

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[8:10 a.m.]

MR. PURDY: I will call the meeting to order at 8:10. Could we have a motion for the approval of the minutes as received for September 20, 1983?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gee whiz, I had it for 8:30. Isn't that awful? I was thinking of how early I was.

MR. PURDY: I will now relinquish the chairmanship to the chairman. We are at item No. 2, just getting the approval of the minutes. We haven't had that motion yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you had a chance to check the minutes? Is everyone content? Would someone like to move adoption?

MR. HYLAND: I'll move that we adopt them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an item of business arising out of the minutes, but it comes up again in No. 5. Outside of that, I don't think there's anything we need to follow up there.

Concerns of visitors: we haven't any, have we? Yes, we have a representative of the Independent caucus.

Amendments to Members' Services Committee orders: the support material is under No. 5.

MR. PURDY: Just a question on No. 4, Mr. Chairman. I just want to get this clarified once and for all. In April '83 we had two resignations from the committee. You have made a couple of observations on it; that in actual fact they didn't do it in writing, and so on, so they're still members of the committee.

I take a different view. I take the view that they rose in the Legislature, resigned from this committee, have subsequently been asked, I guess, if they would come back on. They said, no, they would not be coming back on. So I don't think we have, by the rules of this committee or any other parliamentary rules, or Roberts' Rules of Order — whatever you want to follow — any acknowledgment of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How do you mean "any acknowledgment"?

MR. PURDY: We are sending information to two members who are no longer on this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We researched the topic. The only precedent we could find was one from Ontario, where it was decided that in a committee appointed by the House, a resignation was not effective unless it was accepted by the House.

MR. PURDY: But in all due respect, if I rise in my place and say I'm going to resign as a member of the Legislature for the Stony Plain constituency, somebody would forthwith bring me the proper forms and I would have to resign.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But that's covered by law, by statute.

MR. PURDY: That's right. It's the same thing as a member resigning from a committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's obviously a debatable point; we've already started a debate on it. We've been sending notices of the meetings and copies of the minutes to these two members as if they were still on the committee. So it hasn't really had any practical effect, other than that they have been absent from all the meetings.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, do other Members of the Legislative Assembly receive the same documentation that is forwarded to the two individuals who resigned?

MR. CHAIRMAN: These two individuals are still receiving documentation as if they were members of this committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: But that is not being provided to other Members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. For example, they're getting notices of meetings.

MR. HYLAND: But other members are getting minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as I know, they are. I don't recall the distribution. I haven't dealt with that recently. As far as I know, it hasn't been changed since the spring. But I will check on that and let you know what the distribution list is right now.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think the point Mr. Purdy raises is a valid one, in the sense that I am sure that if he or I were to rise in our place in the House today to say that we resign and tomorrow we wanted to come back in, everybody would say we had resigned. Everybody would have agreed, I am sure, that we had resigned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is whether a member can, just on his own, change what the House has decided. That's quite different from resigning your seat. If it's going to have any real practical effect, other than their being absent from the meetings, let's pursue it.

MR. PURDY: I would make the following motion, Mr. Chairman: that the resignation of the two members be accepted by this committee and that any further correspondence cease until such time as they bring a resolution forward to the House to have themselves or two other members of the party reinstated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will certainly put the motion, but I must question what its effect will be. Is there any discussion on the motion? All those in favor? Carried.

Can we go on to Item 5, the amendments to orders. These arise from a previous meeting, as you may recall. Mr. Clegg has prepared draft amendments, which are under tab 5 of your support material. Very briefly, the first one includes typewriters in the list of equipment in the constituency services amendment order. Perhaps we should take them one at a time.

MR. KOWALSKI: Would you like a motion on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: If we're taking them individually, then I move the adoption of Amendment Order No. 1, Constituency Services, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To include typewriters?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? All those in favor? Carried.

The second one deals with section (3) of the Constituency Services Order, reasonable living and travelling expenses for a member of the staff of a member's office at the Legislature to travel to his constituency office not more than twice in a fiscal year.

I am assuming that we can interpret "Legislature" as including the Annex, and that we really mean the Legislature Building and the Annex. My own suggestion would be — and I guess the Law Clerk didn't get around to it. But I pointed out that . . . Oh, I see. He says he deliberately used the word "Legislature". I hadn't seen this before; it just got here this morning. He assumes that it will be taken to mean both places.

