

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Thursday, June 2, 1983

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

5:45 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the committee to order. I'd like to mention two main points. One is on the -- well, we can leave it until we reach number five. The other is that we have a host of items here of varying degrees of urgency -- some not terribly urgent. We're not likely to finish them all. In fact, there's at least one item we can't deal with tonight. It's under "other business"; I'll mention it a little later.

My suggestion is that we might go over the agenda and see if we can get agreement in the committee as to the items we should deal with first, and then the most urgent item, which arises under "other business", will be to fix the date for the next meeting. The reason that is urgent is that once the new Legislative Assembly Act takes effect, there will be certain things which heretofore have been looked after under the old Act and which are now the responsibility of the Member Services' Committee. We therefore must meet just about at once and pass resolutions to provide for some of those things. Otherwise they'll be suspended or cut off until we get around to it.

I have asked, and I'll remind, the Law Clerk to review the new Act and list those items. We'll work out some outline of what we're to do and share it with the members of the committee. But shortly after that, we should have a meeting.

MRS. CRIPPS: What specific items are you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, for example, they're setting a rate per kilometre to be paid to members travelling on committee business. This is to be done by the Speaker on the recommendation of the Members' Services Committee. I can't move until you recommend it. That's just one, and there are some others. They may not be that onerous. As soon as I get an outline worked out with the Law Clerk, I'll share it with all members of the committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just picking up on the first point you mentioned, the review of the agenda. Number one, I very much appreciate receiving this book, in this order of information. I think this is just excellent. It afforded me the opportunity to read everything through it. So first of all, it's a compliment. Secondly, I don't think it's going to take very long to go through this whole agenda in terms of my concerns with the items. I think we can just rattle off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm in the hands of the committee. If you want to try it that way, we can take it in turn.

MR. HYLAND: Let's start at No. 2 and go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 16, is there a motion? Mr. Hyland. Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Business arising from the minutes -- I really don't think there is any. I reviewed it and the only possible item, I guess -- there were

several resolutions requiring that certain things be passed on to the committee on privileges and elections. If that has been done, and I assume it has, then we've looked after any business arising from the minutes.

MR. KOWALSKI: One item, I guess it would be minute 83-183, on page 43.83: I know it has been done. Basically Dr. Reid has moved that a certain provision be made for up to 24 *per diem* subsistence allowances over a period of one year on the submission of a declaration. I know full well that that recommendation was passed on to the other committee that we're talking about, the committee on privileges and elections.

In looking at the Act, I have a little concern with some words that are in the Act. I have brought it to the attention of the Government House Leader, and I'm not sure that we need to do anything further in this committee. I just wanted to highlight it. There is one item in one section of the Act which basically says that you have to maintain a residence. That was not the intent of the recommendation put forward by the Members' Services Committee. I just want to flag it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that this is something that we should look at again once the Act is passed?

MR. KOWALSKI: My intent would be to have it covered before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that'll be up to the members who are . . . Do you want this item carried forward to the next agenda?

MR. HYLAND: It should be dealt with before, otherwise it's . . .

DR. REID: I think it will be dealt with elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that sufficient for the minutes of the previous meeting? Okay.

Concerns of visitors to the meeting -- that's possibly a puzzling item. That's a carryover from the former committee. Occasionally MLAs come in. They've sent memos to the committee, they want certain things to be considered, and they come along to explain and support their proposals. So we give them a fairly high place on the agenda. We haven't any of those this time.

It looks as though Mr. Kowalski may be right. Number five, opposition representation on the committee. We have an interesting situation there. I expressed to the Law Clerk some doubt as to whether the resignations of the two opposition representatives on the committee were actually effective. There didn't seem to be any readily available, clear answer. So I asked the research section of the library to look into it and see what they could find out from other Houses. I got the report today, and I haven't had a chance to see it. It looks a little voluminous, but that's because there are excerpts from other Houses' *Standing Orders*.

But the upshot is that there is a precedent, at least in the Ontario House, for saying that a member who resigns from a committee does not effectively cease to be a member of that committee until the resignation is accepted by the Assembly, because the Assembly constitutes the committee. It in effect gives members certain responsibilities, and the question is whether members may divest themselves of those responsibilities without the approval of the Assembly. The opinion in Ontario seems to be that they may not.

In any case, this meeting is properly constituted because notice of it went to those two members anyway. I thought that if they didn't want to take part, they'd at least have the right to come as observers. I leave that for your

consideration, and I propose to share the results of this research with the two members who purport to have resigned. Is that enough for that item? Okay

Television coverage of the House proceedings. We've had so much material thrown at us in the last while that I'm sure no one could be faulted for not having read the supporting material under tab six. If you want to, we can just hesitate for a moment while you have a look at that.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I went through this and think I did respond to you at one stage, maybe in February, regarding the proposal from ACCESS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did get answers from a number of members after I sent them a memo on this subject, but I haven't the answers here in my book. In fact the memo is right here, January 31. It's in your material.

MR. HYLAND: I wonder if it would be better to get all that together so we could see what some of the recommendations were?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The answers given by the members who answered? I can share those with you easily.

MR. HYLAND: We've got till the fall session to sort something out. Now it isn't going to make any difference in the spring, obviously.

MR. KOWALKSI: I was going to make that suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps we look at this in August or September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it your wish, then, that I send you copies of the answers I did receive? How long do you want it tabled?

MR. HYLAND: What about till the second meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The meeting after next. Is that agreed?

