motion.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the motion as outlined by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is here before us, but it's now the 25th day of August. We got involved in this process as the result of a letter dated May 4, 1992, by the Premier of Alberta to the Speaker of the Legislature, in which the Premier says, and I quote from the letter:

I believe all Members would find it helpful if our Members' Services Committee could consider how to assess Members' benefits as a total package, if and when the freeze is lifted in 1994.

Then he goes on to say, and I quote directly from the letter:

I believe it would be helpful if your Committee, before making any recommendations on future changes, could obtain advice and an assessment of our benefits from an independent, external company or group of Albertans, or both.

He goes on to say:

Also, it might be helpful to all Albertans if Members' allowances and benefits were assessed in as broad a spectrum as possible.

I'll just end the quotation from the letter at that point.

We then went on to a meeting of May 13, 1992, in which we had a motion which was carried unanimously, moved by Mr. Bogle, that the subcommittee be charged with the task of considering

the scope, composition and mandate of the proposed external review of Members' benefits, salaries and allowances.

It's now the 25th day of August and we're still talking about procedures. We have a motion here that, as I recall, was put forward by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff that basically says let's deal with these two matters. We have an appendix that's been identified which would allow us to make a decision, I guess, as to which independent, external company or group of Albertans or both would deal with this. Appendix 2 then deals with the request by the Premier that we assess all of this in as broad a spectrum as possible. We have a discussion paper that we can deal with in appendix 2.

I find, sir, that it would be most helpful if we could proceed. I'm making this appeal that we could go forward to the members of the committee, not to the chairman, who probably is getting quite frustrated with the procedures before us this morning. It seems to me it's quite clear. The Premier asked us to obtain advice and an assessment of our benefits from an independent, external company or group of Albertans or both. I think we have a list in appendix 1 that we can deal with to go forward to that step. The second one is that we can assess it in as broad a spectrum as possible, and we at least have a discussion page on appendix 2 that we can deal with. My appeal to the members is: let's start moving, okay? It's August 25, 1992.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Summation on this motion, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

11:12

MR. McINNIS: The Premier's letter refers to "an assessment of our benefits from an independent, external company or group of Albertans, or both." The Premier isn't particular as to whether it's an independent committee of Albertans or a company hired to do the comparison. I take it the subcommittee is recommending that we do both. Perhaps I'm wrong, but that's the way I take it. So let's try to work that through in roughly the same fashion as the subcommittee did its business. Certainly it is my bottom-line position that the review has to be done externally, and in my view hiring consultants and having them report back to this committee is not quite the same thing as an external, independent body. I have no difficulty with this committee providing data and a data base and I think we should do that, but I think we have to have that external body established before we start providing them with data and consultants and staff and whatever. That's why I think this motion should be approved first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Defeated.

We now move to consideration, I assume, of appendix 1.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I was going to move the acceptance of appendix 2 as the purpose and objective of the job evaluation study. The reason for using 2 instead of 1 is that 1 just lays the companies out. Could I speak to that motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once again, the motion, appendix 2. Should we give consideration?

MR. HYLAND: The acceptance of appendix 2 as the directions for a job evaluation study.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Continue.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, others have outlined some of the discussion we had in the subcommittee, and much of the discussion and comments made this morning were made during those two meetings as well as we wrestled with the acceptance of the motions we passed. One of our problems was that we didn't have a verbatim transcript, so as we proceeded we used the minutes that were kept by the Clerk. But at least in my mind, if we would have had transcripts, they would have shown that the motions passed were related to the Premier's letter from that meeting. It was unfortunate we happened to use the same phrase for both groups. I think the Clerk outlined in his comments how the committee was feeling and what their motions were related to in that aspect.

So as a result, we spent a fair amount of time on these purposes and objectives in the committee. I think it was initially started out by a draft by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands -- she had hers typed; I had some suggestions written -- and by a couple of other committee members that we put this together. The Clerk did some work on it, and we made some adjustments to it during the meeting. That's the reason for trying to centralize discussions so we can get going on this review. Otherwise, we could be another two or three or four or five, however many, months before this review takes place. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

First I'm going to ask the Clerk to read this appendix into the record, please.

DR. McNEIL: This is Purpose and Objectives -- Minister and MLA Job Evaluation Study.

Under the direction of the Members' Services Committee the contractor will be responsible for the following tasks:

1. Evaluate the roles of Minister and Member of the Legislative Assembly using accepted job evaluation methodologies in order to establish the basis for comparison of these roles with equivalent positions in the private and public sector.
2. Upon acceptance by the Committee of the basis for the evaluation of the roles of Minister and Member of the Legislative Assembly, develop total compensation comparisons with equivalent positions in the private and public sectors with specific emphasis on the following:
 - Public servants at the Provincial and Federal level
 - Elected Representatives Across Canada
 - Executives in Hospital and Academic Institutions
 - Provincial and Federal Court Judges
 - Private Sector Executives
 Total Compensation comparisons would include the following:
 - Salaries and Indemnities
 - Accommodation Allowances
 - Travel Allowances
 - Committee Allowances
 - Pension Benefits
3. Provide a summary report to the Members' Services Committee of the results of the analysis completed under point 2 above.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm disappointed, first of all, that the previous motion on the floor failed. I'm not sure I'm going to interpret the remarks made by the Member for Barrhead correctly, but I kind of gathered it was a pitch to move along, get things going. On the basis of getting things going, I believe it was very, very important that we interpret the intent of the Premier's letter, we interpret the intent of Albertans that have been speaking out, we interpret the intent of individual Members of the Legislative Assembly who recently have spoken out on that, and that is to get that external review process in place.

Now, we've defeated the external review process concept at least at this time, and I can visualize some of the arguments coming forward: that first we have to get this in place and then we're going to look at the external review. But, Mr. Chairman, I'd point out that time has gone by, months and months and months, which the Member for Barrhead has pointed out, and here we are. Really, I'm not sure we've progressed at all. When the committee is not bold enough to even pass a motion establishing clearly that there will be the external body, that first we have to go through this process before we make a determination for the external body -- and this process would take a period of time -- I object to doing this separately when I thought the two of them should be done in conjunction with each other to allow that committee to establish.

It's very, very frustrating. Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness I have to question the desire of the Members' Services Committee to really bring this thing to a conclusion, to satisfy what we're hearing out there, that people are saying they'd like to see this done by external review. At one time it may have been appropriate to do the in-house thing, but things have changed. After the 30 percent increase, taxpayers say, "We no longer trust the politicians, the elected reps to do it themselves." I think it's very, very important that we establish that external review, and obviously we failed by defeating the motion from Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will interpret that as discussion in regard to this motion.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had thought we were in a procedural difficulty, but I think more and more it's clear that it's substantive and not procedural. With reference to the comment made by Edmonton-Whitemud, I think what these terms of reference do is in effect put this committee in the position of conducting the review, because it's not just a one-stage process, it's a two-stage process. We're asking consultants to prepare a basis of comparison. They're to bring that to us and then we, the Members' Services Committee, will authorize that and have them go ahead and make the comparison. So it's very much a hands-on type of operation from the point of view of this committee. I understood and I think my colleague from Edmonton-Highlands plainly understood that we were embarking on an external review process, and we put a lot of faith in that.

Now, it's possible I'm mistaken in that, but just to be sure I'm not, I would like to propose an amendment to the terms of reference which would strike out the words "Members' Services Committee" in the first sentence and the last sentence and also the word "Committee" in clause 2 and substitute "external, independent body" in all three cases; and secondly, delete in clause 2 the words "with specific emphasis on the following" and the list of occupations included. Perhaps those two amendments should be dealt with separately. I'm not certain, but I think the more important one by far -- and I have a written copy for the secretary -- is that this evaluation study, if indeed it's data for an external review body, should be reporting to and receiving instructions from an external review body and not from the Members' Services Committee. Just to make things easier, I'll separate them and move that amendment first which strikes out "Members' Services Committee" in the opening sentence, "the Committee" in clause 2, and "Members' Services Committee" in clause 3 and substitutes "external, independent body."