MR. KOWALSKI: The third phrase of Order No. 1 says: this order is effective from the commencement of the 1983-84 fiscal year. I have a question about the other two amending orders in there. Do they become effective on the date of the signature of the chairman, or is it also interpreted that this is effective for the 1983-84 fiscal year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. KOWALSKI: The reason I say it is that if we approve it — I am absolutely convinced that we are going to be approving this in the next couple of minutes — in the event that perhaps a member would have had somebody associated with him in the past two months who would have done this, they would have been negated from that. To make it consistent with the third one, perhaps there should be a clause three added, that this order is effective from the commencement of the 1983-84 fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your concern is that this may already have happened.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. I think there was considerable debate at previous Members' Services meetings. The intent certainly was to have it applicable to this year. I have no specific example to say that this has happened. But in the event that it has, I wouldn't want to see it negated because of the debate we've had [inaudible] with respect to this particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just offhand, I can't see any reason why it shouldn't have that statement appended, that the order is effective from the commencement of this fiscal year.

Is there any other discussion?

MR. HYLAND: I didn't look up the rest of the order. This is two trips for a member's staff from our office here. Is there another one covering the constituency secretary to come here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We covered that.

MR. HYLAND: That's in a different one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we weren't sure we had covered this. So this makes it explicit.

MR. HYLAND: So this is two trips each now.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, if I might make a comment on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. BLAIN: I briefly commented on it when you brought this matter up. I have some concern on this point, for this reason. The employees concerned — the employees at the constituency office and the employees at the offices at the Legislature — are in two different categories. The employees at the Legislature are public servants; they are paid from the general administration budget. They are project employees. They are full-time for the length of the project, and you are all familiar with that. They receive a salary and all the benefits that any normal employee receives, such as health services, dental services, pension, and so on.

If you spend money from your constituency allowance to send them to your constituency offices — and I don't suggest that there's anything improper in doing this, not at all. Nor do I quarrel with the principle of doing it. But I do say this to you: you are expending money from two separate sources. They are being paid from the salary budget, and you are expending money from your constituency allowance to send them to these offices.

It would seem to me that in order to do this, and looking at the type of employee involved, the more practical approach would be to put additional money into the travel element of the general administration budget and leave the constituency allowance untouched; in other words, have them travel as public servants, not as constituency employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Offhand, subject to being enlightened further about the rules followed by the Auditor General, I see no problem with an employee being paid out of one fund and having travel expenses paid out of another. The second point that concerns me is that if we shift this travel cost to the other appropriation, it becomes more open-ended; whereas when we're dealing with constituency expenditures, we have an overall ceiling, even though we agreed some time ago to a pretty complete transferability of funds from three categories.

MR. BLAIN: I make this suggestion for your consideration and whatever value you choose to put upon it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that it's an indirect way of increasing the funding for constituency offices and for representation.

MR. HYLAND: Wasn't that the reason we did it that way, so there was a lid on it? If there was lid on it and it had to come out of your constituency office budget, you would do it limitedly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the reason was that we felt a member's circumstances were different in each constituency. We thought that if a member didn't exhaust his communications allowance and wanted to spend it on his constituency office, he should be able to do so, and vice versa. I think that was the sort of thing we discussed at the time.

MR. PURDY: That's right. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we get a further interpretation from the Law Clerk and bring this back to the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't think it's going to cause any problem for anyone in the meantime?

MR. PURDY: I don't think so.

MR. HYLAND: Being that session is on, what if somebody from a constituency office decides to come to Edmonton to see what session is like?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no problem on that one.

MR. BLAIN: There's no problem there. This is just a suggestion I put forward for your consideration.

MR. PURDY: It's [inaudible] dollars we're talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that we haven't any problem regarding constituency staff coming to Edmonton. The question was just the other way around, and that's why the amendment is going in there.

