

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen] [10:43 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: [Not recorded] estimates. General Administration. Before that, maybe we had better approve the minutes of the last meeting.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, wasn't it at the last meeting that I made a motion about the slide presentation? I can't see it in the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's farther back.

MR. STEFANIUK: On the fourth page, under item (b), Other Business.

MR. HYLAND: You talked about it, and I made the motion.

MRS. EMBURY: Oh, there it is. Sorry. I don't know why I thought I made the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now that you've found that that's there, is there a motion regarding adoption of the minutes? Is it agreed? Carried.

It was agreed that we would spend this meeting on the estimates. General Administration, code 100.

MR. KOWALSKI: This is the one dealing with Salaries, Permanent Positions only: 13 positions, 13 man-years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The reason for that decrease is the shifting of one position from salary to contract.

MR. KOWALSKI: Some time ago a discussion was held by Members' Services Committee with respect to the office of Director of Administration. I was not here. If I raise some questions this morning, they may very well be redundant. But for my clarification, I need them.

Can I have an explanation of the terms of reference for the Director of Administration? I say that on the basis of a note at the bottom of the page with respect to a reclassification item, a dollar adjustment of \$7,500. I need to understand that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Chuck?

MR. ELIUK: The reclassification of an existing Clerk IV to Administrative Officer I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we should just name the person to start with: Jane Pickard. Any of you who occasionally go over to the administration offices will be familiar with Jane. She was 2-IC to Charlene and now to Chuck.

MR. ELIUK: The reclassification was intended for the purpose of freeing the Director of Administration of a lot of the day-to-day, routine activities which relate to the personnel area, purchasing, and the accounts payable section. The intention is that I want to be relieved of those routine duties to allow more time to be spent on mechanizing and re-evaluating various objectives of the unit, to see if we could enhance current systems with our mechanized NBI system, working closely with Mr. Dean, our

consultant. It was the opinion of the previous director that she was not able to devote that kind of time toward an overview of the organization to see if there were any areas within that could be run more efficiently, whether we could mechanize a large portion of the present routine, manual duties that are being engaged in.

Having spoken with the previous director — I don't know if it holds much support here, but she supported the view toward this type of activity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, what Charlene said to Chuck was, "Look, don't do what I did. I was so involved in detail that I wasn't acting as a manager and planner. You can't do that. You have to get rid of some of the things I was doing. Give them to Jane, and then you can act like what you're supposed to be, which is a Director of Administration."

MR. KOWALSKI: How many staff is the Director of Administration dealing with?

MR. ELIUK: We're dealing with two temporary staff and six staff.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that we have drawn comparisons between ourselves and our administrative structure, and others of comparable size. The one that is most comparable in size is perhaps Executive Council. In that organization there is a director of administration, who is at a higher classification than our director, with an Administrative Officer I as assistant, and only one other permanent employee, a Clerk I-II. Others are hired on a temporary basis as required within that organization for administration. We're dealing here with a larger staff complement in administration and no 2-IC as such, with a classification enabling that 2-IC to accept responsibility for some of the decision-making process.

MR. KOWALSKI: Can you tell me why a reclassification from Clerk IV to AO-I would require an adjustment of \$7,500 in salary?

MR. STEFANIUK: That is the requirement that is placed upon us by virtue of the salary ranges which are prescribed by the public service for various classifications of employees.

MR. KOWALSKI: Do I understand that — it's unfortunate there is an individual involved; I'd rather talk about the position than the person in it. Do I take it that the maximum in the range of Clerk IV is \$7,500 less than the minimum of the range for AO-I?

MR. ELIUK: With respect to that, Mr. Chairman, I believe the range of an AO-I administrator is something in the order of \$26,000-plus to \$32,000-plus. Mrs. Pickard is now in the range of \$24,600, I believe. If anything relative to the estimate in this budget, that estimate of \$7,500 could — and it's conceivable we would not hire her at that salary and that it would be something less than that.

MR. HYLAND: Did you say \$26,000? What is she classified as now? That's shown on the budget as

\$23,028.

MR. ELIUK: Mrs. Pickard is at her maximum now and has been for some time.

MR. HYLAND: So she is getting \$23,000 now, not \$26,000.

MR. ELIUK: That is correct.

MR. KOWALSKI: I guess the thing I find difficult to understand here is that the Director of Administration was hired just recently with certain terms of reference. Now within only a matter of several months after his appointment, we're coming up with new terms of reference. It seems to me that it might be more advisable for all of us to let a year go by to evaluate and assess the performance, and then perhaps take a look at that. It's a bit odd to me that after only several months, we're already into a reorganization. It may have been easier for me to understand if we had discussed the question of the new terms of reference at the time of the change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did. As I mentioned last time, the job was advertised according to new terms of reference on the basis of Charlene's very urgent advice that the thing couldn't go on as it was. We haven't changed the terms of reference of the Director of Administration from what they were advertised to be.

MR. HYLAND: You're saying the job was advertised that there would be an assistant director appointed as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that was not part of the search. But that is a consequence of following the advice of someone whose advice, as I mentioned before, we respect very highly because of the way in which she had performed in the job.

MR. KOWALSKI: Not to belabour this point but to make sure I'm very, very clear on it, in essence, the terms of reference of the Director of Administration will see him being involved in less and less of the day-to-day routine administrative matters and personnel-related matters, and there will be greater emphasis on the mechanizing and re-evaluating. Yet we have a gentleman by the name of Mr. Dean, who was hired as a consultant, to do exactly those two things, I thought. Am I confused?

MR. ELIUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer that by saying that Mr. Dean is involved in several different evaluations, the largest portion being in the administrative area directly. He is involved in other projects. To this point in time, Mr. Dean has reacted to recommendations which were provided to him by the Director of Administration at the time. I think it's more an integrated approach and not something we would want Mr. Dean to act upon by himself.

I hope I bring to the job considerable background in automated systems relative to accounting, and there are a number of changes which would enhance the efficiency of that area. We are not suggesting any additional staffing. We are going to accommodate the workload, which is growing, with the existing staff. But it's the more efficient use of the resources

we have, and that involves both manpower and automated resources. Our NBI system, although it's fantastic, still has a way to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. HYLAND: You said a senior clerk. Is that Clerk IV?

MR. ELIUK: She is presently a Clerk IV.

MR. HYLAND: That's the senior level of clerk?

MR. ELIUK: That's right at the top.

MR. HYLAND: So \$23,000 would be approximately the top range of a clerk.

MR. ELIUK: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: What's the bottom range of Admin-I?

MR. ELIUK: In the order of \$26,000 to \$32,000. I will concede that the \$7,500 was taken at the maximum and is probably a point I should have been more attentive to in preparation of the budget.

MRS. CRIPPS: It works out to 13 percent.

MR. HYLAND: More than that; almost a third. So if she went to the maximum, you would have the assistant paid the same as the director was a year ago, and a new director.

MR. ELIUK: If we were to go for the maximum, which would not be my recommendation.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, the reasons Chuck is giving to deal with mechanization and the introduction of modern accounting equipment and other things are somewhat similar to the situation that has gone on at the motor vehicles branch in the last year. It's a temporary situation during the evaluation, installation, and introduction of the new systems, when admittedly there is a squeeze on personnel, and that's why we hire consultants. What happens after you've done it? My understanding is that the whole aim of it is to try to avoid the constant escalation of the numbers of people that are required for an escalated volume. For that reason, Chuck is saying that they intend to function with the same number of people in the office.

Once the thing is done, I'm wondering whether Chuck's time will really as busy with that type of thing as it is at the moment. In other words, we're looking at a temporary situation and producing a permanent answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's valid as far as it goes. But as I understand it, the shift of responsibility is a continuing thing. In other words, there were certain management functions which Charlene was unable to do, mostly for lack of time. As I see it, Chuck will be doing those things. As a result, some of the things that Charlene was doing will be shifted to Jane Pickard.

DR. REID: [Inaudible] utilize the equipment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the help of the computer equipment.

MR. HYLAND: Who was doing those things before?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Charlene was doing them, and we're shifting them to Jane.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just doing some calculation, I went from the maximum of one position to the minimum of the other, that's still a 14 percent increase. That's a \$3,000 difference, which is what it would be. That's a substantial increase, given the guidelines were under today. So I guess I can't understand where that \$7,500 comes from.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As Chuck mentioned, the \$7,500 is a sort of ballpark thing. I can imagine that we'd still have [inaudible] if it were reduced to \$4,000 or \$5,000. She has taken quite a bit of training. In fact she is away on a course right now. She is really upgrading herself. She applied for the Director of Administration position. In the course of the evaluation, she was told that her native abilities were okay but she needed more training. So she has been quite diligent about that. She's been with us — how long?

MR. STEFANIUK: Five years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: She's a good staff person.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm just looking at the 14 percent increase, from \$23,000 to \$26,000. It's substantial without going to the \$7,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. If you look at it by itself, it looks like a lot of money, like a big increase. Of course, it depends too partly on what you calculate the 14 percent on. If we were up in the \$60,000 range it might be different.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think it's generally accepted that when one moves from one classification to another, there is a substantial increase inherent in that move. It does not necessarily reflect merit or cost of living at all; it is simply a change in responsibilities that goes with another salary range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. What is your wish? Any more questions? Is there a motion? How do you want to deal with this?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have another point. I would like to see the whole function of that office reviewed once we get the system in place. I think that's a better time to do it, because we may need some other changes for the operation of the new equipment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in the offing. The Clerk and I have been dealing with that for several weeks.

DR. REID: We're looking at one little splinter of the thing at the moment [inaudible] in particular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're looking at the place where the situation is most acute, as I see it.

DR. REID: Are we piecemealing rather than addressing issues?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some piecemeal things that have to be attended to while you look after the long-term things as well, as in patient care.

MR. HYLAND: You say you're reviewing the operation now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're planning the review. It will go beyond that.

MR. HYLAND: And you're what, Chuck? On a six-month probation?

MR. ELIUK: I assume the probationary period is consistent with whatever is in the public service.

MR. HYLAND: Can I assume that all things will be completed by the probationary period? Obviously a decision has to be made one way or the other about the director's future. Are you going to have the review done at that stage of the game, or will it go on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The review could lead to some changes in methods, in the sequence of doing things, and so on, and I expect it will. I don't see the review as indicating that the Director of Administration isn't qualified for his job.

MR. HYLAND: You lost me somewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe I didn't get what you're driving at.

MR. HYLAND: I was asking whether this review will be completed when the assessment is made whether Chuck is a permanent employee or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It could very well be. In fact, it is my expectation that it will be totally completed and acted upon before the House opens in March.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'll go back to what I said a little earlier. I think there's a period of evaluation that has to take place, so I would like to make the following motion. I move that we do not approve the reclassification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? That is four to one, and one abstention.

Code 120, Wages. Any discussion or questions?

MR. HYLAND: I have one question there. Half a runner, which is shared between government caucus and general administration: do they just run for government caucus and general administration, or are they running stuff from general administration to the Independents' office there or from the Independents' office here or the Official Opposition's office here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess that could have crept in since the Independents moved. Do you know, Bohdan or Chuck? Does the runner occasionally take things for the Independent opposition? Are you suggesting that we should...

MR. STEFANIUK: He is required to do all runs between the two buildings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But when he started, when we made the sharing arrangement with government caucus, the only running being done was for government caucus and general administration. Alan is saying that now the Independents have moved over there, are they getting the benefit of some of this running?

MR. STEFANIUK: They might be, but I suspect it's very minimal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think you're talking about a lot of bucks.

MR. HYLAND: Are we doing it page by page or the whole?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever your wish is. I'm prepared to go through it item by item.

MR. HYLAND: Okay, I'll move that we accept this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Code 130. The reason for that increase is switching Michael Clegg from 100 to 130. Is it agreed?

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd like clarification, please. Under code 130, we have an associate Sergeant-at-Arms at \$14,500. There is another item, code 430, dealing with the Sergeant-at-Arms. The Sergeant-at-Arms contract under code 430 is \$4,450, and under code 130 is an associate Sergeant-at-Arms at \$14,500. Does the Sergeant-at-Arms receive as an honorarium \$18,950? Could you explain that for me?

MR. STEFANIUK: We're talking about two different people. The Sergeant-at-Arms is a permanent employee of the Department of the Solicitor General. He cannot be employed by two agencies of government, in the broad sense, at the same time. It was agreed quite a long time ago that the Sergeant-at-Arms would receive an honorarium in addition to the regular salary he receives from the Solicitor General's department. It must be paid as an honorarium out of another expenditure so that there will not be a requirement here to deduct at source for various compulsory deductions, such as income tax, Canada pension, and UIC. So that is paid strictly as an honorarium.

The associate Sergeant-at-Arms is another employee, who is on contract. He receives a guaranteed wage of \$14,500.

MRS. CRIPPS: How many security people are there?

MR. STEFANIUK: Seven.

DR. REID: If you look on the yellow spread sheet, you'll see Security Force: seven contracts at a guaranteed income of \$10,500 for each. The associate Sergeant-at-Arms is to some extent an eighth member of that force but is also Sergeant-at-Arms. Oscar is a permanent employee of the Solicitor General and receives an annual salary which goes on while the House is sitting. This is an

increment in addition to that salary for the responsibility of being Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a bit much.

