

## Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

1:42 p.m.

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee is now about to begin. We have the proposed agenda before you. All those in favour of the agenda as proposed, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries. Thank you.

Item 2, Approval of Agenda. We've already done that one by speedy work.

Item 3, Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes for August 25, 1992. What is the pleasure of the committee?

MRS. BLACK: Approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Calgary-Foothills that the minutes be approved as circulated. Any questions or comments? Is there a call for the question?

MS BARRETT: Sure. Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the approval of the minutes of August 25, please say aye or approve in some other fashion. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Hon. members, we have received regrets from one member, the Member for Cypress-Redcliff. There was a tragic death in the family, so he will not be here today. Thank you.

Moving along to item 4, Business Arising from the Minutes, Consideration of Request for Proposals with respect to the Minister and MLA Job Evaluation Study. The Clerk and others have been busy working on this.

DR. McNEIL: Mr. Chairman, given that there are certain commercial considerations involved in this discussion with respect to the consultants who have or have not provided proposals with respect to this request for proposal, I would suggest that it may be better to consider this issue in camera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a problem with that as long as the reason we're doing it clearly is for those commercial considerations, and then we come back following that. I don't have a problem with that based on that.

MR. McINNIS: I'd like to clarify one matter before we go in camera. What is the function of this committee exactly in relation to this matter today? I know that previously we authorized that a study be done. What do we have to do as Members' Services?

DR. McNEIL: I would suggest that the committee would either want to make a decision with respect to the consultant or decide on a process to make a decision on the consultant. We have a recommendation based on our analysis of the proposals that we would like you to consider, but you may have other alternatives that you'd want to consider.

MR. McINNIS: So we don't have the process yet, basically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Barrhead, the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, this is further to the question raised by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. Just so I understand, is the question being raised by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place what exactly it is that's going to happen today? Is the intent here to have the Members' Services Committee make the actual decision on the selection of this particular consultant today? Are we going through all of this criteria? It seems like kind of a technical thing. I don't know; would it not be just as easy to have a subcommittee make the recommendation back to the committee, and then we go with it? Are we going to have eight, nine of us sit around here talking about should we select this consultant or that consultant? Is the intent this afternoon to do that? I'm either way on it. I just want the most efficient and effective way, because there are certainly a lot of questions that you tend to raise in these things, and we could be here all afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair's understanding of the process is that the Clerk together with Mrs. Scarlett did the evaluation of it all. The matter went out on a proposal for tender. There were various replies. The evaluation has been done. The Clerk with his support staff has done an assessment and leaves it up to this committee to decide today as to who might be appointed to get on with the business of doing the report.

Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not satisfied that there's a need to go in camera to make a determination as to which consultant may be taken on board or as to why a particular consultant is being recommended. I would want some further rationalization or justification as to why we can't do it in this room here in the open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's the awarding of a tender, hon. member.

Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I agree with the chairman; it's the awarding of a tender.

To answer Ken's concern about time and stuff, why don't we put a time limit on it? I mean, this is a technical matter. I've already reached the summary page. I can tell what you're recommending and why you're recommending it. We don't need the rest of it. Why don't we go in camera, discuss the tender, get the report from the Clerk? Let's get on with it. We've got other agenda, and we've got work to get done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion to go in camera? Red Deer-North. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

[The committee met in camera from 1:47 p.m. to 2:58 p.m.]

MRS. MIROSH: We were trying to decide with regards to the criteria of interviewing MLAs: the comparison of anywhere between three to six, and some proposals up to 80, and others. That doesn't seem to be extremely clear to us, as to how many MLAs these people are going to interview. I think it's clear to this committee that we would like all MLAs interviewed in one fashion or another. That would reflect in the cost, of course.

There's also a variance between whether management does it or whether a low or below management person does it. So there's a cost of anywhere between \$200 an hour up to \$450 an hour. I think that has to be reflected in who is going to be doing these interviews and what that cost is. Also, some of them indicated their expenses would only be in Edmonton; some just said carte blanche expenses over and above their quote. I think that has to be established. We can't just have an open ceiling for expenses and what they want with regards to travel.