MR. HYLAND: They won't be going anywhere when session is on anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It doesn't seem likely. It has been moved by Mr. Purdy that this be deferred to the next meeting and that, in the meantime, we get some further clarification from the Law Clerk, especially with regard to whether there should be an express statement that this is retroactive to the beginning of the current fiscal year. Is that right? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

We have the amendment to the Transportation and Administrative Services Order. That also is a matter of clarification. We had a little problem there. There is an omission. I drew it to the Law Clerk's attention, and I see by the memo we just got a few minutes ago that the word "or" should be inserted in the second line of that amendment where it says "owned leased"; it should be "owned or leased".

MR. KOWALSKI: I move that the committee adopt this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? All agreed? Carried.

MR. HYLAND: Shouldn't that have the same phrase as what Ken suggested on the other?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one Bill Purdy suggested about the retroactivity?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. That one is open-ended too, unless it's covered somewhere else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's your feeling on that? Is there a possible merit or benefit in retroactivity on this one, perhaps even for consistency?

MR. PURDY: I wouldn't think so, because automobiles are now covered from other sources. This is just a clarification that Ian wanted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is one explanation that crosses my mind for the omission of both of these, and that's the possibility that the main order already says it is effective from the beginning of the fiscal year. Perhaps that's intended to cover the amendments in these two cases. Why not in the first, I don't know. On the other hand, I think it's a good thing to be exact and to say specifically when the amendments take effect.

So if you agree — we have passed this amendment to the Transportation and Administrative Services Order, but I will still raise with the Law Clerk the possibility of further amending it by adding the effective date.

Item 6: we have had some discussion about that. There is no support material on this. Perhaps I could tell you the background to it. When staff are engaged by the caucuses, they are Legislative Assembly staff and are paid out of the Legislative Assembly appropriation. We had an incident a couple of years ago that caused us some concern. There was a staff person engaged by one of the caucuses and it was found that his services were no longer needed, so he was given three months' pay in lieu of notice. It so happened that at the time, we had work for that individual to do, and he declined to do that work. He was being paid three months willy-nilly for free and told us quite candidly that it was his intention to get another paying job, notwithstanding the fact that he would be drawing double pay. Of course we told him that he couldn't work in the public service or at taxpayers' expense and draw double pay, so he refused to take the work that we had for him to do for the remainder of those three months. We found that the form of contract used by that particular caucus permitted that to happen. That started our concern, and of course the election and so on intervened.

Since then we have had some discussion with a representative of the government caucus, to the effect that they want to fix their own contract terms and it's none of our business. They weren't rude about it or anything, but that was the idea that was put forward. With great respect, I disagree. We have fiscal responsibility for these funds; it is a direct concern to us. If the caucus, as an implied agent of the Clerk, makes a contract with someone which has financial consequence — and they all do — then it seems to me that we are being irresponsible if we don't ensure that those financial consequences come within what we are properly allowed to do. It's not that we want to pry into any caucus' affairs, tell them whom to hire and whom not to hire. It's just that we want to ensure that no liabilities which we can't properly meet are undertaken in any of those contracts.

MR. PURDY: What's the problem, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The problem is that we have representation from the government caucus that we are not to meddle in this sort of thing. I am just mentioning this, since the government caucus is reasonably well represented here, so that you may take it back to your colleagues and say: we do indeed have a duty to look into these things, and might we now get on with the process of developing a suitable form that can be used for this type of contract. It would cover researchers, for example.

MR. PURDY: Is that particular problem with the contract?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the reason why this is on the agenda, so that I might raise this point, explore this difference of opinion, and ask you if you might take it back to your caucus, if you agree, that, pretty please, we'd like to work together with you in developing a form of contract.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think our major concern is that the contract be developed in such a way that it protects both the Assembly and the government caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we didn't think we ought to be excluded from the development. In other words, I think the Clerk and the Law Clerk, or Parliamentary Counsel, should be involved: the Clerk because of his responsibility, and the Law Clerk because of his expertise. That's really an information item and, as I say, there's no supporting material.

Number 7.

MR. HYLAND: Are we going to come back to that? The people involved, the Clerk and Dr. Reid, aren't here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right, but I am reporting to you the result of their discussion. If it can be developed in that way, it won't appear on the agenda again unless you wish to have the final form subject to your approval, because it does affect services to members. I think it comes right within the responsibility of this committee.