DR. REID: It has to be done as an honorarium to avoid government penalties for deductions at source.

MRS. CRIPPS: So there are actually eight security people, not seven.

MR. STEFANIUK: Both the Sergeant and the associate Sergeant spell off on security. For example, when the House is sitting in the evening, the Sergeant-at-Arms takes on security duty at the main entrance of the building, while the associate performs the duties of Sergeant-at-Arms in the House. During the day, when the Sergeant-at-Arms is in the House, the associate augments the security force.

DR. REID: It has to do with the whole security business in the building [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. HYLAND: Systems manager at \$32,000 — what is that? Is that a new position? Is that Dean?

MR. STEFANIUK: That is a contract position that has been established for two previous years. We have filled it on an "as required" basis. This is the fee out of which we have paid hourly consultants' fees. The fact is that the total amount has not been used by any means, but it provides us with that ability to retain a professional consultant who is able to develop customized software and deal with the technicalities inherent in a computer installation.

MR. HYLAND: So this is how we got the evaluation of ...

MR. STEFANIUK: Right.

MR. HYLAND: This is more of a consulting amount of money than a position amount of money.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: Even though it's under contract, it's more a piecemeal type of thing.

MR. STEFANIUK: It is. We have it under contract in the event that we ever found that it would become a full-time contract position. To date we have not found the need for that.

MR. HYLAND: If it becomes that, then it has to come back.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, this is what was budgeted last year?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS. EMBURY: You obviously see approximately the same ...

MR. STEFANIUK: We don't know what the requirements are going to be, so we have protected ourselves with this amount of money. We had some customized software to be developed last year, which we foresaw. For example, we had to integrate our systems with the requirements of Treasury insofar as accounting was concerned. We did not foresee, at the time at which we developed last year's budget, the need for planning out a system for use by members. We were able to tap this fund for the work required in evaluating the development of a system for members.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, if the Parliamentary Counsel switched to this one and that gives the increase of 29 percent, what vote was that switched from?

MR. STEFANIUK: From 100.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It went from 100 to 130, but the percentages aren't the same because they aren't reckoned on the same amounts.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Out of this \$72,900, as I remember the discussion, when we settled on 14 percent there were hidden costs in there as well. Are we going to be able to recover those hidden costs from other departments that provide it? The 14 percent was originally what you had settled on, and then the extra up to the 25 — the 14 was the direct cost we would have. I thought the way they estimate the remainder is that they're hidden costs that are provided generally. Is there any way for us to recover those hidden costs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That 11 percent difference between 14 and 25 was calculated on the analogy of what is done for solicitors in the AG's department, and you may remember having a memo from Neil Crawford saying that that was what they were doing and that they considered it fair and he would support the change. I haven't made the change yet, but it's likely that I will go to the 25.

MR. HYLAND: I had assumed that the way they arrived at those costs, the 11 percent — and maybe Bo can help me — was that they were hidden costs, borne inside other departments, maybe Personnel Administration, et cetera, and that's how they arrived at the numbers.

MR. STEFANIUK: The 11 percent was generally regarded as the value of tenure. It was provided for loss of tenure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe you're thinking of what I mentioned in that connection. When we first discussed it, we said we would stay with hard figures. This is an allowance, and as they say, the AG's department has decided it's worth 11 percent.

Any other questions regarding code 130? Incidentally, is it too breezy? It's just open a crack. Dilution is the solution to pollution.

MR. KOWALSKI: Would you like a motion for code 130?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Code 140. I think that is one we haven't much to say about.

MR. KOWALSKI: Could I ask one question? It deals with management salaries times 9 percent management pension. I'd like clarification for my understanding of this. Does a person in management contribute to their pension plan a total of 18 percent, 9 percent contributed by the government and 9 percent by the employee?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Your contribution is 18 percent? Why do I keep thinking of 4.5 percent and 4.5 percent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe you're thinking of the calculation of the pension.

MR. STEFANIUK: You may be thinking of that pension as applying to the public service generally. There are separate pension plans for permanent employees and for managers.

MR. HYLAND: Which one are MLAs in?

MR. STEFANIUK: Their own.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm sure I have the clarification I needed. It's not that the province is picking up the complete pension contribution for the Clerk, for example. The Clerk is also making a contribution for his own welfare. So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 150. What is this large percentage?

MR. STEFANIUK: Syntopican.

MR. HYLAND: That's the word.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's the conference which is staged annually by the Association of Information Systems Professionals. It is one which Mr. Bubba, when he was Editor of Hansard, and I attended in San Francisco, which resulted eventually in the development of the system which is now in place in Hansard and in the Clerk's office. It is not a conference that we choose to attend every year necessarily; in fact we did not in this past year. We evaluate the conference material and program and relate that to our specific needs. That same process would follow in 1985.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

DR. REID: Just one thing, Mr. Chairman.

Memberships: Law Society of Alberta. That's the compulsory membership in order to practise law. The Canadian Bar Association is the lawyers' union, isn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: It is a voluntary association of the legal profession.

DR. REID: The equivalent would be the Alberta or Canadian Medical Association, which is the doctors' union.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You wouldn't call the Canadian Medical Association a doctors' union, would you?

DR. REID: It lobbies the federal government like AMA lobbies the provincial government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. REID: I just wanted to clarify which was which.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must belong to the Law Society to practise. You need not belong to the Canadian Bar Association, but there are advantages because of the publications and occasional conferences.

DR. REID: It's responsible for ongoing education and things like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, especially the Alberta section of the Canadian Bar Association, which is also covered. They alternate between Calgary and Edmonton, and they have real bread-and-butter stuff on the agenda every year. In fact, I feel deprived that I can't go.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I assume that those four memberships — the Law Society of Alberta, the Canadian Bar Association, the International Bar Association, and the Alberta Government Civil Lawyers Association — are for the legislative counsel, who is now under contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. KOWALSKI: On what basis would General Administration want to pick up his membership if the individual is now not a direct servant?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because it enhances the value of his continuing services to us, whether he be under contract or on salary. We still want him to be well informed and abreast of things when he helps members with Bills.

DR. REID: That's fairly standard across the government, including contract positions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you have a contract position and a staff person is trying to extract out of it every cent he can, he's not going to pay for going to conferences.

MR. HYLAND: But it becomes a deductible item on his income tax if he's under contract. He can write it off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he pays it himself.

MR. HYLAND: Under contract, he has to pay it himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily. If it were a short-term contract, where you're getting somebody to do a study and a report, obviously that person works as an independent . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: In the contract that was negotiated between Mr. Clegg and I'm not sure whom, was this a condition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's just not changed.

DR. REID: On a short-term contract, the government doesn't usually pay these things, but it does on a contract position.

MR. HYLAND: This contract position is one year?

MR. STEFANIUK: Two.

MR. KOWALSKI: If you need a motion, I'll move code 150.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we have the total. Bohdan, my book goes from code 150 to code 840.

MR. ELIUK: The updated sheets were circulated; I think everyone just took their old sheets out and inserted the updated sheets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Instead of interleaving?

MR. HYLAND: We can use the yellow pages.

DR. REID: My staff made the same mistake as yours, Gerry, because I didn't do the interleaving and neither did my staff.

MR. HYLAND: No, I didn't either.

MRS. CRIPPS: Some of us do our own.

MR. HYLAND: Why don't we just go on the yellow sheets, which we all have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Code 200.

MR. KOWALSKI: This question about the control group 001, Manpower — when I moved that motion for code 150, do you want to look at this total estimate for that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to move the totals for codes 100 to 150? That's just the total of what we've approved.

MR. STEFANIUK: It is not the figure which is now on the sheets, because that has been altered by another decision, the reduction of \$7,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. I was forgetting that.

MR. STEFANIUK: The totals cannot be dealt with as they are presented in this book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we'd have to approve the 001 as amended.
Code 200.

DR. REID: Who is buying Petro-Canada gas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not me.

MRS. CRIPPS: Nor me.

DR. REID: Husky — which is nowhere in Alberta — Corporation, \$849; Petro-Canada, \$2,700. I wonder who is buying Petro-Canada gas.

MR. HYLAND: I'll tell you later, and it's not me.

DR. REID: I can guess.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise the point, and I suspect it's kind of a minor one, that there may be another credit card, for Air Canada, if we get the new airbus to Calgary.

DR. REID: That will be in lieu of PW.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It shouldn't increase the total amount.

MRS. EMBURY: No, you might just be listing another credit card.

I have one question I would like to ask, about the rental of the Clerk's vehicle at \$322 per month. That's quite an increase from last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't fix that.

MRS. EMBURY: I was just curious about why the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're going after government services.

MRS. CRIPPS: On that same point, on page 6 under the Speaker's office you have two vehicles, for the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, for \$562. \$322 and \$322 is \$644. How come there would be a difference in government vehicles rented?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR. HYLAND: Did you get a new car this year, Bo?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. HYLAND: So it should be constant, at a regular price.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't get a new one either.

MRS. CRIPPS: The rental for the Clerk's vehicle is \$322. That would work out to \$644 for two vehicles, almost \$100 more. If you haven't got a new vehicle, I can't imagine why.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm not due for one either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether I'm due for one or not, but I'm not taking one.

MR. HYLAND: It should be at a constant rate.

DR. REID: [Inaudible] the vehicle you chose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I've had it for two years.

DR. REID: But what is the Speaker's vehicle?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a Volvo.

DR. REID: That may be less. Frank has an Olds 98.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the time it was bought, the Volvo with the manual shift was close to . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Mine is a lesser car; it's a category two vehicle.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, there's a discrepancy there in rent, and I think we should look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want us to get you an explanation?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: I would think that if Bo's is in its second year and he has one more to go, they should be renting it at the amount they purchased it at and not increasing it.

MR. STEFANIUK: It seems sensible. I don't know why it's up.

MRS. EMBURY: Could I ask one more question? Gasoline for the Clerk's vehicle at \$250 a month: I question the \$3,144. Twelve times \$250 is \$3,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That must include more than gasoline.

DR. REID: That must have been done by the computer, Bo.

MR. PENGELLY: That works out to about 125 miles a day for a 20-day month.

MR. STEFANIUK: That includes the maintenance as well. It may well include the maintenance on the rental. Category one vehicles have all the maintenance costs absorbed by Public Works, Supply and Services, whereas for category two vehicles the department is required to pay all the maintenance.

MRS. CRIPPS: You mean to tell me that the \$562 for the Speaker's and Deputy Speaker's includes the gasoline, and the \$322 doesn't?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. They include maintenance.

DR. REID: The Speaker's car, which is a category one, is equivalent to a minister's car and is treated differently from the Deputy Speaker's or the Clerk's.

MR. HYLAND: Is it, though? We have two deputies, a Deputy Speaker and a Deputy Minister.

MR. STEFANIUK: But the Deputy Speaker is entitled to a category one car. What happens is that all category one vehicles, which are generally regarded as ministerial vehicles, are completely serviced by Public Works, Supply and Services, and the cost of servicing is absorbed in that department's budget, including all the car washes, any repairs or maintenance. In the case of category two vehicles, whenever the car is washed it is charged back to the department and Public Works doesn't handle it. The operator of the vehicle is required to maintain it and submit all the invoices for payment.

I suspect that what we have here is an estimate based on experience, showing the maintenance as well. That includes all the tune-ups, oil changes, washes, tires — whatever.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry. Where is that, Bo?

MR. STEFANIUK: I suspect it's included in the rental costs, and that's why we see that figure higher.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Did anyone answer my question about 12 times \$250?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's unanswerable.

MRS. EMBURY: I guess the answer is that it's going to be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MRS. EMBURY: When Bohdan was talking about car washes, I thought that maybe that was in there. But the rest of the maintenance wouldn't be in there, of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any more discussion on code 200?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, there is. It's with respect to constituency travel by the Director of Administration, the 25 trips. I'd appreciate an explanation of that. I would like to know, number one, where the Director of Administration would like to go, and, number two ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean "has to go".

MR. KOWALSKI: That's inherent in the question. Secondly, why?

MR. PENGELLY: That's my question.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, those trips have been made in the past in response to requests by members that the director visit that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That office.

MR. STEFANIUK: Sometimes it's an area. For example, in Calgary it works out to be an area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a continuation of a custom that Charlene started some time ago, after a substantial number of members' offices were in

place.

MR. PENGELLY: I'm still wondering for what purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To look at the equipment, make sure everything is the way it should be, and so on. Otherwise, we'd have no idea. When we buy equipment for the offices here, we see it; it's right there.

MR. HYLAND: Are you saying you don't trust us? They have forms come out and we put our signatures to them, and ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Auditor General doesn't expect us to trust anybody.

DR. REID: That's what I was wondering about. Is this an expense in order to satisfy the Auditor General, or is it a valid, worthwhile expense? Certainly not everything the Auditor General recommends needs to be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's true.

DR. REID: He only needs a satisfactory explanation, and that he accepts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a policy decision within our own organization so as to keep tabs on what is going on. If we didn't and things happened that we didn't know anything about, we would certainly be taxed for not showing a modicum of interest in the offices we administer. The Clerk signs the leases, we engage staff for those offices, and they are paid through these appropriations. We provide equipment, supplies, and so on. I think it would be a minimum expectation that we know that the things are there.

