

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Tuesday, March 2, 1982

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

4:15 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you have your agenda of the February 1 meeting, first is the approval of the minutes. They've been circulated. Is anyone sufficiently content with them to move the usual motion?

MR. APPLEBY: I move it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Carried. Business arising from those minutes: first of all, there is word processing equipment. You'll find that as agenda item 6; that's item 3 of the minutes. Item 4 of the minutes is just a report item. So is No. 5. Speaker Turner, his chief of administration, and the chief executive assistant were here. We had some good discussions with them. I don't know whether we got more out of them than they got out of us, but it was worth while.

The Petro-Canada credit cards: that is simply a report item, except I was asked to send a memo to members concerning those cards and the possibility that other credit card companies might cease sending vouchers with their month-end statements. That information has been given to members.

Agenda item 5 is airport parking. The next item is the national youth parliament association. That of course is deferred until I get back from the Speakers' meeting in Ottawa. Item 3, promotional items -- item 9 under the old minutes. The long-term disability insurance is item 4 of our present agenda. The next item -- recording of meetings -- doesn't require anything further. Inventory receipts doesn't either, nor does the last item in the February 1 minutes.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on 9d, equipment inventory receipts, while the Clerk is here. I mentioned it to a couple of members. I guess where they got up tight was the fact they had to have a witness to a signature. Is that a legal requirement, Bo? Is that why that is there?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A legal requirement?

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, you designed the form.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That doesn't make it legal. The only reason that was done, John, was not because we thought a member would deny his signature. It was just in case we couldn't read it, and we'd ask the witness.

MR. GOGO: The people I talked to had their noses out of joint.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For that?

MR. GOGO: For that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll wipe it off right now.

MR. GOGO: If it's a requirement, so be it. But if it's not a requirement . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll change it. Where the signature is called for, we'll put "legible signature".

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thought we agreed Code 600 was going to be "presentational items".

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a subheading of that same heading, isn't it?

MRS. OSTERMAN: No. I think it was to be called "presentation items" or "presentation materials".

MR. CHAIRMAN: What did we call it in the estimates?

MR. STEFANIUK: Materials and supplies.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Wherever it reads in our minutes, it should be "presentation items".

MR. STEFANIUK: Particularly on item 9 of the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Will the mover and the meeting agree to amending the motion approving the minutes, so item 9 of those minutes may have the first subheading changed to "presentation items"?

MR. APPLEBY: I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you all agreed that the minutes be approved thus amended?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we could go to item 3 of the agenda, we'll change that to read "presentation items". I think Bill Purdy was going to kick off on that. Understandably, he's had highway problems, coming in from Wabamun. What is your wish?

MR. APPLEBY: You circulated people about that by phone or something. All we have to do is ratify the decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I just thought maybe Bill should be here.

MR. GOGO: He should, but he can't be.

MR. APPLEBY: I move we ratify the decision made by your telephone survey.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? Agreed? Carried.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I raise -- it fits in well with this item, even though I didn't give notice. Because a number of members had asked me, I had asked about the combination of presentation items and the communications budget. They're both under the same code. A number of people feel they would use one area much more than the other, for various reasons. I would like to present that idea for discussion by the committee. I'm trying to remember who I asked, the Clerk or whoever. I guess it was Charlene I talked to. It would be administered under just one amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but would we lose the connection with the rule that the communications allowance is based on the number of households, as calculated from the last voters' list, divided by 2? We have that rule with regard to the communication allowance. If we lumped the two of them together . . .

MR. GOGO: Do I hear you saying that with 20,000 households, divided by 2, is 10,000, times 40 cents, is \$4,000, you would like the option of using the communication allowance for presentation materials out of that amount?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Vice versa. Some won't utilize the amount that would be allowed in the budget for presentational items. I understand -- I could be wrong, but if I remember the figure we allowed for communication, we said we probably wouldn't go as far this year because of the number of people in some constituencies. When it was divided up on an equal basis, it wouldn't allow for the kind of communication we had been able to do before. So some members would like that option.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we're really doing is departing from the formula for the communication allowance. We're now saying that perhaps it should be the names on the voters' list, divided by 2, plus what is in the presentation items.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR. APPLEBY: I wonder if the Clerk would see any difficulty with that.

MR. STEFANIUK: I do, Mr. Chairman, simply because the accounting records for each program are maintained separately. In other words, we account to Treasury and the Auditor General for expenditures incurred in connection with each program. If this kind of flexibility is permitted, we are at a disadvantage in attempting to establish needs for inventories of certain presentation items. The assumption had been made, when the budget for presentation items was approved, that that budget would reflect a certain number of presentation items being made available to each member, and therefore advantage is being taken of bulk purchases, and so on. If the flexibility feature is going to come into being, we are at a disadvantage unless members announce early in the year their preferences as to what we do with the purchasing.

MR. COOK: Could I just ask a question with regard to that? It would seem to me that the Clerk is going to have some difficulty in anticipating individual members' plans for presentation items in any event. Some might prefer to present a scroll and a plaque at an anniversary, and others might prefer to present something quite different. I think it would be almost impossible.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, there are no guidelines for use of the presentation items allowance as yet. However, a presentation was made by Mr. Purdy in connection with the budget submission. That in fact spoke of a standard list of presentation items. The budget was approved by this committee on the basis of that presentation, which presumably was made on behalf of members. The fact of the matter is that the Auditor General has requested enabling legislation relative to the communications allowance. That is being considered at the present time by the Government House Leader. If a change in direction were to be made, I suggest that he, among others, should be advised immediately, because it has some effect on the type of amending legislation that is being drafted.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I've raised this. I think it has alerted the members to the request. Certainly it's true that most members, in discussion with us, will use the presentation allowance as outlined. I don't know whether you'd normally go out and expend the whole budget and buy 79 of this and that. I can understand that bulk buying is going to be preferable. That's certainly important. But I think only a percentage of it could be purchased ahead anyway, because you're not sure what members would use. Maybe I should consult with the Government House Leader. If the Auditor General requires enabling legislation, it's very important that we adhere to whatever it is he is suggesting.

MR. STEFANIUK: In considering our various budget items, we did identify expenditures for individual programs. In effect, we now have separate expenditures identified for the communications allowance program and another for the presentation item program.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it may be too late to do anything, even if it were agreed to by the committee. I will investigate this further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, item 7 on today's agenda will bring us into the communications allowance and whether these factors should be taken into account.