11:22

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first amendment then, hon. members, is this deletion and replacement. If you have appendix 2 in front of you so you can do some kind of notation, delete "Members' Services Committee" in the first line. It should be "external, independent body." Again, in clause 2 would be deletion of the word "Committee" and replacement by "external, independent body" again. Is that correct? Down in clause 3 the same thing takes place: deletion of "Members' Services Committee" and the replacement "external, independent body." We take that as being the first amendment.

Speaking to the amendment, the Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: May I have clarification on one matter first, Mr. Chairman? Was appendix 2 which appears before us agreed to unanimously? I might direct that question to Mr. Wickman since he was a member of the committee. Were the purpose and objectives agreed to unanimously by the subcommittee?

MR. WICKMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, we did not come to a conclusion on the question of the resource or management consultants. We were discussing it.

MR. BOGLE: That wasn't the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes or no. Was appendix 2 approved by the committee?

MR. WICKMAN: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Clerk.

DR. McNEIL:

Moved by Mr. Hyland that the sub-committee accept, with amendments as agreed to, the document, "Purpose and Objectives -- Minister and MLA Job Evaluation Study."

The minutes indicate it was carried by the subcommittee. It does not indicate it was carried unanimously. That was the 20th.

Just to add to that, the amendment made to that list was to include the issue of tenure of position as a factor. That the consultants should consider as well tenure of position was the amendment to this list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the minutes confirm that on June 15 it was carried.

MR. BOGLE: I'm speaking to the amendment, and I'm speaking against it. I think it's imperative that the study be done and the results of the study be released to the public, made public. In my view, we then as a committee need to determine the makeup of an external group of citizens who would review that in comparison with other things. What I'm hearing is that people want the facts. They'd like to know the comparison, and that's the information we'd like to get out as quickly as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Further discussion on the amendment? The Member for Barrhead.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Taber-Warner answered the first question I wanted to raise, and that was the source of this appendix. Now it's clear to me that this comes out of the subcommittee. This is correct, is it? That's the source of this particular document.

Number two, I'd like to speak against the amendment, because I think it's really important that all of the public understand what it is we are doing, how and why, and the nuances and everything else. This has to be a matter of the public record. This is an open committee, a very, very open committee that sits in this Assembly, that has minutes. It has *Hansard* associated with it. Any member of the media who chooses to attend or any member of the public who chooses to attend can be a part, can observe and see what is happening.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because in this year of 1992 there have been a couple of bad examples. As a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I'm speaking as only one individual, but it seems we get criticized when we've never been involved. Look at the electoral boundaries thing, where you have a committee that works and all of a sudden when the thing doesn't proceed the way the public expects it to proceed, the responsibility seems to fall on the shoulders of the Members of the Legislative Assembly. Just recently I had the unfortunate experience of being tarnished with some involvement in something I didn't even know was happening, a so-called committee.

This is an open-government governance process. I believe that this committee, the Members' Services Committee, has to be responsible. I think all men and women who were elected in 1992 have to stand up and be counted for what they say and the positions they take, and that first line that says "Under the direction of the Members' Services Committee the contractor will be responsible for the following tasks" is an openness -- very, very much an openness -- in the public record. I think anything we've received should be made available to the public. The contractor should be able to appear before this committee, rationalize, explain, provide all the reasoning, be susceptible to questioning, and on and on it goes. The openness of government is very, very, very important. We're following through in terms of the letter of May 4. We "could obtain advice and an assessment of our benefits from an independent,

external company or group of Albertans, or both,” report back to this committee, Mr. Chairman, and that's the basis. Because of the openness of government and the openness of observing what this committee does, I speak against the amendment.

I have a great deal of other items I want to raise with respect to the specifics of this sheet, but on that very small point of the amendment I really believe we need openness. Everybody needs an opportunity to observe, to see the questioning and the exchanges that go on with respect to all these issues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, speaking specifically to the amendment as proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, I refer to the minutes of June 15 on page S8.92.

Moved by Mr. Wickman that the discussion of management consultants be tabled until the item dealing with the composition of the commission had been dealt with, which was defeated. I made that motion at that time because I felt, as the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is now pointing out, that it's clear that it be defined as the external review. When we flip over to the next page, again I move

that the words “Members' Services Committee” be replaced on the purpose and objectives document with “External Review Body,” again highlighting the need to clearly establish that we are talking in terms of an external review body. With the amendment being proposed by the member, it then starts to make sense; the whole thing starts to jell. The amendment -- which I anticipate by the sounds of things is going to be defeated -- simply allows for a further delay, a much further delay, without that necessary input by the committee, and I object to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Calgary-Foothills, Cypress-Redcliff.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I must be missing the whole concept of this, because what I understand we're trying to establish from looking at appendix 2 is: the Members' Services subcommittee has put forward a recommendation that this whole body consider the following, but once we establish what it is we want done -- in other words, the scope -- then we look at who's going to do it on a review outside. Pat Black, member of Members' Services, is not going to do this review. That has never been my thought. I understood that we were given instructions to look at an outside review, but we have to know first of all what we're going to ask them to review. I don't know how, unless we go back and amend something, a body other than this committee can make a contract from this Legislature with an outside review consultant -- I don't know how you can ever get this thing started. My thought is that what they've said to look at is a recommendation from the subcommittee. Are we not just looking to see that this is what we agree we should be looking at, and then we'll move to who's going to do the review? There's a whole list of companies that we would ask for recommendations for a contractor to be hired to do that. I certainly have no intentions of doing that review. I don't know if you're coming off on a different wavelength, Percy, but I thought all we were looking at was the scope of the review. If that's acceptable, then let's get on with it and let's hire the guy to do the review. Now, do you have a problem with that?

11:32

MR. WICKMAN: I have a problem . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. You've spoken to the amendment. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In speaking to the amendment, the reason I would speak against it is that in my remembering of the committee meetings we had a lot of discussion. Maybe I'm wrong because Percy said that he didn't vote for the motion, but I don't remember any of the motions that were carried not being unanimous in the committee because we thought we were trying to get something together to report to the main committee so the process could get going. If the intention of the government members on that subcommittee was to delay, we wouldn't have agreed to the composition under number 5 of the motion of June 15. As I said, that motion does show carried unanimously. As I remember, the other motions throughout the meeting were carried unanimously.

My proposal is: let's defeat the amendment and get on with the Members' Services Committee giving direction and get the gathering of data portion on the way, as outlined two or three times in the minutes, so that this is not delayed further. I've seen press releases go out saying that we're delaying. Now who's delaying? The guy sending out the darned press release is delaying. Let's get on with it. Let's get it done.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I find it really astonishing that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud wants to abdicate his responsibilities as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. He constantly wants to form a committee to review. We've already talked about a management consultant committee, a professional committee, then he wants yet another committee to review whatever the management consultants come up with. I just really find it very frustrating. We sit in this Assembly; we're asked by the public to make decisions. We're here to make decisions, and here he sits for the last hour wanting to set up yet another committee to take on the responsibility that we here have been elected to do.

I'd like to just suggest: let's move on with it, get the management consultant professional committee in place and get our job done, as we've been asked to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All members have spoken except one with regard to the amendment. Is there a call for the question on the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment, please signify. Opposed? Defeated.

There was notice given of an amendment which I believe was the deletion of certain portions of 2. Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: The amendment is to delete “with specific emphasis on the following” and then the list: “Public servants at the Provincial and Federal level, Elected Representatives Across Canada, Executives in Hospital and Academic Institutions, Provincial and Federal Court Judges, Private Sector Executives.”