DR. REID: What I'm worried about, Mr. Chairman, is that once we get into this, I can see this becoming the most rapidly escalating cost item in the whole budget of the Legislative Assembly. The MLAs are in those offices probably at least every two weeks, even the ministers. During sittings, I imagine most of us are in those offices at least once a week. The equipment, furnishings, and supplies that are there are fairly constant, once you get the typewriter, the copier, and the furniture. I'm wondering if there is any useful function of having the Director of Administration running around doing that and taking away time from his other duties, which are probably much more suitable for his designation, rather than checking that furniture and equipment is where it is supposed to be. Can that not devolve upon the individual MLAs?

Incidentally, I haven't yet seen the updated list of the equipment that's in my own office. I don't know what is supposed to be there in the way of furniture, and I'm not at all sure you have that list. It came out of surplus furniture at the forestry school.

MR. STEFANIUK: We still have it in our inventory records. Our inventory records are required to show all furnishings and equipment which have been located in each office. Those records are audited by the Auditor General's staff every year.

DR. REID: Can I bring out a fine example? My office has been in three different rooms along a street since it was opened. On each occasion the furniture that was there was changed because of the size of the room and the layout. I have never seen a list of what was supposed to be in any of those. I know there is supposed to be a Selectric II typewriter and a Xerox copier. Some of the furniture came out of surplus furniture at the forestry school, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, and some of it came from I know not where.

MR. STEFANIUK: Did it come through arrangements through our office?

DR. REID: I presume it was furnished originally through your office, but the stuff came out of surplus.

MR. STEFANIUK: That in fact was the arrangement we reached.

DR. REID: But the items have changed twice since the office was opened, and I've never seen another list.

MR. STEFANIUK: That should be recorded in our inventory records.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll check and report.

DR. REID: I'm satisfied that I haven't run off with the furniture and brought it back, and I'm satisfied my secretary hasn't. It has gone to the forestry school and come back. I'm wondering what the useful function is of having anybody go out and look at that office from time to time. It's 180 miles from Edmonton, a three-hour trip by road. So to go out and inspect my office is a working day. I'm just wondering what it achieves, why we're employing a Director of Administration at \$40,000 a year to do it.

MR. STEFANIUK: As I said earlier, these visits are often made in response to requests by members to have the office visited, not at the administration's initiative. Secondly, when the offices have been visited, there have been occasions when we have found that not furnishings but equipment which had been placed in those offices was not in place.

DR. REID: I think my telephone answering machine, which is no longer there, disappeared at the forestry school.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the trips, as little as I know about it, but I think it has been a valuable service in the past. To back what the Clerk has said, I'm sure there were originally some requests from the constituency offices. I think it was beneficial for a person to go to Calgary. I guess I question the number of trips or whatever — I don't know how many they could visit in Calgary; probably four in a day. I think it was interesting and of assistance to MLAs on a consultative basis. I for one didn't get very much information but I used to say, well, what are some of the different functions the offices are performing. I know there are all kinds of different setups. I happen to sublet, and that's quite different.

I thought the person who made the visit had a terrific wealth of information, and I know it was of great help to the person I have in my office in Calgary. There would be a joint luncheon meeting with the person who came from Edmonton and a few of the secretaries. They would clarify a lot of questions. They do the ordering; they handle that paperwork. I haven't got a clue what they order. If they had questions, at least they felt that if they phoned Edmonton they were talking to somebody. I suspect that is going to change. I don't know the system, and I may be wrong, but if it was the person who made the trips in the past, you could talk right to that person if they had a concern. I think it was valuable to at least put a face to a name. So it was a good system from that point of view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have about 60 offices. It's 25 trips for 60 offices.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, when it's initiated by the constituency office, either individually or as a group, would it not be reasonable that that be a cost to that constituency office or group of offices?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can hear the echoes of doing that. The members might say, "Everything is okay in my office."

MRS. EMBURY: I guess there is one other thing I should have said in regard to this, and I think it's important. These are offices of the Assembly. I don't think they've ever gone around just to check on what is there, but we have had instances where there has been political information of some type in the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Party information.

MRS. EMBURY: Party information. I think it's worth having that brought to the member's attention. I was one person — it wasn't actually in my office per se, but in the other part there were some political matches. Those things are very bad when they hit the press. So I think there are a lot of reasons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly thought it was a practical thing to do. If you think this is a good place to cut out \$3,700, I'm sure we'll be glad to abdicate the responsibility totally.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, on that point I would like to move that we decrease the trips — nights, days, meals, miscellaneous — by 80 percent. In other words, instead of 25 trips, it would be reduced to five trips; instead of 10 nights, it would be reduced to two nights; instead of 25 days of meals, it would be reduced to five; instead of 25 days of miscellaneous, it would be reduced to five.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why not just reduce the \$3,692 and save all the arithmetic?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I'm quite prepared in those circumstances where there has been an initiative from a member to extend an invitation to have a person go. If you want to cut it all out, that's okay with me. I have a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's wide open for a motion.

MRS. CRIPPS: You made a motion.

MR. KOWALSKI: I did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the item by item be reduced by 80 percent. Any discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is lost. Is there another motion? Oh, is it carried? All right. All those in favour? Oh, four. It's carried. I'm sorry. I missed some hands.

Is there anything else on code 200?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would like to ask a general question. Because all the conferences and whatnot are listed, obviously it's still deemed very important to attend all of them or I'm sure they wouldn't have been put here. I only raise it as a point of questioning, because I find that in the public sector today, people are certainly not going to quite as many conferences as they used to — 7, 7(a), 8, 9, 9(a), 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What are you saying, Sheila?

MRS. EMBURY: I've just asked — obviously it is still deemed to be important, in a time of restraint, that we consider sending as many people to all these conventions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They seem to be useful. I don't think we've been going wild about it.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'm just as edgy about restraint as anyone. I think the interface between Commonwealth and Canadian parliamentarians and North American — I don't really know if you could call them parliamentarians; whatever we should call them under their system. It is a useful thing to make sure there is the free exchange of information on what is happening in the different jurisdictions. I think it does perform a useful function. We have a system, particularly the parliamentary system, which is very amenable to change, and that has been the major reason for its success over a period approaching a thousand years. I think we should keep doing this type of thing.

MRS. EMBURY: Would another reason be that in a time of restraint, when we certainly haven't done much to salary changes, it's viewed as a little benefit for people to go away?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suppose that every trip has its enjoyable and interesting moments.

MRS. EMBURY: Even though you spend most of your time working.

DR. REID: By and large, working experience is even the social aspects.

MR. HYLAND: We don't have any total.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, we do. Page 6. I move that we approve code 200.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed? That's subject to

that amendment.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subject to the amendment of 80 percent, is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Then there is the checking on the other, to find out if . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Subject also to checking the car rental discrepancies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Code 260.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 270.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 290.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 350.

MR. KOWALSKI: Chairman, a question with respect to Rental of Property, Equipment and Goods. The last time Members' Services had a meeting, I had a motion which was approved that directed the Clerk to do some things with respect to a word processing system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To get some proposals.

MR. KOWALSKI: More than just proposals. I'm wondering if the figures we're dealing with here would cover the motion I addressed to the committee and, secondly, if this figure of \$66,418 for the leasing of the NBI computer system is the dollar figures that . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: No, it is not, Mr. Chairman. That figure is there to cover the existing equipment. Our preliminary information relative to installation of a system for members indicates that a configuration which would include the placement on every government member's desk, for the moment, of a computer terminal, together with printers, based on servicing two to three secretaries, depending on the location, and two processing units, would cost in the area of \$135,000 per year. That is inclusive of servicing, because a service contract would have to be carried on all that equipment. It takes into account as well the cost of leasing the equipment, that is the interest payments.

MRS. CRIPPS: If we lease it, why would there be interest payments?

MR. STEFANIUK: We're paying carrying charges on the lease. In other words, if you bought the equipment and paid for it in cash, you would have no lease costs. But if you're leasing it over a three-year period, and at the moment that's what we're looking at, then you obviously have to attach something for

that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Stefaniuk, the \$135,000 per year would cover — we would have to have an item in this. Would it come under code 350?

MR. STEFANIUK: Part of it would come under 350, and I think part of it would come under 430. The service contracts would come under 430. So we would have to split it off. If we are to proceed, we would need tentative approval for a total of approximately \$135,000 a year. Considering the proposed installation date, which is early in the new year, we do not anticipate that there would be additional funding required for the balance of the current fiscal year, and that could be absorbed within the existing budget.

MRS. CRIPPS: You said putting a terminal on every member's desk.

MR. STEFANIUK: Every secretary's desk.

MRS. CRIPPS: You said "member's".

MR. HYLAND: Both opposition parties have their own now. Does your number include if they want to change?

MR. STEFANIUK: Depending on what we do, that's difficult to say today. We know that the opposition caucuses are now equipped with IBM equipment. We know that IBM is compatible with NBI, which is the system that currently exists in the Assembly. Assuming that from among the vendor community, NBI or IBM would be the successful bidder, we see the potential for integration with the existing system, probably requiring little enhancement.

MR. HYLAND: But the opportunity is still there for them if they want it.

MR. STEFANIUK: It ought to be.

DR. REID: There is another alternative if their equipment is leased. That lease could be taken over by Legislative Assembly rather than being in their budgets.

MR. STEFANIUK: Without having reached the stage where we have a firm dollar proposal, we find it difficult to calculate all those configurations at this moment.

MRS. CRIPPS: What is the \$66,000 for leasing NBI equipment?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's for the equipment that is in place now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I remember rightly, that represents a fairly substantial saving over what we used to pay to the Data Centre. Something around \$50,000, wasn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think so.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Stefaniuk, when this motion was passed on October 31, by way of explanation of it

I used the following words: "I would see the Clerk advance work without delay to see the early implementation of equipment in January or February 1985." Are we still in that time frame?

MR. STEFANIUK: We've been working toward February 1.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any more discussion on code 350?

MR. STEFANIUK: I would indicate that that is really tight. What we have to determine is that all the equipment that would be required would be available. We're pushing for it. We feel that if it's going to be operational by the opening of the spring sittings and for the staff to have had some time and hands-on experience, we need to push for at least that date.

MR. KOWALSKI: One other question on that. When do you anticipate that you are going to be in a position to make a decision on which equipment will be utilized?

MR. STEFANIUK: We will have the abbreviated request for proposal ready to go to the vendor community by the end of this week. It will be for a limited number of the vendor community. We anticipate the responses from the vendor community by the end of next week. Based on the responses, we will be in a position to make a decision as to the equipment. We propose to go into the detailed description of the equipment configuration and the detailed costs a week after that.

MR. KOWALSKI: If I follow this process, by perhaps the end of the first week of December, you will be ...

MR. STEFANIUK: We're really hoping for the end of this month. Then we have to do the preparations for the installation, which, as you can appreciate, requires considerable liaison with the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services to run cable and prepare areas for housing the equipment. There are a number of things we can do. For example, where we locate printers in any office complex will determine whether we need acoustical hoods. If they are all located in one enclosed area and the noise produced by the printers does not disturb people working in the office, we do not need to worry about acoustical hoods. On the other hand, if we take 513, for example, and printers are to be located in various areas of the outer office, then we would have to worry about acoustical hoods. Those are details that need to be considered.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Stefaniuk, as you move towards the decision, because you've been given the authority to come up with a decision in this regard — I'm not sure how many vendors you'll be putting this proposal to.

MR. STEFANIUK: Three.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay, on the basis of three — what are the three?

MR. STEFANIUK: Wang, Xerox, and NBI. We know that NBI is already compatible, and we've heard or know that IBM is weak in the word processing area.

MR. KOWALSKI: On the basis of the decision that should arrive by the end of the first week in December, do you have a plan in mind that would allow the secretarial staff to gain some familiarity with the system prior to that system being deposited on their desks? As an example, it is my understanding that NBI is the system used by Hansard. Hansard should not be functioning in the time frame December and January. Is there a plan you might have that would encourage these women to get some hands-on experience during the time frame December and January so that by the time these machines arrive at their desks on February 1, they will already be accustomed to them?

MR. STEFANIUK: There is normally a program developed by the supplier for hands-on experience or training prior to the installation being completed. I understand that the supplier normally wishes to present that program at his premises. However, we have already taken that question into consideration and, if it is NBI, in consideration of the equipment that has already been located in this building, intend to insist on having the training periods scheduled in this building, in all probability on Hansard equipment, since some of that will be freed up. I say some of it, because we anticipate that some committees may continue to meet and there will be a requirement to use some of that equipment to serve committees. But we feel we could more practically schedule employees' time by placing the training program in this very building, thereby eliminating the need to travel back and forth to the supplier's premises.

MR. KOWALSKI: Do we need a motion with respect to setting aside dollars for this in the 1985-86 budget?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we'll need a motion for that purpose. I would feel a whole lot more comfortable if we could also make provision for consultation, perhaps by a subcommittee of this committee, on an ongoing basis. We may arrive at certain junctures in this process which will require decisions. As I said, we would feel more comfortable if perhaps two members of this committee who are directly concerned with the installation were empowered to make certain decisions which we would be in a position to place before them. Meetings of this entire committee have been scheduled for the second Wednesday of each month. If we in fact were required to wait for a meeting of the full committee, that might be a detriment to meeting the deadlines which have been placed before us.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think that is an excellent idea, and I would suggest that Mrs. Embury and Mr. Kowalski be the two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything more on code 350?