Number 7: the Alberta Bill of Rights in the Legislative Assembly. May I try to take you briefly and quickly — more briefly than the last item — through this. As you know, we had a carved wooden plaque hung in the Chamber. It turned out that it wasn't legible at all and visitors couldn't read it, except perhaps the title, and it wasn't suited for the dry atmosphere in the Chamber — I am sure you will agree that's true. It started to crack, which of course we're fortunate doesn't happen to members, who also live in this dry atmosphere.

MR. BLAIN: And Officers.

MR. PURDY: Officers are immune.

MR. BLAIN: Not necessarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, it has now been put in the place where it was originally intended to go when it was ordered, which is the Jubilee Auditorium, northern Alberta edition. There is now a move afoot to replace it with something else. Whether frugality will set in and delay that, I don't know. But my concern is that whatever goes in there should be legible, and I would like to see this committee have some input.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think I would sooner see that other plaque back, because if you couldn't read it — and it was four by six or something? — you're sure as shootin' not going to read a 28 by 21 inch, 24 by 36 inch, or 16 by 20 inch, from anywhere but right on the Floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no assurance that those will be the sizes adopted. Those are just proposals. You have a copy of my answer there. The thing is that with the original one, there was no contrast between the letters and the background — just to deal with Mr. Hyland's point. They were all the same color of wood, and they were stained the same color. With a bronze one, it would be possible to have the background dark and the faces of the letters polished. You've seen that sort of thing on bronze. I am sure that would make it readily legible by visitors and others. In any case, legibility is my main concern as long as the rest of it is in good taste for the Chamber.

That's an information item just in case — which may happen — some of you are involved in discussions relating to that item. There is nothing really for us to decide this time. If you are content with the treatment of that item, we can go on to the estimates.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a general thing with regard to the estimates. Yesterday I received — and I have copies for each of you; you may wish to put them aside and then consider this when we come to the appropriate estimate — a memo from the Deputy Speaker, suggesting that coffee in members' offices should be a legitimate inclusion in the expenses that are paid out of members' constituency office funding.

I think we can take this as information. You may wish to consider it, and someone may wish to propose a motion at a future meeting. Or if you so wish, I will put it on the agenda for a future meeting. We can also deal with it when we get to that part of the

estimates.

Can we go to the first, the Legislative Assembly estimates?

MR. KOWALSKI: Can I make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker? I really appreciated getting this documentation some time ago; it was really excellent. That afforded me an opportunity of reading through it very, very thoroughly, and I know that a number of my colleagues have also done that. We took the opportunity yesterday of having a brief coffee discussion, and I would like to make the suggestion that for the purposes of this morning's activity, we skip the first three and begin with the Speaker's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It sounds a little malicious. Before we do that, what is your wish with regard to the first three? Do you want them up at the next meeting or what?

MR. HYLAND: We can't really do that without . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Depending on the progress of today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't have to put it in the minutes or anything.

The Speaker's office, which includes the Deputy Speaker of course. You see the wrap-up in the white pages, and the working papers follow.

MRS. CRIPPS: The overall increase is .26 per cent, is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CRIPPS: And we're dealing with it on a global basis?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's up to the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move that we pass it.

MR. KOWALSKI: I second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor? Opposed? Carried.

MRS. EMBURY: Excuse me, I just thought I reflected a little disappointment in your voice when you asked if there was any discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. What my tone of voice reflected was . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Amazement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Astonishment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not a bit. What it reflected was the utmost concern to ensure absolutely that the will of the committee is expressed, with no inadvertence.

MRS. CRIPPS: Considering Sheila's comments last time and mine, the .26 has a decided impact on our decision.

MRS. EMBURY: As a matter of fact, I would be very proud to use that figure in my constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you look through those estimates, you are going to see a considerable degree of frugality. That is an almost infinitesimal increase, having regard to the fact that there are some increases but they are offset by decreases.

May we go on to the next one, which is government members. Did you want to defer that one too?

MR. KOWALSKI: No. I would like to submit a motion, Mr. Chairman, that the estimate input of \$922,586 be reduced by an amount of \$41,212, to now read that the estimate input for the government caucus be \$881,374 for the 1984-85 fiscal year. That will afford the government caucus an increase of 0.96 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was that amount again?

MR. KOWALSKI: The reduction is \$41,212. The new amount would read \$881,374.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is up for discussion.

MR. BLAIN: It would be of material assistance to the budget officer — meaning me — if I could know from what control group that came.