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number 2 then would read, “Total Compensation comparisons would include . . .”

MR. McINNIS: That remains in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would remain in this?

MR. McINNIS: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So the motion is to delete everything from the word "Upon" down to "Executives" in section 2. First, is that correct?

MR. McINNIS: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Secondly, do you wish to speak to it?

MR. HYLAND: For clarification, John, relating to the minutes, the last line just before you draw up the list was changed to include "but not be limited to the following," if that makes any difference in your desire to do anything with the list. Page S8.92 of the minutes, a third of the way from the bottom of the page. It means they can use it or they can't use it, whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purposes of this meeting we have to deal with what's in front of us here, and this printed chunk is what the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place's amendment for deletion is. So it would delete "Upon acceptance by the Committee," all of that section, plus the five listings under that. Number 2 would drop down and come beside the words, "Total Compensation comparisons would include the following."

MR. BOGLE: Did he give a reason?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. That's what we're now going to deal with. Thank you.

MR. McINNIS: Let me deal first with Mr. Hyland's question. I take it that the subcommittee wanted to present a different set of purpose and objectives than the one that's related in appendix 2. There were a couple of changes made in the committee. I suppose it would have been easier if those were included. I thought the motion was to adopt appendix 2, but probably that motion should in itself be amended to include the other changes that are made.

I appreciate what's been said about not limiting the committee to these particular occupations. I think this is really the nature of the problem: how does the electorate compare their elected representatives; who do they compare them to? If we set out at the beginning that we regard ourselves as being the same as judges or senior administrators of hospitals and academic institutions, then we in effect have answered that question for the whole world before it's even really properly addressed.

So my preference for any study that's being done would be to leave the question of what's equivalent up to the process rather than us saying that we want to specify what the equivalent occupations are and then have you compare them and see where they're similar. I think that the words "to include but not be limited to the following" makes it clear that there's no limitation, but it also points the consultants clearly in a specific direction.

I'm not certain that those are the relevant comparisons to be made. That's really the nub of the question: how you calculate the compensation package. I think it's what I felt very strongly an independent committee would be doing. Again, I think it's a step on the road towards stacking the deck to point the consultants clearly in a certain direction. I think you could say: compensation comparisons with equivalent positions. You've said it all right there.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to provide advice with respect to this amendment. I deal with ministerial portfolios that have the privilege of dealing with literally hundreds and hundreds of consultants who are hired to undertake a job. My experience is and has been that the broader you make the mandate,

or in other words the less specific the question, the greater the time it takes and the greater the costs and the more involved you are as minister answering innumerable questions that seem to develop. We are hiring a contractor here. We're hiring an independent external contractor to provide a review. I think it's very, very much incumbent upon us to make sure that we agree on what it is we want done and then to tie down the parameters as tightly as possible.

11:42

Let me just give you an example. As the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services I want to hire a consultant to design a public building. That's quite a mandate to give somebody: design me a public building. Now, the final document that goes out to the consultant usually has between 30 and 100 pages of specifics describing the public building, and then the person who wins the contract knows what they have to deliver in terms of what's expected. I have an idea how long it will take. I have an idea how much money will be involved, and it'll come down very, very earnestly. At the end of the year when I stand up in the Legislative Assembly, I can say: "Yeah, these were the specifics. This is how much it cost."

To give somebody an open-air mandate to go and do something, we'll be here in the year 2020, and we'll have a review of every person in every elected capacity in all 180 new countries of the world that will exist by that time.

Now, we've really got to come down to it. We're looking at a letter that came on May 4, 1992, a request made by the leader of the government of the province of Alberta saying: would you seek advice from an independent external contractor -- I agree; that's the way we should go -- then would you do a comparison within Canada -- and we're not going beyond Canada -- and would you then do a comparison with certain groups of people who are in public service within the country of Canada? I think we have to zero it in, and I think we have to zero it down, but to go with an open-air mandate, heaven help us. The budget of Members' Services would be adjusted every two months or three months with a request here for additional dollars to do it.

I appreciate the intent of my friend from Edmonton-Jasper Place with respect to that. I think we both have the same objective in mind: to get this job done as quickly as possible, and let's put it within the parameters of what's expected of us. At least that's a good first cut. I've got some suggestions as to how the five groupings might be modified a bit, but at least there are the groupings within Canada. We're looking at a comparison of all the provinces within Canada and the federal government. We're looking at elected and unelected people. We're looking at private-sector people, public-sector people with apparent similar kinds of involvement. But to put it wide open, I don't know how I could ever stand up in this Assembly as a minister of the Crown and respond to any question that the hon. member might direct to me: "Well, don't you know what it is you want to study? Don't you know what it is you want to do? Where's your responsibility in terms of getting the job done?"

DR. McNEIL: Just to clarify, the consultant will establish what equivalent positions are. In other words, they do an evaluation of the role of MLA and minister, and then they assign that so many points. It was suggested that they would look at jobs in these areas that have the equivalent number of points in the private sector and public sector. So it's the consultant who would establish what are equivalent levels of positions, and they evaluate it based on responsibility and complexity and so on. That's the standard approach to job evaluation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Taber-Warner, followed by Calgary-Foothills.

MR. BOGLE: My comments were made by Barrhead.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification. When I was in the private sector -- I call it real life -- I was with a large firm that went through a massive evaluation process as a result of many mergers that had occurred, and there were tremendous discrepancies between locations, departments, et cetera. This process is very, very complex, and this is why it must be done by a qualified body. If I get frustrated with this process at this end, it's because I've seen the process at the other end in the private sector.

The Clerk alluded to evaluation and comparison. I'll just name a few. Normally they look at the scope of the job, the responsibility, the accountability, the know-how, the experience level, and the tenure of positions and compare that as closely to a like position already established. It's literally points that get added up. It almost is like you get five points here and 10 points there. Then there's a comparative level or basis for comparison to do the evaluation. You can't really evaluate anything unless you have something to compare it to. How are you evaluating it? It's a very complex procedure to go through. So I think the comparisons between public and private sector are very critical to this process.

As Barrhead mentioned, I have a thought on maybe another one to look at that would fit into the overall scheme, but I think this is a very good start for the basis of the mandate that we would hand to a consulting firm to take off with. We have to have some form of mandate if we're going to have an outside consulting firm present a tender. Unless they know what they're tendering, they have no idea what to bid for the job. So we're going to have to have something laid out as to what we're going to ask these people to do.

In appendix 1 there's a list of companies. From what we decide, there may be four of these that say, "We aren't in a position to do that." If you don't lay it out, they have no idea what the dollars will be, no idea what their manpower commitment or their time frame will be, or even if they have the wherewithal to do the job. You've got to lay it out specifically, or you defeat the whole purpose of going to an outside body. I would suggest that we start from here and build on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: I'll make an amendment later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a call for the question with respect to this amendment? Those in favour of the amendment, the deletion with respect to most of paragraph 2, please signify. Opposed? Defeated. Thank you.

Back to the main motion, which was acceptance of appendix 2 as the basis for study. Those who have already spoken to this main motion: Cypress-Redcliff as mover of the motion, Edmonton-Whitemud, Edmonton-Jasper Place. On my list I now return to Taber-Warner, then Barrhead.

MR. BOGLE: I'll pass.

MR. WICKMAN: If you'll allow me to make an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, hon. member, you've missed the opportunity to make an amendment because you did speak to this main motion. Sorry.

Barrhead, on this main motion.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the main motion then deals now with appendix 2 and the affirmation of appendix 2. This is correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, is it then permissible to ask some questions of the subcommittee members who worked on this as to why certain things are in and why certain things are not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: I have had no chance before, Mr. Chairman, until this opportunity this morning. I don't want to be pedantic, but it seems to me that under point 2 it says:

Upon acceptance by the Committee of the basis for the evaluation of the roles of Minister and Member of the Legislative Assembly, develop total compensation comparisons with equivalent positions in the private and public sectors with specific emphasis on the following . . .