MR. HYLAND: The next meeting could be fairly soon, couldn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It should be fairly soon if we're going to get the Legislative Assembly Act in operation. It's agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item seven. These are some incidental items, and the supporting material is under the lettered tabs. First, refrigerator and microwave oven in Room 513. That arose from a memo from Mr. Gogo, which you'll find in your material, dated April 26 this year.

MR. HYLAND: Just a question or a comment. When we talked about and made the motions relating to global budgeting, I thought that was the kind of thing we made it for, so that these kinds of small things could be done and Members' Services wouldn't be looking at them all the time. For example, if a minister wants to purchase something for his office, it comes out of his office allotment and that's it. I'm speaking mainly about (a).

MR. KOWALSKI: May I raise a question, Mr. Chairman? When a refrigerator and a microwave oven were supplied to the seventh floor in the Annex, was it the Members' Services Committee in an appropriation under their responsibility that provided that, or was it some other . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no recollection of it. That doesn't mean it didn't happen.

MRS. CRIPPS: I sent a request to Government Services for a fridge for 503 at the beginning of this session, because there were a number of nights that a lot of us missed any meal whatsoever. You know, you were here for meetings. Personally I think there should be a small fridge in both 503 and 513.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If this is done for part of the government caucus, is there any need to look into whether it be done for any of the opposition members?

MRS. CRIPPS: They've got a ministerial budget.

MR. HYLAND: It depends where it comes from, I suppose. If it's taken out of the budget they can do the same thing, can they not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Pratt's here. I think perhaps she could add some explanation.

MRS. PRATT: I'd just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we didn't estimate for that amount. That sum of money wasn't estimated.

MR. HYLAND: But you're looking at what for a small fridge? Two hundred dollars?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It'd be a question of stocking it too, wouldn't it?

DR. REID: No, that would be up to the members.

MR. HYLAND: The one we have over there -- you put your own stuff in it to keep it cool.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it turned out to be popular, would a small one be big enough?

MRS. CRIPPS: It would in 503.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, as a rural member I'm only speaking for myself, but I'd never use a microwave or a fridge. I don't know where they find time to make a lunch and pack it in there. I don't really see the need for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we say that the committee considered this and if Mr. Gogo wishes to pursue it, would he care to come and speak about it at a future meeting.

DR. REID: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, since we're talking essentially about 513 and 503, it should be, as Mr. Hyland suggests, an internal matter for the government caucus to look at. If they make the decision and decide not to take it out of our global budget figure, they come back to Members' Services asking for the additional funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would it be agreed that we reply to Mr. Gogo by saying that it was the opinion of the committee that this was an internal matter for the government caucus? Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7(b): this is based on a memo from the Member for Barrhead, who is here. The memo is in your supporting material, dated January 28.

MR. KOWALSKI: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I can just explain what this request is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think you can say it better today?

MR. KOWALSKI: Essentially the request, on the basis of the memo dated January 28, 1983, is very simple. All members currently have a communications allowance. My request is that one of the acceptable purchases listed under the communications allowance be a camera that the member would have in his constituency office that would allow him to take with him or her in attending a public function for a picture in the event that no local reporter/newspaper person was there. This is not a request for an additional sum of money over and above what is currently available under the communications allowance. This simply is a request for permission that an acceptable expenditure under the communications allowance be such that it would allow one to purchase a camera.

DR. REID: Which would the possession of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suppose there isn't a great deal of difference in principle between producing images by a photocopier and producing them by a camera.

MR. HYLAND: It would be tough to carry a photocopier around in your back pocket.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As in the case of word processors, if it's bought out of public funds and isn't consumed, it becomes public property and thereby imposes on the administration of the Assembly the requirement to keep account of it. I don't know whether it's appropriate for me to raise a political consideration; I don't whether such a camera would have a tag on it saying: Property of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. If you took it to a family picnic and somebody saw that on it, you might wish you had used your own camera.

MR. PURDY: I have a big family out there, 26,000 electors, so I guess I'd get away with it all right.

MR. KOWALSKI: Frankly, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, at one point I would have made the argument that there's absolutely nothing under the rules with respect to the expenditure of the communications allowance that would prohibit a member from using those funds for such a purchase. I've always viewed that unless legislation says you can't do it, you have the inherent right to do it. Of course that's just a philosophy. That's always a debatable item when it comes to law.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sometimes legislators aren't sufficiently omniscient to rule out certain things.

MR. KOWALSKI: From my perspective, I see no difficulty with this at all. An identification tag on it would be no different from the pocket recorders that all of us have. They're not identified with that label, Property of the Legislative Assembly, yet we all have one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's Legislative Assembly property and it needs repair, does the Assembly have to pay for that?

MR. KOWALSKI: If the principle is accepted that it would be an appropriate purchase under the communications allowance, yes, that would certainly have to follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would have to come out of the communications allowance?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, which each member would have.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, a question to the Member for Barrhead. What about the processing of films? Where does that come in?

MR. KOWALSKI: It would logically follow that that would also come out of the communications allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to deal with it or consider it?

MR. KOWALSKI: I would like to propose a motion that one of the acceptable purchases permitted under the communications allowance be the purchase of photographic equipment.

MR. HYLAND: When you say it that way, that could mean a whole darkroom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Hasselblad you could get for \$7,000 or \$8,000.

MR. KOWALSKI: There's a governing factor: some of us have a very, very minute amount for a communications allowance.

MR. BLAIN: I was about to suggest, with respect, Mr. Chairman, that it might be advisable to set a ceiling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean they could get a Brownie but not a Hasselblad.