MR. APPLEBY: I think this is one reason Connie brought it up, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, we thought that was a way out of this situation, because we have our budget in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to take that to the opposition members too, Fred, and see what they think about putting the presentation allowance into the communication allowance? I'm not sure about this; this is off the top of my head. But if this committee were to approve doing this and during the year a member were to run short in the communications allowance, then if it were legal and financially acceptable, I could approve a transfer from one allowance to the other.

MR. APPLEBY: If they had a surplus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose a member runs short in the communications allowance, and some of us, such as Milt Pahl, have had some pretty substantial increases in our number of voters -- if that happens and that member wants to say, I'll forego the presentation items allowance for what it was intended; I'd rather

use it for communication in a different way. As I said, if it's lawful and financially okay as far as the Auditor General is concerned, maybe that could be done on an individual, per-member basis by my signing approvals of transfers.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Could that be investigated, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you look into that? Is that enough for item 3?

Long-term disability insurance: there are some attachments to your agenda. I don't think they're exhaustive of the subject by any means. John, are you carrying the ball on that?

MR. GOGO: I've been doing a fair amount of enquiring on this, Mr. Chairman. A recent edition of *The Parliamentarian* had a listing of other jurisdictions, many of which had long-term disability insurance; many didn't. I presently have correspondence sent to those provinces for an update. I also had it put before our caucus. Matters are now being discussed. So I'm not prepared to speak to it today. I don't even want to table it till the next meeting. I'd like it tabled indefinitely, until I have sufficient information.

It does raise an interesting point I'd like to put on the table. In '79, you published a members' guide. Speaking to members -- I don't know whether it's because of the size of it or what, but many people don't seem to be familiar with it. Many members seem to think they're covered by life insurance, which they're not. It's only accident insurance. Which means if Frank were dead in the morning, obviously Dorothy would be wise to drag him out on the road and run over him.

In my reviewing other jurisdictions, it seems to me that two things come out. One is that the benefits to Alberta members are not what many of the other jurisdictions have. Be that as it may, that's a decision of ours. The other item, which is more important, is that our colleagues don't seem to be very well informed as to what they have or don't have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, they may think they have something they haven't.

MR. GOGO: Yes. I recall something from either you or your office saying that the amount of life insurance was to the tune of \$50,000 or \$100,000, when in fact there is no life insurance at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean we said you had life insurance when you don't?

MR. GOGO: Yes. Either in the minutes or a comment made by you, or something, whereas in reality it was only accident insurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Accidental death. It's not accident insurance to cover you for accidental injury; it's accidental death. That was put in after Len Werry was killed.

MR. GOGO: As opposed to life insurance coverage. I'm now discussing a variety of these things with my colleagues in my caucus. We'll be coming up with some recommendations at some point.

So I'd like to table that indefinitely. I just raise, for your benefit, Mr. Chairman, even though you've published this members' guide, that for some reason many of them don't seem to be aware. Maybe a memo from your office -- I'm thinking of Fred's caucus, the Independent member, and the new member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The new member got his guide on Monday, I think. Is it in the guide? I've forgotten.

MR. GOGO: That's a good question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supposing we do this. We'll check to see if it's in the guide. If it is we'll send a memo, drawing members' attention to it. If it's not in the guide, we'll issue an addendum sheet, to be inserted in each member's guide -- and hope they do it. Is that all right for a solution for the time being? That's as far as the insurance for accidental death is concerned. The item dealing with long-term disability is tabled.

MR. GOGO: With no disrespect, any memo that has ever come from the Clerk of the Assembly I've read and remembered. I can't say that for other memos I've received. So maybe, Mr. Chairman, if it came from you through the Clerk, I know I and other members would read it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: There's something magic about Bo's memos.

MR. GOGO: There is.

MRS. OSTERMAN: He says "no" all the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually the explanation is very simple, and I don't feel the slightest affronted. It's because the Clerk's memos often have financial implications.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just speak to how, interestingly enough, all of us don't remember what is in the members' guide. I think when we were elected, at least a new bunch of people, we were digesting so much information at the time. We went through that, and then didn't really think about what wasn't in it. A lot of members are walking around thinking they're covered like employees anywhere else, and they find out they're not looked after like other people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I'll send a memo out drawing attention to the guide, if it's in the guide; if it's not, we'll do a supplementary sheet for the guide. We'll put a footnote with it saying that it does not include long-term disability or any kind of life insurance. Are you all agreed that the item be tabled?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Airport parking: that's a perennial.

MR. GOGO: Some people have said that the answer to the health care problem is to introduce a Bill in the House making it illegal to be ill. It may be that the answer to airport parking is to recommend no members drive an automobile. We've been at this thing for two years, I think, and we haven't resolved it, for whatever reason. Maybe today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have something to add. First let's see what the Clerk has to add. I don't want him to trump my ace.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, two or three meetings ago -- I don't have a book of minutes here -- appended to the agenda was the latest status report relative to airport parking. It described what was available at Calgary and Edmonton. It also made reference to the lack of practicality in using a universal charge card, because that had been suggested as one of the solutions. The bank credit cards do not provide with the statement a copy of the receipt and, in that form, are unacceptable to Treasury for issuance of payments. That's the point we had reached.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What happens to the air fares? I should know this, but I don't remember. For example, you, George. You come to a meeting here and park at the Calgary airport, take the airplane, and use your charge card on the airplane. That looks after that. In other words, your trip is covered. For your car, you have mileage for constituency purposes.

MR. STEFANIUK: A gasoline credit card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So apart from whether that's adequate or inadequate, the travelling costs of your trip are covered, except for the airport parking.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: And taxis here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How do you get those?

MR. APPLEBY: You put that on your expense sheet.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: If I come to this meeting, I do. But for caucus or anything else, it's included in the . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Your expense allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would this be something we could do or consider? I have some reason to believe, as a result of discussions with the Ontario Speaker and his chief of administration, that we could probably quite safely simply reimburse those parking costs, and there wouldn't be any tax implications. Apparently they're doing that kind of thing in Ontario -- not exactly that, but that kind of thing -- and are not having any problem. But it has to be vouchered. Could we cover the thing in this way? We tried all the other angles. Could we consider going about it as a sort of extension of the gasoline allowance, or some kind of allowance for essential MLA travel? That would have this additional -- and maybe it should be confined to non-urban members, certainly non-Edmonton members; we can't exclude Calgary and Medicine Hat. If we were to extend that in such a way that we could cover airport parking, and then pay it on the basis of getting the vouchers, would that be something you'd like to think about? In other words, by putting it under an appropriate category -- because it's not fair for our southern and northern members. I'm told that in Saskatchewan, the far northern members have a special allowance even in their indemnities or their pay. I haven't verified that.

