

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Wednesday, November 12, 1930

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

6:15 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay, then let's go back to November 4. Those are also under item 1 in your book.

MR APPLEBY: So moved.

MR CHAIRMAN: All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. So that covers that, and we can go directly into estimates.

MR STEFANIUK: Who moved the minutes of November 7, please?

MR CHAIRMAN: John. And Frank moved the November 4 ones.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is your machine on now, Mr. Chairman?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. Did you have something bad to say?

MRS OSTERMAN: No, no. It may be a matter of opinion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. We covered general administration completely in our last meeting, right? Okay. We have adopted the minutes of the meetings of November 4 and 7.

So should we go to the next heading, which is . . .

MR APPLEBY: Did we do Legislative Assembly?

MR CHAIRMAN: We did the general administration. That's all.

MR APPLEBY: Before you go to the next one, I wonder if we could go back and do Legislative Assembly.

MR STEFANIUK: The tab that says Legislative Assembly is the summary of all of them. We've done general administration, and the next one is members' indemnity.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would assume there isn't much we can say about that. They're fixed by statute, eh? I haven't checked the calculation. Do you know whether the calculation reflects the increases that are already provided by statute, or is it on the basis of present rates?

MR STEFANIUK: They're on the basis of present rates, because the increases cannot be effected until December, and we have no right to calculate increases ahead of time.

MR APPLEBY: This is also tied in with CPI, isn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: Right. Okay.

MR PURDY: One other question regarding benefits for members is the recent one we discussed around this table last week, the dental plan that's proposed. I don't see anything in here for that.

MR STEFANIUK: At the moment, Mr. Chairman, there is no departmental charge-back arrangement for any portion of the dental plan. An optional portion of the dental plan provides for an employee contribution.

MR APPLEBY: But there's no coverage for MLAs?

MR STEFANIUK: There's no dental plan coverage for anyone at the present time, because the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration has no plan for departmental charge-back. It's assumed, at least for the time being, that the basic plan which is provided wholly and entirely by the employer, that is, the province of Alberta, will be covered out of some sort of general fund the Treasurer will establish.

MR APPLEBY: The object, though, was to expand the plan to include MLAs?

MR PURDY: That's right.

MR APPLEBY: And it doesn't.

MR STEFANIUK: I have advised the Speaker as to what would be required in the event that the benefit coverage were to be extended to members.

MR APPLEBY: Okay.

MR CHAIRMAN: The proposed plan that I have here, that says it's supposed to start on October 1, doesn't include members.

MR APPLEBY: No. That's what we're saying. We wish it would.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Do you want to pass an appropriate resolution?

MRS OSTERMAN: If we look at that, are we looking at the entire thing -- isn't there a second part to it?

MR CHAIRMAN: There are two parts.

MR GOGO: Maybe I can summarize it. The plan is voluntary. It's not binding on anybody. There are two parts. Part (a) has no premium and certain benefits. Part (b) has a premium that's totally paid for by the applicant, according to the information. With respect, Mr. Chairman, I think, though, that we are dealing with a matter of principle, whether the coverage indicated on the document should include MLAs. Is that not right?

MR PURDY: That's the issue. I understand that we're not recognized to be included.

MR CHAIRMAN: The ministers are in it, incidentally. Well, if the MLAs are going to be included on the same basis as ministers, the same two options will be available to MLAs.

MR PURDY: The only reason I brought it up at this time is that we are on that appropriate . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I think that's very appropriate.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, maybe you could look into that.

MR CHAIRMAN: What would you like me to do?

MR APPLEBY: To see if the MLAs could be included.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. I would be inclined to make a representation that they ought to be, with the same two options.

MRS OSTERMAN: Would it be an option as to whether they even . . . I know a couple of people who feel everybody should have a dental plan, and that if the government is going to have a dental plan, then we're talking about the whole public. And I can hear a couple of people right now. So I'm wondering if it would then be optional, because I wouldn't want to commit our members to even a dental plan that doesn't cost them anything.

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe it's the sort of thing you should take back to your caucuses.

MR APPLEBY: This is the detailed information that John has, is it? Anyway, maybe we could study it a little more before we proceed further.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Would you agree then that we defer this until our next meeting, or shall we say, to the next meeting that is held after there has been an opportunity to check it with the caucuses?. Fred, is that all right?

MR MANDEVILLE: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it's deferred to the next meeting that is held after there has been an opportunity to check it with the two caucuses.

Apart from that, are we ready to deal with members' indemnities? We really don't have too much to be concerned about there, so long as we can be assured by the staff that they followed the statute. Okay?

The Speaker's office.

MRS OSTERMAN: I didn't realize that we had 50 per cent coverage for health care.

MR GOGO: That was passed a long time ago.

MRS OSTERMAN: I didn't realize that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe you're overpaid.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, Joe is paying Alberta Health Care.

MR APPLEBY: Well you and Joe had better communicate then.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are there any questions? You can see what the percentage changes are.

MR STEFANIUK: Do we consider members' indemnities approved?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, as I say, we really have no choice. I don't know if a motion here would . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Well, there are other estimates, Mr. Speaker, than what is provided for by statute. There are estimates of the subsistence allowance on page 12a, for example, based on a certain formula . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR STEFANIUK: So there are some arbitrary calculations involved.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR APPLEBY: Is that standard?

MR CHAIRMAN: The \$50 a day is fixed, is it not?

MR STEFANIUK: The \$50 a day is fixed, and we're estimating 120 sitting days by 61 members.

MR APPLEBY: How does the 120 compare to previous years?

MR STEFANIUK: It's probably high.

MR APPLEBY: Good. We may be back three or four times this year, you never know. I had thought we had approved all of that . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Sitting days divided by 5 gives you more than that, doesn't it? 120 sitting days divided by 5.

MRS OSTERMAN: That would make a fair estimate.

MR CHAIRMAN: Really, there's nothing . . . As I say, it's in the statute, and that's just a guess as to the number of days we may sit. I'm sure nobody can prophesy that. Do you approve the estimate then of the number of proposed sitting days? On your motion, Bill: all agreed?

MR GOGO: What's that called, members' indemnity and ancilliary matters?

MR CHAIRMAN: And allowances.

Now can we go the Speaker's office? When you're dealing with page 13a, you may want to be sure to look at the replacement page rather than the original.

MR STEFANIUK: All members' books have been updated with replacement pages.

MR GOGO: I wonder if I could ask about Code 350.

MR STEFANIUK: That's on zero-based budget, Mr. Chairman, on the figure submitted to us by the Speaker's office.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm trying to give a good example.

MR APPLEBY: Does this microphone and recording system come in here?

MR STEFANIUK: That is all explained on page 13c of your supplementary notes. It shows that it is for rental of reproduction, photocopying equipment.

MRS OSTERMAN: Do we own this equipment?

MR STEFANIUK: That's Hansard equipment, and the charges are against the committee's budget.

MR APPLEBY: Do you have a xerox machine down here, then?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR GOGO: The other question . . . I hate to appear stupid, but the asterisk, Bohdan, that's used for example in Code 004. What's that for?

MR STEFANIUK: Total or subtotal. It's opposite the percentage change.

MR CHAIRMAN: You have it in your code at the front, John.

MR GOGO: I just assumed it was something new.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you look at your glossary of terms at the bottom of page 3 at the front of the book, at the very bottom.

MR STEFANIUK: The control group total for a single asterisk, and a double asterisk is an element total. So the single asterisk indicates a subtotal percentage increase.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any questions about any of those items?

MR APPLEBY: Your contract employees come in there, your EA?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's it.