MR. KOWALSKI: Dr. Reid will be providing you with some detailed specifics on that in the forthcoming days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a calculation extant somewhere.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, it will be provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? Is the motion agreed to?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is passed. Is the amended appropriation agreed to?

MRS. CRIPPS: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mrs. Cripps. Are you ready for the question? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amended appropriation is approved.

Okay, may we go to the Official Opposition.

MR. BLAIN: Since this book was produced, we've had a minor amendment. So could I hand out the amended sheets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. There's an increase of 15 per cent.

MR. PURDY: This is a global one, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, according to the committee.

MR. PURDY: Same as last year. I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the increase for the Official Opposition's budget be the same as the government members' budget, at .96 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we make it 1 per cent?

MR. PURDY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought I might pick up a subamendment somewhere.

MR. PURDY: I'm saying no to my motion. Other members may overrule me and make it 1 per cent.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'll second the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, are you ready for the question? Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. I am assuming, from Mr. Blain's comment of a moment ago, that this means we must go back to the Official Opposition and say: this is what's been done, and would you kindly allocate the decrease to various elements. If you choose not to do so, then for accounting purposes we must do so in the Clerk's office.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, on that point, there is no decrease. It's an increase of .96 per cent.

MR. PURDY: What the chairman is saying is that the 15 per cent . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The figures show the increase right here, and we have to deal with these figures.

MRS. CRIPPS: Fair enough.

MR. BLAIN: It's a decrease in the recommended increase.

MRS. CRIPPS: But there is no actual decrease.

MR. PURDY: No, it's an overall increase of .96 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we have a motion that the increase be identical at .96 per cent. That's been carried. Now we need a motion to approve the estimates as amended.

MRS. EMBURY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. Now we come to the Independent members. We have an amendment there, that we just received.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's just a correction of the calculation. The original calculation was

incorrect.

MR. BLAIN: It's really to correct a typographical error.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Assuming all the arithmetic is correct, Mr. Hyland, there's an increase of 6 per cent.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that the office of the Independents' estimates be increased by .96 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? Sorry. The motion is that the increase be reduced to .96 per cent.

MR. HYLAND: Be increased .96 per cent over last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are you ready for the question? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Is there another motion to approve the estimates with an increase of .96 per cent?

MR. PURDY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. Committee estimates — and as you can see, this is full of round numbers.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, before you go much, if any, further with committee estimates, I would like to ask that you defer this item. I make that request for this reason. I asked that this submission be put in as a stopgap, more or less. It's been our custom for some years, as I've explained to the committee on a number of occasions, to submit a realistic 'guesstimate' in the amount of \$100,000, because I seldom know in advance what is going to happen in the new fiscal year.

However, there are major changes taking place in committee operations at this time. I have reason to believe — tentative information — that there will be two new and relatively major committees formed in the very near future to operate both in this fiscal year and into the next fiscal year. There are some developments in the Legislative Offices Committee which will result in increased expenditures, and I'm only now receiving the information on that.

So if you could see your way clear to defer this item, perhaps until the end of the estimates, I hope to be able to and intend to present a firm estimate, which will be far in excess of \$100,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This \$100,000 goes back years. It's been in round numbers. When we run out of money, we go for a special warrant. It would seem prudent to me to try, even though it's a round number, to make it correspond as closely as possible to our expectations so that if a special warrant is required, it will be as small as possible.

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

MR. KOWALSKI: Good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's agreed that this be deferred until — what? — the next meeting?

MR. BLAIN: At least until the next meeting; if possible, until the last item on the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then we go on to the interns.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I move that this be accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. Hansard: it's 2.6, but there are some pretty substantial reasons for that. I didn't think we would reach this today, or I would have asked the Hansard Editor to be here.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's minus 2.6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, right. In any case, I would have asked him to be here if I'd thought we were going to reach his estimates today.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, is there a particular reason that we'd want him here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, only to answer your questions; that's all. There's one related topic I was going to bring up, which I'm not prepared for at the moment. I'll mention it anyway. I think we should review the subscription rates. They haven't been changed since 1972, when Hansard started.

MR. PURDY: It hasn't been a best seller either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you have received copies of September 29. My suggestion would be that we bring this up at the next meeting. We'll put it on the agenda for the next meeting.

