

## Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

11:08 a.m.

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. We started a little bit late. Hello to those of you out there in never-never land.

[Mrs. Black, Mr. S. Day, and Dr. Elliott attended by telephone]

MR. S. DAY: Good morning.

DR. ELLIOTT: Good morning from Bob.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That looks to me like we have everybody present or accounted for in one shape or another.

The proposed agenda is really just to deal with the item that's before us: the report of the subcommittee and the action. Do you have a consensus as to that being what our agenda is today?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. McINNIS: Can we possibly add an item about the electoral boundaries report? I'd just like an update on the \$300,000 that was advanced in August.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I really don't think that's part of what this meeting is all about, John.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I didn't receive an agenda until I arrived at this meeting. This shouldn't be a lengthy or difficult item, I don't think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you.

MR. S. DAY: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. The electoral boundaries report as it related to what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amount of money that was spent in terms of the previous funding.

MR. McINNIS: The \$300,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

Clerk, have you got some mental arithmetic on that, or do you want to go out and make a call?

DR. McNEIL: I'll get it. You bet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Those two items then: the report of the committee and action therefrom and this query with regard to electoral boundaries. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Did I see you guys with your hands up out there?

DR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: No.

MR. S. DAY: My foot is in the air.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Black, I said "guys." I knew you would be voting.

All right; the subcommittee report. The chairman of the subcommittee, Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Have those of you in never-never land received a copy of those minutes that were distributed?

DR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: Yes.

MR. S. DAY: Yes.

MRS. MIROSH: Good. You can refer to the first set of minutes of November 3. The subcommittee met to discuss a motion to hire the consultants and to lay out what we indeed wanted them to do.

MRS. BLACK: I don't have November 3.

MRS. MIROSH: You don't have November 3?

MRS. BLACK: I have November 9.

MR. S. DAY: I have November 3.

MRS. MIROSH: You do, Stock?

MR. S. DAY: Yes.

MRS. MIROSH: Bob, do you?

DR. ELLIOTT: No.

MRS. MIROSH: Bob, you were there anyway, so you know what happened.

DR. ELLIOTT: Yes, I was.

MRS. MIROSH: Maybe we could have yours faxed to you, Pat. You're at McDougall Centre?

MRS. BLACK: Yes, I am.

MRS. MIROSH: They're being faxed to you right now.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you.

MRS. MIROSH: At that meeting it was decided that we would have the consultants interview all 83 members if they wanted to -- some of them may not want to be interviewed, but they have that option -- and that 30 would be a benchmark -- in other words, they would have lengthier interviews, somewhere between 15 minutes and a half hour -- and that 10 of those 30 members would be followed around their constituency. So that would be divided 21, seven, and two. Is that right, Pam?

MS BARRETT: Twenty-one, six, three.

MRS. MIROSH: And then seven, two, and one for following the members around.

We passed the minutes of the November 3 meeting on November 9. We had another one with the consultants in attendance, and they gave us an excellent presentation. At least I thought it was an excellent presentation. You have those November 9 minutes, right?

MR. S. DAY: Right.

DR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah.

MRS. MIROSH: In those minutes we discussed the cost of interviewing all 83 members. That would be an additional cost of \$15,000, which was still lower than other bidders. So our recommendation is to move ahead to hire this consultant to do what we had outlined to them. I would like at this point, Mr. Chairman, to make a motion

to endorse the hiring of the firm of Peat Marwick Stevenson & Kellogg to move ahead and get this show on the road, so to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Discussion on the motion?

MR. S. DAY: Will this will be a final total amount, Dianne? In terms of just doing rough math, \$15,000 and 83 members, they're talking some \$180 for each member. I mean, I'm glad it's that low. I just don't want them coming back saying, "We goofed, and actually it's going to cost more than that." The \$15,000 will be a final figure? Do we have some kind of assurance on that?

MRS. MIROSH: Actually it could be less, depending on how many they interview. Not all 83 members may want to be interviewed. But that's not including expenses. Expenses are an additional amount.

MR. S. DAY: Depending on the travel, you mean?

MRS. MIROSH: Right. Depending on who we choose for them to go to.

MR. S. DAY: So other than travel, then, they really think this \$15,000 -- I mean, if they can do it for that, that's great. Per MLA that's a low figure. I just want them to be held to it.

MRS. MIROSH: They will be held to it. That's a commitment they made in writing.

MR. S. DAY: Okay.