MR MANDEVILLE: I move that we accept it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fred moves that we accept it. Do you agree with it?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Should we go to government members?

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, the administrative officer for government members provided me with a list of changes which government members wish incorporated in the estimates.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would have been glad to have had those earlier today.

MR APPLEBY: They are a result of the last meeting, I think.

MR OSTERMAN: This is a result of members from my section. I take some responsibility for this.

MR STEFANIUK: The change, Mr. Chairman, is to Code 350, which is the second page of the explanatory items. It is an increase in the number of xerox machines in the government members' facility, from three to four.

MR APPLEBY: It means about a \$2,000 increase.

MR GOGO: Bohdan, a xerox machine costs us \$2,000 a year if we supply our own paper. Do we pay a per item cost in addition to all that?

MR STEFANIUK: The figure you have here reflects the per item cost, in addition to the basic rental.

MR PURDY: It's about three cents, isn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not sure what the plan is at the moment. It depends on the machine, the quantity, and so on. There's a fluctuation there.

MR APPLEBY: What's that plus 9.5 per cent on 350?

MR STEFANIUK: We've taken the current rental and added 9.5 per cent as an inflation factor. We can't do it with personnel items, but we can do it with equipment items, and we feel that's a reasonable projection.

MRS OSTERMAN: I hope everybody will concur with this.

MR GOGO: Now that you raise it, perhaps . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I move we refer it back to the caucuses.

MR APPLEBY: Do you want to take a vote?

MR STEFANIUK: As you can see, the totals are affected by that, and are summarized on Mrs. Pratt's memo.

MR APPLEBY: On the percentage change from the forecast. I notice there is an asterisked 20 and a double asterisked 15.

MR STEFANIUK: Those are the subtotals.

MR APPLEBY: So the subtotal, total expenditure is 15, is it?

MR STEFANIUK: The total increase is 15 per cent. As you can see, the first 15 on top is opposite the line that says manpower control group. So that's a 15 per cent increase in the manpower control group. Then the second one opposite the 20 per cent is on the total of supply and services control group, so that group is increased by 20. The overall increase is 15 per cent. I'm not sure whether it'll be affected or not by this additional \$2,000-odd.

MR CHAIRMAN: It'd be a fraction of 1 per cent. Any further questions? Fred, doesn't some of this spending on the government members arouse your suspicions?

MR APPLEBY: On the detail there, Code 150, allowances and supplement benefits have gone from \$600 to \$5,300.

MR STEFANIUK: We felt we had to make some provision for staff development. You see the formula on the detailed sheet for having calculated staff

development. That's to enable staff to attend courses that are offered by the government or outside agencies during the course of any given year. The detail is on your first page, explanatory note under Code 150. An allowance is made for staff development and conference fees, for the director of research and the researchers.

MR GOGO: Just so I'm clear in my mind. If there were a conference out of province that involved travel in addition to registration fees, it would come under that same item, right?

MR STEFANIUK: No, it wouldn't. Travel and accommodation would come out of travel, public service and non-public service. This covers only fees in connection with the conference. As you can see, travel is under Code 200. For the director of research and the research assistants, it is assumed that secretaries and researchers attending staff development courses would be taking those locally, without any need for a travel budget to be provided for that purpose.

MR GOGO: The only other question I have, Mr. Chairman, is in dealing with the estimates of government members, we come into estimates of other people. I guess this is a technical question for Bohdan, but in terms of Code 130, payment to contract employees, which is probably primarily research and research assistants. Somebody other than you, Bohdan, has the layout on this sheet of paper. Obviously, you don't determine that; you fill in the spaces.

MR STEFANIUK: The information is provided to us by the government caucus.

MR GOGO: I'm talking about the columns; for example, there are X number of members under government members, X number of members under others, and so on. I guess it's a technical thing, but I'm dividing in my head Code 130 by the number of government members into 196. Would it be possible in future to put that on a per member basis on the same sheet?

MR STEFANIUK: We could put it on as an addendum for this.

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure. Easily.

MR GOGO: Then I wouldn't have to figure things out in my head.

MR CHAIRMAN: Am I right that the total per government member is around \$10,000?

MR APPLEBY: \$11,000-plus, I think.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, we could work it out at the end.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you like us to add that calculation?

MR APPLEBY: I have to ask John: what is the purpose? Anyone can work it out for himself.

MR PURDY: It works out to \$11,119. It's not easy; it's easier with a calculator. I don't have it with me.

MR STEFANIUK: It's all divisible by 44.

MR APPLEBY: 43.

MR PURDY: 42.

MR GOGO: That's why it's not a bad idea for someone else to do it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Bill, what did you say that was?

MR PURDY: I was a little bit out because I had the wrong the figures. I said \$11,119, but it's a bit over that because I see the total expenditure is \$499,000 and I was working with \$467,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it's between \$11,000 and \$12,000.

MR APPLEBY: But I'm still concerned about John's question. Where did you want this to show in the estimates?

MR GOGO: Just opposite the various codes, that's all. Code 130: 196 divided by 42, 43, or 44 comes to . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: You want it done on a code basis, not on a total basis?

MR APPLEBY: Where it says government members' services, in brackets after that you could put 42 members. Anybody can do their own division.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think some of our members ask for relative figures. I've had that asked me a few times. They think they're not getting their share.

MR APPLEBY: They know how many members there are.

MRS OSTERMAN: But they don't get these figures, and I guess it would be easier to pull out if it were done. It would only have to be done once, and we wouldn't all be doing it separately.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

MR STEFANIUK: It works out to \$11,894.57 per member.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're moving that one, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: Okay.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's very appropriate. All agreed? As amended and as shown in your books. Carried.

The next one is the Social Credit caucus. I wonder if anybody is going to return the compliment, Fred.

MR APPLEBY: I'll move that one.

MR CHAIRMAN: You've seen the calculations on page 15a.

MRS OSTERMAN: The total is . . . This is one figure I don't show our members.

MR CHAIRMAN: And this is divided by 4?

MR MANDEVILLE: There is an 8 per cent increase.

MRS OSTERMAN: I know. But when you're already working on those kinds of figures -- I think I'm going to move over. I'd get treated better.

MR APPLEBY: Just wait until we get some more space, and then we can start complaining about that.

MR GOGO: That's really \$11,894 versus about \$100,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's not right is it? \$97,000 per member? I have \$97,601.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Notley's at \$96,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: So far.

MR STEFANIUK: It's \$97,000 all right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions about any of those items? The layout follows what it's been in previous years.

MR GOGO: You've sure as hell done a super job for your colleagues all these years, Fred.

MRS OSTERMAN: Do they treat you well after you come back from these meetings with that kind of budget? I think we ought to watch this smoothie a little closer here.

MR MANDEVILLE: I can recall in 1975, when there were only six of us in the opposition, \$150,000 allocated for research.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR GOGO: Total opposition.

MR MANDEVILLE: Right. On account of the small numbers. How far do we go with this? I mean, it can inflate or . . . It's an area where we don't have any policy set down. We don't know for certain. To start with, the \$150,000 came to the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier thought, on account of the small opposition. We had \$150,000, and then the Leader of the Opposition divided it up six ways.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's the same \$150,000 you mentioned in the first place. There weren't two?

MR MANDEVILLE: No. Just one.

MRS OSTERMAN: But it's inflated significantly.

MR MANDEVILLE: Yes, it has.

MR CHAIRMAN: Another thing that happened, as you recall, when Gordon Tailor left, the remainder of his allocation was divided among the five continuing opposition members.

MRS OSTERMAN: And then that was not pulled out of the budget the next year?