In the meantime, maybe we could work out some kind of concept on it, through the Clerk's office. They've got nothing else to do anyway. The Clerk and I will discuss it at our next meeting, and we'll try to work out a concept whereby we can include that airport parking and get a little equity in this thing. Edmonton members obviously never have to pay it, and members who

travel from out of town and never use airplanes and can't because they're aren't any around.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Just one correction, Mr. Chairman. Edmonton members could be on business, going to a meeting in Calgary or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let us work out something, and we'll have regard to the cross-Canada surveys that were in *The Parliamentarian*, and the Ontario report. Is that all right for that item?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Word processing equipment: the thing there, and I'm still concerned about this. It has financial implications beyond the immediate short term. As we know, the Social Credit caucus have more or less committed themselves to a purchase of computer equipment. They have asked for a transfer to cover that purchase, a transfer from a budget item that wasn't all used. The government caucus is looking at leasing. It may well be that this idea of getting word processing equipment may spread to the Independent members, and it might even conceivably spread to the Speaker. The question is: which way should we go? Does it matter if there's uniformity? Does it matter if some people purchase and others lease? Does it matter if the equipment is standard and we have to get different repair people in from different companies to service different types of equipment? Are we in any way missing economies of scale for things like disks and so on? I don't know.

Mr. Bubba has been working on word processing for quite some months. He has been consulting with someone in the Data Centre, and I think he also has information from industries supplying these. Perhaps I could ask him to lead us into the labyrinth.

MR. BUBBA: I don't know whether I really have to dwell too much on the advantages of these systems. From the mere fact that people are interested in acquiring them, it's fairly obvious that they would already have canvassed some of those and seen that there are certain advantages to them. However, it's important to know that there are certain disadvantages and caveats as you anticipate entering the labyrinth. As I begin, I'd like to bring a few of those things to your attention.

The first is that a word processing system is going to take you a little time to get in. If you don't spend that time at the front end, you're liable to end up with a system that doesn't do what you want or a system which you discover you have to make changes to soon after you acquire it. If you go into a purchase situation you could be in trouble there, because it might be difficult to get shut of the equipment once you have it. It's much easier to make changes if you lease.

The second item as far as time is concerned is that it will take you several months to realize the advantages, the pluses, of the word processing system. Suppliers tell you that it takes approximately a week or 10 days to train a person on the system, and that's right. Generally a person can pick up the rudiments of these systems in the course that's provided by the supplier, whether it's one where you teach yourself or where they come in and teach you or take you to their plant and teach you. You can pick up the rudiments in the basic lessons. Our finding, as far as word processing is concerned -- and we've been doing it for 10 years now -- is that in order to get the most from a word processing system, you'll have to have your best people on it. Those

people will have to do a lot of experimentation, a lot of just general fooling around: getting to know not only what on paper it says the system can do, but the things the system can do that aren't written down on paper.

That opens up a whole other area. Your offices are organized in a certain way to do your business right now. That doesn't matter whether it's a government office or an office in the private sector. You're organized to do your functions in a certain way. Before you go into a word processing system, you have to see how adaptable your present systems are to a word processing system, and what changes you would have to make to your present system to bring in a word processing system. No word processing system, or data processing system, is going to allow you to do things exactly the same way as you do them now. You'll have to make some adaptation. You'll have to look at that system and say, well, there are five different systems; which of these five different acceptable systems does what I want it to do, closest to the way I want it to do it. A certain amount of adaptation is going to be required.

Another area of caveat as you enter is the important area of under-utilization. Word processing equipment, like any other office equipment, is going to be idle when the office is closed. The only difference is that a word processing system that is in any way sophisticated will cost you 15 to 20 times as much as a standard correcting Selectric typewriter. So it's a lot of equipment to have sitting idle. Another thing to bear in mind is that studies have shown that a word processing system, at best, is used for 60 per cent of the time that an office is operating in normal office hours. If the work isn't properly scheduled and channelled to the word processor, it can be used as little as 20 per cent of the time. So you're talking about a system that for a stand-alone system with one screen and disk drive and printer costs somewhere between \$20,000 and \$25,000, and it can be working for as little as 20 per cent of the time. That's something you have to determine. What the "that" is is: do I have enough of the kind of work that would profitably be done on a word processing system to make a word processing system a feasibility? A word processing system will not justify itself on the basis of cost alone. It will justify itself if you can balance the cost of it against the overall time saved, the amount of through-put, the quality of the product, and how well it's integrated into your operation in terms of your personnel. The personnel area is one that is fraught with a lot of problems. If you want, I can get into that a little later.

A lot of people will sell you word processing systems on the basis of speed. In the overall, yes, they are faster, because you never have to retype your entire document. You can always save what's good and correct only what's bad. You avoid making new mistakes when you do the second draft. But the initial keying stage is 8 to 15 per cent longer; it requires more key stroking on a word processing system than on a standard Selectric typewriter, because you have a whole other range of keys that are involved in the formatting of your text and that sort of thing.

Specialization is another area of caveat you should watch out for. Because the industry is so competitive, the tendency is for systems or vendors to specialize their systems; in other words, no interchangeability between systems. The idea is that once you have a client, it's very difficult, especially if he happens to be a smaller client with a stand-alone system who really can't afford to make the changes, to go to another system, even if he may not be quite satisfied with what he has. So the systems do not have interchangeability. Of course this gets you into the question of

standardization. Is it a good idea to have everybody in an operation with the same system?

Well, standardization has a lot of advantages on the face of it. Those would include the possibility of a better break on the price when you front-end, also the possibility of a better break on the operating costs, for the overhead, for supplies, maintenance -- that sort of thing. Probably the bigger the system you get, the better chance you have of better service, especially if it happens to be public sector. Public sector installations for word processing companies are very big selling factors. At the back of everybody's brochure is a list of how many public sector areas have this company's brand of word processors. Universities, court houses, legislative assemblies, parliaments: all very big selling points. It can be turned to advantage, because you can make the demands. The bigger the system you put in and the more you're prepared to spend, the greater the demands you can make and the more chance you have of their being met.