Having said that, I still feel that either a subcommittee of this group or our own people go back to establish that cost to reflect exactly the criteria that this committee wants with interviewing 83 people and their extra costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, thanks. I don't oppose, in essence, anything that the Member for Calgary-Glenmore has said, but I would like to suggest that we need to move the process along. How about, as I suggested to her and the Member for Calgary-Foothills and some others, if we request that all 83 MLAs receive a standardized questionnaire for filling out, questions such as: how many hours per week or per day do you spend traveling to your meetings or what have you; variations from when the House sits and when the House does not sit; how many hours a day are you in House committees or caucus committees; how many hours are you in the constituency; rate your stress level when the House is sitting compared to when it's not sitting -- the sort of things that you'd ask anybody in a management position. Then only do personal interviews of a dozen or so MLAs. I think doing a personal interview of 83 MLAs would take forever and cost a fortune. I mean, I don't want to put a motion on the floor if we're in a general discussion. I think we should get to a motion in a minute about how we can accommodate the concerns that some members of the committee have and at the same time get the process moving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could have a few more comments. In the meantime, somebody can be crafting a motion.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I think any review of MLAs' salaries, remuneration, ministerial salaries, and the like should start with a very good idea of what the job actually entails. I think the point's been made by the previous two speakers that the more data you have to work from, the better in terms of beginning the process of making comparisons and what ultimately boils down to value judgments about what these jobs are worth. Having said that, I think the further we go into the mechanics of how that's to be done, the number of MLAs, the format of the interview, the mechanics of the interview, the factors to be considered, the further and further we're drifting away from first principles. I think the work that the committee has done at this point has been very useful. We've obtained from a number of independent consultants their ideas about how these comparisons should be made in a general sense and with a lot of specific detail as well. I think that's highly useful information.

My proposal -- and I'm not sure everybody is going to like this -- would be to make a way that we can go forward with that. I would like to move at this time that motion 92.125 from our last meeting, which is found in the minutes of our last meeting on page 81.92, be now lifted from the table. That's the motion to in effect set up an independent committee to review this matter. My suggestion would be quite simply that we refer all of the proposals that have been received to this independent group so that they can then proceed to make the kind of detailed value judgments that we're talking about

today: how many to interview; whether to interview them in person, by questionnaire; whether to follow them around on the job; whether to do all of these things. We're getting very heavily into the implementation of this thing, and I think maybe we should just sort of cut our losses in terms of the MLA-driven process and go to the other process now. That's my suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I cannot lift that motion from the table because the motion which you moved was dealt with by a subsequent motion that your motion be tabled until the job evaluation study by the independent external contractor was completed and presented to the committee. That motion was carried. So I appreciate the subtle parliamentary procedure. The Chair awaits a motion.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, at the risk of moving this thing forward, I'm going to suggest a motion. I'm going to suggest a motion

that the committee endorse the recommendation put forward by the Clerk with respect to the selection of KPMG Peat Marwick Stevenson & Kellogg and that, secondly, a subcommittee of this committee be appointed to modify the proposal to ensure that all Members of the Legislative Assembly are interviewed in the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Hon. members have heard the motion. Speaking to the motion.

MR. McINNIS: I'm just wondering if there isn't some cost implication associated with that, in which case I'm not exactly sure what would be the effect of passing the motion in terms of the expenditure of public funds. If the motion entails no change in the bottom line, then I think we know what we're getting into. But if it doesn't, then how do we interpret the need to make changes in a proposal that has a price attached to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that there would have to be a change in the total cost, but I would allow that recommendation to come forward by a subcommittee of this committee. They can debate as to how long the interview should be, and it may very well be that they could come back and say: "Well, fine. The motion said 83, but in the case of 15 or 18 or 20 the interview can be very short. In the case of the others, it may be a little longer." It's one of those points that the members of the subcommittee could deal with. I recognize, though, that there would have to be some modification, I'm sure, in the contract. They would have to come back with a recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was taken as a question seeking information.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, because of the desire to ensure that enough data is gathered for the evaluation to be completed, as is the desire of this committee, might we add a caveat onto that motion or a suggestion that we provide the subcommittee with the flexibility that in the event that the arrangements were not be compatible with KPMG, they would be allowed to take one of the other proposals and utilize it instead of KPMG? I'm thinking of this in the standpoint that they may not have the personnel available to do that or the time commitment available or the lead time available so we can, in fact, get this process going, that we provide at least that much flexibility with the sincere desire and goal that all factors of an MLA's life are in fact evaluated and that data is made available to

the evaluating group. Could we have that as a friendly amendment to the motion? Flexibility?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It gives extra power to that committee, basically saying that if they don't like this first proposal, they can negotiate a second one. Is the mover amenable to that subamendment?