Under the third one it says, "Executives in Hospital and Academic Institutions." Municipal government is not mentioned in there, and municipal leadership is not mentioned in there. I would wonder why that perhaps had not been in there.

Under the next section: "Total Compensation comparisons would include the following." There are five items identified: "Salaries and Indemnities, Accommodation Allowances, Travel Allowances, Committee Allowances, Pension Benefits." That's fine, but if the word "include" would not ameliorate additional ones, then that would help me in my understanding.

It seems to me that there are a number of things here that are missing unless salaries and indemnities would include such things as re-establishment, termination, and settlement, which is a prerogative, a thing that occurs all the time in the environment in which we live in in Canada in 1992. Where is that parameter being evaluated or thrown into the maze of the reviews? Where is the subject matter of such things as insurance and health and welfare benefits? I mean, are our benefits that accrue to Members of the Legislative Assembly in the province of Alberta in the area of insurance and health and welfare above the norm? If they're above the norm, we should know that so we can take the appropriate steps in taking the correct action. That's not mentioned in there.

11:52

There's nothing mentioned in there about the parameter of being involved in the private sector when you are involved in a public-sector job. We had a new code of ethics come into the province of Alberta in 1992 that basically prohibits men and women of the Legislative Assembly from having any private investment portfolio at all, essentially none. Where is that in these parameters in terms of a comparison with other people? If this is a norm for other people involved and we want to find this comparison, why don't we get that and put that in there as well?

The question of tenure. Needless to say, we all know that in politics there is no tenure, but it is a reality for people who are in the marketplace. If we want to have this external review, that should be one that should be looked at as well. On the basis of the changes that are coming in with respect to the code of ethics, I would wonder how that would be adjudicated as well.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are actually five or six items in there. It is important when you want to go build something that you first of all get the blueprint down pat so you have no misunderstanding at all at the end and nobody can come back and say, "Well, these guys were incomplete, or they didn't do the job expected of them." We want them to do a complete and thorough review, and in order for them to do the complete and thorough review, they must have the blueprint.

It is in those areas that I'd like some response back from committee members. Were they just not deemed to be worthy, or were they forgotten? Were they not looked at, or did they deal with them and decide not to put them in there? After knowing what that answer is, I may be in a position to basically ask for an amendment to add things to this so that we get it as tightly knit as possible so that when we have this external independent review, these people know exactly what it is they have to compare so that we're not going to delay more at the end. We want to build the building and have it done exactly the way the people expect us to get it done.

My question is basically one for clarification: how did these subcommittee members deal with this? Why did they not put these things on here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those questions are asked, and then you're giving notice that you're possibly prepared, in light of the answers, to move an amendment. All right; the ones that we have here are municipal level of government, re-establishment allowance, insurance, health benefits, investments, tenure.

The Member for Grande Prairie as a member of the subcommittee.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to the Member for Barrhead, I think the key words in this purpose and objectives list are under the paragraph identified as number 2, and I'm going to the bottom line of the first paragraph. It says, "with specific emphasis on the following," not restricted to but "with specific emphasis on the following." In the earlier minutes, which is a draft set of minutes that has not been passed by our committee, you'll note a statement in there has recommended that that specific emphasis statement be changed to read something else, but the intent is still the same.

Then I'll go down to the second half of the section under 2 where it says, "Total Compensation comparisons would include." It doesn't say restricted to or it would stop there but "would include." Also going back to the minutes, which is in a draft form, tenure of position was one of the items brought up by one of our committee members.

Now, this particular appendix 2 comes to this committee today, Mr. Chairman, to receive the kind of suggestions and comments that the Member for Barrhead has just brought forth. The concern I have is with how big the list becomes before it then becomes too demanding upon the contractor that will be doing this job. As this contractor does the job, I believe it would be quite possible that he might discover something else out there which should obviously be included in his report. By not including some open ends for this, does this then imply that if we don't mention it, he can't mention it either? I just caution against that. I'd like further discussion on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do the members of the subcommittee want to make a comment about these various issues as raised? Edmonton-Whitemud? Cypress-Redcliff?

MR. WICKMAN: No, I think the Member for Grande Prairie made it very, very clear that the earlier portions of the minutes reflect the discussion, parts of which are incorporated here. I don't think it's necessary to expand specifically on further positions. As the member said, it's not specific. It allows for other areas to be explored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Cypress-Redcliff, answering the questions.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I guess the only thing I could add to it is that because we're dealing with appendix 2 and appendix 2

doesn't show that wording change from the minutes, we'll have to give some consideration to the concerns of the member. The intent is there, but the limiting factor isn't quite the same as it would be if that were included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on that point. The words which are missing at the moment because of other procedural difficulties and which I wouldn't allow were: "to include but not limited to . . ."

MR. HYLAND: ". . . the following."

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right then; thank you.

The Member for Barrhead with regard . . . The questions have now been answered.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think it's really prudent and really important, if this committee is going to direct that an independent, external review be done, that the parameters of that review must really be tied down. If whoever the agent of the Members' Services Committee is -- if it's the Speaker or Clerk -- has to put out a tender to have somebody bid on something, whoever this external review is must know what it is that is expected of them. To that extent I would move an amendment, I guess, to item 2. Where the phrase currently reads "Executives in Hospital and Academic Institutions," could that be changed to read "Executives in Hospital, Academic, and Municipal Institutions"? I added the word "Municipal."

Sir, if I could go on, then I would add to "Total Compensation comparisons would include the following." You've got five listed there, and I would add four more items: health, welfare, and insurance benefits; private investment portfolio opportunities; re-establishment allowances, termination, or settlement provisions; and tenure and its value. That's meant to be a friendly amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; now that we're speaking to this amendment, the floor is open to all members to participate.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just observe that this is an increasingly tangled web we're weaving here. The initial response of our subcommittee was that the review be conducted on allowances, benefits and remuneration, without restriction, in as broad a spectrum as possible, including those appearing in the Members' Guide.

That's very plain: the whole thing is up for review.

Now we're pointing these consultants in more and more specific directions; for example, wanting to be compensated for not having investment portfolio opportunities in the private sector. I think that really is leading the witness in a way I feel uncomfortable with. I think we're getting further and further away from a broad-spectrum review by an independent body and more and more leading the hand of the consultant in a direction of justifying or suggesting some particular arrangement. I think the more you load onto these lists, perhaps the more difficult and complex the contract is going to become. So I think I feel more comfortable with the idea of a broad spectrum than I do with this item, this item, this item.

MRS. BLACK: Might I ask for a friendly amendment to the Member for Barrhead's motion? I also feel it would be important for us to look at adding in -- again in section 2, where we get into private-sector executives, I think we should also get into labour executives as well. Then in the second portion under total compensation there are three items I felt should be looked at that are

very important in a comparison: expense accounts and bonuses and ongoing living allowances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bonuses and which?

MRS. BLACK: Living allowances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Barrhead, you were given an invitation on a friendly basis. What was the response?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the latter part I have no difficulty with. The first part I didn't hear though.

MRS. BLACK: Labour executives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Labour executives. A friendly amendment. Mover? Thank you.

All right. For hon. members and for the sake of the poor secretary trying to sort it out. The first section, executives: that would also include labour. Then in the second section: expense accounts, bonuses, living allowances. All of this accepted as a friendly amendment. Thank you.

Dealing with this particular amendment, which is rapidly turning into an omnibus amendment -- but that's fine; the committee's used to that -- Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Grande Prairie.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, from a procedural point of view, will you allow me to make a subamendment to the amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will move a subamendment to the amendment which would read that the evaluation be completed by September 30.

MRS. BLACK: Of what year, Percy?