Of course, the other area is training. You have an awful lot more in the way of changeability. First off, you don't have people in several areas of your operation knowledgeable on different system so they can't move around as much. Even in this building, you'll find a person who is working in one area during one legislature and another area in another; that sort of thing. It costs, in time and money, to take that person off one word processing system and put them onto another. It's easy to go from one system to another, easier than going from no system to one system. It's easier if you've used an AES system to go on to a Micom, Wang, Digital, or what have you. You have the rudiments. You know what's going on and can say, oh yes, I do it this way on the Micom system. So it doesn't take as long to train a person from one system to another as it does from scratch, but it takes time. If you standardize your equipment, you save that time and money, and your personnel is productive for you all the time. Those are all the obvious plusses.

On the other side, standardization ought not to be entered into just for the sake of standardization. It simply comes down to this: if for the sake of standardization you end up with a system that really doesn't meet anybody's needs, maybe you should be looking at a little variation here and there to accommodate. As I mentioned earlier, you're going to have to make certain compromises in order to adapt your present system to the introduction of word processing. If for the sake of standardization that word processing system creates further problems, you probably should look at an aberration from a general trend towards standardization.

As I mentioned earlier, training is a long process. In addition to the initial learning process, where the person becomes familiar with the rudiments of the system, there are regular brush-ups. The companies are always coming out with new releases, which have to be learned, and general brush-up on how to use the system. It can take a good long time, up to six, eight, nine months, to learn a system. When you consider that the design life of a system -- that is, how long it will be before that system is obsolete -- is about two to three years, there is not very much lag time between when you decide to go into a word processing system and go through all the initial study and the acquisition and training, and the period when the system is going to be technically obsolete. From the point of view of its usefulness, it will last you five to seven years. Mechanically that's about the life of these systems now. But from the point of view of its obsolescence: two to three years. However, the companies do provide updating. It depends on what system you buy whether it's included in the purchase or whether it's something you have to

buy extra. But they always have new releases and will be providing these to users.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. When do you have to go, Fred?

MR. MANDEVILLE: I have to catch the 6:30 plane.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't mean to cut you short at all. In fact I can see that some of us are going to have to come and have some private talks with you, to get the full benefit of what you've prepared.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I think that's wise. We're putting word processing in our office. I just heard one side and now I'm hearing the other side. So I want to sit down and talk. We're putting word processing in. The salesmen are just the opposite to what you're saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, he's not selling anything.

MR. MANDEVILLE: That's right.

MR. APPLEBY: He's pointing out things we should look at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing of immediate concern here -- I think the decision has been made to go into word processing, at least as far as the Social Credit caucus and the government members' caucus are concerned. The question is whether to lease or to buy, and whether to standardize. Those are the things. As far as whether they should do it at all, that is really not on the agenda. I realize what you say, that you can be conned into putting these things in and have them stand there, an expensive item used 20 per cent of the time, because it doesn't fit in with your way of doing things. For example, I don't want to lengthen this, but we just had a demonstration by one of the companies downtown for law offices. We found out that in order to change from one thing to another, you had to change the program in the system. The amount of time that was going to lose just didn't seem acceptable.

MR. BUBBA: Exactly. I think I've covered whether to standardize. Whether to lease or buy . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you really said everything you wanted to say about standardization?

MR. BUBBA: I think so, unless someone has a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe Rollie has one.

MR. COOK: I think another aspect is security. I wouldn't mind having a different system from what is available in another office, because if my floppy disk goes over to the wrong office I'd like to be able to have one little impediment.

MR. BUBBA: As far as that is concerned, there isn't too much of a problem with the security of those things. Every time you store something on that disk, you have to store it with a name. If only you know what that name is, there's not too much chance that anyone can get the information off that disk.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I was turned on to this a year ago by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who expressed a desire to be able to keep his constituents informed, which to me is mass mailing. A month ago, I was in Kelowna, at an alcoholic treatment centre of 30 beds. They have a word processor there. The points I want to raise that Bob really didn't raise: one was the economies of scale. The director of that institution told me that a \$16,000 word processor, three years old, saved three positions. We sometimes think of three positions as being three people. We forget things like building codes, governments that insist on cubic feet per person, and all this. In other words, a word processor eliminating three people on staff also eliminated a tremendous amount of bricks and mortar. That's something Bob didn't mention which sort of excites me, because economies of scale are involved.

The other point, that I'm a little nervous of, is that Mr. Pepin, as you may be aware, as Transport Minister is putting in radar systems at our international airports. Bob touched on this. From the time they hire someone to design a radar system for an international airport in Canada today, it's obsolete before it's in place, which is the other thing that intrigues me. If we are going to go for this equipment that is obsolete before it's in place, bearing in mind the time it takes from decision time, the training time, this time, and that time, recognizing that a super-organized office might get 60 per cent use, or a super-organized office may get only 20 per cent use -- a law office might get 3 per cent use, and so on -- it becomes a very expensive proposition to achieve what the Member for Edmonton Glengarry proposed to me a year ago, i.e. to keep his constituents informed.

I'll just say this and be quiet. I'd like a demonstration -- I don't care whether it's by a salesman or whoever -- of word processing equipment. I'd take two hours, go somewhere, watch a demonstration, and hear about its capability.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I just did.

MR. GOGO: Did you? Then maybe I'll rely on Connie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where did you go, Connie?

MRS. OSTERMAN: That was just for our needs. I wanted to talk to people who were running it. That was just for our group's needs.

MR. GOGO: A year ago, I thought it was a glorified xerox system, in terms of mass communication for your constituents. I've really had my eyes opened, particularly in B.C. a month ago, financially and all of this, saving three positions on a \$16,000 machine.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in our case, one unit for 43 people -- it would be nice if we could have it going 24 hours a day, three people working eight hours. It's just going to be a drop in the bucket.

MR. COOK: I have observed that the concept of obsolescence is not really a fair word. The newer machines might have different bells and whistles, but basically if you set out to do an objective and you have a talk and the present machine is adequate, then just because a new machine comes along that is a little fancier, has 50 doodads -- you might say the machine is obsolete, but it still performs the task you set out to do three years ago. So it's not obsolete in that sense.

MR. BUBBA: If the initial planning is okay, and you decide what you want the system to do over its useful life, and get something that's reasonably adaptable so you can make certain add-ons, then everybody is really dealing with obsolescent equipment. We deal with it upstairs all the time, and it puts out a reasonably good *Hansard*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Mr. Mandelbaum?