MR. HYLAND: I'll make the motion on — that would overlap on a couple of votes, wouldn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: If you could give us a motion for the number of dollars, we would spread it into the appropriate places.

MR. HYLAND: You think \$135,000 will do it?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's what we estimate.

DR. REID: That didn't include any Official Opposition or Independents.

MRS. CRIPPS: Theirs would move into this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. KOWALSKI: If there's a leasing cost attached to their equipment, it would be exempted from their budget and picked up by General Administration.

MR. STEFANIUK: Our meeting with the Independent caucus, for example, is taking place only today. It may be that we will have to consult those two members of the committee you've just appointed about configurations. I think it should be understood as well that we are basing this estimate on equipment which will be located in this building and in the Legislature Annex. We should recognize that that equipment will ultimately have capability for telecommunications, but that is not envisaged in this initial installation, nor are any pieces of equipment envisaged in constituency offices at this particular time.

MR. HYLAND: Not with this figure. I move that...

MRS. EMBURY: Could I just interject one question? This is basically equipment you're talking about. I am wondering about training of the staff...

MR. STEFANIUK: And the software? That's taken into account in this dollar figure I have given you.

DR. REID: Before the motion is made, perhaps Mr. Stefaniuk could give us some advice as to any additional amount that might be required to cover the other two caucus offices. Have you any idea at all?

MR. STEFANIUK: I can't until such time as we have concluded our discussions with the other two caucuses. One discussion has already taken place. Based on the report which has been given to me, some definitions have been provided of services which go beyond what it is intended to provide at the present moment. For example, management data systems, which are not foreseen here, and mainframe access. There was one suggestion for providing a printer which could provide coloured charting and graph work. We didn't envisage that in this system. That's why, as these particular requirements are placed before us, we would like to be able to consult with Mrs. Embury and Mr. Kowalski as to whether or not they should be considered. What we are looking at here is a standard form of service to all users. I anticipate that we may be able to accomplish that for everyone by using some of the existing

equipment, which is IBM and which we know will interface with NBI at least.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I want to get in again before the motion is on the table about the sum of money.

MR. STEFANIUK: \$135,000.

DR. REID: But then we might be coming back with a supplementary one at, say, the next meeting, on December 12, to authorize an additional sum to cover the other two caucuses.

MR. STEFANIUK: I doubt that. As I said, for the moment we're looking at existing IBM equipment, which we have now, interfacing and being able to function with the central processing unit it is proposed to install.

DR. REID: My concern is with the lease costs of the equipment they currently have, which is covered within the budgets of the Official Opposition and the Independents — equipment which would be moved over to a Legislative Assembly General Administration item rather than in their budgets.

MR. STEFANIUK: I stand to be corrected, but I think the existing equipment was purchased outright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The original unit was \$25,000, and that was paid for — finished. Then after the '82 election we added two or three items of equipment and divided it so that the Independent caucus and the NDP caucus each have IBM equipment.

DR. REID: Funded out of their caucus budgets.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. That equipment is owned; it wasn't leased.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What happened was that the Social Credit caucus, as it then was, ordered the equipment and then asked me to approve a transfer of funds from one category to another to pay for that equipment. I held off for a while, because I was concerned about standardization and so on, and then eventually signed the transfer. At that time they were the only ones who had equipment and, as Bohdan says, it was bought. It was augmented after the '82 election.

MRS. CRIPPS: There were surplus funds that year too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The \$25,000 with which the equipment was bought in the first place came out of the Social Credit opposition's funds.

DR. REID: Like the word processors for government members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So right now, as far as I know, our only responsibility in regard to that equipment is maintenance and supplies.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have also begun to look at the disposal of any of the current equipment which may become obsolete as a result of this. We have thus far

been able to determine that there is an agency in Calgary which provides that service. We hope it might be possible to apply some of the revenues which might come about as a result of disposal directly to this installation. We're examining, with the Provincial Treasurer and the Auditor General, the possibilities of accomplishing that, as opposed to directing disposal revenues to the General Revenue Fund.

MR. HYLAND: I move that we empower — I'm not sure what the right word is — the Clerk, Mr. Kowalski, and Mrs. Embury to deal with the computer subject we've been talking about in the amount of \$135,000, and if they find, among the three of them, that they have to make adjustments because of the opposition or because of moving some of the [inaudible] costs from the opposition, if there are any, into this amount, they be empowered to do so and add it to the budget when the final budget is drawn up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion on that motion? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have code 350 and an item of \$135,000. Any motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: I thought we just had that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understood your motion to be — your motion was for the \$135,000 to be adjusted?

MR. HYLAND: Plus the committee. I should have added that at the last.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then what about code 350?

MR. HYLAND: I meant to add code 350 as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Everybody agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 400.

MR. HYLAND: How did you know when you drew up the budget that Edmonton Telephones were going to raise their amount?

MR. STEFANIUK: I didn't.

MRS. CRIPPS: On code 400, has anybody ever checked to see if the telephone calls to Calgary are made through RITE numbers?

MR. STEFANIUK: We have advocated the use of RITE numbers.

MRS. CRIPPS: What's the difference in actual costs?

MR. STEFANIUK: If the charges are made to RITE numbers, the cost is absorbed elsewhere, whereas if they are using the regular long-distance lines, we cover all the costs. So the difference is very significant; it's 100 per cent. We have the ability, and that has been advertised, to dial Calgary directly

from here, using the 116 code. We also have the ability to dial across the country on the 118 code. I have personally found the problem with 118 is that all too often it's not available, and we simply can't afford to sit and wait until a line is available. So we resort to the direct-dial system. I'm not sure what it is with 116, because I use it infrequently. I don't know what members do.

DR. REID: It's usually available.

MRS. EMBURY: It's generally available, but there are times when I have to revert to my credit card.

MR. HYLAND: I know that you might as well forget the RITE number to Lethbridge or Medicine Hat.

MRS. CRIPPS: My specific question is: if you use the 116, is that just transferred to another department or is there an overall saving to the government?

MR. STEFANIUK: There is an overall saving to the public purse, because those lines are made available at a standard, fixed price for an unlimited number of calls. They are monitored insofar as usage is concerned by the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, and I know that on 118, for example, we have been getting a printout as to the frequency of use. We use those to ensure that the lines are not being used by staff for personal use.

DR. REID: I would like some explanation for the fact that the credit cards are still running \$114,000 a year compared to legislative offices, constituency offices, and residential ones, which come to a total of under \$100,000 a year. It looks as if we are still looking at an unnecessary use of credit cards. Is that true? Are credit cards being used from numbers where DDD is available?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, they are.

DR. REID: How do we get this through people's heads, because it's twice the price?

MR. STEFANIUK: We have maintained that all along. We introduced a program whereby we provided members with the opportunity to install extra telephones in their residences, as a matter of fact, and encouraged them to use DDD. I don't know whether it's simply a question of breaking old habits, and I respectfully suggest that the encouragement can perhaps be provided through the caucuses.

MRS. EMBURY: I was going to suggest that we have a memo come out sometime indicating the percentage increase. Then I think we could follow up, Bohdan, but I think people need to have that basic information brought to their attention.

MR. HYLAND: Does everybody around this table have an extra phone?

DR. REID: I haven't had one put in, because I didn't think it was worth while. When I look at \$5,500 for excess mileage in rural areas and look at this \$114,000 on the credit cards, maybe I should get one put in. That's a ridiculous cost.

MR. PENGELLY: I had one installed.

MRS. CRIPPS: I remember that when Bohdan gave me my telephone bill we did an assessment on it. It was less than 50 percent by using direct dialing compared to the credit card, so there are major savings. I agree with Sheila. We have to do something to make sure members use it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll get a memo out to members.

MR. KOWALSKI: Just to follow up what Sheila said, I think this information is available, and perhaps at the next Members' Services meeting we could have a complete listing of all 78 MLAs to tell us what the figures are.

MR. STEFANIUK: Over what period of time?

MR. KOWALSKI: Can we go back six months?

MR. STEFANIUK: How much can we pull off the computer?

MR. ELIUK: I'll have to check.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think three months is about . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: We want to check the pattern to see exactly what it is. I think the easiest way is to follow up.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we have to do in all likelihood is be in a position to examine all the telephone accounts.

MR. KOWALSKI: You have that information in a global figure.

MR. STEFANIUK: Offhand I'm not sure what is involved, Mr. Chairman. If it's a considerable amount of administrative work, then I suggest the committee should realize that we are being taxed to the hilt with our existing staff facility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Notwithstanding sardonic smiles, we're still . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: I really appreciate that. I'll tell you what, then. I'll volunteer two hours a month to look at this. Instead of sending every MLA his phone bill at the end of the month asking for approval, send them to me. I'll spend two hours on it.

DR. REID: The thing is that we do know now that the cost of a credit card call is twice the cost of DDD calls. If any calls being made from DDD phones in the Legislature or the Annex or from constituency offices or from those who have a DDD phone in their home are being put on credit cards, that's where the problem is.

MR. HYLAND: At night it's even worse than that, isn't it? It's more than twice at night.

DR. REID: It's a minimum of twice.

MR. HYLAND: Aren't all these bills on the computer? Don't you just push the right code and it

comes out on paper?

MR. STEFANIUK: What we have is a charge against the telephone account of each charge against each and every number and each and every credit card.

DR. REID: I'm not sure if it's a useful exercise, because we have the facts about the costs of the different kinds of telephones. What we need to do is somehow to remind members that they should be using the DDD telephones.

MR. KOWALSKI: I agree with you completely, Ian. The point is that a general memo going out to 78 MLAs in the province that affects only four or five or six who might not be following it — they're not going to read it.

MR. HYLAND: There must be more than that.

MR. KOWALSKI: If you're going to teach somebody, you have to come to them with the problem. You can't speak about peace in the world when you're sitting there with a \$400 sumptuous meal. You talk to the two warring forces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we look into the feasibility of it and report back.

MR. KOWALSKI: The feasibility. Let's get it resolved, if this is an item of concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not a question of delay. I'm concerned about not burdening the staff excessively. That's all.

MR. KOWALSKI: I've volunteered to assist them. I'll do it on Christmas morning for two hours to resolve the problem. If we have a problem, let's resolve it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You know that that last remark has been recorded.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So what do you want?

MR. KOWALSKI: Let's get to the root of the problem and resolve it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's be specific. Do you want a printout showing what has been charged to each number?

MR. KOWALSKI: If that's too much trouble, the other suggestion I made was — I have sent to me once or twice a month a phone bill, telling me: these are charges; approve it. If it's too much trouble to do anything else, send them all to me. I'll do the evaluation. That doesn't take any time for anybody to do that, just so I get 78 of them.

MRS. CRIPPS: On Ken's point, we only need the credit card calls. We don't need to worry about the other numbers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's true.

MRS. CRIPPS: All we have to worry about are the

credit cards, because they're the ones that are excess.

MR. ELIUK: Mr. Chairman, if we had the numbers, which we do, we may be able, through AGT, to have them spit it out for us, because we maintain all that kind of information: credit card usage statistics. It might be that the information is readily available and it just means a telephone call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My only concern is that whatever motion is moved on the basis of this discussion is practical. Is there a motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: I move that we undertake a review of AGT long-distance credit card tolls, to see if we can ascertain improvements in the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Code 400: do you want the review first?

HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's now about 20 minutes past 12. What is your wish?

MR. KOWALSKI: Can we have some sandwiches sent in and just work right through?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What kind of sandwiches? Brown or white? You're going to get a bunch of cold cuts.

MRS. CRIPPS: We're going to get fish, fish, fish. It must be cheap.

MR. PENGELLY: It's good for you. Ask the doctor sitting beside you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sandwich spread and stuff like that. Do you want to face that?

DR. REID: Assorted sandwiches.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want some pie? Coffee, tea, milk? Gary, did you hear this a la carte stuff going on?

DR. GARRISON: I've got most of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you count heads and mouths? I think it will be the same number.

DR. GARRISON: I hope so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. 410.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question on the maintenance of the NBI computer system. It talks about a 54 percent increase. Last year it was \$12,000 and it's now \$10,000. Could I have an explanation, please?

MR. STEFANIUK: Last year I don't think we were

dealing with a full year. The installation was new, and we're dealing with a partial year.

MR. HYLAND: You're saying the 54 percent is over an actual, so the \$12,000 last year has no bearing?

MR. ELIUK: I don't think the 54 percent increase has any bearing on this item. That should be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's an error?

MR. ELIUK: I'd simply take it out. The previous estimate was \$12,000. This is \$10,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's a decrease.

MR. HYLAND: But you have a 50 percent increase in your total allotment. Where does it fall?