3:08

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think that would substantially change the intent of the motion that has been moved. It would be friendly, I suspect, if the subcommittee were to come back to the committee to seek permission, but I think the manner in which my colleague from Calgary-Foothills has recommended it would take away dramatically from the intent of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that it will become a second motion after the first one is dealt with.

Speaking to this main motion as proposed by the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, Edmonton-Whitemud. Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, can I first have the motion repeated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary, please.

MRS. SHUMYLA:

that the committee endorse the recommendation put forward by the Clerk with respect to the selection of KPMG Peat Marwick Stevenson & Kellogg and that, secondly, a subcommittee of this committee be appointed to modify the proposal to ensure that all Members of the Legislative Assembly are interviewed in the process.

I may have missed a bit in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is subcommittee B.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I didn't have my motion written down, so I assume that it was there. It did include a subcommittee and the interviews and the subcommittee to work out the details with respect to the interviews.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to follow through on the motion, the subcommittee of what? Of this? You mean a similar process to what went earlier, with the subcommittee chaired by the Member for Red Deer-North?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I think that would be determined by this committee, if this particular motion does indeed pass. It may mean new members, but I certainly would expect that it would have representation from each of the three political parties as represented in the House.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, to the Member for Barrhead, would there be the intent to have this committee work in conjunction with the proposed subcommittee or is the intent to form another subcommittee to further study what we had studied earlier but this time, I guess, involving one particular consultant? It's not very specific to me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, let me try, and if I don't succeed, Ms Barrett, you might just help me out. Okay? Thank you very much.

The purpose of the motion, Mr. Chairman, is to move this process ahead. By moving this process ahead, point 1 of the motion was to

accept the recommendation put forward by the Clerk in terms of the waiting factor to select the prime consultant. Number 2: there was some discussion about whether or not all members of the Assembly should be interviewed or not. I'm suggesting that it's fine, let's go forward with an interview of all members of the committee. But instead of us spending the next three days here determining what the process for the interview will be, let's have a subcommittee of this particular committee meet. It can have a normal kind of makeup of representation: two from the government caucus, one from each of the two or three caucuses, whatever the normal makeup is. They can sit together and determine what the criteria will be in determining how extensive these interviews should be and then come back, and then we can move forward with this process. It's meant to move everything really quickly, Mr. Wickman, to move it forward.

Now, Ms Barrett may want to add something, if I've missed something.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, you know, I have some difficulties with what's being said because on the one hand we're talking in terms of moving it forward. We had a process in place at one time that I thought was moving forward, and then it ground to a halt. That particular subcommittee simply never did meet. There were no further meetings called. I simply don't want to be part of another scenario like that.

Mr. Chairman, if we're serious about moving this ahead, I would propose that we simply set up the subcommittee as we originally proposed. We set it up, we get it in place, and we have that subcommittee do the work of requesting the resources that they need. They make the determination as to who they have to interview, how long, and so on. Let's not do the work of the subcommittee. The subcommittee of independent people is going to be in place, but they're going to be so restricted by what we've come down that they're not going to have the flexibility.

This isn't moving the whole thing along. It's simply delaying it further and further and further. When did we start this process, Mr. Chairman? How far back? It was -- what? -- April or May when that first subcommittee met. We were talking optimistically about completing the work by June 12 and then June 30. Now we're towards the end of October, and we're talking about the subcommittee coming back to life.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's incorrect.