MR. MANDELBAUM: Just dealing with economies of scale and confidentiality. Even though confidentiality may not be a problem with floppy disks, is it not on a printer, especially if you have a universal printer? Assuming that within one caucus different people may need different printers, are there real economies of scale from standardized service?

MR. BUBBA: In terms of?

MR. MANDELBAUM: For example, if we had a word processor and the government caucus did, I'm sure the government caucus would not be happy about having a high-speed printer in our office for their correspondence. Seeing as there are different offices that would need to have their own printers, are there real economies of scale?

MR. BUBBA: As far as the standard element printer is concerned, it's okay. The place where you run into high cost at the output end of a word processing system is if you want to have high-quality printout in large numbers. Then you have to be looking at a piece of equipment that might run you somewhere from \$50,000 or \$60,000 to \$125,000 or \$135,000. I'm thinking of something like an IBM 6640, the ink jet printer, at the low end, and at the high end something like Xerox 9400 or an IBM 6670, laserized equipment. It's very expensive, and it just doesn't justify itself even in an operation this size. I anticipate that the needs here would be rather like the needs in the *Hansard* office: they hit peaks, when you really need the service, and then they'll hit some really deep valleys. If you want an idea of what the high-speed, high-quality 6670 printer printout is like, that's the printed draft Bills that come into the House, on legal size. That's the quality it prints, and they have one at Legislative Counsel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your minutes of the last meeting were done at the Data Centre's printer.

MR. BUBBA: The 3800.

MR. COOK: I'd like to ask about accessibility to the government data base. Could it tie in for information on taxation or some social service field? We know there is data there and we want to get it out.

MR. BUBBA: That's something you would have to build in at the initial stage. Most word processing equipment that's on the market today has the ability to communicate with what's referred to as a suitably programmed host computer. If you make sure you have that compatibility and access to the programs -- that's part of your planning at the outset.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Referring to what you said a moment ago, would it be your advice then that before a decision is made to choose equipment, the quality of the

product should be seen insofar as what the printer will do that is going to be included in the package?

MR. BUBBA: Yes, especially in terms of what your anticipated requirements are going to be. The standard correspondence quality printer that you will get with an AES-plus or a Micom 2001 -- any of those systems basically use the same kind of printer. That printer is not built to do really high volume work. It's not suggested that those printers be left unattended to run, and they're just not built -- they don't have the capacity. They will break down. If you're anticipating doing mass mailings to constituencies, that sort of thing, you're looking at an investment in a large, high-speed, high-quality reproduction system.

Of course, the other thing you might consider is that after you go a certain distance in volume, after you reach a certain point -- you want to make so many copies of a document that is so long -- then you start getting into the area where you ought to start thinking of phototypesetting. In that area, you can cut down your number of pages, and maybe your cost of purchasing a phototypesetting service; in other words, having your word processing system phototypesetting compatible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Producing a tape.

MR. BUBBA: Producing a tape or sending over communications lines to a printing shop, and doing it that way. There's a point at which your volume starts to justify the cost of phototypesetting. Then you get around the necessity for a commitment to a high-speed, high-quality printout machine.

MR. COOK: Can you tell me what that point might be? For example, I'm doing a 200-piece mailing.

MR. BUBBA: I could figure it out for you.

MR. COOK: Ballpark.

MR. BUBBA: You'd have to be into the thousands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taken as a given that free choice is to be preferred to anything else, do you think that the advantages of standardization are sufficiently strong that at this stage of our knowledge and experience, we should definitely make a decision in favor of standardization? Or should we just simply say, look, it's too soon to do this; let's do it on the basis of free choice; whatever caucus or office wants this or that out of our estimates, we'll do it that way, as long as it stays within the estimates.

MR. APPLEBY: Fred, is your caucus buying or leasing?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Buying.

MR. BUBBA: It comes down to this. First off, those areas that are anticipating going into a word processing system should know exactly what they want it to do and what they anticipate they'll want it to do over the life that it is in their office. Having done that sort of study, if everybody's needs can be accommodated by standardization, then I think it's a good direction to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But don't you think that at the present state of our knowledge, any study we do is just going to be tentative and we're going to have to have some experience in this before we know? For example, the needs of the government caucus are going to be vastly different from the needs of individual members. You can't get the economies of scale, the volume -- all sorts of things. The needs of a three-person caucus would be different from those of a 40-person caucus, and so on. Even insofar as the capacity of the machines is concerned, and it may well be that one maker is tops in a certain capacity of machine and another maker is tops in another capacity. Whoever produces the best motorcycle may not produce the best truck.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think there is one very important consideration relative to acquisition of word processing equipment for caucuses, and that is to recognize that caucuses may change every four or five years, and in the past have changed considerably, to the extent that the requirements of those caucuses may not be the same as they are at the present time. May I suggest that consideration be given to standardized equipment, in light of the possibility of the equipment needing to be moved from one area to another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If as Connie has pointed out, we're just starting as far as the government caucus is concerned, a mere beginning . . .

MR. APPLEBY: That's why we're leasing.

MR. STEFANIUK: I suggest that leasing is the practical direction in which to go because there is an out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't -- I shouldn't twist your arm. I don't want to get into this standardization business, frankly. The only reason I raised it was that I felt maybe it was part of my responsibility for the bucks.

MR. COOK: I prefer not to get into standardization, for some other reasons. I appreciate the Clerk's argument, but it's also fair to say too that, let's say, there is a caucus of 10 members, or whatever. Again, you're operating on different orders of magnitude, and the machines that might be in government members' caucus could not simply be picked up, as little units, trundled down the hall, and installed. You'd have to have a different system for different needs. I doubt that you can just slip down the hall on rollers and set up shop. I don't think that's really a factor.

MR. BUBBA: What it really comes down to is that I can't tell you that you should or shouldn't standardize. What I've said is that there are advantages to both. Really it has to come down to the prospective users' decision, whether he feels that either of these ways is best for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other question is leasing as against purchasing.

MR. BUBBA: If you decide that you're not going to standardize, and if what you have in mind is the possible change with each Legislature, you're going to have an awful commerce in surplus equipment if you purchase. On the face of it, purchase is less expensive. But if you anticipate a lot of moving around and in and out of equipment, and there is some uncertainty at this stage as to what it's going to be doing and where so you may find as you go along that you want to make some changes to it, I would advise you to lease it. From my

point of view, for applications in *Hansard*, I might have a different recommendation, because that situation is different. But if there is uncertainty, I would say that lease is the better way for you to go.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether or not you're about to conclude this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope so.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Mandeville has indicated he has to leave. We have a new member elected, and we may have to deal with his budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to wind it up now or leave it for the next meeting?