MR MANDEVILLE: Just divided up proportionately.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any questions? You moved it, Frank. All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried. Independent member: Mr. Sindlinger.

MR APPLEBY: The NDP comes next.

MR CHAIRMAN: It doesn't in mine. No, I take it all back.

Mr. Puxley is here from Mr. Notley's office, and I'm sure he'd be glad to answer any questions you might have. There's some explanatory material on 16a.

MR GOGO: Code 260, advertising. Could I inquire what that's for?

MR APPLEBY: The most substantial change here -- at least one of them, as far as I've seen -- is the Code 200, travel expenses, which have gone up from \$1,941 to \$8,000. I see there's a note about that here. It's suggested it should be 8 per cent of the total request.

MR PUXLEY: Mr. Speaker, the short of it is quite straightforward. In the year I've been there, we have not been able to afford to send me, for example, with Grant on any occasion outside the range of driving from Edmonton. So I inquired of Charlene as to what was a reasonable percentage of budgets that have been allocated to travel in other situations. She gave me the 8 per cent figure. I put in 8 per cent as a reasonable proportion, backing up with the fact that I spent out of my pocket, whenever I took Grant somewhere by car, quite simply because we can't afford it out of our present budget. This \$1,900 portion from last year was used almost entirely by Grant. So this would account for more staff travel with Grant.

MRS OSTERMAN: Then we would all take that, wouldn't we? Are we setting a precedent here?

MR CHAIRMAN: It depends on how your budget is set up.

MRS OSTERMAN: What are the other allocations for travel? We don't have an allocation for staff.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Notley has the same air pass as everyone else. He has the same deal on his car when he's traveling on constituency business.

MRS OSTERMAN: I guess I need a further explanation, because I don't understand the special treatment. His budget is already so huge in comparison to government members.

MR APPLEBY: I think you have to refer it to opposition members rather than government members. Social Credit travel expenses are \$24,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: But they're the Official Opposition.

MR APPLEBY: The category there -- this was the original idea for the additional funding, because of the size of the opposition and so on. In fact, they had a global budget for the opposition at one time and it had to be allocated by the Leader of the Opposition. I see that the forecast increase now for the Social Credit Party is 16 per cent, isn't it? That's \$4,000 over the \$20,000. If you divided what they were getting previously, which was something over \$3,000 per member, and now they're going to . . . No, \$5,000, and now they're going to about \$6,000 per member.

MR GOGO: Well, they have four and it's \$24,000, so that's \$6,000.

MR PUXLEY: The breakdown of the additional would be somewhat less than \$6,000, if you account for an average increase of around 9 per cent in the budget as a whole. I put in four conferences, travel to conferences, at roughly \$500 apiece.

MR PURDY: What kind of conferences?

MR PUXLEY: I presume they'd be conferences associated with staff development. In this case, I was talking about four staff people.

MR APPLEBY: What kind of staff development conferences do you go to?

MR PUXLEY: I haven't gone to any conferences.

MR APPLEBY: I thought you said you'd been to some on your own.

MR PUXLEY: No, I can't afford to do that.

MR APPLEBY: So you've included an estimate for these, is that correct?

MR PUXLEY: Yes. I'd pass this around if you like. As far as I'm concerned, the most important part of this is the 20 in-province trips, which I would suggest would cost a minimum of \$175.

MR APPLEBY: What would be the purpose of those?

MR PUXLEY: That would be for staff people going with Grant to events he is invited to in his capacity as an opposition leader, throughout the province. I suggest that the demands on his time are considerably more than the average MLA.

MR CHAIRMAN: Isn't there a question, though, of recognition? I'm looking at the thing from a parliamentary point of view rather than a party point of view. Isn't there a question as to whether any member, because he happens to have a special function outside the Legislature, should have, shall we say, some of the financial consequences of that function reflected by something that's intra-parliament?

MR PUXLEY: That may be. I think most of the demands on my time in that office come from people who are not necessarily party members at all. We certainly get calls from all over the province, and I would say that most of them don't have anything to do with any kind of partisan conflict, but they have to do with intercession with the bureaucracy or whatever.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, I've represented the ministers or the government of Alberta at numerous functions, and I remember attending one in Lake Louise that cost me out of pocket for everything except my gas to get there. I didn't get a cent for it, including the rental of a tuxedo, because it was a black tie affair, which I found out after I'd accepted to go. To use a well-known phrase, apples and oranges: this is what seems to me this is. Golly, we don't get this sort of travel allowance.

MR APPLEBY: Just in response to one of your comments, that you receive a lot of calls or do a lot of work for people who are not party members. I am sure each one of us does. This is a general thing. You get calls from people, and you don't say, do you have your card? I don't think that is really relevant.

MR PURDY: I've got to compare with what George said. I've gone to a couple of functions, too, where I've represented the government, and I've had to pay hotel rooms out of my own pocket. I think that's part of the \$500 a month I get as a member for expenses. That's what that expense amount should be going for in some cases. So for a budget increase like that -- I'm opposed to 20 trips in the province at \$175. Putting in the political part of it, there's going to be politics in these 20 trips, and if the leader of the NDP in the province wants somebody to accompany him, let the NDP pay for it.

MR GOGO: As I recall in the conversation, these 20 trips were for people to accompany the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, not the member himself. Is that right?

MR PUXLEY: That's right. This is staff travel.

MR GOGO: I probably wouldn't have any quarrel with that, if each other member could have the same thing.

MR PURDY: Well, I do.

MR APPLEBY: How could you have that? You don't have an executive assistant.

MR GOGO: I could take Marg Pratt here, or anybody I wanted, so long as somebody was paying for it. Why can't I take my secretary in my constituency and teach my stenographer in the constituency office how to file? At the wages I'm paying her, at \$3.80 an hour, she can't afford it. That's the sort of thing I'm thinking of.

MR PURDY: John has a viewpoint different from mine. I'm opposed to that type of increase for trips within the province. If it's going to be 20 trips into Grant Notley's Spirit River-Fairview constituency, that's a different matter. But if it's going to be 20 trips -- one into my constituency, one into Frank's, one into George's and so on -- I'm opposed to it. Because if they're going to come in there, they're coming in on a political basis, and at that time, the party itself should be paying for those trips.

MR PUXLEY: I would say the bulk of them would be to his constituency.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's a long way off.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do think it's precedent setting. I think that if we want to do this, it would have to be considered for all members, because we're not talking about the Official Opposition, which has a different status.

MR PUXLEY: If I could just speak to that briefly, I agree there is a difference in status between the Official Opposition and the NDP member. On the other hand, I think the overall opposition function, which is a very important part of the Legislature -- we do have to shoulder a considerable burden in that regard. We don't have the advantage of having government departments available to us in the field. As a researcher, it's quite important for me to be able to get out of Edmonton if I'm to do a half decent job of researching a variety of issues that come up. This is the kind of thing that this means to me as a staff member.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Just on that point. Do I understand you to say that if you go out to anyplace out here where there's a government office or something, research for Ag. Development Corporation or any of those places, you can't get

the same information we can? To get information, for example, on what the water flow is down the river or something like that, you can't get that information? Do you mean the government offices won't give you that?

MR PUXLEY: I'd say that in some cases that is true. In general, we don't have people in the field to look into a matter that's been raised in the field.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: We don't either. We have to go through the department to find that out, or else go on our own, if it happens to be in our constituency. But we don't have anyone out there to do it for us. I was concerned that the inference was that the government office wouldn't give it to you, but would give it to us. You didn't mean it that way?