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

MS BARRETT: Yeah. For all the members who weren't at these subcommittee meetings, I'd like to report first of all that there was consensus on this process. Secondly, I've been concerned that if they were conducting interviews with all 83 MLAs, the price tag could really skyrocket. What we finally agreed to, both between the members of the committee and the representatives from Peat Marwick, was that the 30 people benchmarked would get at least a one-and-a-half hour interview. Of those, a few -- I think a third -- would be interviewed on site, in other words in their riding, so the interviewers could get a feel for how much time you spend in your vehicle going from place to place, that sort of thing.

The remainder of the MLAs will have an option as to whether or not they want to be interviewed. If we approve this motion, what

will happen is a memo will go out to all members saying: "We have hired Peat Marwick. Here's the process. You, not being one of the 30, have an option to have an interview over the phone or in person. If you wish to exercise that option, here's who you call."

MR. S. DAY: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: I'm just trying to follow all the numbers in the report. The motion is to add \$15,000 to the Peat Marwick contract?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; the subcommittee's recommendation is "to endorse the hiring of the firm of Peat Marwick Stevenson & Kellogg." Then there would be a subsequent motion after that.

MR. McINNIS: Am I correct that there's a base contract and then there's an add-on?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: What's the amount of the base contract?

MRS. MIROSH: We had that last meeting.

DR. McNEIL: The base is \$100,000 plus an estimated \$5,000 expenses. That's excluding the recommendation phase, which is an option. Now we're talking about up to another \$15,000 for interviewing all members. So that would be the upper limit. Then another component is the travel component, which I assume the chairman of the subcommittee will speak to.

MRS. MIROSH: They can't give us the travel until we tell them where they have to travel. So they can't give us a cost yet.

MR. McINNIS: So \$100,000 is the base fee, plus \$5,000 estimated expenses.

DR. McNEIL: That was the original estimate of expenses.

MR. McINNIS: Then we're talking about \$15,000 plus additional expenses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Edmonton-Whitemud, unless I hear from the other of you out there on the telephone.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I can't hear what John is saying. I'm sorry.

MR. S. DAY: I can hear John on my line, but there is somebody rustling papers quite close to a microphone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll recognize your motion of censure of the chairman right after this. Sorry.

MR. S. DAY: Did I zap the chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, you zapped me. That's okay.

Okay; Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, just for the record. The Member for Edmonton-Highlands made reference to there being a consensus on this process. I don't believe there has been a consensus from day one as to the exact process we're following. I for one have always

stated that the process that would be more acceptable is to have the independent committee in place first, prior to the hiring of the consultants.

MR. BOGLE: Always?

MR. WICKMAN: I've maintained that position.

MR. BOGLE: Always? I'm not sure the *Hansard* will support that position.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Bob, you're going back three or four years ago or something. I'm talking in terms of this particular motion that we're dealing with at this time. [interjections]

11:18

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Order.

MS BARRETT: In the subcommittee you didn't mention that. When I said "consensus," we sat around that table and we talked about: do we interview all 83 MLAs or just 30?

MR. WICKMAN: Yes, and I don't agree with interviewing all 83. I never have. So there is not a consensus on the process. I just want that for the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Additional comments?

Is there a call for the question? All those in favour of the motion "to endorse the hiring of the firm of Peat Marwick Stevenson & Kellogg," please signify by raising your hand. In this room? Okay. How about out there?

DR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Red Deer-North?

MR. S. DAY: A hand is up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Calgary-Foothills?

MRS. BLACK: A hand is up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Opposed? It's carried.

The next motion.

MRS. MIROSH: Now, the next motion, the consultants. At the back of your minutes it says, "Other Decisions." Have you got it in the back of your minutes? We talked about how we would proceed once we hired them, and we talked about who would be interviewed. We passed that all 83 would be interviewed, 30 would be benchmarked for lengthier interviews, and 10 would be followed around. They want to begin as soon as possible. With Christmas approaching, members will be difficult to approach.

What we want from you is an endorsement of the subcommittee to be involved in the ongoing job evaluation plan, the consultants having a group to come back to to discuss some of their findings or if they have problems, whatever. So I would like to make a second motion, Mr. Chairman:

To proceed on the basis of the discussions carried on by the subcommittee as outlined in the draft minutes of November 9, which also includes continuing liaison between the consultants and the subcommittee.

So the subcommittee that currently exists would have ongoing liaison with the consultant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Discussion? Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: I have a question about the . . .

MRS. BLACK: Could John speak up, please?

MR. McINNIS: I have a question about the development of recommendations. I certainly agree with what Percy said on this occasion about having all of these issues and the data referred to an independent group to form recommendations to the Assembly for making changes. The question was posed earlier about whether the consultant is to give recommendations or not, and that was a \$5,000 additional expense for them to make recommendations. I just wanted to know which way the subcommittee is going with that. Are you in favour of the consultants bringing recommendations forward or not?