MR. APPLEBY: As far as I can see, we shouldn't be making any decisions today.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we indicated last time that government members were interested in information, but obviously after we get that information, we were going to be operating on our own. We budgeted for it, and it wasn't the committee's decision.

MR. APPLEBY: The Social Credit caucus has made its plans as well. I don't know that we as a committee can change the caucus plans. We've put this in our budget, and it has been approved by this committee for that purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that satisfies you for dealing with the topic, I'm content.

MR. MANDEVILLE: There's only one thing. In the Social Credit office, it was an error on the part of someone in our office. They took part of the funds and went to one particular department, Government Services, to get the vote transferred. We didn't use all our money. They went ahead and got this, then discovered after they couldn't do that without getting approval of the Speaker or the Clerk. That's the situation we're in.

MR. GOGO: That hasn't been cleared up?

MR. MANDEVILLE: I thought it was cleared up ages ago, but . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if we're dealing with something that's within -- they're not asking for any extra funds. They're asking for a transfer within their budget. Because of the kind of error that was made, they're in a very awkward bind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only thing is that if the money is not spent, that doesn't necessarily mean that it should be spent for something else, because it could go back into the public Treasury.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When it is spent, it's going to be acquiring a publicly owned asset. My responsibility, before approving the transfer, is to ensure . . . I'm inclined to agree with what you say, but that's the reason, apart from the information any members would have wanted on this question of word processing,

that it would be some assistance to me in regard to that transfer. Besides that, I'm interested in equipment myself.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Has this already been done? You have no choice to lease instead of buy?

MR. MANDEVILLE: I just don't know where it stands. They got an approval from Government Services for the transfer, not realizing it had to be approved going from one vote to another. I don't even know what vote it came out of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That approval wasn't for the transfer, it was for the purchase.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes. So they have purchased it.

MR. COOK: Isn't there a consensus, Mr. Chairman, that we should basically leave it up to the individual caucuses?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are estimates to buy something, then that's what you have to do. If there are estimates to lease something, that's what you have to do. The government caucus estimates for next year include leasing. It's not a matter of second-guessing that. Is that all right for that item?

The communications allowance: you have an attachment on that.

MR. APPLEBY: Perhaps we should prioritize some of these items on the agenda, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEFANIUK: The caucus budget is perhaps a priority, and Mr. Mandeville has to leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Can we put the communications allowance over? Thank you very much, Bob. You may be hearing further from some of us.

Sheets were distributed to summarize. If you have one that doesn't have "amended" in the upper right-hand corner, please disregard it. This shows the figures on the basis of the estimates we've sent in for 1982-83. We have to make some decisions with regard to funding for the newly elected Independent member. He was given notice of this meeting; I fully expected he was going to be here. Vera went out to telephone, but she couldn't find him anywhere.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't see a column here for the new member's budget. Has he not submitted a budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. APPLEBY: That makes it difficult, doesn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. APPLEBY: We have to provide something. Do you have something, Fred?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Just that I talked to him yesterday, and he didn't know what . . . So I gave him a copy of this, so he'd have some guidelines. I thought that possibly he was going to get a budget drawn up for today, but maybe he didn't have time to have it presented. Yesterday he got a copy of this for a guideline.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, he's going to have to have certain essential services immediately; there's no doubt about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's got them. He's in an office. He has no secretary yet, has he?

MR. STEFANIUK: He has no secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has a telephone.

MR. STEFANIUK: I pointed out to him that as soon as he wishes a secretary, we would be able to provide one. I hasten to mention as well, Mr. Chairman, that here we are dealing with an '82-83 estimate. The comparison is made to what will be proposed to the House for all caucuses for '82-83. Insofar as the current fiscal year is concerned, we have no difficulty relative to the new member's indemnity, because obviously that was provided for in the budget for the current year. The additional expenditures, we feel, will be of such a small amount, in terms of personnel for one month or less, that we can absorb that within available funds in the Legislative Assembly now. That is providing nothing unusual is requested between now and April 1. Certainly if it comes to funding for a secretary, we could handle that, and the normal supplies of stationery, and so on.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, did someone communicate with him directly or was it just a notice that went? Did he know for sure about the meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He was telephoned from our office, and I didn't know that Fred had been in touch with him. Thanks very much, Fred.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I indicated to him that we were having the meeting today and that I thought his budget would be discussed. So I gave him a copy of this for some guidelines, and you say that you had too. Probably he would need more time to draw up his budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not only more time but more experience. He's in an awkward situation. I think the Clerk's office is willing to give him a lot of help in preparing a budget.

There's another question too. We have the estimates that provided for the Official Opposition on the basis of four members. The question is: is there going to be a change there, and if so, what is it going to be? I don't know what the committee's wish is, but it's not something we want to let slide for any length of time.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I have a lot of questions to ask. I really wish the gentleman was here, so he could hear the answers. I think there's a lot of information I wanted to ask, in terms of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ask him?

MRS. OSTERMAN: No, ask even you. I don't know whether you've collected anything from across the country in terms of how normally . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You handle a new member?

MRS. OSTERMAN: As far as budgeting is concerned. We have this incredible anomaly in that we have all these different statuses now within the opposition. I would be interested to find out how Fred feels about this. We have the Official Opposition, with a certain status and have certain expectations of them. The Leader of the Official Opposition is funded as if he were a minister, even in terms of his own personal status. We have the leader of a registered political party, sitting as one person in the Legislature. We have an Independent sitting. We now have a member who is a member of a registered political party, but not a leader. I'm hoping that, somehow -- maybe we can't rationalize these anomalies, but somebody very wise is going to have to look at this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I make this suggestion? If this committee can meet reasonably soon and perhaps have just one item on the agenda: this one. Would the committee favor our simply going ahead and assisting the new member in putting down some figures, arriving at a budget which he can consider. He can discuss it with his colleagues in the opposition, if he wants. Then we'll circulate that to members of the committee. You have this summary here. As soon as that has happened, we'll look for the first available time for a meeting. Is that all right?