MR PUXLEY: No, I didn't.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments? Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: We should have some type of guideline tied in here for coming up with a budget such as this, whether it's Social Credit, NDP, government, or whatever. I'd like to see us have a set of guidelines. Is our increase 8 per cent, 10 per cent a year, or what? And if the principle is right to start with, the increases should be on a percentage basis, not coming in item by item. It would be up to each office to allocate that money however they wanted to allocate it.

MR GOGO: I'm opposed for the reason I gave, which is different from Bill Purdy's. There's a great tendency for me to see some degree of similarity between the members of the Assembly, and I don't see it. For example, I posed a question. Presumably this travel grant here -- I don't suppose there would be any objection, if it were granted, that that person went to the constituency of Spirit River-Fairview, or any other, but primarily the constituency of Spirit River-Fairview, and assisted in the constituency office. Would that be disallowed?

MR STEFANIUK: I'm sorry. I didn't catch it.

MR GOGO: If that travel grant were granted to Mr. Notley's budget and was used for somebody from here to go to the constituency office in Spirit River-Fairview and conduct activities there, that travel grant would still be paid, regardless of the activities. Is that not correct?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. If a question arises as to whether an item should be paid, the first place you have recourse to is the description of that item in the estimates, to see whether it comes within that. Then sometimes, if we have a doubt, we'll go to the Auditor General and say how is he going to interpret this.

MR GOGO: My interpretation is that that is how it would be used, and I'm not entitled to that. I don't have a travel budget like that. All I'm saying is that I would like to see a similar thing done for other members.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we still talking about this? Am I correct, Mr. Puxley, that you say this doesn't relate to Mr. Notley's travel at all?

MR PUXLEY: No. That's staff travel.

MR CHAIRMAN: So you're saying the government members don't have that kind of allocation.

MR GOGO: That's right.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about the Socreds?

MR APPLEBY: They have \$6,000 apiece.

MR PURDY: What I look at, Mr. Chairman, is that it's quite a jump from last year. It went from \$1,941 to \$8,000. That's the increase being asked for.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: The actual in '79-80 was only \$671.

MR PURDY: Pardon me. That was the forecast.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't want to rush anybody or hold anybody up. Are we ready for the motion?

MR PURDY: I would move that the travel expenses for staff be held at \$1,941, as in the forecast for the 1980-81 budget.

MR PUXLEY: That's no increase at all over last year.

MR PURDY: Well, you only spent \$671.

MR PUXLEY: The year before.

MR PURDY: Pardon me?

MR PUXLEY: When I believe there were only two staff.

MR PURDY: You don't know what you've actually spent this year, then?

MR PUXLEY: We are right on target in terms of this period in the budget year.

MR PURDY: Sorry about that.

MR PUXLEY: If you remove the \$6,000 increase from the travel, the overall budget increases by slightly over 10 per cent over last year. I applied a 9.5 per cent yardstick to most of the smaller categories. That's the only one that's up substantially from last year.

MR MANDEVILLE: That would bring your total increase to 10 per cent?

MR PUXLEY: Close to 10 per cent.

MR APPLEBY: In view of the fact that Mr. Notley is the leader of a registered party, I'd like to move an amendment to that, that it be the same as the Social Credit, \$6,000.

MR PURDY: I withdraw my motion. I apologize for not looking accurately at the disparities in forecasts and actual expenditures in various years. I withdraw that motion and then we'll discuss the one Frank's making.

MR OSTERMAN: Are we ready to discuss that motion? Somebody's going to have to enlighten me, but I thought we had one Official Opposition in this

Legislature, who were given special status because of that designation. The Leader of the Opposition has duties, and does that person not also . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition gets a car and a salary like a minister.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: We'd also want to bear in mind that we have an Independent member coming up.

MR APPLEBY: He wouldn't be the leader of a registered party.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: No, he wouldn't, but some of these arguments could apply to him as well.

MR CHAIRMAN: With regard to this, I certainly don't want to get into debate on this on either side, but just perhaps as information, as I see it, being a registered party relates to election expense, which is outside the House. What we're concerned about here is something which is more in-house than that. We're dealing with Members of the Legislative Assembly as members. It seems to me we're not really involved here in the concept of registered parties. We can have a registered party with no members in the House, and we undoubtedly have.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Do we have any information on what's done in other jurisdictions? How many parties are recognized in the House for funding?

MR CHAIRMAN: It varies. No jurisdiction that I know of has a recognized party in the House with fewer than about five members, I think.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: On funding, I mean. Like the Official Opposition would be funded so much. What about other parties in other jurisdictions? How are they funded in the House? Do we have any information on that?

MR CHAIRMAN: I haven't made the comparison. As far as I'm aware, in the federal House, the funding for activities outside the House, such as constituency offices and so on, is the same for government members as it is for opposition members.

MR GOGO: Speaking on that, Mr. Chairman, as an individual, I think any member elected to this Assembly needs certain things to function: an office, a secretary, some research capability. The degree may differ. I think a person needs that kind of infrastructure within this building. As an MLA for Lethbridge West, I travel back and forth and perform my duties, hopefully in such a manner that I'm re-elected. I guess I have some quarrel when I see great differences between people. I get two hours of secretarial services a day, and I'm quite prepared to say that that's possible because of the number within my office and we can share it in such a way. I couldn't find it acceptable if I was sitting somewhere else in the House and somebody had to be a secretary for Connie for X hours and then come to my office and be secretary. So I'd go that far and say that whoever the member is, he should have a secretary. But I think there are very distinct limitations, and that's why I have quarrel with the travelling. I would love to have one or two researchers, and I'd like to send them to 20 places in Alberta, too. So I can't support it.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're discussing a motion which puts the figure of \$6,000 on this, are we not?

MR MANDEVILLE: As I said, we have to have some guidelines here. We're getting \$6,000 for travel, and I have to say that I have to support Frank's motion. I think we should leave it the same. I would certainly hope that before we come up with these proposed details of budget estimates, we'll have some guidelines, so we can't come out of our office and say, we want another sum of money to have our office function. Somebody has to have some guidelines set up before you can increase it. Is it 6 per cent, 7 per cent? Can you come in with different programs?

I can look at Social Credit here and see our increase for the year is 8 per cent. I look over at the NDP and see it's 14.5 per cent. How do you come to these figures?

MR CHAIRMAN: If I may say so, I think you have a valid point, Fred. The only thing is that there is no way we're going to work out guidelines in sufficient time to apply them to these estimates.

MR APPLEBY: In respect to that, too, it's pretty difficult to tie yourself into a percentage guideline when the government members are so far behind the opposition members in the type of services we're able to provide. Space limitations are the biggest factor there, where we can't increase services we're able to provide. I think we'd have to look at it pretty carefully.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we should deal with this motion first, I think. We have the motion to make the figure \$6,000. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor? Opposed? Okay, then the matter's at large again, unless somebody comes up with another figure.

MR PURDY: I think until we get some guidelines and so on, I would move that the budgetary requirement for 200 be \$1,941, plus a 14 per cent increase, which reflects the rest of . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you want to put some round numbers on it? \$2,500?

MR PURDY: \$2,212 is what I work it out to, at 14 per cent. Somebody can correct my arithmetic if they like.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to put it in at that exact dollar amount?

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't like your rationale as to why it should be that.

MR PURDY: I just meant the overall budget at 14.5. I could say around \$2,300 then, which would bring it up to . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The motion then is to make the figure \$2,300.

MR PUXLEY: The 14 per cent is only 14 per cent because of that inflated travel expense. It's more like 10 per cent.

MR PURDY: I appreciate that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? Those in favor of the motion to make the figure \$2,300? Three. Opposed? Carried. I thought I counted right. Three to two, eh?