MS BARRETT: Well, ordinarily I don't have an interest in trying to be a liaison between two disputing parties in this committee, but today I'll try to do that. Obviously there were some assumptions that were made by some members of this committee which were not included in the tender that went out nor included or assumed in any of the bids that came back in. This is going to be a problem. If you don't generally have a consensus on the approach being used by the successful bidder, then you're going to just cause dissension in the subsequent process. I don't see that that's very useful at this point. I also don't want to sit here until midnight and try to work it through as a whole committee.

I am not particularly disturbed at any of the proposals that we've looked at. I think any number of them would be fine. However, if we've got a couple of people who aren't happy with it, then why don't we just get this subcommittee organized, get it to meet tomorrow or the next day, decide what style of interviews and what constitutes an interview and how many shall be done, put the recommendation to this committee, get it through the committee, and get it back to the successful bidder? I just think we don't need to spend much more time on this. I for one hate, you know, the

proliferation of committees and subcommittees, but in this instance I don't see any other way of getting out of the gridlock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Additional comments? A call for the question on the motion?

Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: I'd like to call for a brief adjournment, about four minutes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Surely. We shall reconvene at, I guess, 3:20.

[The committee adjourned from 3:14 p.m. to 3:19 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaking to the motion that is before us, we have had Public Works, Supply and Services, Edmonton-Jasper Place, Calgary-Foothills fleetingly on a subamendment which was not accepted, so therefore that doesn't count as having spoken to the motion, Edmonton-Whitemud, Edmonton-Highlands, Red Deer-North. Does anyone else wish to speak to the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a call for the question. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Calgary-Foothills at one time raised the possibility of a further amendment.

MRS. BLACK: No. But I have a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: After that, we will then deal with what the makeup of the subcommittee is. Oh, unless that's it. Thank you.

Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the subcommittee be struck and that it be made up of the minister of public works, the Member for Calgary-Glenmore, the Member for Grande Prairie, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, and the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I had some specific questions on the intent of this subcommittee. Can somebody tell me what the intent is in terms of a time line, who would chair it, and so on?

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that Calgary-Glenmore serve as Chair for the subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The chairman is named.

The second question is the time frame.

MRS. BLACK: I would ask that they meet as quickly as they can within the next few days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, my last question is: specifically what would the intent of the subcommittee be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was in the main motion, hon. member.

MR. WICKMAN: Just simply to address how many people are going to be interviewed?

MR. KOWALSKI: And the criteria. Yes.

MR. WICKMAN: So you're saying one meeting and we should be able to come back?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see the nodding of heads in the affirmative.

MRS. MIROSH: Did the Clerk confirm that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Confirm what, that he meet with the consultants in the next two weeks? Yes.

DR. McNEIL: Oh, yes.

MRS. MIROSH: There's not a problem for the group to come back within the next two weeks?

DR. McNEIL: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No problem.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there's one more question that should be answered. There never was a motion that indicated specifically that that particular consultant was going to be retained. Now, is it being assumed that that is now being done?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion was to concur with the recommendation as made by the Clerk, and that then meant that it was Peat Marwick. That was the motion that was indeed voted in the affirmative by all hon. members except one.

With the motion before us with respect to the subcommittee, is there a call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: Just to clarify. There was a reference made by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud about the work of the subcommittee, to which we were previously referring, grinding to a halt. Just for the information of members here, the minutes of the meetings of May 20 and June 15 were indeed distributed to committee members at the August meeting, and there was verbal agreement between the chairman of the subcommittee, the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, and the other members who were on the subcommittee that the work had been done. In June we agreed that unless we felt there was necessity for another meeting, there didn't have to be. That was how it was left. There was verbal agreement. I can see now, through some painful experience here, that I probably should have had that in writing from the other members. One member seems to be in some doubt about that. I just wanted to clarify that for point of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4(b) on the agenda, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Ah, the next item. Oh, goody. And it's only 3:25. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Some months ago I wrote to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services requesting some additional basic furniture for the Calgary caucus office of the Official Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member, I think we're back at the previous item. I'm quite happy to do 4(c), whatever.