MR. WICKMAN: Of 1992.

Mr. Chairman, speaking to the subamendment. A lot of the information is available in the library downstairs. There is a book published that lists every benefit, every perk, every conceivable allowance that may be afforded to elected representatives throughout Canada. In the library you can very, very clearly get comparisons of what benefits people receive in executive positions, enough detail to allow for comparison to allow that external committee to get under way. I guess I've tried to stress that I'm concerned that we're going on and on. We've got to start closing things off here and setting some deadlines and having things happen if we expect to deal with this in the fall session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Speaking to the subamendment, Calgary-Foothills, and then Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody is more anxious to see this on the way than I am. I've been frustrated, and if we want to get on with it, then we've got to get through these documents today so we can at least have something to go out into a package so it can be tendered.

Percy, September 30 is ridiculous. We're August 25 here. We haven't even decided what it is we're going to have these people do. Then you've got to put it together and have them tender on the thing. You wouldn't even have the tendering back by September 30, so I think you're in technicolour on it. You can't do that before you even

decide on what we're going to have them do. We've spent two and a half hours this morning on procedural back and forth, so if you're really intent on getting going on this, then let's get going on it and stick to the report from the subcommittee on appendices 1 and 2 and get it done.

12:02

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, recently you sent me to Newfoundland to attend the Canadian Parliamentary Association, at which time I made a presentation speaking to salaries, indemnities for MLAs, the press releases, and what have you. The recent information that is available in the library given to me by your office is totally outdated, as was pointed out to me by the MLAs across Canada. I believe those stats change on a constant basis, and you cannot always accept what is in the library. It does take a great amount of time to do these kinds of reviews. The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, being a past hospital board chairman as I myself have been -- perhaps he wasn't a chairman, but he certainly was a member of a hospital board -- and knowing that these kinds of reviews have been done before but do take time, I think that kind of time frame is totally unrealistic, and we do have a budget we have to consider as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaking to the subamendment? If not, a call for the question?

MR. WICKMAN: May I close debate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, sir, not on a subamendment or an amendment. You can on the main motion.

Edmonton-Jasper Place, speaking to the subamendment.

MR. McINNIS: In my view, the delay in this matter really occurred in August of 1989 when the Member for Edmonton-Highlands suggested we proceed with an independent review rather than go ahead and fix a sum of money on a salary, but it's been very clear that the response to the Premier's letter has been quite swift. It seems to me that the Premier wrote on May 4. This committee met on May 13. Seven days later the subcommittee met and met again. It's taken us a little longer to get together, but I don't think the members of this committee individually can be faulted for delaying this matter by reason of wanting to debate what's done here.

I'm quite concerned about the fact that there's no time frame in any of this. We've already dealt with the fact that we're trying to do a consultants' report before we have established the external, independent body that is supposed to deal with the report, but now we don't have any deadline at all. If the members feel that September 30 is unrealistic given an indication that this will be tendered to a number of different groups, what is an appropriate deadline? I think that's a reasonable question to ask, and I'd like some clarification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff. You're speaking to the subamendment.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, the way I read the subamendment, it means this whole process has to be done by September 30, and that's where I find difficulty. If we come out and we don't get a total review or a good review and all the facts aren't out there, then we're two months down the road and we're further delayed. A consultant is going to have to tell us how long it's going to take us to get the information that we suggest be available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The subamendment.

MRS. BLACK: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question on the subamendment: a report for September 30, 1992. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? The matter fails.

Now we're back to the amendment as proposed by the Member for Barrhead, which became friendly amended along the way. Those who have spoken to it are Barrhead, Edmonton-Jasper Place, Calgary-Foothills, Edmonton-Whitemud. Next is Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: I just want to ask the question, Mr. Chairman: if the words that I pointed out earlier, that these various items would be among those included rather than specific to?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I only respond again by my experience in dealing with independent contractors -- if you wish, external review people. Unless you write down specifically what the job requirement is, they will then come back to you and say, "Well, should we include this or should we not include this?" Every time you put down "but not limited to" just delays them getting the job finished. They wanted to know, "Well, what did you mean by this?" and "What did you mean by that?" I think the firmer we can become with this, the quicker we get the blueprint done, the quicker the job is finished. If we start off with a poor base, then you go on forever answering questions back and forth. So my druthers -- but then again it's the background I have -- is to basically be as specific as we can with what it is that we want with the strictest parameters on it, and then there's no misunderstanding by anybody at the end.

12:12

MR. McINNIS: I wonder if there's any way possible that we could get the terms of reference word processed before we finally vote on them, because we've got amendments that were proposed in the subcommittee, we've got an amendment on the floor from the minister, and we've also got some suggestions from Calgary-Foothills, some of which I thought were accepted as friendly and some of which I'm not sure. If it were possible, then, to amalgamate those three sources of amendment into one draft, it would be a great help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us do that, and we will also adjourn for a quick bite to eat.

Now, before we do that, let me, in the prerogative of the Chair, ask: is the committee -- this is just a yes or no -- prepared to allow at the end of the first paragraph in section 2, with "specific emphasis" built in there: "to include but not limited to"? Do you want that phrase to occur anywhere in this next draft of what we're doing? That came out of the subcommittee, so we can incorporate that. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let the record show unanimously.

All right. Our poor secretary will have to now somehow try to redraft this page with some help from Mr. Day. Thank you.

The committee stands adjourned I would think until we round you up, which is in about 20 minutes, if we're lucky.

[The committee adjourned from 12:15 p.m. to 12:50 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Now we can reconvene. It's 10 to 1.

MR. BOGLE: Could we make a note as well of the adjournment time, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of the adjournment? Oh, yes. All right.

I've been informed that we will lose quorum at 1:55 because of another meeting. I understand the Electoral Boundaries Committee has a meeting at 2 o'clock, and that takes a number away.

The document that has been distributed to you now is the one that includes the friendly amendments. We still have not voted on this. Perhaps you'd put the date on the top of it, and then we won't get it confused with some of the other pieces of paper.

Now, we were on the amendment. I believe that all members have spoken to the document before us.

DR. ELLIOTT: A point of order, Mr. Chairman, a question, or whatever you want to call it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. ELLIOTT: If I had a comment or wanted to make a comment on this form, when and how would be the appropriate time to do it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to this, you've already spoken on this amendment. When we deal with this amendment, we would come back to the main motion, and on the main motion you have not spoken. Okay?

I take it there's a call for the question with respect to the amendment that is before us.

MR. BOGLE: The amendment, for clarification, is the reworded document with the additions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reworded version with all the additions. That's what the question is before us at the moment: the amendment as proposed by Barrhead. A call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please say aye. Opposed, please say no. Carried, let the record show unanimously.

Now we're back on the main amendment which allows for any other comments to be made on the whole page. Again I'd point out that on the main motion, those who have spoken are Cypress-Redcliff, Edmonton-Whitemud, Edmonton-Jasper Place, Taber-Warner, Barrhead. Now Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the first line, "Under the direction of the Members' Services Committee, the contractor . . .", I would like to suggest for the consideration of the committee two words. I'd like to suggest: "the independent external contractor will be responsible for the following tasks."

Just speaking to that suggestion, that identifies that we are following through with the original suggestion, the original instruction and the intent of the committee and the intent of the subcommittee that we are going with an independent external contractor. We are taking it out of the Assembly totally. I seek your guidance as to whether we do that by amendment.

While I'm at it, Mr. Chairman, under item 1, second line, second word in, I see the word "an." Should it be "and": "using accepted and job evaluation methodology"? Is that a typo?

DR. McNEIL: It's a typo. It should say: "using an accepted job evaluation methodology."

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the "an" would come a word earlier. That's a typo. Okay. Thank you.