So there's one amendment with those estimates. Is there any other item that you want to give further scrutiny or consideration to? Is there a motion for approval of the NDP estimate as amended?

MRS OSTERMAN: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: All those in favor? Opposed? Carried.

All right, do you want to go now to the B budget proposal? We can go to it at this time. It doesn't matter. Do you want to volunteer?

MR PUXLEY: The rationale is the same, Mr. Chairman. If I could pass out one other thing in support of this. It comes down to the same question, whether it's funding an opposition function or just another MLA. The workload in the office stems in part from the demands of the Legislature: preparation of legislation, constituency demands, whatever. But we get between 2,000 and 2,500 requests for help from all across the province. We now have one clerical person and a legislative intern, and three permanent staff.

MR CHAIRMAN: How many requests was that?

MR PUXLEY: Between 2,000 and 2,500 per year. Many of these are recorded. Some of them require a lot of time; some can be dealt with almost immediately on the phone. But in terms of a period of time like this when the Legislature is in session -- it's just nuts working there at the moment. As I say, one clerical person can't handle all the calls that come in. It's very difficult for the rest of us to maintain our hand as far as the Legislature demands are concerned. So the most important part of the B budget, as far as I'm concerned, is the request for an additional clerical position.

MR CHAIRMAN: When you say present staff is two executive assistants, one researcher, and one stenographer, are those all paid out of public funds or are any paid out of party funds?

MR PUXLEY: Those are all out of public funds.

MR CHAIRMAN: In addition, have you staff on the premises paid out of party funds?

MR PUXLEY: No.

MRS OSTERMAN: We have added constituency offices from last year.

MR PUXLEY: And that's probably created an increase in our workload.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you like to give it up?

MR PUXLEY: The constituency office?

MR CHAIRMAN: I mean to reduce the workload.

MR PUXLEY: It's not for me to say.

MR GOGO: Speaking to the B budget proposal, Mr. Chairman, a reference was made with regard to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and other MLAs, and that he's not like other MLAs. I think the recognition of that is that he has a budget eight times that of other MLAs, and I think that's sufficient.

MR APPLEBY: I'm looking at these figures. They're quite interesting. Estimated that the office deals with 2,000 to 2,500 cases. I would estimate that my office alone deals with 600 to 700 cases in a year, and all I have is a part-time secretary.

MR CHAIRMAN: How many did you say?

MR APPLEBY: 600 or 700 requests for various things, information and so on.

MR MANDEVILLE: I wish I could get by that easy, when calls I get in my office when I get home . . .

MR APPLEBY: I'm not counting the calls I get at home, Fred, just the ones I get here.

MR PUXLEY: This has nothing to do with the calls Grant gets in his constituency. This is in the office here.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'll bet you Candy gets more than two and a half a day.

MR APPLEBY: Probably. I was just doing it off the top of my head and being fairly careful on that. I don't think that's too much to expect at all.

MR PUXLEY: I guess I would add it on top of what I would consider to be the opposition function; that is, to research and monitor what is going on within the government, prepare a lot of legislation, compared to the average MLA. Considerable demands are made in terms of other kinds of engagements Grant is involved in because he's an opposition member, which require my time as a staff person. I don't think I've ever worked hours as long and hard as I've worked here at the Legislature. I think it's a public service that I perform. So I'm making an appeal as a staff person on the question.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you say that you'd have roughly about 22 working days a month?

MR PUXLEY: Myself?

MR CHAIRMAN: In the office, that you're opened.

MR PUXLEY: About that.

MR CHAIRMAN: For 12 months. That comes to around 260. So if you're getting 2,500 inquiries a year, you're right around 10 a day.

MR MANDEVILLE: I think anybody's office would be getting that many calls a day.

MR PUXLEY: I'm not talking about phone calls. I'm talking about calls that require our time in pursuing . . .

MR APPLEBY: For something to be done.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're including mail?

MR PUXLEY: I guess I am including mail.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think we should all be in a position to more thoroughly -- I suppose I should put it that way -- research the requests that come in. I'm just not sure how far you go in that regard. We could each have an extra person just on that account. I think people who make inquiries . . . I know I make sure they're onto the area to which the inquiry should be directed. We have a civil service that is supposed to be doing some work also. Unless they

have a complaint with a person in the civil service, and then of course you have to ascertain who that is and make sure somebody's apprized of that.

MR PUXLEY: I'd say that is most often the case, in my experience. They do have a complaint. The first thing I would do is refer them to the appropriate people in the civil service, but may be something they have already been dealing with.

MR APPLERY: Tell me, in these situations, when you get a call, I presume you get them from all over the province.

MR PUXLEY: Yes.

MR APPLEBY: Suppose you get one from Highwood. Is your first question, have you referred this to your MLA?

MR PUXLEY: Usually I find out who has been involved in it, yes. I usually contact others who have been involved, so I'm sure I'm not responding in a one-sided way. It take some time to research them.

MRS OSTERMAN: If I may follow up on that. I have never gotten a call from anybody who has said they've checked with your office first. You probably don't have 2,500 cases coming out of your constituency. We're MLAs. It doesn't matter what political stripe people happen to have; we represent all the people in our constituency and certainly must make inquiries on their behalf. I for one would appreciate having people from my constituency referred to me. If I don't do the job and they have to come to you, that's altogether different. But I think that in terms of doing the job, the kind of extended resources you people have are just incredible. I just feel that within that sort of budget you should allocate in terms of your own priorities.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion?

MR PUXLEY: As I say, the plea here is particularly for an additional clerical person. I believe the woman working with us now is overworked. I don't think that's going to change by a shift in our priorities, because the demands are still going to be coming in. It's just a question of our being overworked. It's that simple.

MRS OSTERMAN: I suppose we all feel that way.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'll bet you Candy does.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'll move that the B budget be denied. I can't honestly see it. There's no politics involved in that motion. It's strictly a matter of what we do and what our staff are doing. I can't see why one member should have that extra help. I know the five of us in our room don't, and I assume it's the same with the rest.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion of the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much for coming.

Should we go back to the A budgets now? We're up to the Independent member.

MR GOGO: Have we passed the . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: We passed the A budget as amended and rejected the B budget. Now we're on the A budget of the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: John's description there that every member should be entitled to an office, secretarial help, and research help. I can't see this differentiating between members. We set the precedent last year of the B budget on one member, and it's just escalated. I can't see this here. I think that if he had an office and secretarial help -- well, I can't see why he needs any more travel allowance for his constituency than I do, or why his freight and postage, telephones, repair of machinery, material, and supplies . . . That's all here. I think that if he gets an office and secretarial help and research help, I should think he should consider himself a lot luckier than the rest of us.

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just on this 1980-81 portion of the expenditure year, would that have to be by special warrant?

MR CHAIRMAN: I expect. I rather doubt that we can shift funds. In fact, we can't, because that's more than the total was for the whole year.

MR GOGO: I wanted to ask the Clerk, but I'll hold my remarks until he comes back. They're of a technical nature related to salaries for a clerk and that kind of thing.

MR PURDY: I'm going to agree with what George has just said. I think if a person would have been elected to the Alberta Legislature as an Independent, then he has a case. But when you sit in the House as an Independent member, there's a difference there. He just serves the one constituency. I just don't see the amounts he has under the various codes being -- materials and supplies. Those are supplied through the Legislative Assembly anyway, the paper and all that. Professional, technical, and labor services: I imagine he's talking about research there. I can anticipate repair and maintenance to machinery and equipment. Telephone and communication: that's paid for anyway under the . . .

MR APPLEBY: If he's talking about research in 430, I'm not sure what he's talking about in 130.