MR. HYLAND: You have to get a simple one if everybody is going run it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My concern is that I don't feel confident in foreseeing the ramifications that might arise from a precedent of that kind.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my motion and my memo of January 28, 1983, to the Members' Services Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With, I hope, the freedom to raise it at any other time. It hasn't been dealt with.

DR. REID: I wonder if in the interim, Mr. Chairman, we should allow the purchase and the processing of film under the communications allowance.

MR. HYLAND: The purchasing isn't what gets you. It's the processing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word "communications" is almost unlimited in its scope. Throwing a brick at someone is a form of communication.

MRS. CRIPPS: As a follow up, though, to what Dr. Reid said, I know some members who, when they make a presentation or an opening, do take pictures and send them to the people involved. As Alan said, that's a very costly item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not a frivolous thing at all.

DR. REID: That's why I was making the suggestion, Mr. Chairman. I'm thinking of openings and things where you get the group to take a photograph with your camera, and you end up sending 10, 12, or 17 copies of the picture.

MRS. CRIPPS: Half a loaf is better than none.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to propose a motion. The last one has been withdrawn, so I move that the cost of the purchase of film and of processing the film be acceptable items of expenditure under the communications allowance.

MR. HYLAND: When it's being used for legislative purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When used for the purposes of the communications allowance. Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're leaving the camera in abeyance, are we?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It means that I'll never have to buy film because I can't afford the camera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item is transportation allowance, including the special northern allowance.

AN HON. MEMBER: You missed (c), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I missed 7(c), to fund entertainment. That's based also on a memo from Mr. Gogo, which is in your material. It seems to indicate that the communications allowance might also be used as a hospitality allowance.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move that we hold that in abeyance until there's more time to think about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you imagine, for example, a member taking people to lunch and having a bottle of Baron Rothschild's best? Over to the next meeting: is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

MR. HYLAND: Just another point on the same thing. I suppose it depends how much we have at the next meeting, but it's the same thing: how soon the next meeting comes. It may be called just to deal with the necessities from the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're concerned about overloading the next agenda by carrying over. But don't you think that having had a little opportunity to discuss and think about these things, we'll likely deal with them more quickly at the next meeting?

7(d) was raised by Mr. Fischer. To some extent I think it's looked after by the new Legislative Assembly Act, is it not?

DR. REID: Item one is.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think we should hold this one until we have more time. We may have to spend a whole meeting on this.

MR. KOWALSKI: The question of transportation allowances for the three northern representatives has been resolved.

DR. REID: Item one on Mr. Fischer's memorandum to the chairman is also dealt with in the new Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. KOWALSKI: So the only outstanding one is really the one dealing with certain transportation costs. I would accept the recommendation of Mr. Hyland that we hold it over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the next meeting?

MR. KOWALSKI: A future meeting.

MR. HYLAND: A future meeting. We won't have time at the next meeting, because that's going to take a major discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, would you want it tabled indefinitely but we would add a reminding note of it on the agenda of future meetings until it's dealt with? Is that satisfactory? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered. Training for constituency office secretaries, 7(e). That also is a memo from Mr. Gogo.

DR. REID: I presume from the last paragraph that what he's suggesting is that the Members' Services Committee approve this as an expenditure under the constituency office allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, it would mean that one of the costs of running your office would be for your secretary to take a trip to Edmonton once in a while.

MR. HYLAND: I think that would be worth while, so that they'd have a chance to talk to each other from all over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean have a convention of constituency secretaries?

MR. HYLAND: Or just a meeting, whatever.

MR. PURDY: A question to Mrs. Pratt. Have we got the money in the budget? I know that most constituency offices are up to the allocated amounts in their funding anyway, and the expenses are there. I could envisage that one office would have some money left to bring a secretary in for a training session, but the other office for the other constituency would be up to its allocated amount and wouldn't be able to afford to bring a secretary in. So I could see some problems arising from that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's only for approval to use it within the ceiling. It would be up to the member how he applies the money.

MRS. PRATT: [inaudible]

MR. HYLAND: This way you've got one coming to a certain place. There you have one going to three or four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My concern is that a lot of things look pretty legitimate, but the public perception of it is otherwise. If somebody in Milk River finds out that there's a constituency secretary from there travelling to Edmonton once in a while at public expense . . .

MR. HYLAND: I'm thinking once a year, not necessarily once a month. They'd go in, talk to the others, and see what the common problems are.

MR. PENGELLY: They can pick up the phone.

MR. PURDY: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: We do it with everybody else. The government pulls people in from all over the place to bring them in for a briefing session once a year, or whatever, from all parts of the province. Then you're not necessarily working out there in isolation all the time.

MR. KOWALSKI: I might give you a real example. This week, I instructed my constituency office secretary in Barrhead to come to Edmonton to visit with my Legislative Assembly secretary and view the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, something she's never had the experience to do. Currently, of course, she will be paying for her transportation out of her own purse, which is no problem.

I say that because I do support the concept put forward by the Member for Lethbridge West. In fact, I would be prepared to propose a motion to that effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion? Does somebody want to move a motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I move that one of the acceptable expenditure items under the constituency office allowance be the provision of travel costs for a constituency secretary to travel from the constituency office to the capital city, to a maximum of two times per year.

MRS. CRIPPS: Providing there's funding in the budget.

DR. REID: Within the budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you want to put a limit on the number of days the secretary might stay here? Would it be okay for a couple of weeks?

MRS. CRIPPS: We'll deal with that when it happens.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I can sense a feeling here that -- there's a difference between the constituency secretaries working out of the city of Edmonton or near the city of Edmonton, and mine and John's working a long way away from the capital, or Ian's, out in Hinton. It's vastly different.