What we have here now is an amendment to line 1: "Under the direction of the Members' Services Committee, the independent external contractor will be responsible for the following tasks." That's the amendment. Okay. Now we're open for whomever.

Edmonton-Jasper Place, hold your hand up, and if not, Edmonton-Whitemud. We can come back.

MR. McINNIS: I think the amendment is absurd. What we're doing here is taking the demand for an independent review and turning it into a consultant's study under the direction of this committee, and since we don't like the optics of that, we want to call it "independent external." Give me a break. It says clearly "Under the direction of the Members' Services Committee" these consultants have to come back with their "methodology" and their "basis for comparison." If we accept them, they can go ahead and do the thing. How can we possibly call that "independent external"? These are hired consultants to do a specific job under very close supervision. To call that "independent external" is more stretch than I'm prepared to go, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to support the amendment. I'm not going to support the main motion when we get to it. The difficulty I have -- and I'm all for a proper procedure in trying to establish external review -- is that we're going about it wrong. I simply see this is a method that is going to delay, delay, delay. It's not getting down to the issue that we want to get down to. I think we're into something that was not the intent of the subcommittee. It's totally gotten off the track. What's in front of us is simply not acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Additional to the amendment?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would speak in support of the amendment. We may well have the ability in-house in the public administration office or whatever, if that's the right title, under Mr. Dixon. I wouldn't want the internal group doing that review. I agree with the member and add the words so that we make sure it's an outside group that's not associated with a government department that does that review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional? Call for the question on the amendment. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? It's carried.

All right. Any additional comments?

The committee will now meet until 2:25. The Electoral Boundaries Committee is now going to meet at 2:30 instead of 2 o'clock, so that will allow us to continue a bit further.

All right then. The document that was circulated now will read in the first line, with this last correction, "Under the direction of the Members' Services Committee, the independent external contractor will be responsible . . ." All the rest of that page then has been approved, unless there are any additional . . .

MRS. BLACK: Including the typo correction?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The typo as well. Thank you.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, it still doesn't read smoothly. I'm just wondering, maybe it wasn't even intended to be in there: "using

accepted and job evaluation methodology." Maybe the three-letter word should be deleted. I'm messing around with what I thought was a spelling mistake, but maybe it's more than that.

MRS. MIROSH: The "and" should come out. You don't need "and."

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Accepted job evaluation methodology."

MRS. MIROSH: It should be "using an accepted job evaluation methodology." "An" is in the wrong place.

MRS. BLACK: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we're on the whole page. We've gone through the other amendments.

MR. McINNIS: What this means is that the methodology has to be accepted by the committee. That's what it means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk? You're the one who's going to have to deal with it.

DR. McNEIL: In writing this, my purpose was for the consultant to establish the methodology he or she was using that was the standard accepted in the industry methodology. That was the intent.

1:00

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's going to read, "Using an accepted job evaluation methodology."

On this main motion, which is this whole page that has undergone a number of amendments. Those who have spoken: the original mover, Cypress-Redcliff; Edmonton-Whitemud; Edmonton-Jasper Place; Taber-Warner; Barrhead; and Grande Prairie. Do any others wish to speak to the main motion before we put the question on the page? Does Cypress-Redcliff wish to sum up? A call for the question. All those in favour of this page as amended, please signify. Opposed? The motion carries. Thank you.

Clerk, please.

DR. McNEIL: It would be useful for some direction as to how you'd like us to proceed now with putting this motion into force.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move now with the passing of this changed appendix 2 -- how am I going to word it?

That the Clerk, through your direction, approach those firms listed in appendix 1 to obtain a tendered proposal from them to complete the project.

Is that clear enough?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That the Clerk so do. Discussion? The Member for Barrhead.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification here. Presumably there has been some work done by the administration in the Speaker's office, the Clerk. The firms that are listed on appendix 1 are bona fide, nationwide consultants with experience in this background. Is this correct?

DR. McNEIL: Yeah. These are the consultants based in Alberta who are considered major consultants who have done work in this area before.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay. It's the only clarification. I just don't want somebody coming back in a month and saying, "Well, they didn't have these skills." I'm reassured, so we can move on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the mover of the motion a question and then make a comment? Is there any time frame visualized at all for this process?

MR. HYLAND: I would have to talk to the consultants. What I would say is that the Clerk would begin immediately to do some of the work to get the proposals out, and then he would have to report to the committee on the information that comes to him. I would suggest that part of the job could be done as soon as possible.

MR. WICKMAN: Could the Clerk give us an idea?

DR. McNEIL: I'm not certain as to how long it would take. It may take an estimate of at least a couple of weeks to put together a request for a proposal to go out to the consultants. I'd have to get a sense from them how long a period it would take before they would be in a position to get a realistic closing date on that request for a proposal.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, is there any idea of the amounts of money that may be involved in conducting the process?

DR. McNEIL: Not having talked in any detail with any consultants, I have no specific idea as to how much this will cost. That will be what will come back in these bids. If I were to estimate it, I could say it might go from \$10,000-plus up to I don't know how high.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I again express a concern about the time delay and such and, I guess, draw a comparison as to what we're going through now and what we went through three years ago when members reviewed their entire package. It was a question of two weeks, and bang, bang, bang, it was a done deed. I'm saying that now we're into a process that if we go back to when it originally started, by the time it's completed, it's after the next election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, hon. member, all we can do, now that we finally have a motion and a direction from the committee, is the Clerk can only start to work on it. Certainly he'll be at it the beginning of this week and try to deal with it as expeditiously as possible. There's no way to be able to answer some of the questions.

MR. McINNIS: There are at least a couple more unanswered questions I think we need to answer as a committee. One is the return date for proposals, how quickly we want them back. I think the next is: what happens after they come back? Obviously, somebody has to make a selection and authorize the expenditure of funds. Now, I don't know if we have any money budgeted for this item within the Members' Services estimates; I doubt that we do. We have to deal with the question of where the money comes from as well. So I think we need to put a return date on the proposal request, which would be probably 30 days or so, and then figure out the process for making the selection and the funding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think what we need to do is give the Clerk sufficient latitude to prepare the tender documentation, to contact the firms, and to get responses. I would

hope the next meeting is at the call of the Chair and would come as quickly as possible. So once that information is in, or when it's coming in, the chairman can contact members of the committee, determine the most appropriate date, and call the meeting. I know the Chair had some difficulty calling a meeting in July and August, but that's because of the summer holiday schedule and commitments in various constituencies. As we move into September and October, presumably more of us are back in the Assembly doing our normal work, and the chairman will be able to call us together quickly and we can move on with this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think all we can do at this moment is follow through on that kind of advice and allow the Clerk to get off and get on with it. Okay?

Cypress-Redcliff. This is summation on the motion.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, the reason I put the motion forward, as I think is obvious, is to get something started, to get proposals flowing forward. The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud made reference to the time in '89 when the salaries were set. That was set by a group of legislators with information that we could gather ourselves. We had a number of subcommittee meetings, of which he was one of the members. I was another member of that subcommittee. We came to an agreement, using factors here and there, on what the salaries should be.

Now we're asking for an external review by people rather than using the information that we achieve ourselves to come to that end. According to our legislation and according to previous legislation, I don't think it matters what kind of review you had: external, internal, or whatever. The way the legislation was previously, the way the legislation is now, ultimately we have to pass an amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act or Members' Services order to set those levels. Unless we change that legislation, we can't pass it on to anybody else.

I would like to see this review go ahead. I remember the motions that we made previously, and I remember that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud was the one who made the motion for the largest increase in salary, a motion related to the leader of the third party. So let's get all these comparisons so we know if indeed the way we set all those salaries previously is right or they're in some sort of order as to where they should be.

1:10

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question on the motion for the Clerk to approach the various firms with respect to the proposals. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

The next item of business on our agenda is item . . .