MS BARRETT: Oh, the Confederation Room. Let me just see what happened. I think it had been tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: Okay, yes. Well, I'd like to revive the motion. All the same arguments stand. Who knows if the House is going to sit before there's another election, but if it does, I think the Confederation Room should be reassigned to the media for the purpose of interviews. As I said before, the Official Opposition has no particular interest in the room on the west side of the building. If government members still needed a meeting room, that could be converted to a government members' meeting room if it was necessary. The point is that we need to make sure that tempers don't rise in the hallways as interviews are being conducted. This is a good way to do that. It was a successful formula for many years. We could even go back to the divider system if people wanted. Do you remember those acoustic dividers that we used to have so that you basically got little interview rooms along the east side of that east room? The west side of the room you could just use for walking through or casual discussions. It was a very successful formula, and I think we should readopt it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The mover of the motion, Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, there was a subcommittee to be struck and to report back to this main body. I don't believe that subcommittee has had a meeting to discuss the usage of the room. I would move, then, to table this item until such time as the subcommittee meets.

MS BARRETT: Who's the Chair for that subcommittee?

MR. WICKMAN: I think you are, Pam.

MS BARRETT: I think I better convene a meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk has pointed out in the binder, if you go to 4(b), that while a motion was moved to be referred to a subcommittee, the committee did not vote on it. We had to have the adjournment of the committee because of a commitment of the members. Then when the item next came forward, it was tabled until this meeting. So this would be a further tabling to the next meeting; however, there's no subcommittee that has been formed. Therefore, not having a committee to refer it to, the motion to table is not in order. Thank you.

Calgary-Foothills, you still have the floor.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I therefore would like to re-move the motion to have the subcommittee look at the usage as was originally laid out in 92.127 in 4(b) of our binder and report back to the main committee at a subsequent meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the motion is to put that into effect. You've now taken up what was originally the Member for Edmonton-

Whitemud's motion. Thank you. It's a separate motion from the one before us. The one before us is that the Confederation Room revert to its former usage.

3:29

MS BARRETT: Okay. I'll withdraw the motion for the time being so we can entertain a motion to strike the subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member.

The motion before us, then, is the one as proposed by Calgary-Foothills that the subcommittee be established, and I assume comprising the same members.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I made reference to 92.127. The subcommittee would be comprised of Ms Barrett, Dr. Elliott, myself, and Mr. Wickman. Could we add Mr. Hyland to that? I'd move that we add Mr. Hyland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who's going to chair it?

MRS. BLACK: To be chaired by Ms Barrett.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The makeup of the committee: Grande Prairie, Calgary-Foothills, Edmonton-Highlands, Edmonton-Whitemud, Cypress-Redcliff. And the Chair to be . . .

MRS. BLACK: Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edmonton-Highlands.

That's the motion. Discussion? Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Well, maybe this is a good approach. I think we have to do something about what happens outside here. Every day after question period you have not one but two lines of depth, intermittent space in between. I've personally seen people come close to being injured in the jostling in a space which is not in any sense suitable let alone designed for the purpose for which it's used. If we're going to physically remove media from the surrounding rooms, then I think we have to designate a space where it can be done. That's usually what's done in the House of Commons or Queen's Park or other places. There is one interview area which is basically accessible to all concerned, and I think that's what the committee should look at.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is assuming that people have been injured. I'd like to see if there are any incident reports that indicate that there are a large number of people who have been injured. I think that perhaps we could get some sort of a report about safety.

MR. BOGLE: My only point, Mr. Chairman, would be that we are now beginning to prejudge the work of the subcommittee. Clearly one option in the mind of the member may be to take the Confederation Room, which is used as a government members' area when the Legislature is sitting, and turn it back to a media area. Another is to designate an area on the main floor or in some other part of the building, whether it be the media room or some other area. I just wanted to urge the committee when examining alternatives to keep in mind the need by members of the Assembly, both opposition and government, for rooms attached to the Assembly, so that when we are sitting there is an opportunity to have discussions with colleagues on a variety of issues, whether they're from the constituency or a minister with a department concern and a responsibility, and that there are alternatives other than the

Confederation Room. That may be the handiest for members of the press, but it is not the only alternative available.

MR. S. DAY: That was my point also, Mr. Chairman: that this subcommittee would not be restricted just to looking at that as the only option. In the House of Commons -- and you can see it virtually any night on the 11 o'clock news -- there is in fact a very clear line beyond which no media can go. Members coming out of the House can easily go up the stairway without even talking to the media if that's their desire. There's a very clear line, and nobody steps over that.