I sense a feeling that there isn't a need to bring them in and there isn't that difference. Those offices were started four years ago as something new -- three years ago, whatever. I know that in mine, we're getting all sorts of

things that we never, ever dreamed would be involved in them at the start. But it's a service to the constituents.

I think there are benefits to their coming in, not only to talk to your secretary here. Sure, you can talk to her on the phone. But you can talk to somebody on the phone for five years and never meet them. It's a lot easier, even if they just get a chance to say hello to each other face to face. Not only coming up and doing that; that's only one thing. I think there's a need for them to get together, whether it's here in this building, where they get together and sit down and talk, or whatever. But at least part of that thing is to have the opportunity for them to sit down and discuss their common problems and the things they face. That might even save people like Charlene answering 75 different questions about one thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Charlene does try to make one tour a year of the constituency offices.

MR. HYLAND: It's not the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you think, though, that if you're going to consider the motion to provide for two trips a year, there should be a time limit on the trips?

MRS. CRIPPS: I think you're restricted by the total amount of your budget, in any case. Our constituency office allowance is set. Inherent in Ken's motion is that your constituency office allowance cannot exceed that amount. I really don't see it as a problem.

MR. PENGELLY: If she's on an hourly wage, she won't get paid while she's up here, anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, she just might.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's not part of my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's part of the job.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's not part of the motion.

MR. BLAIN: If you're sending her here, she should be paid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: She's not coming on a holiday.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may. Before you vote on the motion, may I suggest that the motion be so worded as to incorporate the purpose. As I recall, it was that the secretary be authorized to make two trips a year to the capital city. Because you're dealing with public funds, I think you should be very careful in the wording of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of orientation? Is there a better word?

MR. KOWALSKI: Louise, do you have that motion?

MRS. EMPSON: That it be acceptable under the constituency office allowance that there be provision of travel costs for a constituency office secretary to travel from the constituency office to the capital city to a maximum of two times per year.

DR. REID: I think we should have the caveat "for the purpose of orientation".

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of orientation?

MR. BLAIN: And to the Legislative Assembly.

DR. REID: To the Legislative Assembly, rather than the capital city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Are you content with that?

MR. KOWALSKI: Absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of orientation with regard to the Legislative Assembly. Do you want to say that? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor? Opposed? Carried.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, this was not part of the motion, but inherent in the motion I presented is that the costs that would be incurred should follow the guidelines in place for the public service, so that there's no misunderstanding. In the event that somebody might get a private jet aircraft -- that's very extreme. But it would be the guidelines currently in place for the public service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to add to the motion "and that the payment for travel and subsistence be in accordance with public service norms"?

MRS. CRIPPS: Fair enough.

MR. KOWALSKI: Who's going to present that motion?

MRS. CRIPPS: You did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's your motion.

MR. KOWALSKI: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the assembly agree with the motion as amended?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. HYLAND: Can I make another pitch related to that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the topic we're on.

MR. HYLAND: I don't think it would cost a lot of money, if any, if a group of them decided to come in, that the staff would be prepared to spend some time with them. I mean not only our staff, the secretaries -- that we can take care of -- but the staff of the Legislature, to have a session where they can ask questions and exchange information. It'll cost in time, but I don't think it will cost in dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One thing just occurred to me as an afterthought, unfortunately. I know of at least one constituency where instead of a constituency office secretary, there is a constituency office assistant, a person who doesn't do much correspondence but helps run the office.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's in the same terms, Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't say that we would differentiate between . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't want to say a constituency office staff person?

MR. BLAIN: I think you could probably take "secretary" as a generic term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

Okay, can we go on to the next item, which is . . .

MR. HYLAND: I wonder if there's agreement with my suggestion. If a group of them wanted to come and wanted to sit down with the staff, so they can have a general discussion -- like I said, it's not going to cost any money, but it's going to cost some people some time. Would that be an acceptable set-up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That wouldn't change the text of the motion, would it?

MR. HYLAND: It wouldn't change the text of the motion at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You just want it understood in the minutes that that's one of the things that could happen.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. I just wondered if there was any opposition to that. Like I said, it's not going to cost any more dollars.

MRS. CRIPPS: A good idea for a future thought.

MR. BLAIN: I think that would be an administrative detail which could be worked out.

MR. KOWALSKI: Sure. Inherent in the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And which you couldn't very well legislate.

MR. HYLAND: No. It wouldn't necessarily be put in the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Can we go on to 7(f)? That arose from a memo of Mr. King's.

MR. HYLAND: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, is that something that has to be dealt with? That matter was relating to the averaging of the dollars -- not in total, though, was it? I mean the averaging, where you could pool your . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The pooling of the salaries with the rent.

MR. HYLAND: Not only that, but communications, et cetera. We haven't done that yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, this is under constituency allowance. You'll notice the bottom item, under the supporting material, is Mr. King's memo of March 19, 1981.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that we deal with this matter at a future meeting, when and if Bill 67 becomes law?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion of that motion?

MR. HYLAND: That was my question. I don't know if we can, before that.

DR. REID: I think it's wise to defer the discussion, because the present legislation just doesn't allow it.

MR. KOWALSKI: No, but they know when it would.

MR. HYLAND: We'll have to repeat it if we pass it now.

DR. REID: I don't think we can pass it now.

MRS. CRIPPS: And the next one, the photocopier, will be the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion that we defer item 7(f) until after the new Legislative Assembly Act takes effect.

DR. REID: And item 7(g).

MR. CHAIRMAN: And likewise item 7(g). Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered.