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: I don't think we've quite concluded this item of business. There are still a number of outstanding recommendations from the subcommittee, dealing with the composition of an external commission, and we haven't even begun to address those. I would like to move that this Members' Services Committee accept the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee regarding the composition of the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's found on which page of which minutes, please?

MR. McINNIS: S9 and S10 of June 15. Basically it goes in three parts. Ms Barrett moved a certain composition. It was added to by Mr. Wickman and then further added to by Dr. Elliott. The minutes record that the amended motion as subsequently amended again was carried unanimously, and I'm moving that the unanimous recommendation be adopted by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to read out the exact wording here that you are happy with, please? I see one motion there, and then later on it was carried, and they take away the judge. So which one in particular, please? S10.92, the top motion?

MR. McINNIS: How about if I construct a motion rather than doing it as an adoption of a recommendation?

The independent review body be composed of a representative each from the Alberta Chamber of Commerce and the Alberta Federation of Labour, an urban representative appointed by the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, a rural representative appointed by the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, a senior citizen appointed by either the Senior Citizens Secretariat or the Society for the Retired and Semi-Retired, a public servant at the provincial or federal level nominated by the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, a retired Alberta Member of Parliament, a hospital administrator nominated by the Alberta Hospital Association, and a private-sector executive nominated by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta.

I believe that incorporates the final position of the subcommittee. Nine members.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the motion be tabled until the job evaluation study being done by the independent external contractor is completed and presented to the committee and indeed made public. At that point in time, the committee should consider whether or not we wish to proceed ahead with the motion as presented by John.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion to table. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Additional?

Item 4(c) on our agenda, Temporary Residence Allowance. This is under Business Arising from the Minutes.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, included in the package is a letter which I sent to the Chair the day after we last visited this subject. There was a suggestion made at that time by one of the members of the Assembly, the leader of the Liberal Party, that the 14 hour a day rule was a joke and subject to rampant abuse by MLAs. I don't believe that. I think it was very, very clear in the discussion we had that we were talking about a situation that happens on occasion when members within the 100-kilometre radius had a necessity to acquire hotel accommodation because of an extremely long day. That situation would occur relatively infrequently, certainly not 200 times a year.

I think it's a relatively simple matter to clarify that this is an instance when a receipt would indicate that in fact an expenditure has been made against which the allowance is to be charged. I think that was the clear understanding of the meeting as I understood it. This other suggestion, I think, was a misinterpretation. So I would like to move

that we require receipts in the case of MLAs outside of Edmonton but living within the 100-kilometre zone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So your motion is to require receipts in those circumstances? That was a motion?

MR. McINNIS: Yes. As far as the other allowances and the question of receipts and so forth, I think that's best left to the independent review, if and when we get one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will occur.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we table that motion until the completion of this independent external contractor's review regarding total compensation comparisons, which already lists accommodation allowances and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Another motion to table. All those in favour of the motion to table? Opposed? Carried.

Item 4(d) with respect to use of the Confederation Room. Edmonton-Highlands is not here.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, our committee has not had an opportunity to meet on this issue, and I would therefore like to move that we table it to our next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the motion to table, those in favour please . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Can I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; motion to table. If the motion fails, I'm certain you can ask.

Those in favour of the motion to table with respect to item 4(d), please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Item 5(a) on our agenda under New Business: MSC Order, Out of Country Travel.

DR. McNEIL: This order is here as a result of a memo from the Provincial Treasurer to the Speaker indicating that Treasury Board Directive 06/92 had been passed which applied to all departments and agencies of government including the Legislative Assembly Office. It suggested that if the Legislative Assembly Office wished to be exempt from the application under the directive, a Members' Services Committee order would be necessary. In order to ensure the separation of the legislative branch from the direction and control of the executive branch, this order proposes to exempt the Legislative Assembly Office from having to submit any requests for out-of-country travel to Treasury Board.

1:20

MR. BOGLE: I just might add that this is very similar to a motion recently passed unanimously in Legislative Offices with regard to the four officers who report to the Assembly through the Legislative Offices Committee and the Speaker.

MR. McINNIS: So far as I'm aware, Parliament asserted its independence from the Crown quite a long while ago. Didn't somebody lose his head over that? With all due respect to Charles I, I wonder why we have to pass a motion like this that Charles paid for with his head.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk, are you going to make any comment about bean counters?

DR. McNEIL: Just that the way the Legislative Assembly Act is presently drafted, it requires an order of the Members' Services Committee to exempt the Legislative Assembly from Treasury Board directives, and we've done that in a number of instances.

MR. McINNIS: I guess it's a more peaceable procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly easier on the throat.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move we accept Members' Services Order MSC 6/92 as presented to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The motion: Members' Services Committee 6/92. Any further discussion? All those in favour of approval of the motion as proposed, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Clerk, the matter of the Electoral Boundaries Committee budget.

DR. McNEIL: This is just a proposed motion that funds that initially were allocated by this committee to the Electoral Boundaries Commission be authorized to be transferred to the budget of the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that unspent money allocated to the Electoral Boundaries Commission be allocated to the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries and the Clerk be instructed to transfer the funds accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's our motion, Calgary-Glenmore.

Yes, Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, my first question is: how many dollars in that kitty are left unspent?

DR. McNEIL: There's approximately \$300,000 as of the end of July.

MR. WICKMAN: Secondly, Mr. Chairman, is it appropriate for me to ask at this time how many times that committee has met to date and which members have been in attendance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the chairman is here.

MR. BOGLE: The first meeting of the committee was held on July 29. The meeting was actually delayed three weeks so the Official Opposition and the third party could reflect on whether or not they wished to participate in the committee, because the way the motion was worded in the Assembly, once the first meeting was actually held, any members not appointed by the opposition parties would be ineligible for appointment. Meetings have been held since that time.

A general invitation has gone to all members of the Assembly to make their views known on their own constituencies. Several MLAs have come in to date. Several members have indicated in a written form their preferences, and that includes both government and opposition members. The attendance at the meetings has ranged from four members, which is the full composition of the committee, down to as low as two members.

MR. WICKMAN: Are the meetings held in public, Mr. Chairman?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, the meetings are held in public and *Hansard* is present unless there's a specific request by a presenter that we go in camera for a portion of the meeting. I would indicate that once the committee concludes hearing from -- and we did send invitations to the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the improvement districts of Alberta, the municipal districts and counties, as well as the mayors of Edmonton and Calgary and the former commission members to come forward. Some of those meetings have been held.

Others are scheduled in the near future. When the committee actually sits down to draw lines, that will be done in camera. Then, of course, the report will be made public once the report is released on or before November 15.

MR. WICKMAN: My last point, Mr. Chairman, is that I won't support the motion. I don't condone the method of establishing the boundaries, and feeding money to that committee simply reinforces a concept which I believe is wrong.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose this is just another chapter in a very lengthy saga of the attempt to get new boundaries in Alberta. I don't have any intention of repeating all the history in the debate that's taken place, but I do want to remark on the comment that there are members of the government party as well as opposition members participating in these meetings. That matter was discussed by our caucus. During the spring session of the Legislature we took the position that the committee of MLAs to draw the boundaries was inappropriate. We spoke against the motion, we voted against the motion, and we declined to nominate members. The subsequent invitation was to come and make a presentation to the committee. Obviously people have very mixed feelings about that because an awful lot is at stake. I think we have the position that in principle we're not going to meet privately with the committee to make representation on our own behalf as MLAs. There may be some bringing some portions of the public record to the attention of the committee -- that is to say, presentations that were made at public hearings affecting riding boundaries or perhaps submissions that were made to the original commission -- but I'm quite clear in my mind that as a matter of principle we're not able to participate in the process. I think logically it follows that if we can't support the process, we can't support funding it.

MR. BOGLE: Just for clarification on one point. Any of the members who have come forward to date have done so not in private but in public, and it is on the record.