MRS OSTERMAN: Maybe we ought to have that clarified.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make some explanatory remarks about that, Bohdan?

MR APPLEBY: John, you had a question?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't have anything to offer.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Bo if he would mind looking at the budget of the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I'd like some guidance. Code 100: a member in the Assembly requiring a secretary. Is \$16,000 the going salary, or is \$20,000?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't believe we have any secretary -- in fact, no secretary in the classification of a Clerk Steno IV, which is the member's entitlement, would be making \$20,000. I think the highest -- and I think the secretary Mr. Sindlinger has engaged is \$16,000 and change.

MR GOGO: Say that was \$17,000. Code 120, if the Clerk Steno IV at \$17,000 takes sick for a week, presumably someone has to be hired to replace that person. Is that what the wages are then?

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. Wages for that or for a stenographer taking annual vacation leave and having to be replaced for a two or three week period, depending on the entitlement.

MR APPLEBY: Do you have any guideline as to what the average steno collects in a year in this respect? Would it be \$400, \$500, or more? It'd probably be salary for half a month, I suppose.

MRS OSTERMAN: What's the average of having to replace somebody?

MR APPLEBY: \$10.50 an hour is it?

MR STEFANIUK: About \$10.50 an hour is the going agency rate these days.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at the request for \$24,500 for secretary staff for the year. I hate to keep harping back to my situation, but I know I get two hours per day of secretarial staff, and it sure as hell is not \$24,500 a year. I feel very strongly that a member of this Assembly should have an office and a secretary and some of those things. What I'm searching for -- and I have the one figure, \$17,000. I'm prepared to go as high as Clerk Steno IV. The one I'm searching for now would be wages, and if a person were off two weeks a year sick and they had to hire somebody, maybe that figure should be \$500 or \$800. I want to put these things on the table and see what other people feel. I'm prepared to spend as much time as necessary on the member's budget. I don't want to appear to be rushing through it.

MR STEFANIUK: For lack of any information from the member, I can only refer members to the budget of the NDP member, who reflects, I believe adequately, the cost of one secretarial position and the value of wages for replacements and so on.

MRS OSTERMAN: Which is?

MR STEFANIUK: Wages is \$1,314 in the NDP member's budget.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is that for one secretary?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: And has that normally been spent?

MR STEFANIUK: You see that \$1,005 was spent in 1979-80 by the NDP member. The forecasted expenditure for the current year is \$1,200, and that's been increased to \$1,314 for the next budget year.

MR APPLEBY: So if you took the figure of the \$20,000 for the two of them . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: That's the Socreds. Do you want the NDP? I think that \$1,200 figure would be more accurate.

MR APPLEBY: There's \$1,300-something for the NDP one. It should be equivalent, I suppose.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Maybe that's replacement of more than one staff.

MR APPLEBY: The others in the NDP office are all contract, are they not?

MR STEFANIUK: That amount shown in the NDP budget would reflect one position. He couldn't have more than one stenographic position.

MR APPLEBY: You're right on with that \$17,016 for their salary, too.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, Code 130, payment to contract employees. We have eight interns. I wonder if you can highlight the way they're broken down now.

MR STEFANIUK: Interns are not covered under contract.

MR GOGO: No, but I want to consider that in dealing with contract employees.

MR CHAIRMAN: Because of the division of the House being the way it is, there is a substantially larger amount of intern time per member spent on opposition members than on government members.

MR GOGO: Four out of the eight on government members now?

MR CHAIRMAN: Four on the opposition side, four on the government side.

MR APPLEBY: Will there have to be a reallocation for those opposition ones to give Sindlinger some?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. He knows that. We've discussed that with him.

MR GOGO: So Mr. Sindlinger will be entitled to some intern assistance, because that's important in considering Code 130.

MR CHAIRMAN: In that regard, if we have equity between him and Grant Notley, for example, both will get very considerably more intern time per member than any government members.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is the contract employee a researcher?

MR APPLEBY: Yes. I don't know what you're paying researchers these days, Fred.

MR MANDEVILLE: I couldn't tell you for sure what they're getting. I know we have two researchers in our office. I can't tell you what their salary is.

MRS OSTERMAN: Ours are not over \$20,000.

MR APPLEBY: They're in around the \$17,000.

MR MANDEVILLE: I'd say \$15,000 to \$16,000, although I'm not accurate on that.

MRS OSTERMAN: So if we had \$20,000 under research, that would be more than . . .

MR APPLEBY: I would say \$16,000 or \$17,000 at the most.

MR GOGO: Government members are getting about \$4,600 per member for research.

MR APPLEBY: How much? It'd be more than that.

MR GOGO: \$196,000 divided by 42.

MR APPLEBY: Oh, yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to go through the proposed budget item by item?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Expenditure Code 100.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go through it tentatively, without actually voting on it. Could we do that? Instead of the way we've been doing so far.

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. As we go through it, do you want to deal with both figures? I realize we can't do anything about the remainder of this year, except that on your recommendation I would ask for a special warrant.

MR APPLEBY: Then we can make a prorata decision basing the balance of this year on . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. So let's go to Code 100, salaries and permanent positions. Are there any observations in the first column?

MR GOGO: \$17,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: In the second column. What does that do for you on the first column.

MRS OSTERMAN: We'll go back after.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then Code 120 . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: How about Code 130? That person has to work independently. I don't know whether that makes a difference -- by himself, instead of with other people -- whether that makes a difference in terms of . . .

MR APPLEBY: All researchers do that when they're working on a specific project for specific people.

MR CHAIRMAN: They don't supervise each other; they don't have a director or research over there.

MR APPLEBY: Fred's people are right in line with that same kind of salary range.

MR MANDEVILLE: I would say right in there.

MRS OSTERMAN: \$ 7,000?

MR MANDEVILLE: You'd get a good researcher for \$17,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Employer contributions is pretty well a consequential figure we'll have to calculate from the others.

150: allowances and supplementary benefits. I think that is also a consequential figure, is it not?

MR STEFANIUK: No. Allowances and supplementary benefits is that figure which looks after staff training, you recall.

MR CHAIRMAN: Ah, yes.

MR STEFANIUK: Conference attendance and whatnot.

MRS OSTERMAN: Fred, what do your people get per person in a training allowance, if that's what we're talking about?

MR MANDEVILLE: I don't think it's spelled out individually.

MR APPLEBY: Around \$900 and some odd per MLA.

MRS OSTERMAN: I was thinking of the number of positions they have as opposed to per MLA.

MR MANDEVILLE: I don't think you could relate it. It would have to be on the position.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, on a position basis.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: How many positions do you have in that?

MR MANDEVILLE: We have three.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: And there's \$3,900; that's about \$1,300 then.

MR APPLEBY: That figure looks fairly reasonable then.

MR CHAIRMAN: So what do you say on Code 150?

MRS OSTERMAN: The \$1,000 seems to be right. If anything, it could be higher. Well, maybe we should be looking at somewhere in between the two. I suppose ours is maybe significantly lower in terms of the government staff who would be eligible for this sort of allowance, the supplementary benefit. Have we got the amount per staff person who qualifies for it in our group?

MR STEFANIUK: There was an allowance of \$100 per secretary and \$100 per researcher for staff development. Then there was, I believe, \$300 per researcher for a conference fee.

MRS OSTERMAN: \$1,000 is very high.

MR APPLEBY: Ours is \$400.

MRS OSTERMAN: Okay. The \$1,000 is more than reasonable.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on Code 150? Anybody want to change a tentative figure in there? Okay.

Do you want to deal with manpower control group or go through the rest of it first?