Can we go to 8? We've run into a problem there. PWA informed us they were no longer going to send us individual vouchers for items charged under the travel credit cards. I'm not sure whether we discussed it two or three meetings ago, but I did discuss it with the Clerk. I suggested that if they're going to -- what they were proposing was that there would be one account in the name of the Legislative Assembly, and we would get a lump-sum billing on it. We wouldn't know which member charged what for which. I suggested to the Clerk that he go back to PWA and ask them: in that event, why not open up 79 individual accounts? They agreed, so if the committee approves, I assume that we'll proceed to open up 79 individual accounts.

We checked with Time Air, and they don't propose to do that. They're going to continue sending us the individual vouchers.

MR. HYLAND: I would so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Is it agreed that we open up 79 different accounts?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, if I can revert to item 7(e), when we originally started discussing it, a comment was made that perhaps the secretaries here in the Legislature should be able to reciprocate by going out to visit the constituencies they're dealing with. I don't think some of them have much idea as to the nature of the constituency unless they see it. I'm not referring to city girls out in the country, necessarily.

I think it would be useful to have that capability. It strikes me as just as important that the secretary in the Legislature as much as possible have a knowledge of the constituency, as it is that the secretary out there have a knowledge of the Legislative Assembly, out of the same budget; in other words, that the member have some discretion. Rather than two visits a year to the Assembly by the constituency office secretary, it might be just as useful to

have one visit here by the constituency office secretary and have a visit to the constituency by the secretary in the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you regard the training of a secretary who works under the dome or in the Agriculture Building as a constituency office expense? Or is that perhaps an expense that relates to what we do here?

DR. REID: Well, we used the word "orientation".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but can orientation of secretaries on staff to caucuses here, for example, be called a constituency office expense?

MRS. CRIPPS: I would support Dr. Reid's suggestion, but I don't know how you'd bill it to the constituency office. I wonder if we could just do it out of the government members' budget.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I think this is a question that you should examine very carefully, because the people you're referring to are permanent employees, paid from the salary vote for the Assembly. I don't say that it can't be done, nor do I recommend that it can't be done. I do say that you should examine very carefully the question of sending them out to the constituencies at public expense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But aren't they really contract employees, whose employment ends when an election is called?

MR. BLAIN: No, they're not contract employees. They're project employees.

MR. HYLAND: They were laid off when the election was on.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, but they are a classification of permanent employee. They're distinguished as being project employees, as opposed to temporary or wage.

It's only a suggestion, but perhaps it should be examined quite carefully.

DR. REID: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the staff could work on the implications of it and, if we decided to go ahead, how it should be handled on a financial basis, then give us the information and we can address the issue again at some future meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that perhaps Mr. Blain or Miss Blaney might take it up with Mrs. Pratt and with people on the staff of the Independents and the Official Opposition? Is that all right? Would you like to carry it over to the next meeting?

DR. REID: A future meeting -- once we have that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we do this. If you agree, we'll table it. We'll carry it forward by way of a reminder on future agendas until it comes off the table. In the meantime, we'll share with you the results of the consultations with the members' staff.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe we can try to get a handle on the estimated dollars it would take to accomplish that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? It's been proposed that we ask the staff of the Assembly to consult with appropriate staff persons of the government members,

the Independents, and the NDP to work out the ramifications of this proposal and also to calculate probable costs. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You wanted to go back to something?

MR. HYLAND: I'm not sure where it fits. It could be in administrative or it could be in service. Mr. Chairman, when do you as Speaker have the power to change the amount in the constituency office allotment? I understand it's normally done once a year, as things grow, and I just wondered if it's time that it should be done again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do it only on the recommendation of this committee.

MR. HYLAND: But is it time that you need a recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd have to check. My recollection is that it was done last year.

MR. HYLAND: Well, this is possibly a new year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's how we ended up with odd numbers. Would you like me to check and send you a note as to when it was last done?

MR. HYLAND: With inflation and some of the changes in the contracts coming in -- some of those offices have been open three years -- I would suspect some of them may be getting near the limit. It might be an appropriate time to make that adjustment you normally have been making.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it really hasn't settled into a practice as yet. As far as I can recall, the only adjustment made since this funding came into effect was some time last year, quite a few weeks before the election was called.

MR. HYLAND: Well, if it was at that time, then it wouldn't be due for a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like me to check it and send a memo to each member of the committee saying what and when it was done? Is that all right?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we go on, then, to item 8(b)?

MRS. CRIPPS: In item 8(b), Mr. Chairman, what is the functional date? If this phone has been installed -- many of us, I believe, already have it. What is the functional date when we start billing direct to our numbers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess that depends on completing arrangements with AGT or simply changing the way in which you make the calls. I think the funding is effective from April 1.

MR. HYLAND: We're on now.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, we are in the building. I'm talking about my home phone and my constituency office phone. I have not -- and I don't believe any other member has -- received confirmation of that change. Every day we do not change it, we're costing the government money.

MR. HYLAND: I thought at one time -- somebody told me to start constituency office right after the first of the year, and that's what I did. The Legislative Assembly receives the bill for your constituency office, anyway. I just told my secretary to start accepting calls on the number, not on the credit card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Isn't it just a matter of switching from operator assisted calls to direct dialing, without the assistance of the operator?

MRS. CRIPPS: What about the home? What I'm asking is, when do we do that on, say our home phone?

MR. HYLAND: Can't this be done any time we decide? It's a budget item, not an item related to the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there is a question of the mechanics of it. It would seem to me that perhaps what you might have to do is send the Clerk a photocopy of your long distance account from your home phone number and tick off the items.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm not talking about the home phone number. I'm talking about our private MLA phone in the home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I meant.