We've seen the media here use a number of options. Later on in the afternoon they set up their cameras at the bottom of the stairs, they set up their lights. There's lots of room to move. So I just want some comfort that this isn't just going to be the usual deadlock over the Confederation Room, the former usage of which, by the way, was not for media but for other uses. When you go back historically, it was fairly recent in the history of this building that for a short period of time it was designated for the media. Problems arose, notwithstanding some people's feelings about that, and then it went back to other usages. I don't want to see the subcommittee just stuck on one possibility but other options open to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare to the committee that I would not take a portion of the room back to its previous use as the Speaker's robing chamber and put up a wall again. I'm not interested in that.

All righty. We have a motion before us. Is there a call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

Item 4(c). Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Gee, I have the floor today twice in a row.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman -- both -- some many months ago I wrote to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and requested a couple of items of furniture for our Calgary caucus office. He wrote back to me at the end of June saying that this is actually a matter which would be pursued by Members' Services. The request is for a small computer table, a small working table, and a regular desk necessitated by the hiring of an additional employee but in particular one who has permanent spinal damage and can't walk around. The current configuration of desks is pretty hard for her, so if she's got her own set of everything, she can just use the swivel chair and won't have to get up. She has to walk with the use of canes. The nature of her job is essentially sedentary, so it's a request to facilitate a person with a disability.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I simply responded to the request. I was governed by a decision of this particular committee dated Monday, January 12, 1987, when the Members' Services Committee discussed the matter of members' offices furnishings, and a motion was passed at that time. Subsequent to that a decision was made about a package for Legislative Assembly constituency offices. I just simply don't know how to deal with another caucus office, because we're governed to provide furniture to caucuses within the Legislature Building and the Legislature Annex and constituency offices, and this is a new request for an additional type of caucus office. To my knowledge there is no other caucus office for anybody else outside of the Legislature Building and the Legislature Annex and offices outside of those which would be allocated to an MLA in each of the 83 constituencies in the province

of Alberta should they so choose one. This would just be an extension of it, and I just wonder what it would mean. Would every caucus then come to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, irrespective of whether it's the government caucus or the Liberal caucus or the NDP caucus, saying, "We're now opening a caucus office in a variety of different places in Alberta," and I'm supposed to deal with that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take that as a question back to Edmonton-Highlands, and then that would be followed by Red Deer-North, Calgary-Glenmore.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, this office was opened several years ago. It currently has some basic furniture which was supplied by PWSS, so what we're talking about is the addition of some furniture to accommodate an employee.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's not my information as being correct. I have a note from my deputy minister dated October 5, 1990, saying that caucus office furniture has not been supplied by Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services in the past. So if there's some public furniture owned by the taxpayers of Alberta in somebody's caucus office, I have no idea how it got there and what the basis of that would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't seen this facility, but is or was this adjacent to another member's office?

MS BARRETT: You know what? I'd better table this. A good question has been put, so I'm going to move to table it, and I'll come back with more precise information at our subsequent meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion to table, not discussable. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Do you want to adjourn for another few minutes?

3:39

MRS. MIROSH: The Calgary caucus wants an office in Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't believe the Calgary caucus has met to make such a decision.

MR. S. DAY: The Red Deer caucus wants one too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. members. Thank you. [interjection] Order please. I'm glad to see negotiations going on apace, but we had sort of thought about perhaps leaving the Chamber sometime this afternoon.

Item 4(d), Members' Services Orders Consolidation. Parliamentary Counsel speaking to this issue as a means of making things much more intelligible and certainly much more readily accessible.

MR. RITTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The consolidation as presented basically combed out a lot of the lapsed clauses. A lot of transitional clauses had been accumulated since 1983. It doesn't change anything. The Speaker wouldn't let me put in a special clause that increased my salary. I'd just kind of slip it in there, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ask him about his resignation.

MR. RITTER: Yeah.