MR. McINNIS: I thought you said there is an in camera provision.

MR. BOGLE: There's an in camera provision if someone appearing before the committee requests it. What I'm saying is that to date no MLA has requested it. I would urge them not to do so. Several participants, I believe one or possibly two previous commission members, have requested that their comments be in camera. We will respect their request. No MLA has requested that their comments be in camera.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time, but could I ask one more question? Will members of the public have an opportunity to appear before the committee?

MR. BOGLE: We're certainly not denying anyone access. On the other hand, it's clear from the time lines -- and the reason this job has been left to us is because the previous five-member commission was unable to conclude their work and they submitted five individual reports. It's clear to everyone present that we can't have our cake and eat it too. If we want new electoral boundaries before the next election is held, then the work must be done and must be done very quickly. We're on a fast track right now. That's one of the reasons I'll go from this meeting at 2:30 to an Electoral Boundaries Committee meeting. We're meeting four out of the next five weeks. So we're not inviting submissions from the public. We have over 600 submissions, submissions that were given to the previous all-party committee and submissions given to the Electoral Boundaries

Commission. We're going through those carefully, reviewing them to ensure that the recommendations given previously are well known to us. Then we'll proceed accordingly. We have received some letters from individuals and organizations pointing out certain factors to be considered, and those letters are being acknowledged.

So a short answer, John, is: no, we're not inviting submissions from the public. The time lines are such, plus the fact that we had so much input in the past. We did feel it important to go back to the leaders of the major municipal organizations and the mayors of the two largest cities as well as the previous commission members to receive their direct input.

1:30

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Additional comments with respect to this motion? If not, is there a call for the question? All those in favour of the transfer of the funds, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

MR. BOGLE: Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, because of my interest that I abstain from voting and it be so recorded?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It can be recorded, and I noticed that you did not vote. The matter still carries.

Item 5(c), Office Furniture, Official Opposition Office, Calgary. Edmonton-Jasper Place, have you been apprised of what this is? Are you prepared to speak to it?

MR. McINNIS: I wonder if we could table that to the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

The motion to table by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Item 5(d), "Clean Feed" of House TV Coverage. Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, in the last year the Assembly has graciously undertaken to provide American Sign Language translation to the cable TV broadcast of question period in the Assembly, and I'm sure that's much appreciated by hearing impaired Albertans who now have full access to the proceedings. I'm quite certain that in doing that we intended to expand the use the public could make of the signal that comes from the Assembly here. We do pay a substantial amount of money to produce that. I understand that the equipment in use now is absolutely first-class; the quality of the feed is excellent. But there is a problem in that the television news outlets can't use the feed they now have because it has the signing embedded in it. It would be quite a simple matter to split those two things so that you would have the signed portion available for broadcast in appropriate form and also have the nonsigned portion available for public broadcast in the appropriate form for that. I understand that in commercial news they use a different system and rather than signing on screen use closed captioning, so that's why the two systems are incompatible. Now, I think what that means is that perhaps this wasn't considered at the time the setup was made, simply making a feed available a step before the broadcast step so that could be used by the television news.

I also want to make it clear that I think there is now a 20-year tradition of news cameras being in the Assembly. That is our tradition in the Alberta Legislature, and in no way am I suggesting that that tradition should be altered -- simply that we basically install a splitter so there is a clean feed available for commercial broadcast purposes. Otherwise, we're spending one heck of a lot of money in eliminating a very large audience which potentially has access to commercial television news for which you don't even have to have

cable. Only cable subscribers can get access to the Access broadcast of question period and the rebroadcast later in the evening. So this is simply to give us much better value for the money already invested and being spent, to make it available both for commercial television and for the needs of the cable subscribers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comment? Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, do we have any idea of the cost of this or how long it would take to put it in, all those kinds of questions?

MR. R. DAY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. McInnis is quite accurate when he states the technology exists to split. When we first entered the contract with the cable supplier, it was something we did not contemplate.

In response to Mr. Hyland, the last time I personally looked at it, there was an estimate of somewhere between \$2,000 and \$2,500 to put the technology in place. I understand it's technology that's in ready supply, so time would not be a major consideration.

MR. HYLAND: Is that a one-time investment of \$2,000 or \$2,500 and not a yearly investment?

MR. R. DAY: A one-time investment similar to the purchase of a camera or a monitor.

MR. McINNIS: How does that compare with what we have invested in the system now?

MR. R. DAY: On the award of a three-year contract, the contractor would make certain improvements to the equipment in the Chamber and the equipment in the back room. Over the three-year period that called for a \$50,000 investment. They have fulfilled that equipment, as reflected in the comments you have already made, but unfortunately did not contemplate that because we added the sign language interpreter after we had signed the contract with them.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, how about if I make a motion? I move

that the committee authorize the expenditure of up to \$2,500 to install a splitter to provide a clean feed for television news media from question period broadcasts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question? All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Well, we've certainly had a number of comments about the usefulness or appreciation for the use of the sign language. To be able to do this indeed will help with the transmission, as pointed out.

One comment made by Edmonton-Jasper Place is indeed true: that we have the tradition in this House from 1971 that the television media are invited to be on the floor of the House. But we do maintain the position that they are not there by right. They're there by invitation, yes, and as long as they conform to general guidelines for the operation of cameras on the floor of the House, that's quite fine. We've not had any kerfuffle about that side of it at all. Again, because of a court case pending at the Supreme Court level, I have to make those comments in that way.

Thank you very much. That's useful.

Under the heading of Other Business, I wonder if I might have Parliamentary Counsel speak for a moment about a project he's been working with.

1:40

MR. RITTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the most successful publications the government of Alberta puts out is the *Revised Statutes of Alberta* in loose-leaf form. Members are all familiar with it. Over the years this Members' Services Committee has accumulated a considerable number of orders, some of which have been repealed, others of which partially lapsed when we were implementing group health plans and that type of thing. One of the initiatives the Legislative Assembly Office would like to undertake to have ready for all members possibly by the next meeting is a consolidation of revised Members' Services orders much on the same basis as we have the *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980*. In other words, members would have a complete loose-leaf set of Members' Services orders, and every time a new order was implemented by this committee, a more efficient method could be achieved by just sending out the loose-leaf pages, the inserts that update the Members' Services Committee orders to be absolutely current. Of course, it's more ecologically sound because it uses up less paper.

As they've evolved over the years, the orders have gotten kind of cumbersome. We have fractionalized section numbers. Things like car allowances are all scattered throughout different orders. If this revised consolidation were presented to the committee, all allowances of one type would be found in one order, all benefits of another type would be found in another order. The mechanics of implementing revised Members' Services orders would involve no real legislative changes on the part of the committee. All it would be would be one motion that would repeal all the existing Members' Services orders and re-enacting an appendix, which is the revised version, and all the various orders consolidated so it would make a lot more sense and be easier to find things.

MR. WICKMAN: You're asking for some dollars?

MR. RITTER: There wouldn't be any dollars associated with it. You can give me some.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's provided for information purposes. After the meeting you will stand outside the front door with a tin cup to collect your pennies.

Any other items under Other Business for today? Failing that, the date of the next meeting. Earlier on I'd heard perhaps at the call of the Chair. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, do we need a motion to suggest that, or can we just leave it at the call of the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll just take it as general notice. Call of the Chair. Okay. A motion by Cypress-Redcliff that the next meeting will be at the call of the Chair.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps the suggestion that we try to do that before the fall session if at all possible.

MR. BOGLE: Which fall session?

MR. McINNIS: 1992.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will work on the theory, as mentioned earlier by Taber-Warner, that might be easier to get the group together. The last time it was an interesting challenge.

All those in favour of the motion that the next meeting will be at the call of the Chair, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Today's meeting is now adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 1:43 p.m.]