MR. HYLAND: You have to change your billing from your name to your name care of the Legislative Assembly on the private number.

MRS. CRIPPS: And that's all there is to it?

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, members should also refer to the memorandum of May 27 from the Clerk to Miss Blaney. He says that funds are not available for anything right now, until such time as the Appropriation Act has been passed.

DR. REID: But that's for installation of additional telephones. Some of the members already have telephones that were installed by the Legislative Assembly. Where they would otherwise be on a party line, they now have a single-line telephone.

MR. PURDY: I didn't realize that.

DR. REID: On those ones, it should be straightforward. You just switch the billing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were a number done after the '79 election.

MR. KOWALSKI: But the authority for what Mrs. Cripps is referring to has been in effect since April 7, 1983, under minute 83-62 of this committee.

MR. BLAIN: That's correct. That's the date it became effective. In response to the comment about the memo of May 27 is perfectly correct. The funds are not legally available to us until the Act is passed; however, we do have funds. We have one-third of our funds available under interim supply.

MR. HYLAND: As long as not more than a third of the members put in their phones. Is that what you're saying, Mr. Blain?

MR. BLAIN: Not really. We can pay for it out of that third. When the Act is passed, then of course our full money is available to us. But I take your point

MR. HYLAND: I don't know what all members are going to do, but my intention is to change the number that is currently in my name to government, and instead of having another phone installed, have one put in in my own name. That will be my private line. It will cost more money to change all your letterheads and all your calling cards to change your number.

DR. REID: How it's done depends on the individual person.

MR. HYLAND: There'll be a lot of variations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Cripps, would it meet your concern if, on the basis of this discussion, the administration prepared a memo of clarification and sent it to all the members?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, I think that should be done. I understood that the provincial government would pay for one phone for a member, and so I said, all right, pay for my constituency office phone. I've always paid for the phone that's in my home. Mind you, it's the private line; the government installed it, but I paid for it for the last four years. My husband has paid for the other phone.

MR. KOWALSKI: As of April 7, you could pay for yours.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll just send the last bill to Charlene. Okay, there's no problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there may be some members not aware of what's been going on.

DR. REID: They may not have had the benefit of the very clear discussions in this committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amen.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to cloud the issue again, but if a note is going to be going out for clarification of this one point, there are some members, myself included, who have no intention of putting in another telephone. I have enough telephones in my home, and I would wish to continue using my credit card for the very few calls I make on it out of my home, so as not to require an additional expenditure of another telephone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but there's also a lot of additional expenditure -- I think someone said it was double -- to make an operator-assisted call as compared with doing direct dialing without the assistance of the operator.

MR. HYLAND: Double the daily rate. So that's four times the rate at night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk made a rough calculation, and it came to a very impressive total sum. So would it not be advantageous to the fisc if you were to change over one of the numbers you already have, so that the billing would go to you care of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I did premise my comments with the very limited number of calls I make out of my house using my credit card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It wouldn't make any difference.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I cannot make that judgment until I know exactly what my charges are on the credit card. I don't get those statements.

MR. HYLAND: If you make \$40 worth of credit card calls out of your house, you're probably at a break-even point.

MR. KOWALSKI: At this point, I can't tell you that, because I never see the telephone statements.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, the difference would be that Mr. Kowalski may not have to phone his constituents long distance; 95 or 98 per cent of mine are long distance.

MR. KOWALSKI: I don't disagree with the policy; I think the policy is a very good one. I just don't want to have something change that's working very well for me at the moment.

DR. REID: It's not a compulsory thing, Mr. Chairman. It's an option.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As Dr. Reid says, it varies from member to member.

MR. HYLAND: Dr. Reid's going to have to get an answering box somewhere in the house.

DR. REID: I'm going to have to get a warning indicator, which telephone it is that's ringing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we'll work up a memorandum, send it to all the members and, hopefully, try to clarify it. Is that all right for item 8(b)?

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, under item 8(b), before you leave it, at the request of the Clerk I drafted guidelines for the use of private line telephones. I've endeavored to make them as simple as possible, not because I'm simple minded but because, as I said, I've found from long experience, the simpler the guidelines are, the easier it is to be adhered to. So this is a proposal that's in front of you under 8(b). It can't of course have any force and effect unless you agree with it. I would appreciate it if you would glance over it and see if the committee agrees, disagrees, or has anything that they'd like me to add or take out.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I just note very quickly, glancing at it, that a lot of spouses, and mine's the same -- if I try to put a black phone in my house, it gets thrown out, the installation man and the whole thing. I would agree with her. I would want to see a color to contrast with the living area of the house.

MR. BLAIN: I might add to my comments the guidelines are based on the information given to me from the Clerk and Miss Blaney. The installation of black telephones is a matter of cost, I assume.

MR. PURDY: Twenty-five cents a month more, Mr. Chairman, for color.

MR. BLAIN: As I say, the guidelines are proposed. I'd be grateful for any changes you would like to have.

MR. PURDY: I'd like to see added that color is the choice of the member.

DR. REID: Let's just say telephone; delete the word "black".

MR. HYLAND: Another question. Where it says: room and floor in residence where it's to be installed. What if you want to put a jack in more than one place but you only want one phone? I have a problem. My office is in the basement. I might want a jack upstairs. The house is already wired for it. It's just a matter of putting an additional jack.

MR. BLAIN: I think that could be accomplished. It had been my intention, when you had agreed or amended these guidelines, that they be incorporated in the members' guide for future reference.