MR. ELIUK: Mr. Chairman, from last year's estimates, we have an marginal increase in dictaphones, 6 units, from \$225 last year to \$270; dictaphones and transcriber last year \$825 to \$1,000 this year; telephone answering devices, 50 units, from \$2,700 to \$3,250. The biggest item was the maintenance of the Xerox 2600 copiers, 50 units, at \$57 per unit per quarter, which is \$11,400, an item which was not part of last year's estimates. Then of course there is a decrease in the maintenance of the NBI computer system from \$12,000 to \$10,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That 54 belongs somewhere.

MR. HYLAND: These Xerox copiers that are in our constituency offices — what about the ones, like mine, that are far away? I don't think it ever gets looked at.

MR. STEFANIUK: Maintenance contracts are provided in the event that it needs looking at.

MR. HYLAND: So would we have to bundle it up and send it back to Edmonton?

MR. STEFANIUK: Somebody from the closest community where there is a Xerox centre would go to your constituency office and repair the machine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on code 410.

MR. KOWALSKI: Just one little question with respect to this. I take it that there is some follow-up, that when Xerox goes out and does this maintenance, they must fill out a form that goes back to your office so you have a running track that they are honouring their contract.

MR. ELIUK: We have one for our own machine in the Clerk's office, but I don't think they follow up with anything to our office.

MR. STEFANIUK: What happens is that a copy of the repair form is left in the constituency office when a repair is effected, and it must be signed by not only the repairman but the person who was there to see the maintenance performed.

MRS. EMBURY: Is that then sent up here?

MR. STEFANIUK: Not unless the constituency secretary does it.

MRS. EMBURY: I wonder if it should be signed by the MLA.

MR. HYLAND: No, we won't be there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By the staff. Is there any further discussion of code 410?

MRS. CRIPPS: Remember when we were talking about the repairs to the Clerk's car. It seems to me we would be better off in class one. In class one, the expenses to the Legislative Assembly are much less.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only thing is that they have certain guidelines in that department.

MR. STEFANIUK: The determination is made by Executive Council. I don't know how practical it is, but it sometimes seems ridiculous to me that the cars parked on all sides of me in the garage are taken away by somebody and washed and whatnot and brought back, and mine sits there covered with mud because I haven't got the time to go out . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Have you tried parking in somebody else's spot?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MRS. CRIPPS: I've heard it works.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion on 410? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 430.

MRS. CRIPPS: On 430 we have calculated 79 constituency offices, and actually there are only 64.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have done that as a matter of practice because everybody is entitled to a constituency office, and we should budget in the event that those who don't have an office now decide they're going to get one. What we should realize as well is that some members who do not have permanent offices rent temporary offices from time to time. They may elect to rent a spot in a shopping centre or a trailer once a week or once a month or whatever. Those costs are charged against their constituency office allowances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I do.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'd like to make a motion that we move the amount for constituency offices from \$14,700 to \$16,000. If you calculate that at 64 offices, it's \$1,024,000, which still leaves you a contingency fund of \$140,000, providing the others decide to have an office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The \$14,700 is statutory, isn't it?

MR. HYLAND: No. It's by your order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right; on your advice.

MRS. CRIPPS: So I'd like to offer some new advice.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mrs. Cripps, I'm supportive of moving it from \$14,700 to \$16,000, but the other part of the motion . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm just saying that we don't have to recalculate the estimate here in order to do that.

MR. KOWALSKI: But if you base it on 64, what do we do with our colleagues who don't have constituency office and who might want to rent space?

MRS. CRIPPS: There is \$140,000 contingency fund in the estimate.

MR. HYLAND: What happens if all of them decide to open constituency offices next year? Would you consider changing your motion and just increasing . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: That wasn't part of the motion. My motion was only that we move it from \$14,700 to \$16,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you're deducting 79 times \$1,700.

MRS. CRIPPS: \$1,300.

MR. KOWALSKI: Her motion is to increase the allocation from \$14,700 to \$16,000.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm saying that I really don't see any need to change the calculation, because we've only got 64 and that works out to \$1,024,000.

MR. HYLAND: But we have to in case everybody else opens one.

DR. REID: What you're really talking about is a 9 percent increase in the constituency office allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we can get by with this, why don't we leave it?

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I think we can do without changing the estimate at all.

MR. KOWALSKI: But how do you deal with the situation if 15 members of the Legislative Assembly who may not have an office today rent temporary space? There would be no funding for them if the other 64 have taken advantage of it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Ken, if they don't begin their constituency office at the beginning of the year, then that and the other \$140,000 that's available is going to take care of it. I don't care if we change it.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, we're talking about two things at cross purposes here. We're talking about total allocation, which may or may not be taken up, for the Members of the Legislative Assembly, and we're also talking about the limit of \$14,700 that was recommended to you by this committee and a

potential increase of roughly 9 percent. They are two separate issues. Whether we budget for everybody to have one is one issue and whether we decide whether there should be an increase in the allocation per member . . . One would follow the other. What is the justification for increasing from \$14,700 to \$16,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some people are going to use it.

DR. REID: Some people would use \$150,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They would use whatever the limit is.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm supportive of moving it from \$14,700 to \$16,000 on the basis that this is a service that Members of the Legislative Assembly provide to the people of Alberta. There are two components to the \$14,700 that currently exist: one is the rental factor, and the other is the provision of dollars to the individual who would serve in that office.

I give you an example by way of this. It's specific in attempting to answer your question of justification. The monthly rental for the constituency office in Barrhead is \$550. That has not increased in this fiscal year, and I've advised my landlord that I will not entertain any debate on any raise in rent next year either. I've told him that's going to be the way it is, and if we cannot function in that same thing, I'll simply find another spot. That's one way of controlling costs. The remainder, that's \$8,100, is essentially provided by way of hourly fee to the secretary. I think it's \$6.25 an hour. We generally look at approximately 30 hours a week or something like that. My office is becoming very well utilized by the great number of senior citizens in our area, 23 to 24 percent, and I would like to see that individual work an additional 10 or so hours per week. I'm not sure if these calculations average out, but at least that would allow me to provide that additional service to my constituents. That's the rationale for it.

DR. REID: I have no problem with the rationale. I think it should be put on the record as to why it was being done.

MR. HYLAND: Just adding to what Ken said, I think it's been three years since we've adjusted it — two for sure, maybe three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have two different ideas before the committee: one is to increase the constituency office allowance to \$16,000, and the other is possibly doing something about the number of offices for which the allowance will be made.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm wrong on that other. That is transferable, so the other members could use it elsewhere.

MR. HYLAND: You could withdraw part of your motion.

MRS. CRIPPS: It wasn't part of the motion anyway. The motion ended it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there still a motion before the

committee for \$16,000?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

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

Is there any further motion?

MR. HYLAND: Is there any reason the price of the Visitors' Guide increased 500 percent in the last year? It's \$23,000 and, if I looked in last year's book right, it was \$4,500. Have printing costs come up that much?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's a question of consumption, Alan.

MRS. EMBURY: The Order Paper is quite a jump too — \$26,716 to \$43,000. I don't think the forest industry is getting that.

MR. ELIUK: I would have to suggest that perhaps that was based on actual expenditures of last year in addition to the increased printing costs. It's something I could check back on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you phone your office and get somebody to look it up?

MR. PENGELLY: It must be a mistake.

MRS. EMBURY: I'd like the first three — the Visitors' Guide, Order Paper, and Votes and Proceedings — checked, please. Votes and Proceedings goes to \$48,000 from \$33,128 last year.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have a question on the budget documents. That works out to over six bucks each.

DR. REID: On the ones distributed by members.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. That's an incredible price.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No doubt there's a lot of paper here.

MRS. EMBURY: That item was up from \$35,000 to \$48,556.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So are we going to leave 430 for a bit? Are there other items you want checked? Code 500.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600.

MRS. CRIPPS: What's this?

MR. PENGELLY: Page Uniforms. We were wondering about this one.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. Do we buy new page uniforms at \$444.44 a year, and do our security uniforms cost us \$857? Unless I've miscalculated . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: We don't buy these every year. In fact there haven't been pages' uniforms bought for eight years. We're having trouble maintaining the ones that are in place right now, because they are adjusted every season to fit the new pages who come in. So they go back to the tailors, and they're taken in, let out, opened, shortened, and everything else. They're cleaned with some frequency and, as you can appreciate, dry cleaning takes its toll. When we talk about pages' uniforms, we are not necessarily talking about a uniform for each page. We are talking about a supply of uniforms over and beyond that which will be required on the basis of one per page or one per security officer. Sometimes, depending on weather conditions and so on, it is really difficult to have, in the case of trousers and skirts, just one in place. The cleaning process takes place once a week, on a weekend basis, and sometimes they just won't stand up for a whole week, depending on what they've been doing. So this is what we've estimated would be required as an outlay in the next fiscal year, which would hopefully cover the next number of years.

MR. HYLAND: In other words, the same holds true with the security.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right. When we talk about uniforms, it's not just that. It's the ties, shirts, and so on.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, on this particular page, we have the item called Promotional Allowance Program, a total per member of allowances. My understanding is that the current allowances allocated to members are based on the number of constituents.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: I would like to make the following motion with respect to the per member allowances. I would like to move that we increase the dollar allocation by \$39,500 and that we allocate an additional \$500 per member for the promotional allowance.

DR. REID: Allowing for the fact that the constituency allowance, promotional allowance, and communications allowance are interchangeable.

MR. HYLAND: Ken, are you saying that \$39,000 is the amount that \$500 per constituency comes to?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right. The \$39,500 is based on 79 members times \$500.

MR. HYLAND: The way you worded it, I was wondering. I was concerned that you had attached the \$39,000 plus the \$500.

MR. KOWALSKI: No.

DR. REID: To what extent are those three interchangeable allowances transferred, and to what extent do we propose to spend [inaudible] expenditures of the Assembly? I know there are many members who do not spend the total of the three put together.

MR. STEFANIUK: Toward the end of any given fiscal year, we come very close.

DR. REID: Increasing frequently as the year goes by.

MR. STEFANIUK: Transfers occur to a large extent among some groups. Others certainly stay within the allocations for each of the allowances. But some transfer significantly.

DR. REID: If you were to lump together in your budgeting a constituency office allowance, a communication allowance, and a promotional allowance, out of that total for 79 members, what percentage is spent and what percentage is not spent by members?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think you'd come fairly close to 100 percent expenditure. What we have is a practice whereby toward the end of the fiscal year, if there are moneys left, there are [inaudible] sums transferred into promotional allowances, where we've seen a very real depletion of virtually all our inventories of presentation items — to the extent the moneys are there. Incidentally, we discussed the theft of \$6,000 worth from one member's car.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion to increase the promotional allowance by \$500 per member, the total being \$39,500. Is there any further discussion of that motion? Are you ready for the question? Al, I was just putting this motion of Ken's for \$500 more per member for the promotional allowance, a total of \$39,500 to go under code 600. Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried by a majority.

MR. HYLAND: I move we — do we need a motion to accept the whole thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As amended. Moved by Alan Hyland. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 790. Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have two yeses and one nod of the head.

MRS. EMBURY: Sorry, three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 850. Apart from the [inaudible] item, on which further information is to come, I think we're ready to go to Members' Indemnity, concerning which we can't do much.

MR. HYLAND: Why do we show an increase on that? Unless the rate of the equation changes, we're below that this year, aren't we?

MR. STEFANIUK: We have to provide for an increase, assuming that one will occur on January 1. If it does not, it won't be used.

MR. KOWALSKI: Where do those dollars end up then, Bo?

MR. STEFANIUK: Either the final budget will perhaps be changed, if the inflation rate is known prior to the publication of the budget books, or the amount will simply not be used; it can't be.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, one other point on that page, and it deals with the second last item, temporary residence allowance. A number of members have indicated that that 24 days might be a bit shy, and I just wonder if other members of the committee heard that and whether or not it's an item that should be . . .

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, I've had members express concern, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps some of them are not on committees and they come in more than 20 days per year, so they are out of pocket. I move that that be raised to 30 days.

DR. REID: To refresh my memory, do the members have to claim that, and do they have to give the dates?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

DR. REID: Is that number statutory?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, it is statutory.

DR. REID: So the 24 is statutory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you look up the Legislative Assembly Act and see if the 24 days' temporary residence allowance . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm not sure about the days; I know there is \$75 [inaudible].

DR. REID: I think both the amount per day and the number of days are statutory.

MR. PENGELLY: I think you're right, Ian.

DR. REID: Because it's not a — what's it called? It came under the benefits. It won't be in the RSA of '80.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, you'd have to look at a consolidation that's been updated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The new Act.

DR. REID: I'm fairly sure payments to members and things like that were put in the statute.

MR. HYLAND: Didn't we leave the \$75 — we left out one of them that could be adjusted, and maybe it was the \$75.

MR. KOWALSKI: If I recall, the only thing in there that dealt with \$75 was for legislative committees.

DR. REID: It's section 41(3): "A Member is not entitled to receive payments under subsection (1)(b) in respect of more than 24 days in any year".

MR. KOWALSKI: Does it say anything about the fee or just the number of days?

MR. HYLAND: It says a fee of \$75 is statutory.

DR. REID: Subsection (1):

... Member may claim and be paid an allowance at the rate of \$75 a day for ... each day on which he was in or near Edmonton on public or official business and maintained that residence ...