MR. HYLAND: The only thing I note here is that we still haven't dealt with the classification, et cetera, for budget purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no change there. I think the members did say they wanted that brought up at the next meeting. We can go to that, if you like, after we finish going through as many more estimates as we're going to deal with.

MR. HYLAND: I was just wanting it noted that that's the way it is, the way it shows there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, in the working paper.

MRS. CRIPPS: In view of the fact that there's no increase, I'll move we accept the

Hansard budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. The Legislature Library, 2.8 per cent. Again, had I known, I'd have asked the Librarian to be here. But I know he is not in the building, because he was going out as I was coming in.

MR. BLAIN: You might note that the Library has a B budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right, the next tab, a B budget proposal.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns on this budget; I don't know about the other members. I see they have budgeted for a new position, a research officer. I feel that in the particular times we're in right now, it is not warranted. I'd like to see them justify to us why they need another research officer when I think they're over-researched right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Suppose we leave this until the next meeting and have the Librarian here, because I'm not able . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't think it's necessary to leave it. I think we should just lower the budget to zero increase and leave it at that. The rest of the Legislative Assembly budget has been held at under 1 per cent. In view of the times, I think we could do the same with the Library budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, if you take a look at page 1 of the white sheets, there is a request made for the reallocation of manpower. In the 1983-84 estimate year, there are 24 man-years' salaried positions. As I understand, we're asked to approve one additional permanent staff, a research officer, and one new program. I will not be voting in favor of the one additional permanent staff. If that reduces it to the level Mrs. Cripps is talking about, then on that basis I could find myself voting in favor of it; otherwise I would not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a calculator here and somebody who knows how to run it.

MISS BLANEY: Reducing it by those two figures mentioned by Mr. Kowalski — that is, one salary for a research officer and not approving the B budget of \$35,000 — it would work out to an increase of .05.

MR. BLAIN: The B budget is not relevant at this time. You can't make that calculation until the B budget is approved, and then the A budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The B budget isn't included in this.

MISS BLANEY: On the bottom line it is.

MR. BLAIN: I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, right.

MR. BLAIN: I retract that; that's not usual.

MR. KOWALSKI: I intend to make a motion not to accept the B budget item anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other discussion?

MR. BLAIN: I make this suggestion on the B budget. It may be worth consideration by the very nature of the item, and the expenditure is not great.

MR. KOWALSKI: We're sort of jumping ahead here, Mr. Blain. I was going to suggest that I'm sure it has great merit but that it be deferred until next year, and that in the meantime, for 1984-85 we say no. Bring it up again for 1985-86.

MR. BLAIN: We're on the same train but in different cars, then.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right; the same direction but at different speeds.

MRS. CRIPPS: On Ken's point, in this committee we're talking in terms of global budgeting. If the Legislature Library feels that it's important enough to somehow work into their budget in another manner, I don't think I personally — I can't speak for all of the committee — would have any objection to it. But I do have objection to increases.

MR. HYLAND: This is a per annum thing, though, not a once in a lifetime thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you look at page 3 of the supporting material, the yellow sheets, you'll see under related statistics that the use of the information and reference services increased 23 per cent, and the research services increased 141 per cent. Then there is a comparison with the Legislature libraries of Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia.

MR. HYLAND: For example, Ontario has got — what? — four times our membership?

MR. PURDY: They have 125 members.

MR. HYLAND: Better than twice our membership.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By no means. Twice would be 158.

MR. PURDY: They sit 10 or 11 months of the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's true.

MR. PURDY: They have three different caucuses, larger caucuses. So I think comparisons of library services between Alberta and Ontario . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's British Columbia, with 55 members, where the staff is 10 higher than ours.

MR. PURDY: They may not be after some things take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Out of these four, we're fourth in the amount we spend per member on the Library.

MR. HYLAND: Without looking at what those caucuses have for research and everything else, you're not really comparing the same either. There could be a lot of the research in there too.

MR. KOWALSKI: We don't have a motion on the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We were close to it but didn't get there. Mr. Kowalski, with a motion.

MR. KOWALSKI: This motion deals with the Legislature Library and the B budget item, and with page 2 of the sheet. I move that the estimate input of \$1,137,413 be reduced by \$63,000, to be \$1,074,413 for the 1984-85 fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What will that do to our percentage?