The clauses that are all here are identical to what has been passed since 1983 and what is still in force. After taking all the things that are no longer of any force or effect or were transitional way back when, when we were changing health plans and that type of thing, the result is Members' Services orders that are a lot more like the *Revised Statutes of Alberta*. Some of the drafting has been cleaned up because it was kind of a patchwork quilt over the years. Items were renumbered. We had the fractional section numbers, and sometimes pieces of transportation would be supplied in one order and then in another order. So it's all been reorganized. There's nothing new here, and there's nothing that we had before that's been taken away. It's basically the same. It's now just put into a format that'll make it a lot easier to follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions?

MR. RITTER: Robert is showing up just the proposed format of the book.

MR. R. DAY: It's similar to your members' guide binder, where you put them in a binder.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This will be the companion to your benefits green booklet, and then everybody has ready access to what the current status is.

MR. RITTER: It will make it a lot easier to amend. When we have a new order, all we'll have to do is just send out the loose-leaf pages that have changed and all the little binders. That one's a prototype. We haven't got them printed up or anything. I just did one on the photocopier to see what it would look like and if it was readable, and it seems to be quite satisfactory.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's fairly technical stuff from the point of view of, you know, legal jargon I guess is the expression to use, and you have to assume this is an interim until the subcommittee meets and reports on new criteria, whatever is determined.

My question, though, specifically relates to one area that I don't really see in here, and that applies to the subsistence allowance and the change of rules that this committee made. Should that not be part of this package?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Parliamentary Counsel, would you like to give him that assurance?

MR. RITTER: Yeah. To the member. The revised consolidation that you have here has virtually every single clause that was in effect in the old Members' Services orders. This has been checked through the relevant departments as well and double-checked and triple-checked by administration personnel. As I say, it does not add anything and it does not take anything away that was there before.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to Parliamentary Counsel. How did it address the motion brought forward, if I recall correctly, by the Member for Red Deer-North?

MR. RITTER: I'm sorry. I request clarification.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, there was a motion dealt with by this committee that laid out that so many kilometres of paved highway from Edmonton, so on and so forth -- that those persons would be

exempted from a subsistence allowance unless they were here for so many hours, whatever.

MR. BOGLE: Page 10, the temporary residence: 5(1) and (2).

MR. S. DAY: And (c) deals with the 100 kilometres.

MR. BOGLE: Yes. The specific point he raises is 5(1)(c).

MR. WICKMAN: Specifically, exactly what that particular motion brought forward and approved by this committee. Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, as I read this, no motion is required. What's being brought forward by Parliamentary Counsel is a consolidation of previous orders. He has merely streamlined. He's not adding anything; he's not subtracting anything. It's merely a consolidation, a new numbering of previous orders past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct, but to see our tab there -- I think what we have here is our zeal to make sure that everything is passed on this date so that then we have it seen as a consolidation that's been viewed by this committee.

Parliamentary Counsel is going to have to rule on his own thing. Does it have to be passed?

MR. RITTER: Actually, Mr. Chairman, because the other Members' Services motions are already enacted right now, we would require a motion to repeal all the old ones. I've got it tentatively effective on November 1. The old ones would automatically be repealed on that day and replaced with the new consolidation. Otherwise, we'd have duplicate orders that would all be in force. It's very much exactly the same thing like in 1980 when we did the *Revised Statutes of Alberta*. We just repealed all the old outstanding ones and replaced them with the new ones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Other Business. No notification was given, but Other Business?

MS BARRETT: Could we do Date of Next Meeting now? That would help organize the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me; I didn't hear.

MS BARRETT: I'm sorry. You're not supposed to speak when you're doing that.

Can we do Date of Next Meeting now and then get the subcommittee organized, a date to report by?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm open to suggestions. Date of next meeting?

[The committee adjourned from 3:48 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; we're back on. Hopefully all members will review their calendars if not today, tomorrow and contact my

office so that we have some available dates as to when you might next meet as a full committee of Members' Services. Hopefully we might do this within the next two weeks. That will allow the subcommittee to meet at an early opportunity.

If the evaluation sheets of the proposal earlier in the agenda under item 4(a) are now collected, that would be useful.

Hon. members, the Chair notes that one member's on the move and takes it that the motion to adjourn is moved by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. All those in favour of the motion to adjourn, please signify. Carried. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 3:51 p.m.]