MRS. EMBURY: Well, it's helpful to have that stated so we can let the members who are concerned about it know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion on code 900? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaker's office, code 100.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 110.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 120.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 130.

MR. HYLAND: Just a minute. Looking at the amounts here, we had a discussion at another meeting about renewal of your executive assistant's contract. Can you explain to us your reason for it? Can we assume from the amount shown here that there's no adjustment in the following year? You show the same amount for total estimate and total forecast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no adjustment beyond the one we discussed last time.

MR. HYLAND: In other words, for the next year there's going to be no merit increase or no — when we see the budget documents next year, it will be this amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't say that. You know, he might quit; he's a contract employee. I might have to hire another one.

MR. HYLAND: Assuming that he stays, is it a year contract?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right; it's a year-to-year contract. That's my present intention, but I don't think I should give any guarantees.

MR. HYLAND: I'm concerned that the 10 percent or whatever, plus the merit increase, is a fair bit in a year. I just wonder if it's going to happen again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly don't anticipate that it will. I think I have been more than frugal in this

regard, to the point that maybe I'm not being fair to the executive assistant. I believe the present one is in the lower third of the scale of executive assistants. My intention is to continue to be frugal. There's just no question that over the six years or so that I've had one, I could have cost the taxpayer an additional \$40,000 with no difficulty. But I operate a tight ship.

MR. HYLAND: I guess I wasn't looking at the dollar amounts. I was looking at the percentage increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know. That's what caused the problem the last time.

MR. HYLAND: I guess it's partly selfish. All of us have commitments too, and for whatever reason we've stayed the same. It just bothers me once in a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm in the same boat as far as my personal — in fact my pay was cut by mistake in the Miller report, after the '79 election — not by a large amount. Frank's was too.

MR. KOWALSKI: We corrected all that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sure. I'm not complaining at all.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right; we did correct it last year, didn't we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no question about that. That was just a little aside.
Anyway, we are at code 130. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 140.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 150.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then there's the total. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 200.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just subject to checking into that vehicle thing that leads up to that other one. There should be some consistency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 270.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 290.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 350.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 400.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 410.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 430.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the total 002. Is that agreed?

MR. KOWALSKI: How about code 900?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't have that on my list.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's your salary, Mr. Chairman.

DR. REID: We haven't got there yet. We're at 002, Total, Supplies and Services Control Group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 820.

MR. PURDY: We don't have all these sheets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm following the white sheet.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 004 is the same, because it's zero. Code 900.

DR. REID: May we ask if this has something to do with your reaching pensionable age?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which is that?

DR. REID: Code 900, Payments to MLAs and Executive Council, has has gone down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

DR. REID: Contributions to CPP and all that kind of stuff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I really don't know. Who's that? Henry Kroeger?

DR. REID: No, this is Frank.

MR. HYLAND: On, this is just the two of them.

DR. REID: This is the two of them, and it has gone down slightly. I presume it has something to do with contributions to CPP, et cetera.

MR. KOWALSKI: They didn't get the 5 percent last year; that's why.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's the statutory increase they didn't get, Gerry.

MR. KOWALSKI: If we defeat code 900, that means you're going to be on the dole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some people think I'm on the dole now.

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed. I mean . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's going to look bad when it's typed. Control group — agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total expenditures?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Can Chuck answer that question on 430?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready with that information yet, Chuck?

MR. ELIUK: Jane is coding some actual expenditures from the vendor cards. Her recollection of what Charlene — it was complicated. It was based on actual expenditures of producing the Bills, the Votes. With respect to the brochures, the Visitors' Guide . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we should go back to that, so we are all looking at the same thing.

MRS. EMBURY: Page 17.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're back at page 17, the Visitors' Guide. You were saying, Chuck?

MR. ELIUK: It's based on a publication of 60,000 brochures. We are reprinting the Visitors' Guide for the next year. That's how the figure was derived. The Order Paper and Votes and Proceedings . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the Visitors' Guide, we placed one order when it was first produced. Eventually we started getting close to running out, so we placed another order. This figure may not be the same from year to year, depending on which year we run out.

MR. ELIUK: It's a combination — without being able to be too specific, because I'm not that familiar with the figure that was derived here — of increased issues plus increased costs in printing. With respect to the Order Paper, Votes and Proceedings, and Bills, that's pretty static. We have a certain number of subscribers, and that doesn't change from year to year. So those increases would be due more to

increases in printing costs. With respect to the Visitors' Guide, from the recollection that Jane had, that one was due largely to the calculation based on 60,000 pamphlets.

MRS. EMBURY: I can see ordering a large number to boost it up, but why \$4,500? That's the problem. Did they just order a tiny amount that year? That's hard to imagine.

MR. STEFANIUK: It may well have been. We have not been producing the Visitors' Guide until this year. It was something that came into being. What is described as Visitors' Guide may very simply have been a seating plan, which was all we gave. I suspect that our actual costs on the Visitors' Guide were considerably higher than the \$4,500. But what we had in fact budgeted for was a seating plan. That's all it was at that time.

MRS. EMBURY: I see.

MR. HYLAND: That's all we used to give them.

MR. STEFANIUK: I gather that what we're doing now is looking at the actual cost of producing a Visitors' Guide that, insofar as usage is concerned, not only answers the need of the visitor to the building but was developed to answer the need of the inquiring student by mail. For example, I know the Legislature Library distributes a significant number of them in that fashion.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's probably a better guide.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept vote 430.

DR. REID: Excuse this subconversation we're having across the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I'll put it on the table. While you were discussing, I was just asking Ian: what reactions are you getting with regard to the Visitors' Guide? At one time we put out only a seating plan.

MRS. CRIPPS: This is better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can guarantee you there were many, many hours put in, putting that through about three drafts, before we finally went into production.

MR. HYLAND: While you and Ian had the side conversation, I made the motion that we accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. But I'm still interested in the kind of reaction you're getting.

MR. KOWALSKI: In response to your question, I think the guide is a quality piece of paper. I think it's very, very well done. I just wonder, do all children who come here get one?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Every student that comes walks away with one?

DR. REID: Whether or not the Legislature is open.

MR. KOWALSKI: I was not aware of that, because I had never seen them walk out with one.

MR. STEFANIUK: They are given to the teacher involved. The reason is that if we gave them to the kids beforehand, we'd have all kinds of them in the galleries, paper airplanes and all the rest of it. So the plan is that they're given to the teacher involved and distributed by the teacher following the visit.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's very good.

MRS. CRIPPS: Chuck, did I understand you to say that you just ordered another 60,000?

MR. ELIUK: The estimate was based on a 60,000 order.

MRS. CRIPPS: Which would not be ordered until the new seating arrangement is made up.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's what we estimate for the next year.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay, fair enough.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we will sometimes do as well — as you know, the seating plan is confined to one side of the brochure. We will order a massive quantity and stock one side printed, with the idea that we can save money by doing that and overprinting the other side when the seating plan is revised.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is code 430, General Administration, now approved?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're back at code 100.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, for the next three I thought our agreement in previous years was that there would be one motion, and that would be a motion of the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Global funding.

MR. HYLAND: I move that the government members' budget be increased by 2.8 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And approved in the amount submitted here? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready to go to the Official Opposition?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: An increase of 6.12 percent.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the budget of the Official Opposition be increased by

2.8 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.
Independent Members.

MR. HYLAND: I have a question, not on the dollars but on a subject related to the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In relation to the Independent members?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, but there's nobody here from the Independents. I read a part in the Medicine Hat paper ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I really missed something. Mr. Dryden is here from the Official Opposition. It seems to me that before I called the vote on that one, I should have asked him whether he would like to say something to the meeting. Could we go back for a moment?

MR. HYLAND: I think Mr. Kowalski made a motion once before — was it on last year's budget? — that staff would be here to answer questions. If the opposition, who have members on the committee, wanted to discuss the budget, they should be here themselves. They had full notification of the meeting, as we did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case, if you'll go back, I would like to ask Mr. Dryden what he would like to say about the proposed increase.

MR. DRYDEN: It is slightly less than what I had said to our caucus was an absolute requirement. It would possibly necessitate one position on contract that we will not be able to fulfill. Our minimum amount is \$345,000 — I'm sorry, let me correct that. We can live with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can live with the 2.8?

MR. DRYDEN: While that may be shocking, yes. We are budgeting now, and I believe we are now operating below expenditures because we have fewer staff. The contract of Mr. Notley's EA has been terminated, and there will be a saving in our budget there. We also had one position before that we would perhaps restore — it's not currently being filled — on a contract basis. That would perhaps be filled in a subsequent budget at a lesser amount. The rock bottom we had heard of was 1 percent, so in all honesty 2.8 percent is something we can live with.

MRS. EMBURY: This could be a mistake.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Dryden is here for information, and it's a point of information that I ask of Mr. Dryden now. What is the name of the gentleman whose contract you said was terminated?

MR. DRYDEN: Tom Sigurdson.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? May I assume a motion for reapproval, since we opened it up again?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to go on to the budget of the Independent members?

MR. HYLAND: I have a question; I'm not even sure what sort of question it is. Anyway, after Mr. Speaker was in Medicine Hat, I read a report in the Medicine Hat News. I hate to get my information from the paper, but it said that Brian Norwood — I think that's the right name — had been appointed as executive director of their new party. Is Mr. Norwood on staff here? If he is on staff in their office, I wonder if that's okay or if it's a conflict for the executive director of a political party to work in the Legislature, paid by Members' Services or Legislative Assembly money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't we have two things here? One is the approval of the budget, and the other is whether an expenditure which may be made out of the budget may be open to question.

MR. HYLAND: I asked that because it becomes part of the budgeting process. It seems that we don't single out ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the budget is approved and the expenditure is questioned or questionable, it would be a simple matter to transfer that expenditure to another individual. Aren't we first concerned about whether we're going to have global budgeting here and, if so, what the percentage is going to be?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the policy established last year and maintaining it this year, I'd like to move that, as for the Official Opposition, the budget of the Independent members be increased by 2.8 percent.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty with the documentation on the Independents. We have a forecast of \$201,920. Is that the same as their estimate? In other words, it would be a percentage increase from estimate to estimate. The only thing I have is the forecast.

MR. STEFANIUK: The budget submitted last year was \$201,920.

DR. REID: So that was the estimate as well as the forecast.

MR. STEFANIUK: Looking at the previous year's budget book, I cannot say without looking into the records whether that in fact was the amount which was approved.

MR. HYLAND: Going by memory, the amount was far above the one-point-whatever we settled last year. In Mr. Speaker's letter to the chairman, he says it represents a zero increase. They're asking for the same amount they asked for in last year's estimates.

That is how I take it — not what they were given but what they asked for.

DR. REID: That's what I meant. We should have a motion that the estimates for the next year increase by 2.8 percent from the estimates . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: From the voted appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From the amount voted last year.

DR. REID: Presumably the forecast of \$201,920 was the amount that was approved.

MR. HYLAND: What did you say it was, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: My records indicate that \$201,920 was the budgeted amount, but I would have to look at the records to determine precisely what was approved.

MR. KOWALSKI: I hope it's not being redundant, but clarification is really important here. The appropriation voted in 1984-85 for all caucuses is to be increased 2.8 percent for 1985-86.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Specifically in this case for the Independent caucus.

MR. HYLAND: The \$201,000 is probably right. We had \$50,000 for each member and \$100,000 for the office, so \$201,920 should be close to being right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion of Ken's motion? Is it agreed to?

MR. KOWALSKI: It was Sheila's motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheila, did you move — I thought Ken just moved. All right.

MRS. EMBURY: Ken was actually clarifying what it had to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're willing to withdraw yours in favour of his?

MRS. EMBURY: It sounds like a great idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone contra?

MR. KOWALSKI: I now go down in history as providing both the NDP and the Independents with a 2.8 percent increase for the fiscal year 1985-86, and perhaps I'll get a letter of appreciation.

DR. REID: If that's your contribution to history in the province, I'll be surprised.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Dryden smiles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committees.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can figure out, we have quite a little problem here with our

sheets. I can only speak for myself, but I have a duplicated set of papers, and I'm missing something that somebody else has.

MRS. CRIPPS: What are we on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committees.

MR. ELIUK: Page 1 is Legislature Committees, code 120.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wages, including overtime.

MR. ELIUK: The second sheet, Legislature Committees, has \$3,900 for Freight and Postage. Page 3 has \$100 for Telephone and Communications.

MRS. EMBURY: I have page 2, Legislature Committees, Freight and Postage. Then I have a page 2 which has Contingency Travel of \$10,000.

MR. ELIUK: Basically with committees we have a total new package, because they were the ones that were not submitted to us in any consistent fashion. We had to rework the totals.

MRS. EMBURY: But my total new package goes from page 1 to 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The new 2 is 290, Freight and Postage.

MRS. EMBURY: Pardon?

MR. HYLAND: They stuck an extra page in or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we go right through, and if there's a problem we'll run off a copy right now.

MRS. EMBURY: Which is the correct page 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The correct page 2 refers to code 290 for a total of \$3,900 for Freight and Postage.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

DR. REID: May I make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman? When we get revised documents, we need to have a date on the bottom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right; absolutely no question.