MRS. MIROSH: That's number 4. We have decided that we would hold off on that at this current time, that that's not part of this motion.

MR. McINNIS: So in effect the consultant will prepare data which will then go to an independent group.

MR. S. DAY: Is not the motion on the table to ask whether the subcommittee continues in a liaison, or are we talking about point 4?

MRS. MIROSH: No. The motion is just referring to the subcommittee's ongoing liaison. We aren't talking about recommendations yet.

MR. S. DAY: Is the subcommittee all in agreement with that?

MRS. MIROSH: We agree one hundred percent, even Percy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, I have here -- was it Taber-Warner on that point?

MR. BOGLE: Yes. I just want to be clear for the record that no decision has been made by Members' Services Committee vis-à-vis the question of an independent committee. It's been discussed. Suggestions have been put forward. No motion has been put forward . . . [interjections] Well, let me finish. No motion has been put forward, debated, and passed to create such a committee. So we should not slip into assuming -- and I'm not saying that it won't happen. For the record I wanted to be very clear that we stay with the decisions which have been made on this matter.

MR. McINNIS: So if I'm clear, the subcommittee will decide at a later date whether to seek recommendations from the consultant or not.

MR. BOGLE: That's my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Edmonton-Highlands, and then Public Works, Supply and Services.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Well, I'd like to speak to two issues at once. One is on the subject of: "Do you want us to develop recommendations?", a question put by Peat Marwick. My strong reaction in the subcommittee was no, no, no. You get the data, and it should go to an independent committee. Now, I said that on the assumption that we had passed a motion to strike an independent committee comprised of a list of nominees that I presented to the Members' Services Committee and which was amended there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd have to pull those minutes. I think we have those tabled, don't we? Isn't it on the table?

MS BARRETT: Oh, it's tabled. I thought it got passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know, because I haven't got the minutes right here.

DR. McNEIL: It's never been passed. It was tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll get that part checked.  
Were those the two points?

MR. McINNIS: I think my recollection is that it passed in the subcommittee but not in the Members' Services Committee.

MS BARRETT: Maybe that's it.

MRS. BLACK: What are we doing now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're still talking on the whole issue of the second motion "to proceed on the basis of the discussions carried on by the subcommittee [basically] outlined in the . . . minutes of November 9," where I am at the moment. I recognize the Member for Barrhead and then anybody else out there.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate that the sheet that Mrs. Mirosh brought forward here includes statement 4: "Do you want us to develop recommendations?" Quite clearly this would not be a discussion point at all. The motion basically says "proceed on the basis," continue consultation. Points 1, 2, and 3 were the three they talked about at the subcommittee, agreed to and endorsed by the subcommittee. If this sheet would have just arrived here without number 4 on it, we'd be moving right on. That's all the subcommittee said. I'd just ask everybody to agree with it, and let's just get the process going. We've always left open the opportunity that if we wanted to have a further discussion in the future either with the subcommittee or the Members' Services Committee to talk about them developing recommendations -- it could be forwarded to wherever we would choose to make them go -- that would be a decision later. You can't deal with that unless you first of all have the data base, and that's where we're at right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So is that the general consensus that I'm finding here?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Essentially strike number 4 off of that page so that the decision we're making is just the other stuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that can be construed as a friendly amendment in the reworking of this motion.

MS BARRETT: It's not in the motion. What's confusing it is the "Other Decisions" page.

MRS. MIROSH: My motion doesn't include this "Other Decisions" by Peat Marwick.

MR. McINNIS: That is different than the answer I got a few minutes ago, which was that the subcommittee would decide that later. It's the Members' Services Committee who will decide that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, Members' Services.  
Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, are the minutes in fact coming forward? Because I interpret the intent differently than it's been interpreted here.

MRS. BLACK: Percy, please speak up.

MR. WICKMAN: I asked if the minutes are coming forward specifically from the Members' Services Committee that dealt with this matter some time ago, after the original subcommittee report, which would go back to about, I guess, July or the end of June, at that particular time. The question now is: was there clear indication given by the Members' Services Committee that there would in fact be an independent committee set up? There seems to be some hesitation.

MS BARRETT: I think it got clarified. The Clerk and others said that the subcommittee agreed to this, presented it to the full committee, the committee tabled it and got to work on getting a consultant in place first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the matter is not a dead issue?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the matter has not been resolved. Thank you.  
Anything further, Edmonton-Whitemud?