On your question of installing jacks, again I think that would be an administrative detail that could be worked out with the company. In relation to the equipment to be installed, you would like this reference to black desk sets to be deleted. Has the committee any objection to "desk sets", or just leave it at "telephones"?

MRS. CRIPPS: Just leave it at telephones.

DR. REID: Somebody just might want a wall phone.

MR. BLAIN: So the telephones to be installed will be telephones with touch tone dialing.

MR. PURDY: Just to be a little picky on that, some areas of the province won't have touch tone dialling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we just say "telephones"?

MR. BLAIN: Private, single-line telephones will be installed in members' residences.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right.

MR. HYLAND: Can I ask you a question, Mr. Blain? I assume there's going to be a lot -- I think I'm right -- where the installation cost will be on the new line for my family that's going into my house. It won't be for the existing line. All it will be for the existing line is a change in the billing. That's acceptable, isn't it?

MR. BLAIN: I would say so, yes.

MR. HYLAND: That's what I would think too. I assume that 98 per cent of the phones going in the same thing will happen.

MRS. CRIPPS: Your installation costs won't be high.

MR. HYLAND: No, but I'm saying the installation costs will be on the second phone and not on the business phone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has to convert the present phone to charging to Alan Hyland, care of AGT. In order to replace that phone, he's having another one installed. It seems to me that Mr. Blain's memo is very straightforward.

MR. HYLAND: Let's not put any more in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All we need to add to it, in the line of what we were discussing previously, is the step the member should take to change the billing.

MR. HYLAND: I wonder if that needs to be in here, Mr. Chairman, or that can be just in a letter. This is more of a thing that's going in the book, and that doesn't need to be in the book.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, this is a general guideline.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we not add it under "system of billing"? It's going to be necessary for those telephones to be billed in the name of the member care of the Legislative Assembly. Then the phones can be used only for legislative Assembly business, and the entire bill will go to the Clerk's office.

MR. BLAIN: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right? Well, one way or another, we'll achieve compliance with the motion passed at the instigation of Mrs. Cripps, so that all members get complete guidelines. Is that all right?

MR. HYLAND: If you put that in, I suppose all you need is one line that says, charges on this number will be billed to the Legislative Assembly for the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8(c), spouses travel allowance.

MRS. CRIPPS: That last sentence is no longer true at all, is it? First paragraph, last sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It almost looks as though we're going to have to get certificates of co-habitation.

DR. REID: A legal affidavit, duly countersigned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does it say that here?

DR. REID: No, I'm just saying that will be the next thing.

MR. HYLAND: It almost sounds like a lot of stuff we did one time on the Workers' Compensation Act.

MRS. CRIPPS: Why do we define spouse?

MR. KOWALSKI: It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that what we're really looking for is trying to find an easy definition to cover this principle that we've already agreed to in this committee, that compensation should be provided for up to four visits. I would like to move that for the usage of this committee, spouse be defined as either, one, a person who is married to the member or, two, a girlfriend or guest as identified by the member.

MR. HYLAND: Don't use girlfriend, use guest.

MR. KOWALSKI: A guest, as defined by the member. Those be the two definitions.

DR. REID: I agree with that.

MR. HYLAND: I agree with that, too. That trip up north, some of the other groups had their children along. Some of the other members were allowed a family member and, I'm not sure, the one was even a secretary, wife, whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That had to be cleared with the host branch. That's the end of the definition? There's a motion before the House defining spouse.

MR. HYLAND: Before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry?

MR. HYLAND: You said "before the House".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh well, this is a small House. Okay, the bungalow. Is there any discussion? Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Does anyone know of any further attention this topic needs?

MR. KOWALSKI: Just for clarification, how have we resolved the question of expenses incurred? I'm sorry, my memory is a bit shy there. Did we resolve that at an earlier committee meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought we had. Do you remember, Mr. Blain?

MR. PURDY: Which expense?

MR. KOWALSKI: For the cost of the travel. As an example, on this memo we've just looked at from Miss Blaney to Mr. Stefaniuk, we looked at, one, the definition of the spouse. Number two is the calculation, and the bottom two paragraphs are the ones of a little concern for members who do not have an opportunity for their spouses or guests to use airfare.

MR. PENGELLY: You should include Innisfail on that too.

MR. KOWALSKI: How were we going to resolve if there were car expenses? If we've clarified that, I have no further questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought we had. I'm sorry, I'd have to look at some previous minutes.

MRS. CRIPPS: I understood our motion was not just to Edmonton but to any place in the province providing the member was on government business.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, that's correct. These are hypothetical costs developed from various points of the province to the capital.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's great.

DR. REID: I guess my spouse doesn't come, because it doesn't list Edson.

MRS. CRIPPS: You're not even in the have-nots.

MR. HYLAND: You can drive to Edmonton and fly to Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is all the attention we need on this item the definition of spouse? We've agreed to Mr. Kowalski's motion? Okay.

9, other business. The main item I'm aware of is that Legislative Assembly Act; in other words, the things that we must decide arising from duties that have been delegated to us under that Act. I think at the beginning I mentioned, and perhaps I could repeat, that I would propose, as soon as possible, to send a memo to the members of the committee outlining what is required of us under the Act in order to continue programs or funding which was provided under the present Legislative Assembly Act and which is now turned over to us for decision.

Is there any other "other business"?

MR. PENGELLY: We have to set the date for the next meeting, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it's possible to have the meeting on June 13 or 14. Would that be too soon for Mr. Clegg?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaking for myself, I don't think there'd be any problem.

MR. KOWALSKI: The 14th in the evening would be a super time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 14th is a Tuesday.