MRS OSTERMAN: Let's go on to the rest of it.

MR APPLEBY: That's just a total.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right. Code 200.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: There shouldn't be anything for that. We don't have anything.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's public service and non-public service.

MR APPLEBY: The opposition people get \$5,500 for their office, the Leader of the Opposition. He's asking for \$5,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: Of course the members travel by plane.

MR CHAIRMAN: This would be for staff people.

MRS OSTERMAN: Oh, for staff people.

MR CHAIRMAN: The same kind of discussion we had in relation to Mr. Notley.

MR APPLEBY: \$6,200 we've got in there.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Notley got \$2,300.

MRS OSTERMAN: For how many people?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Four. But then he wants to go all over the province, and Sindlinger is just one constituency.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't want to get into the debate, but I really think we should keep the parliamentary point of view here, to play an old record.

MR APPLEBY: Well, we've allocated \$2,300 for Mr. Notley. Can we divide that by two -- because he's got four people, and Tom will have two -- so it would be \$1,150.

MR CHAIRMAN: So, tentatively Code No. 200 is . . .

MR GOGO: Tom would have two what?

MR APPLEBY: Two staff.

MR GOGO: That's applicable to secretary as well?

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're including that kind of staff for the other people. Did you have your hand up, Connie?

MRS OSTERMAN: No. I'm just thinking of explaining this to other people. Right now, what are we allowed for government members to take a staff person along?

MR APPLEBY: \$6,200 total.

MR APPLEBY: Divided by staff, 22 I think.

MRS OSTERMAN: Including the researchers?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MR GOGO: \$300.

MR WHOLSTENHOLME: When do we ever get that used? It must be all researchers, and so on.

MR APPLEBY: No. Some of the secretaries go to training seminars and things.

MR CHAIRMAN: You get those in the city here. You very seldom pay more than \$75 for a thing like that.

MR APPLEBY: We have no travel allocated for our secretarial at all, I don't think. I think it's all for researchers.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there a tentative figure there, then? Somebody said \$1,150.

MR APPLEBY: I was just dividing it up to see what it came to.

MR GOGO: So I'm clear. So, public service/non-public service -- secretary would be public service?

MR STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR GOGO: Research assistant would be non-public service?

MR STEFANIUK: Research assistant would be public service. Non-public service is the member.

MRS OSTERMAN: The member already has all travel paid.

MR STEFANIUK: No. The member has the use of a credit card between the constituency and the capital. That's the only purpose for which the card is issued.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's the air travel. But the gasoline and . . .

MR STEFANIUK: The member can claim mileage, or as a matter of fact the member has a gasoline credit card.

MR APPLEBY: Well, let's get a figure folks. \$500? Or whatever.

MR MANDEVILLE: I'd say if he's got half the staff that Notley's got, we should give him half of what we recognized the NDP member for, which would be \$1,150.

MR APPLEBY: Let's put that figure in and we can come back and make an adjustment when we see what the total comes to.

MRS OSTERMAN: Then by taking that figure, you're acknowledging that he has the same status as the other member that we're talking about. I guess I don't believe that. I think there is some difference.

MR MANDEVILLE: I think this is just a training program, so I would think a person could look at it a little differently.

MR CHAIRMAN: So, I've got \$1,150 down tentatively. If anybody wants me to change that, I will. All right, freight and postage.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's already paid, is it not, out of the Legislative Assembly?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: What does he do that we don't?

MR GOGO: Government members have a budget of \$200.

MR CHAIRMAN: Per?

MR APPLEBY: \$219, total. I wonder what that's expended for.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is there any rationale for that figure?

MR APPLEBY: The Social Credit opposition has \$5,500. Is most of that postage?

MR STEFANIUK: It could be postage, it could be special shipments of printed materials.

MR APPLEBY: The postage, though, for normal mailing is from general administration.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I can't see the need of that at all. In fact the longer we talk here, the more enticing this looks to sit as an independent PC and get all these benefits.

MR APPLEBY: You wouldn't get on this committee.

MRS OSTERMAN: Now, now.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Hell, I'd have a lot less worries and problems, arguments.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, there are obviously some unforeseen things we should allow a little for. Maybe \$100.

MR CHAIRMAN: I've got \$100.

MR APPLEBY: What's that rental for? The xerox?

MR STEFANIUK: It wasn't described to me. I'm sorry, I can't tell you.

MR CHAIRMAN: He put it under Code 350.

MRS OSTERMAN: The one thing the member would need that doesn't come out of general Legislative Assembly funds could be a xerox. Is that right? There isn't one for general use in the building?

MR STEFANIUK: Oh yes. Any one of the machines located in the Clerk's office are available to anyone.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's not very handy for someone on the first floor, though.

MRS OSTERMAN: There are a lot of us . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Code 350 says in the explanatory note: payment of rental and lease agreements, e.g. vehicles, long term; photocopy equipment. There's no vehicle involved.

MR GOGO: Bohdan, if we put one in that office -- we amended the budget earlier tonight for \$1,000 for a photostat machine in another office, so that would be a reasonable cost.

MR STEFANIUK: \$2,000, the amendment was earlier.

MRS OSTERMAN: \$2,000 for the rental of one machine.

MR APPLEBY: How be if we go to Notley's for a reference on that. His is \$355.

MR STEFANIUK: Owing to his location, he can use the machine in the Clerk's office on the second floor.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Well, my secretary looks after five, and she goes one floor. His one secretary to one man, surely could go one floor more.

MR GOGO: The point is, is that service available somewhere else in the building?

MRS OSTERMAN: The Clerk is assuring us that it is, and that we're not going to have a major tie-up of the machine. If that were to happen, I would want to be assured that the machine is not only there but is accessible. And you're saying it's not tied up that much.

MR STEFANIUK: I can't promise you that it's going to be accessible. For example, last week when we did not receive from government printed copies of Bills 79 and 80, we were constantly photocopying those two Bills. As you know, they are very thick documents, and the machines were constantly tied up.

MR APPLEBY: Both of them?

MR STEFANIUK: Both of them. We've had to fight for machine time during the fall sittings.

MRS OSTERMAN: Then that puts a different light on it.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: It puts the same light on our office.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, that's true.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Notley would have been in the same position, too.

MR CHAIRMAN: So, is there a figure? Time's aflittin'.

MR APPLEBY: Zero.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That's what I'd say.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Telephone and communications.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That's all paid.

MR GOGO: Government members' budget is \$500.

MR APPLEBY: The opposition is \$150.

MRS OSTERMAN: What kind of calls are we . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Under the explanatory note, it says costs for private telephones, long-distance tolls, telegraphs, et cetera.

MR APPLEBY: He has a credit card.

MR STEFANIUK: Well, what we have to do, for example, in some instances where private telephone lines are not normally available -- as you know, some members live in areas where private telephone lines are not available, and we have to pick up the difference.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's certainly not going to apply in Calgary Buffalo.

MR STEFANIUK: It also covers telegraph.

MR APPLEBY: \$100 there should be ample.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay, \$100. Repair and maintenance of machinery and equipment.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: What machinery would he have to repair?

MR CHAIRMAN: Typewriter, dictating machine, transcribing machine..

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Aren't those all government property?

MR CHAIRMAN: Don't we cover those from our central budget, Bohdan?

MR APPLEBY: The opposition doesn't have any charge for that.

MR STEFANIUK: We cover those out of general admin, just as we do the equipment, unless there is something special.

MR CHAIRMAN: Out?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Zero.

MR CHAIRMAN: Professional, technical, and labor services, Code 430.

MR APPLEBY: Now, what would that be?