MR. WICKMAN: No, that's everything.

MS BARRETT: Can we deal with the motion? I have to go to another meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any additional comments out there?

11:28

MS BARRETT: Call the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the question.

MR. WICKMAN: Could you repeat the motion?

MRS. MIROSH: I gave you a copy of the motion. The motion is to proceed on the basis of the discussions carried on by the subcommittee as outlined in the draft minutes of November 9, which also includes continuing liaison between the consultants and the subcommittee.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay, but I need a point of understanding here, Mr. Chairman. Is it very, very clear that this is not related in any fashion to an independent committee?

MS BARRETT: Oh, yes. It's just the consultant.

MR. WICKMAN: It's very, very clear that this motion does not preclude in any fashion the earlier discussion that related to the striking of an independent commission which has been referred to on many, many occasions, even in correspondence by the Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner, on this point of order again.

MR. BOGLE: The suggestion that the more you talk about it, the more legitimate it becomes -- it is an option, and it should be viewed that way, Percy. The motion put forward to strike an independent committee with the makeup as suggested by Pam has been tabled. It will be dealt with again, but you should not assume. If you're basing your vote on this motion on some extraneous matter, you shouldn't. The motion is as it stands: nothing more, nothing less.

MR. McINNIS: Just on a point of order though. I think the Chair took it as a friendly amendment, that recommendations were dropped from the discussion terms. I interpret that that means that question comes back to the Members' Services Committee, in which case we can debate who's making the recommendations, whether it's the consultant or an independent group.

MR. BOGLE: That's fair, John.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On my copy of my motion here I've put in brackets items 1 to 3.

Cypress-Redcliff, on that.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, that's just what I was going to say. The decision on that committee can't be made by the subcommittee. It has to be made by this committee here one way or the other.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have to go to another meeting, so I'm just going to give my vote orally. I'm voting in favour of this motion. I've got to run.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour in this room, please signify by raising your hand. Thank you. Those out there? Mr. Elliott?

DR. ELLIOTT: I concur, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Red Deer-North?

MR. S. DAY: My hand has turned white; I've had it up in the air so long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Foothills?

MRS. BLACK: I'm for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It's carried unanimously.  
Okay; Edmonton-Highlands has had to depart for another meeting. There was that one other item that related to the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Taber-Warner to speak to it.

MR. BOGLE: I can give a brief report on the matter.

MR. KOWALSKI: Let's get the question first, though, for clarity.

MR. BOGLE: As \$300,000 of unexpended funds from the Electoral Boundaries Commission had been allocated and this committee approved transferring those dollars over to the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries, the question was whether or not the funds were sufficient, where we were. I can give a partial verbal report at this time. Expenses to date include members' allowances, and there were four on a part-time basis; staff salaries, and there were two full positions; contract fees, two part-time services; surveying and mapping; and then printing of the reports. We allocated 3,500 copies for distribution. So the moneys expended on the report to this point in time, keeping in mind that the committee no longer exists, are less than \$250,000.

MR. McINNIS: Okay. Well, we can certainly debate the report at some other time. I don't wish to do that now. Is it possible to get at some point a breakdown of the \$250,000 among the categories that were mentioned: allowances, staff, contracts, surveys and mapping, printing?

MRS. BLACK: I can't hear, John.

MR. McINNIS: I was asking if it would be possible to get a breakdown of the \$250,000 as between the categories that Bob mentioned: allowances, staff salaries, contracts, surveys and mapping, and printing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. It'll come out when the figures are processed through the Clerk's office. Sure.

MR. S. DAY: All I can say on that report is: good job, Bob.

MR. McINNIS: Well, if we're allowed to express that sort of opinion . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whoa. Hold the phone. [interjection] Hold the phone.

Okay. There are no other items except . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, let's just be clear. From this point on the consultants will work with Dianne's subcommittee, and we can continue to proceed right away.

MR. KOWALSKI: Different issue.

MR. WICKMAN: But you're finished, I believe. I just don't want any confusion when we leave.

MRS. MIROSH: No; you're going to work with me, Percy, the same committee.

MR. WICKMAN: But the subcommittee will work with the consultants and they'll continue to flow. We're allowed to now complete that and then go back to Members' Services and hopefully at that time wrap things up.

MRS. MIROSH: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's indeed correct. The subcommittee continues to work with the consultants.

All right. I believe there's one other motion being sponsored by Red Deer-North to get rid of the chairman so that he stops using his hands or breathing.

MR. S. DAY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Motion to adjourn.

MRS. BLACK: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Calgary-Foothills. All those in favour, please signify. Carried. Thank you.

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