MR. KOWALSKI: I don't know. I arrived at the \$63,000 figure by reducing \$35,000 for the B budget item and \$28,000 for the one permanent employee that is listed on page 6 of the yellow sheets.

MR. PURDY: That figure is about \$27,000 for the researcher.

MR. KOWALSKI: The exact figure is \$28,896.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That includes the payments for health care and all that stuff.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on that, I would like to put in a strong plea for the committee to consider that B budget item another year. If anybody on the committee is going to have trouble accepting that, I would like to suggest that in lots of time before the preparation of the budget we have a discussion with the Librarian to gain just a little more background on the advantage of this system. Frankly, I do support the concept and think it would be worth while for us to really look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Assuming that the 1985-86 estimates would be before this committee by October 1984, would you agree with the suggestion that the B budget item be raised sometime late in the summer of 1984, in accordance with Mrs. Embury's suggestion? I think we need to agree on a time; otherwise it may be overlooked.

MRS. EMBURY: In the spring even, if we have a meeting when we're in session. Or is that a particularly bad time?

MR. KOWALSKI: We can discuss it anytime next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you agree, then, that sometime between spring and fall of next year we put this on the agenda again? When we do, we'll circulate the supporting material beforehand. Is that motion of Mrs. Embury's agreed to?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we have a motion by Mr. Kowalski. We're just waiting for the percentage on it.

MISS BLANEY: .14

MR. CHAIRMAN: Up or down?

MISS BLANEY: An increase over the forecast input.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we take Mr. Kowalski's motion off the table? Are you ready for the question? All agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. Is it agreed that the estimate as amended be approved?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Purdy. All agreed? Carried.
Now do you want to go back to the beginning?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, we've done an admirable amount of work this morning. I'd like to suggest that we reconvene toward the end of the current session, to take up these other items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Would you like to suggest a date and time? I promise to be there. I think you have to allow that once every 10 years. I was up at six o'clock, and I had my breakfast finished by quarter to seven. I could have been here just like that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to suggest that the next meeting be held within a day or two of the termination of this session, so we can have due time in order to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we don't know when it's going to end.

MR. KOWALSKI: I know, and that's the difficulty.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would like to suggest that the members, since we're all here, be polled a day or two in advance. We don't have to have very much advance warning. This morning I have three other meetings. It's very difficult to try to work in all the meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think you'd be better able to wrestle with a date when you're in your offices than you are here?

MRS. CRIPPS: Definitely.

MR. PURDY: My calendar isn't up to date here.

MR. HYLAND: In a week or so, we'll probably have an idea of how long we're going to be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is Wednesday. Suppose we telephone all of you on Monday. Is that too soon? Not to have a meeting Monday but to get a consensus on a date.

MR. PURDY: Just a question, Mr. Chairman. When do these estimates have to be finalized?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's nothing writ in the law about that, as far as I know. But the Treasury people, who have them printed and so on, like to have them as soon as possible.

MR. PURDY: In other words, you have no knowledge of the commencement of the spring session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I must say that we're way ahead of where we were last year. I don't know if that's a good standard. I think it was in December when we finished last year.

MR. PURDY: After the election. We couldn't get started until after the spring session commenced, because we had to have the committee established by the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. It was slated for December.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, we're basically looking at the speed of the House now. Perhaps there is one morning in the third week of November when the committee could probably get together for two or three hours. I'm quite convinced we could probably get through all the rest of it if we had about a three-hour time frame, Wednesday morning or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we telephone all your offices next Wednesday, a week from today. Do you think you might be reasonably closer to being able to decide?

MR. KOWALSKI: I would suggest you even defer it until the second Monday from now. By that time, I'm sure all of us will have a good understanding of how much progress is being made in terms of the Order Paper. Then I think we'll be in a very good position to know what will still be left in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there's nothing in the law that says we can't phone you sooner if people start saying, look, call that meeting a little sooner. So if you change your minds, let me know. I'll be glad to get on the blower sooner. Otherwise the understanding is that we telephone everyone a week from next Monday.
Thank you very much.

MR. HYLAND: I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're adjourned.

[The meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m.]

This page intentionally left blank