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think that is a useful suggestion. Something else that I would like to have, Fred, is if you could come up with a figure for what Bob Clark actually had for his own specific use.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's in the separate column there.

MR. APPLEBY: No it isn't. The Leader of the Opposition is Mr. R. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In dealing with his constituents, what part of their budget would have been strictly for him.

MR. APPLEBY: A lot of these expenses are for the opposition as a caucus, and in my estimation you can't split that up as a share for that particular member looking after his own constituency. That's what I was looking at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Frank, you're saying we should work with the Social Credit opposition, and we should try to break out the figures that show what ordinarily was available to Bob Clark from the time when he ceased to be Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. APPLEBY: Just for his constituency services.

MR. MANDEVILLE: If I could speak to this, Mr. Chairman. If you look at our increases, I think they ran around 15 per cent. They tell me in the office that they allowed for Bob Clark being out of the office. If you look at our budget, we increased about 15 per cent. If you look at the government members, it was 44 per cent. That's what they tell me. I was concerned about this too, Mr. Chairman. So I got hold of our office, and they said that when they drew up their budget they realized Bob Clark wasn't going to be here.

MR. COOK: You didn't plan on winning the by-election?

MR. APPLEBY: Probably the estimates were that they would have someone to replace Bob Clark.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Our conversation when we were doing the budgeting -- as a matter of fact, it was Bill Purdy who said that this is based on four members.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I didn't realize it was based on four members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly assumed it was.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the figures we broke out, which appear in the second column opposite the solid line, under the heading Expenses Identified to Leader of the Official Opposition, were those we were able to readily identify from the supplementary budget information provided to the Clerk's office, which we could directly relate as being expenditures peculiar to the leader: the differential between a ministerial stenographer and a member's stenographer, that being of a higher grade; the value of an executive assistant; and certain travel expenses. Obviously a caucus is not obliged to submit detailed information relative to its program. Therefore we were not able to break this out any more.

The other matter that members of the committee should be aware of is the question of the means of raising these funds. As I understand it, the budget books are in the printing stage, at least to the extent that type is being set. We anticipate being able to see proofs of that which pertains to the Legislative Assembly within a matter of days. If a decision were taken today, the process would be for the Speaker, in his capacity as minister for the Legislative Assembly under the Financial Administration Act, to communicate to the Provincial Treasurer any changes which were recommended. The Treasurer would, in his wisdom, determine whether amendments could still be made to the budget book or whether the funds should be raised by special warrant as the year progresses. I suggest that if a decision is delayed beyond this evening, and the Speaker is unable to communicate to the Provincial Treasurer a requirement for any additional funds, if that is the recommendation of the committee, there will be no alternative but to raise the funds by way of special warrant. If a decision is made for a transfer from funds already approved to establish a budget for the new member, the Speaker would be obliged only to sign transfer documents at any time during the year. I provide that merely as information as to the process.

MR. MANDEVILLE: My concern is why these figures are put out: Expenses Identified to the Leader of the Official Opposition, \$40,856. Was that put there as an indication that that was what Bob was getting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that was for Ray Speaker.

MR. STEFANIUK: That was what we could work out, Fred, that pertains to your caucus because you have the Leader of the Official Opposition. In other words, because he is Leader of the Official Opposition and has certain perks which are identical to those of ministers, he's entitled, for example, to a stenographer at a higher calibre. The difference between the cost of a stenographer for a member and a minister would be approximately \$3,000. He is entitled to an executive assistant, at a cost of \$35,000. There are certain travel expenses which pertain to him as Leader of the Official Opposition. But that was all we were able to break out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody in the government caucus has ministerial status in these items. For purposes of comparability, we broke those out.

MRS. OSTERMAN: To get the true picture of the budget of the Official Opposition, you add the two figures together?

MR. STEFANIUK: You subtract one from the other. The total budget for the Official Opposition is \$407,518. In order to arrive at a figure which would not reflect the special perks of the leader, we would subtract \$40,856.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that is covered in the footnote.

MR. GOGO: A simple resolution would be: Fred's party caused the election, so Fred's party can look after Mr. Kesler.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

MR. GOGO: Seriously, though, we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of Alberta. What this committee is going to have to resolve, regardless of the printing -- you know, that's out to lunch. Forget the printing; this could be happening in two weeks. That to me is not an issue. What we have to consider -- and I'm not saying it's easy, Fred -- is what amount of the total budget, assuming it was based on the full complement of their caucus at the time, which included Bob Clark, and break out that figure. I think we're going to have to approach it as what a member of the Assembly needs, such as Frank has pointed out: a secretary, telephone, research capacity, and so on -- the approach we took a year ago for the Member for Calgary Buffalo. We're going to have to approach it in much the same way. I'm not talking about dollars; I'm talking about what a member requires. In fairness to the taxpayers of Alberta, Fred, whether you like it or not, a substantial amount of it, or some of it, or a little, is going to have to come out of your budget. Built in there were funds for the Member for Olds-Disbury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The fact that an estimate is approved doesn't mean it has to be spent. If a member dies, which is one form of leaving the House, you don't expect to spend the money anyway.

MR. GOGO: To hear the press, half of them are that way now.

MR. APPLEBY: We must not lose sight of the fact that the Official Opposition has certain responsibilities, which are included in the global funding for them. You can't take those things out, because the Official Opposition has to undertake those responsibilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure how you put dollars on them, Frank.

MR. APPLEBY: I'm not saying you take any of them out. You just want to say that you're one member less; what were the essential services that member had to have in order to serve his constituents.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I don't know what staff in particular was serving Bob Clark. That's the question I meant to ask and, I think, Frank was asking. That's the fairest way of looking at this.

MR. MANDELBAUM: I'm relatively new in the committee. Just by way of information, there was a precedent where a caucus was one member less. What happened there? Was his staff's salary taken out of the Conservative caucus budget, or was there an addition to the Legislative Assembly budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I couldn't say exactly. Of course, there would be a difference in degree: a one-forty-third reduction compared with a one-fourth reduction. There's such a substantial difference in degree that it would amount to a difference in kind.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I was just going to bring that to the attention of Mr. Gogo when he asked me to take care of Western Concept.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It's hard to get rid of one-fifth of a secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you agree with the suggestion that we will give the assistance we can to the Member for Olds-Didsbury in drawing up a budget? Fred, you might be able to help him a little too, from the point of view of your leader being the Leader of the Official Opposition. It will be understood, however, that that draft budget in no way commits this committee. Or do you want us to say, you're on your own; you go ahead and do what you can, and bring in the amounts?