DR. REID: It was just a shambles trying to put this together. When I was looking through it, I said to my girls: "What dates from when?" I didn't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I went through the same exercise.

DR. REID: And got exercised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

DR. REID: Not exorcised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I could have said the latter too; something got into me.

MR. KOWALSKI: So where are we when we follow this chronological development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Numerical.

MR. KOWALSKI: Numerical; sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2 is Freight and Postage for \$3,900.

MR. KOWALSKI: Do you want these agreed to as we go through?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I just wanted to straighten out Sheila's book. Code 120.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 290, Freight and Postage, \$3,900.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 3, Telephone and Communications Contingency, \$100.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 4, vote 430, Professional, Technical and Labour Services, for a total of \$14,295.

MR. HYLAND: What does this mean? Is that for writing reports and stuff like that?

MR. STEFANIUK: For consultants that may be hired by the committee.

MR. HYLAND: What committee? All committees?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It may not bear any resemblance to reality. Page 5, code 600, Materials and Supplies, \$500, another contingency sum.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 6, code 200, Travel Expenses.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's page 8.

MR. ELIUK: That should read 900, Payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I have some sympathy with Sheila.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MR. ELIUK: For \$8,400.

MR. HYLAND: Is this the right one? At least you have the same as I have. Payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly, page 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. That shouldn't have come in here.

MRS. EMBURY: So who doesn't have code 900 on page 6?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't.

MR. HYLAND: Check under your Interns. Ken found it under Interns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interns? Is this where we are now?

MR. ELIUK: We're on Payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly, daily indemnity and expense allowance, committees, \$8,400.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's page 6.

MRS. EMBURY: You take mine, Gerry, and I can follow Alan's.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. So it's code 900, and the total is \$8,400.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the next page?

MR. ELIUK: Page 7, Legislative Offices, secretarial, \$500, code 120.

MR. KOWALSKI: Five hundred dollars?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, just another [inaudible] figure, Ken.

MR. HYLAND: I don't have page 7.

MR. ELIUK: When the packages were sent out, unfortunately I did not put the date on them. But I did make sure the pages were all there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 120 on page 7, wages, \$500. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone contrary? Now we're on page 8.

MR. HYLAND: I can join you again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're back in business. Code 200, Travel Expenses.

MR. KOWALSKI: This is for Legislative Offices, that one committee.

MRS. EMBURY: Which one is correct? Is the total \$32,054?

MRS. CRIPPS: This is just that one committee?

MR. KOWALSKI: I have \$13,000.

MR. ELIUK: \$32,054.

MR. HYLAND: You have the old sheet. Go back to your Interns; it might be there.

MR. KOWALSKI: This is because next year we'll be looking around for a new Auditor General. Is that correct?

MR. ELIUK: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment here on behalf of one of the members of the committee, who asked me to be sure to clarify to the Members' Services Committee that it was anticipated that a special committee would be struck for the purposes of finding a new Auditor General. However, funds cannot be budgeted for a committee which is nonexistent, and they hoped this committee would understand that all funds budgeted for the purposes of selecting a new Auditor General might be transferred, when a special committee is struck for that purpose, to that committee for its use.

To answer a specific question, the travel is intended for, one, members of the committee possibly travelling to other venues for purposes of conducting interviews or, two, candidates selected for interview travelling to Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 200. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 260, Advertising.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thirty thousand dollars?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Code 260, Advertising, \$30,000. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 430, page 10, audit of Auditor General's office by private firm of chartered accountants, \$11,000. That answers the question: who will watch the watchman?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510, Hospitality.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600, Materials and Supplies.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's \$300? Sorry, I've got two sheets for this other 600. One is \$2,060 and the other \$1,360. Which one did we agree to?

DR. REID: \$2,060.

MR. KOWALSKI: For hospitality?

DR. REID: That's 510, \$2,060.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Incidentally, I thought code 510 had been approved. Agreed? Okay.

Code 600, Materials and Supplies, page 12, \$300. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 13, code 900, for \$10,800.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 14, code 200. This is the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust committee. Total, \$43,050.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, since we have the chairman here, I'd like to ask him if this is just one year's travel or if this committee is going to do this every year.

MR. KOWALSKI: This will cover the year 1985-86. You'll note that the figure that was in here for the current year was \$47,250, and it was reduced in terms of next year. It's essentially travel within the province, based on the cost of \$200 per day times 17 people times 12 days. That's what it is — 12 days. So if you take a look at two days to Kananaskis, one day down and one day there, or visiting the hospital or the Pine Ridge Forest Nursery, as we did this year, it could conceivably be no more than about six overviews in the province. We anticipate going to Prince Rupert under the current year's budget. Just to get there, stay one day, and come back involves three days. It would be one-third of the whole program.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is code 200 agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510, Hospitality, Alberta Heritage Saving Trust Fund committee. It's agreed?

Page 16, code 900 — again, Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: You'll note that last year the expense allowance, which was 13 members times \$75 a day times 40 days for meetings, was not included in the budget last year. It was an oversight, and that's the reason there is a difference in the figure this year.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 17, code 200, Public Accounts Committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 18, Public Accounts Committee. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600, Standing Committee on Law and Regulations, \$350 under administration and office supplies. Is it agreed? Ken, did you have a chance to look at code 600, page 19.

MR. KOWALSKI: I don't have a page 19. I have a page 18; that's where I am.

MR. HYLAND: Neither do I.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's office supplies; trust us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's agreed, then?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 900 for the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations. That's on page 20. Is it agreed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you people don't have the last three pages.

MR. HYLAND: No. We have 20. Oh, just a minute; here's 18.

DR. REID: I'm missing a few of them as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're sharing here. Code 900, page 20.

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But they haven't found it yet.

MR. HYLAND: I have 20. Are they actually thinking of going through, in three days, all the things that were given to the Law and Regulations Committee?

DR. REID: That's in the current year's budget. They're going to do it over the winter. This is after April 1.

MR. HYLAND: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's code 900.

MR. HYLAND: Once this is all over with, is it possible for us to get a whole new bunch with the right numbers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not only possible; it's going to happen.

MR. HYLAND: And we will throw the other ones away?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. And the ones you get will be dated.

MR. HYLAND: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As you see here, we have a letter from Brian Lee. We don't expect to activate that committee this coming year.
Legislative Interns.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, may I be excused?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for coming as long as you did.

DR. REID: It was enjoyable, as usual.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, not only did I not

get some of the other sheets, I didn't any section at all on Legislative Interns. My section was a duplication of committees. I wonder if there's another package.

DR. REID: Maybe you can have mine.

MR. KOWALSKI: Sure, Ian, I'll just borrow yours.

DR. REID: Presuming it's intact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under Interns, code 130.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 140.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's based on a year. Is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've gone through that every year. I don't know why that red tape has to be so starched.

MR. HYLAND: Really they're only for 10 months.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 140.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under 150 there's nothing. Is the total okay? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 200.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have one question with respect to an item called Travel for Attendance at Party Conventions. It seems to me it came up before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. KOWALSKI: It seems to me we dealt with this matter earlier this year, and we said that that was not an appropriate expenditure of public money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't recall that.

MR. KOWALSKI: That was my interpretation of it. If we didn't deal with it, I'd like to deal with it now. My personal point in this is that I'm not sure the people of Alberta should be expected to pay for anybody's travel to or attendance at a convention of a political party, no matter what the political party is. If there is an educational merit in it, I'm sure it's incumbent upon all citizens of society to make the effort to get involved on their own. Quite frankly, I just don't feel good about public dollars being expended in this area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From the experience of about eight years now, it's a very minimal expense. We're extremely frugal. The estimates are given ahead of time, before they're incurred, and then are subject to approval. It can vary, depending on whether the conventions are in Calgary or Edmonton. But we

have regarded it as part of the education for which they're here. They're really not here as ordinary staff people. As you may recall, the program started with Peter Meekison and Grant Davy coming to see the Premier and Lou Hyndman and deciding that this would be a good thing to do with potential future leaders — give them some experience with parliamentary government and so on. I think party conventions are connected with parliamentary government, especially for those parties that have members in the House. So as I say, it's been part of the program ever since.

MR. HYLAND: One thing we talked about at the meeting the other night was the gift from Philip Morris company. That's for travel, isn't it? Or is that for constituency travel and not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We divided it.

MR. HYLAND: That doesn't appear here. It isn't a part of this cost.

MRS. CRIPPS: Read your note, under Remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The stipulation for the Philip Morris donation was that it would be used for something that wasn't otherwise provided. My recollection is that we divided the \$8,000 by providing \$5,000 for constituency travel and \$3,000 to be added to the \$1,500 donation we've been getting every year — it didn't come this year; I don't know — from Canadian Utilities. That has been used for a trip to Ottawa to observe the federal Parliament, hosted by the federal Interns. That's the way the Philip Morris donation is broken down. We have received assurance that it will be coming again this year, but we haven't heard from Canadian Utilities. Someone asked a question about whether the Philip Morris donation was reflected anywhere in the estimates. Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't prepare these estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, that's right. Where's Gary?

DR. GARRISON: Under Remarks, on page 4, there is a brief indication of what private donations are used for. You'll notice that the actual . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does everybody have page 4?

DR. GARRISON: The actual expenditures were \$21,064, and the estimate was \$13,385, which makes a difference of almost \$8,000. That difference was covered by the private donations.

MR. HYLAND: I suspect the travel to party conventions — they're all being held in Edmonton this year, aren't they? One has just been held.

MR. KOWALSKI: Ours will be in the south next year.

MR. HYLAND: That's right.

MRS. EMBURY: I was interested in the explanation about the private donations. Thank you very much. I recall speaking to one of the Leg. Interns — it's only a sample of one — and they was very impressed with

the travelling they were allowed to do and felt it was beneficial. But the comment I got was that that was private money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's private insofar as it comes from . . .

MRS. EMBURY: Part of it is private. But this one lady thought that travelling was all due to private money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you mean including the travel to conventions?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh.

MRS. EMBURY: So I think they should be informed that it isn't all private money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They know that, or at least they should know it.

MRS. EMBURY: I realize they're very bright people. I was just surprised when she told me that. I thought that was marvellous, because I was going to question the amount of travelling they were doing in a time of restraint.

DR. GARRISON: They might have misunderstood, because they are told each year that the trip to Ottawa and maybe other places in the east is contingent upon the receipt of private donations.

MRS. EMBURY: That could be it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One year they had fares donated by Air Canada, but that hasn't happened since.

MRS. CRIPPS: You recognize that there is by far more government expenditure in here than private.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the total program.

MRS. CRIPPS: For the total or even for the trip to Ottawa. It works out to \$7,000. You said the private donations last year made up an \$8,000 difference, so that one trip alone is equivalent to private donations.

DR. GARRISON: The Canadian Utilities donation was \$1,500, but the total private donations were \$9,500.

MR. HYLAND: I move that we accept code 200.

MRS. CRIPPS: Where is the rest of the money? Do you have a savings account built up?

DR. GARRISON: No. That money can't be carried over from one fiscal year to another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's gone back to the taxpayer.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was code 200. Code 290.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 350.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 400.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 410.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 430.

MRS. CRIPPS: What's Honoraria?

MR. STEFANIUK: We've just been asked if the meeting could be stopped for a moment for a change of tapes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

DR. GARRISON: That's for the academic advisers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have three academic advisers from each of the three attendance universities in Alberta, and they get an honorarium for two or three meetings a year. We get so many applicants for the program — this year we had 75 from the three universities — that we had to do the selection in three stages instead of two. Ordinarily we have one meeting where we select those to be interviewed and then another one to interview. This time we did it in three stages.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry — 410 or 510?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I went from 430 to 510 to 600.

MRS. CRIPPS: We didn't approve 430, because we changed tapes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. Is 430 agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And 510?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislative Interns, which shows a reduction of .21 percent.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we go to Hansard. Code 100. Is it agreed? Any discussion?

MRS. CRIPPS: There's no change, is there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's up 5.5 percent.

MRS. EMBURY: You mean in numbers?

MRS. CRIPPS: We don't have any control over that 5.5 percent anyway, do we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The permanent positions.

MR. KOWALSKI: This question of explanation in terms of normal salary increments. Should the government decide in the next short period of time that there'll be a zero percent increase for public servants ... That is in essence the guideline. I'm confused by the word "increment" in here. Is there something in the grid that would allow them to have an adjustment because of experience and/or the like?

MR. STEFANIUK: Within each classification range there is provision for two annual reviews. One reflects cost-of-living increase, and the other reflects a merit increase, which is normally given on the employee's anniversary date of employment following his performance review. What has been reflected here is in fact based on actual experience during the past year rather than a forecast of any reviews that might take place in the future. During the course of the present fiscal year, certain reviews have taken place based on the prescribed formula. There have been no general cost-of-living increases granted in the public service, but there continues to be a provision for a review on the anniversary date of employment and for a graduation within the classification range for an increase if the performance has been satisfactory. That does not apply to management; only to line employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. HYLAND: Only to line employees. So it doesn't apply to contract employees either.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, not unless the agency decides that it's going to reopen a contract and if there has been, in the salary range, an adjustment of the range, because contracts follow prescribed classifications and ranges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is 100 agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 120.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 140.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 150.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the total of 001 — approved?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 200.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There isn't a 260. Code 290, Freight and Postage.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KOWALSKI: We had a discussion about postage before. As I understand it, the delivery of Hansard is being subsidized. We had a debate on that a year ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No question.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's being subsidized, and the increase is accounted for by the fact that Canada Post will no longer allow Hansard to be mailed on a second, third, or fourth class. We've had to upgrade the mailing of Hansard to first class. It doesn't qualify for a lower class of mail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's crazy.