MR. PURDY: No good for me. I'm tied up with the Legislative Offices meeting that day. We don't know how long it's going to go. But I'm free on the 13th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the 15th any good?

MR. PURDY: Caucus that day. We can't do it then.

DR. REID: There's a softball game in the evening against the media.

MR. HYLAND: What about the 17th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 17th is Friday.

DR. REID: The 17th is out for me.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, most of us come back on that flight on the morning of the 13th.

MR. PURDY: Any probability of having it on the evening of the 13th? That way, it fits in well with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For members from the country, though, it means coming to Edmonton on the evening of the 13th and then going home and coming back for caucus on Wednesday.

MR. HYLAND: It would probably mean we'd end up staying around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess Mr. Purdy isn't free.

MR. HYLAND: Ian, you said the 17th is out for you?

DR. REID: The evening of the 14th is out for me. The 17th is out for me.

MR. KOWALSKI: Would the morning of the 13th be out?

MR. HYLAND: What's wrong with the 16th at night?

DR. REID: On the 16th at night, I've got to get back to the constituency for the 17th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the morning of the 13th?

MR. KOWALSKI: Ten o'clock.

MR. HYLAND: We don't get home before that.

DR. REID: Yes, you do. The plane will be in at roughly half past midnight, Edmonton time.

MR. HYLAND: You guys just don't want to see me go home, I can see that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We arrive at half past midnight Edmonton time?

DR. REID: It should be: 2230 out of Toronto, four hours flying time, two hours difference.

MR. KOWALSKI: I agree with ten o'clock.

MRS. CRIPPS: What time does your plane leave, Al?

MR. HYLAND: 7:30 in the morning. There's not much use going home that afternoon and coming back the next Wednesday. Okay, ten o'clock on the 13th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

MRS. CRIPPS: I won't be here in any case.

MR. HYLAND: She's the one that's making it so damn tough.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, I'm not going to be here regardless.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have we a motion for adjournment?

MR. PURDY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PENGELLY: Do we leave our books?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we'll bring them up to date for the next meeting.

DR. REID: There's an item for information. I didn't do it until we had adjourned. With the global budgets, we foresaw that there might be some difficulty within the various caucuses signing things that were to do with those global budgets. We in the government caucus today authorized Mr. Appleby to sign on our behalf documents or anything else that might have to do with the global budgeting. Perhaps you could tell your staff that if there's anything to do with the government caucus, they could contact Frank about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shouldn't they have a copy of whatever authorizing document you had?

DR. REID: We didn't give an authorizing document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's something that requires a member's signature and the Auditor General looks for that member's signature, he may look for an authorizing document for someone else to sign.

DR. REID: I'll check. If there's one needed, we'll get it signed. I don't think there are any circumstances that he will be disbursing the funds. It will be the authorizing of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For what purposes, though, will he be signing?

DR. REID: We foresaw the possibility of it and decided to do something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But for what purposes?

MR. HYLAND: For the fridge, as an example.

DR. REID: Yes, that's an example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I really think we should have a memorandum.

DR. REID: Well, if you can check with them what sort of thing we need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who agreed? Was it a meeting of the government caucus?

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would it be possible to get a copy of the resolution?

DR. REID: No, we don't keep a formal set of minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I could see a staff person having a valid concern about whether -- if there's no record of any authority and later on somebody says, you have no business putting that through.

MR. HYLAND: What about if we as members of the committee make that resolution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suppose you could. Sure.

DR. REID: It's a government caucus thing, not a Members' Services thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's Members' Services insofar as it relates to government members' offices just as much as if it relates to opposition members' offices.

MRS. CRIPPS: But doesn't the Leader of the Opposition or the Independents sign on behalf of the expenditures for their global budgets?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I knew specifically what's going to be signed, I could find out, but I don't.

MR. HYLAND: That's the trouble, though, with global budgets. We don't know.

DR. REID: It might be to do with equipment; it might be to do with financial matters. We don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, is it that Mr. Appleby has been authorized to sign requests for expenditures on behalf of the government members?

DR. REID: Say that the government and private members decide that they wish to have a piece of equipment out of their global budget. There may be documents required to be signed with the authorization.

DR. REID: Or if it's not purchased, to do with the lease or something like that. If there's a signature required on behalf of the government caucus, what we decided is that Frank will provide that signature on our behalf rather than have 45 signatures on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we've never had them anyway.

MR. HYLAND: But we've never had global budgeting before, either.

MR. BLAIN: If you'll permit me to make a comment on that, global budgeting is the manner in which you build your budget and vote on it. It has no bearing on how you expend it. You expend your funds the same as if you'd built them from a zero budget base. It simply means you voted on the whole package, but when you expend your funds they'll be charged to the various control groups within the budget.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Blain, we're talking about the approval of that first step, so that it can be categorized after that. Normally, when we budgeted, it was all itemized so the staff had to say, it fits here and here, whereas now we need an approval up on top before it starts to slide into these things. Is that not right, Ian?

DR. REID: We were just getting a jump ahead of the game. If it's needed, we've got the authority from the caucus that Frank can do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supposing we follow through on that. I certainly don't want to encourage the creation of any red tape. But I'm thinking of staff persons who act on those requests. It would be understandable that they'd want something in black and white.

MR. BLAIN: You're quite right.

DR. REID: Maybe you can dream up the appropriate document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we agree that we leave it with Mr. Blain?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KOWALSKI: Is there a motion for adjournment, or have we adjourned?

MRS. CRIPPS: We adjourned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're re-adjourned. This is a post-mortem. Thank you very much.

The committee adjourned at 7:10 p.m.