MR CHAIRMAN: Under the explanation: payments for labor or professional service that are not subject to an employer/employee arrangement, e.g. consultants, printing contracts, security contracts. Those aren't going to be applicable.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I would say that one is out, because he already has a researcher.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mind you, even if that kind of item went in there and were approved, there probably couldn't be any approved spending under it, so it would just carry over.

MR GOGO: Bohdan, I'm trying to think of some context that would be used in. If you had five researchers and you wondered just how efficient that was,

under that appropriation you'd go downtown and hire someone to come and evaluate that system. That's the sort of thing you could use that for, right?

MR STEFANIUK: In the case of the Social Credit opposition, for example, they prefer to contract certain research projects to professional research consultants in the private sector, and the funding comes from that particular code, rather than from wages, as it does in the NDP office.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think one full-time researcher provides significantly higher service than the government members, and the member doesn't have other special duties. So I don't feel that figure is applicable.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're saying it's out?

MRS OSTERMAN: Out, in my estimation.

MR CHAIRMAN: George?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Out.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Materials and supplies, Code 600. That covers payment for goods required which are not fixed assets, e.g. stationery supplies, flags, pins, congratulatory scrolls.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That's all taken care of.

MRS OSTERMAN: Under the general Legislative Assembly.

MR STEFANIUK: There can be specialized things. For example, the Official Opposition has a budget of \$7,000 in that regard and the NDP has \$2,300.

MRS OSTERMAN: What do they put on there?

MR STEFANIUK: There are additional things they may want. We can provide stationery, for example, for all members. But if the Leader of the Official Opposition wishes to print stationery that has "Leader of the Official Opposition" on it, then it comes out of that expenditure within his department. If he wishes pins for presentation, over and above the normal allotment that's available to every member, they would be charged against that allotment. So with flags and other giveaway items.

MRS OSTERMAN: But with this member serving a constituency, would there be a necessity -- because the leader of the Opposition obviously would be doing things across the province.

MR GOGO: The Member for Calgary McCall has stationery printed which he paid for himself, on the blank stationery from the Assembly.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, if he needs a little, I wouldn't mind putting a reasonable figure in there. I'd say about \$250, if Tom wants to put his name on the stationery.

MR GOGO: Would you do that for me? Just consider the Member for Calgary McCall, because that's the man who is going to talk to me about it.

MR CHAIRMAN: So is there a tentative figure of \$250 there?

MRS OSTERMAN: I would be inclined to be generous there, if he wants to do his own personalized thing.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have contingency for office rental.

MR STEFANIUK: You've skipped over purchase of fixed assets.

MRS OSTERMAN: The figure is \$2,000. What would that be necessary for? Do we have a necessity of a figure there?

MR APPLEBY: Furniture, I guess.

MR CHAIRMAN: If we buy it this year, do we have need for that item next year?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't know; I'm trying to find out what he might have need of under that item.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Notley didn't have anything there.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'd like to leave that open, if we could do everything else but that. I would be concerned if we strike it off, and if there are things that have to be purchased for his office or whatever. I don't know what they are, but he should come up with the details.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'd say if Notley didn't need it, he wouldn't.

MR GOGO: Well, we're going to press with this pretty soon.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's the trouble. We're going to have to bell the cat. If we have afterthoughts about something that should be added, we may have to go to special warrant.

MRS OSTERMAN: We're going to have to go to special warrant anyway for this other.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, we haven't come to that.

MR STEFANIUK: There is nothing for that in the other two opposition budgets. I'm not sure about government members.

MR APPLEBY: It's not listed there at all.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that amount should be struck, and if there are purchases needed to set him up in business -- anything he hasn't got already -- that that be under the special warrant, and we should look after it that way. He obviously has to have it before . . .

MR APPLEBY: Under the office rental one . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The proposal there, you may recall from his memo, is that: I respectfully request consideration be given for space in the Legislature Building for a secretary and researcher; If such space is not available, an item included for renting space elsewhere.

MR APPLEBY: But then Government Services would look into that to see if space were available in one of the other buildings, would they not?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I should think so.

MR APPLEBY: I mean, they would have to supply space.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. Do you want to give that the same treatment as 004?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, I think so. That would have to happen immediately. Then we could always put a special amount in the budget, if that's what has to happen.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's go to the first column, then.

MR APPLEBY: You just prorate everything back, don't you?

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want us to work that out on a prorata basis?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, I think so. Consider the amount of time left in the year, and so on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there anything there that doesn't lend itself to that?

MR APPLEBY: I don't think so.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then, to review. Going down the outside column, Code 100: I have a tentative figure of \$17,000.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Code 120: \$1,300.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Code 130: \$17,000.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Code 140 and Code 150 are more or less consequential, that could be worked out in the Clerk's office on the basis of the other figures.

MRS OSTERMAN: For 150, we agreed that \$1,000 was . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I believe you're right.

MRS OSTERMAN: But 140 would have to be worked out.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're right, I remember now. So the total is whatever it is, right?

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, for 200 I have \$1,150.

MR GOGO: That was tentative, I think. We were going to go back to that.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Too much.

MR APPLEBY: Well, you took a look at your total. You're \$37,900 now.

MR CHAIRMAN: What did you say, Frank?

MR APPLEBY: I think your total budget is around \$37,900.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see.

MR APPLEBY: So I really think you should leave that one.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does that include or omit anything for Code 200?

MR APPLEBY: It leaves it in at \$1,150.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. So Code 200 is \$1,150. Code 290 I have as \$100.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: And Code 350 I have at zero. Code 400 I have at \$100. Code 410 is out; 430 is out; 600 I have at \$250. The total is whatever it is. And 004 is out, subject to later reconsideration and a possible special warrant.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right, for already on this year's.

MR CHAIRMAN: And so is office rental.

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Everybody agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to go back to Code 430, professional, technical, and labour services. That's \$18,500. I was just thinking, if we put enough in there to bring the budget up to \$40,000. I'm sure he's going to need a few dollars in that budget.

MR GOGO: Consequential will bring it to \$40,000.

MR APPLEBY: Where's your consequential?

MR GOGO: Manpower group.

MRS OSTERMAN: In the employer contributions, and that. I think that already will be at the \$40,000 mark.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, there's a committee on, and I'm afraid they may not have a quorum. I would like to be excused.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about your concern, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: I would like to see us have something in there. We're getting it as the opposition, and Notley is getting it. Appreciating that we don't want an incentive for this thing to be happening, but I would like to see us have something in there.

MR CHAIRMAN: What would you translate that something into by way of dollars?

MR MANDEVILLE: I've got it at \$38,300, the total figure. So if we had \$2,000 in there, it would bring it right next to the \$40,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would bring it over, with those other items.

MR MANDEVILLE: It would.

MR APPLEBY: I'm agreeable. I think it should be around the \$40,000 somewhere.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I guess I've been hard all night. I'll give a little.

MRS OSTERMAN: All right.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we're putting in \$2,000. Subject to that, are you all content?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: On motion by? Frank Appleby. And carried.

Now, the next meeting. I think we're out of the heavy stuff, but we have other items that haven't been brought up.

MR APPLEBY: Right. They've been postponed for a long time.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'd be amenable to another meeting, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: What is your opinion about this? We've had the meal upstairs. We now went to something more frugal.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think Bill made a good point. Next time I think we'll split the difference and invite some chicken in, or something like that -- cooked of course.

MR CHAIRMAN: So next time, we'll go in between. Next meeting date in consultation with the two caucuses?

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could I give you warning now that somebody will be calling you tomorrow or the next day for dates?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's just fine.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: Sounds good.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.