MR. GOGO: To the Member for Olds-Didsbury?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GOGO: Oh, Mr. Chairman. He's a new member elected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I realize that.

MR. GOGO: And he should have all the empathy this committee can give him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I want to do.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Just so I'm perfectly clear, so it doesn't appear that we're telling him he has to accept our help, or anybody's help . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll just offer.

MRS. OSTERMAN: By all means. I think you should ask if he would like some assistance, and then leave it up to the members.

MR. APPLEBY: There are all kinds of sources he can go to for assistance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's tell him we deferred this item, that it was too short a time for him to be ready, and that we hope that within the next week or 10 days he can come up with some kind of budget, and then we'll be glad to have a meeting with him to deal with it; but in the meantime, we'd like copies in our office so we can share them with all members of the committee.

MR. APPLEBY: As a committee, Mr. Chairman, I think we should be recognizing that these figures will go into the budget book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The budget book is done.

MR. APPLEBY: That's right.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask too that if Fred can bring from his caucus a suggestion as to what they believe to be fair in terms of their . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He'll be getting a copy of the draft budget prepared . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm talking about their own situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Do you want to do that, Fred? Bring to the next meeting a proposal as to the affect the change in membership may have?

MR. APPLEBY: Their views on it anyway.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I can bring our views on it as far as this was a budget that was drafted. Maybe, as Connie said, they anticipated four.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's what I understood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly did.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Personally, I spend none of it in the Legislature. I get the work that is done in the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right for that item?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just one other thing. Just in case we don't meet for a while, one of the suggestions that could be made is that at the very least the new member should think about -- you've already told him a secretary would be available, but he will need some research capability. He might be thinking about that ahead of time, even though we're not dealing with budget. There's advertising and so on to be done.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I anticipated no problem in providing routine services to the member for the balance of this fiscal year, to March 31, 1982. Certainly before we are in a position to provide other than routine assistance, I would require some authorization from this committee, at the very least. If the hon. member approached me and told me he wanted to hire a research officer at a fairly substantial salary, I don't think I could do that as a matter of course.

MR. APPLEBY: The salary would be comparable with what is being paid for the other research staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't he be in a comparable position to Tom Sindlinger?

MR. STEFANIUK: I'd like some guidance. In effect, this committee has said to me that the NDP office has an amount of \$21,877 for professional, technical, and labor services, beginning April 1. So I'm guided by that in paying out expenses relative to a research service that falls under this particular heading.

MR. APPLEBY: What about the contract employees?

MR. STEFANIUK: There as well I have some guideline.

MR. APPLEBY: Where does the Independent member's research person come in?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think he has \$3,000 under professional, technical, and labor services, and \$22,500 under payment to contract employees. If the Independent member were to direct me to place on staff an employee at the rate of \$22,500 per year, I would be obliged to do so. But if I have no figure at all and no guidance from this committee, I would be rather reluctant to engage someone and make a commitment to them pursuant to the provisions of the Public Service Act.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Can we leave it up to the chairman to make sure there is secretarial and research capacity for the new member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I make an assumption that it is likely that the funding this committee may be willing to approve for the Independent member will include payment to contract employees and professional, technical, and labor services equivalent to those for the Member for Calgary Buffalo?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Until he presents a budget to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, if we can't give a commitment to the research assistant . . .

MR. APPLEBY: Oh yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Secretary and research.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. OSTERMAN: As a starting point, so he can get that off the ground. Then he can present a budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see. So this will be included in the budget. But what about a commitment to staff? At the moment, we're not prepared to go beyond temporary staff, because we haven't yet approved funding for a permanent secretary; neither should we, at the present stage, approve a commitment to a research assistant until permanent funding is approved. That's why I'm asking you . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Doesn't that handicap him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. But I'm simply asking -- maybe I haven't made it clear. I'm simply asking whether you're prepared to give an indication that there is a strong likelihood you're going to approve funding similar to that for the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. APPLEBY: Temporarily the same.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Would it be any help to the Clerk if we were to make a motion that the new member could have a secretary for, say, \$20,000 and a researcher for \$20,000, until we set a proper budget?

MR. APPLEBY: There are other services too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you can't hire somebody for three weeks. This is the whole thing I'm trying to explain. If we don't have a commitment that you're going to go beyond that time, we have to make do with temporary help right now. But if we have an indication [inaudible], then he can go out now and look for a permanent secretary and for a researcher. Otherwise we'll give him a temporary secretary, but I don't know whether we'll get a temporary researcher, until you reach a decision.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: All I was trying to do was get the Clerk off the hook for the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody around the table wants to keep the Clerk off the hook.

MR. COOK: Could we simply say that that member could operate much as the Member for Calgary Buffalo would, and hire a permanent secretary and researcher, so long as that salary would not exceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we're doing then is right now approving a large part of his budget. I'm not saying that's wrong.

MR. APPLEBY: But he has to have other services besides those that are mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supposing we say, look, we're ready to stick our necks out a bit in the Clerk's office. You can get yourself a permanent secretary and researcher, because we think the Members' Services Committee is likely to approve those on the same basis we have for Calgary Buffalo, or something close to it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, my concern is that, number one, I can't imagine that for a short while he'll really have a feeling for what his requirements are. It's just not fair to him to have temporary staff if he's got some good people in mind to hire.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll go ahead on that basis.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I'd have to agree. He's brand new in there and doesn't know the ropes. He needs some help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll have to tell him quite truthfully that this was the best we could do in his absence.

MR. APPLEBY: That he can hire a permanent secretary and researcher if he so wishes, and that the other services will be provided.

MRS. OSTERMAN: And we'd like him to get a budget together as quickly as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then as soon as he gets a budget together and we have it circulated, we'll try to call another meeting.

MR. GOGO: But we don't do anything without talking to the new Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we get a budget from him.

MR. GOGO: To find out that in fact he's interested in this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll ask him to prepare the budget. We'll offer assistance, and Fred has agreed to do the same.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Fred will offer good advice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that looks after the next item of business, which is the date for the next meeting. That leaves only one further item, and that is adjournment.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So moved.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Could we have our next meeting at the call of the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the point, Fred, after we've circulated the budget. As I understand it, the meeting will concentrate on or be confined to dealing with that budget.

All those in favor of the motion for adjournment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.