MRS. CRIPPS: In that area, could I ask what the difference in cost of sending information by government courier is as opposed to Canada Post?

MR. STEFANIUK: Government courier is not practical here, because we were talking about subscribers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many have we now?

MR. STEFANIUK: These are subscribers in the private sector.

MRS. CRIPPS: But I would assume that some of those subscriptions go to, say, the Provincial Building in Drayton Valley. Is there a difference? Is there a saving in sending by government courier?

MR. STEFANIUK: I can't answer that offhand, and I don't know how any saving would be offset by the administrative costs of sorting.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd sure like us to flag that one for major review next year or to discuss it at some future Members' Services meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you make a note of that, Gary? Code 290, Freight and Postage for Hansard. We should see if maybe the new Postmaster General has a streak of decency in him.

Code 350, Rental of Property, Equipment and Goods.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 400.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 410.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's expensive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's that?

MRS. CRIPPS: Isn't repair and maintenance generally included in rental of equipment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. A separate maintenance contract. You'll have the same when you get your equipment.
Code 430.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 500, Data Processing Services.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510, Hosting, \$350.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600, Materials and Supplies.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total, Code 002, \$333,956.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 820.

MRS. CRIPPS: I guess we haven't much choice.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry. What's 820? I don't have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not included. There was an actual expenditure of \$1,756.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 850.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislature Library. What's our situation with regard to that B budget item?

MR. STEFANIUK: The situation is, very simply, that if the B budget item is approved, there would be absolutely no change in the total cost of library operations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of an internal adjustment.

MR. STEFANIUK: What they have done in fact is cut down to the bare bones there normal operations in a effort, for the second time, to get approval for this B budget item that was turned down a year ago.

MRS. CRIPPS: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I was going to make a motion that we approve the B budget item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On the Library, do you want to take it item by item?

MR. KOWALSKI: No. I'd like to move that we approve the whole thing.

MRS. EMBURY: I'd like to have it go on record that I commend them for what they did, having had that item rejected previously. I think it is worth while updating, which we need, and they should be commended for the way they looked at their own budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll send them a message to that effect.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd like to second that. I think they did their boning internally and found a solution to their own problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we'll send a message from the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Did the research branch in the Library remain the same as last year? Nobody moved, nobody was transferred, and nobody was hired.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the quality of the service is gradually improving.

MR. HYLAND: One thing I would like to know on the research part of it — and we had this last year — is the number of projects they did and the number of calls they got, et cetera.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we provided that last year, didn't we?

MR. STEFANIUK: They file that with the Speaker of the Assembly by way of monthly reports.

MR. HYLAND: Can we get a copy of that?

MR. KOWALSKI: We do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Certainly you can have a copy of it; no problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which month do you want, Alan?

MR. HYLAND: If it's just one sheet, give me all of them — just out of curiosity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually it's several sheets.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's one sheet per month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you look after that, Gary?

DR. GARRISON: I sure will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't voted on the total Library budget yet.

MR. HYLAND: I thought we did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ken made the motion, but you asked a question.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have a question on the research too. In answering Alan's question, I wonder if it's really necessary to have four researchers in the Library, given the other research we have available to us in our offices, which I think is used far more readily than the research in the Library.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was a policy decision made by this committee several years ago. As a matter of fact, it was originally anticipated that there would be six or eight, and then we stopped the growth. They do research for Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conferences. That's one of the times I go to them most frequently. I also got extensive research from them, if you recall, when I had to make a decision after the '82 election about who was going to be the Official Opposition.

I think a number of members are using it, and as far as I know, most of the larger parliaments — the Parliament in Ottawa has a research staff in the Library. I don't have up-to-date figures, but I think there must be around 50 or 60, or higher now, people with outstanding qualifications who do research for the members. Ontario has a section. I'm not sure about other provinces.

It gives you high-class research. They're always there; they don't come and go like Interns. They have no party affiliation, so you're getting rather objective — I'm not suggesting that the research that's done for the caucuses isn't objective, but I think sometimes a certain eagerness creeps into it.

Any other discussion?

MR. HYLAND: When we get the information, we can make our own judgment as to dealing with it next year or [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apart from that, are you agreed with Ken's motion on the Library budget?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I regret that our papers were not quite the way we'd like to have them. I think we have to remember two things, though. Chuck came on this job very recently and was almost immediately plunged into a session, and it has been very difficult to cope. We can get things sorted out now before the spring sittings. We are rather thinly spread, and it's very difficult to refer things to people as much as we might under some circumstances.

MR. HYLAND: What about the question I raised on the Independent budget — the question of Mr. Norwood, an employee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As to whether that's an appropriate expenditure? Sure, if any member has a

notion that — in fact I had another question like that raised just a few days ago. It appeared that a member was using his constituency office staff for purposes not related to the Legislative Assembly. If there's a real question of that kind, I assume that it might even lead to the disqualification of the member, but it has to be a pretty clear case. I think there's a difficulty when you have executive assistants, for example, who are being paid for their during-hours work to do certain things and after hours they work for various party efforts. If you think you have a clear case there . . .

MR. HYLAND: I'm just asking. I don't know whether it is or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know the facts, and I'm not sure that I have any means of investigation either. The only thing I can do is discuss it with the member.

MR. HYLAND: I can well see people holding office in a political party, depending on what "executive director" is. But to me, "executive director" means the person doing the work in a party, whatever party it is. President and vice-president are a whole different ball game, but we would normally think that the executive director is a full-time person in a party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess there could be parties where executive directors wouldn't be full-time. What you're saying in effect is that a certain person who is engaged as an executive director by a party is also on the payroll of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. HYLAND: That's what I'm asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as I said, I have no means of investigation. The only thing I can do is talk to the member.

MR. HYLAND: I can show you the article it was in. I don't know, but I've been told that he works for the Independent opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know either. There is a new fellow there, whose name I don't remember.

MR. STEFANIUK: We can certainly check and see if we have any . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to send me a photocopy of the article?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MRS. EMBURY: Could I raise another point? Maybe it's asking too much, Mr. Chairman, and we've passed it today so I'm not going back to change it, but under one of the codes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under which tab?

MRS. EMBURY: It's code 200, Travel Expenses, under General Administration. I think a couple of those conferences are new this year. I don't think they were there before, and I'm wondering if it's unreasonable to ask for something to be starred. Could we have an asterisk or something put beside

something when it's added, tucked in with all the rest? This is the travel, the conferences; they're all listed. Or is that too much trouble?

MR. HYLAND: Just put "new" on them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're almost quasi B budget items, aren't they?

MRS. EMBURY: As I said, these went through today. They aren't major expenses. It's my own fault for not noticing it earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MRS. EMBURY: I wonder if I could have an answer in regard to — Dennis Anderson raised the issue of the purchase of flowers out of this promotional allowance. Charles questioned it, and I want to know if this matter has been resolved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't dealt with it. What does the committee think?

MR. KOWALSKI: I thought I'd talk to the Clerk about that. I couldn't understand why that wasn't. Has nothing happened with respect to that?

MRS. CRIPPS: Those two items are new.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have a checklist, or I expect you will have, with regard to preparing estimates. You could add to it this item of asterisking.

MR. HYLAND: Why don't we just put "new"? What's wrong with the word "new"? Or "new item"?

MR. ELIUK: Do you want it in this budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In future ones, put in brackets — like an extra trip. I'm thinking of some situations where it's already indicated, like a new position or something.

You were asking about flowers?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes. I'd like to resolve the issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you think about it? This is the committee that approves . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm not aware that it's an issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not either. I haven't heard of it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Members have done that in the past; I don't understand what caused this consternation. Perhaps we should get an explanation.

MR. ELIUK: I'd like to speak to that, Mr. Chairman. All we were doing — for some time the girls have been paying such items, and they brought it to my attention. When we went through the policies and procedures with regard to what fits within each of those allowances, this was not one of the items. It's always been a contentious issue, but we've always paid them. We can continue to pay them; I have no problems with it. But sometimes it's difficult for the administrative group in the payment of invoices in

the gray area, because things are not well defined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you can give flowers, you can give a bottle of liquor too. Under the promotional allowance guidelines, section 3(2), a promotional allowance for a fiscal year shall be used only to pay for the purchase in that fiscal year of pins, flags or other things suitable as tokens for the member's constituents and others.

MR. KOWALSKI: Poinsettias at Christmas would be a token. We've done this in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What would be at Christmas?

MR. KOWALSKI: Poinsettias at Christmas to a senior citizens' lodge, hospital, or what have you. There's a great deal of flexibility within the definition. Should there be a problem in the future that the Director of Administration might see himself getting into with respect to this, he might want to refer it to the Members' Services Committee for clarification before rejecting it outright.

MR. HYLAND: As I remember it, the guidelines on that were done with some flexibility so we wouldn't get into the same thing. You remember the argument I had over \$1.03 for two little bottles of gas line antifreeze — as to what was allowed on your credit card. The guidelines were so damn specific. I don't know who paid the \$1.03, but I sure as hell didn't. I think those guidelines were designed to give the director and the committee some movement in decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where this guideline uses the word "tokens", I would interpret this to mean things like pins and flags.

MRS. EMBURY: But now you have the honey pots, cups, and books.

MR. KOWALSKI: The new things the Clerk's office is now providing: tea sets, the openers with the Legislative Assembly crest on them.

MRS. EMBURY: I think it's worth bringing this up every so often.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody spends his own representational allowance.

MRS. EMBURY: There's no doubt it's expanding as time goes on. It's certainly expanded since I've been here. I think it's worth looking at every so often to make sure we're aware what is happening. Maybe we should check with our caucus members just to get an idea of some of the things they're doing. The difficulty will always be that someone could take that extra little step and could well embarrass us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It happens with every set of rules.

MRS. EMBURY: That's one reason I raised it. I have never so much as thought of flowers or plants, but if it's been done, I guess therein lies the difficulty. So it's a question of interpreting "tokens". Mr. Chairman, would you like to interpret it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm interpreting it for myself. If I'm going to give somebody flowers, it's going to come out of my own pocket. And I've done it.

MR. KOWALSKI: The interesting thing about it is that some people send out Christmas cards at Christmastime, and others may be personal and drop into the hospital with a bouquet of flowers for the citizens that are interned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I buy my own Christmas cards.

MR. KOWALSKI: Fair game, but it is permitted.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think there's a distinct difference between giving flowers to a person and delivering them to a hospital or a senior citizens' lodge. I'm like you. I've always paid for my own poinsettias, but if this is an expenditure that's allowed, then I think members should know about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a thing you could discuss endlessly. No matter what set of guidelines you come up with, they would be open to various interpretations. Unquestionably there will always be new situations arising.

On the other hand, if I go to a conference, like the CPA conference, and give some gifts, I do that at public expense.

MR. ELIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add this. The purpose in writing that letter was wanting to communicate directly with the MLA. It was by no means intended to appear that I was putting the screws down. They are valid concerns that the girls in that office work with on a day-by-day basis and they've not had clarification on, although the precedent had been set. The primary purpose in writing to him was to get some type of clarification on it. I cannot anticipate what is and is not allowed in the shady or gray areas of any procedures as they are written.

Further to that, when I as accounting officer sign those invoices and although they are authorized, should there be any repercussions they come directly to my office. So I want to be absolutely sure that I can fall back on something to justify having signed for them.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's an interesting point, but as I recall the Legislative Assembly Act and the manner in which we operate, the Director of Administration is a direct employee of the Speaker. If there is a disagreement under the Act between a member and an interpretation, they can appeal it to the Members' Services Committee. I just want to repeat what I said a little earlier. Should you find yourself in the kind of situation where you feel you have to make a calculated choice, perhaps you should take the initiative to avail yourself of the wisdom of the members of this committee.

MR. HYLAND: We haven't helped him much in this, because we haven't told him whether to pay or not.

MR. KOWALSKI: To me, it's very clearly acceptable. I don't think it's a matter of debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, the next meeting?

MR. STEFANIUK: With respect, Mr. Chairman, before you go on to that, could the administration be given some guidance on this particular issue. I don't think it has been concluded by the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think we're going to settle it today.

MR. HYLAND: My personal opinion is that I don't have any trouble with something that goes to a group, but I have mixed feelings in the case of a community leader or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a provision in our order dealing with the promotional allowance and others:

If any question arises as to the payment of any amount or the provision of any service or thing under this Order, the question shall be decided in the first instance by the Speaker, subject to appeal to the Members' Services Committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: There you are, sir. Let us know what your decision is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. EMBURY: Please let Dennis know. He's waiting anxiously for the money to be paid.

MR. HYLAND: Or not paid.

MRS. EMBURY: There are two bouquets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have an express question here for payment of an invoice of \$2,350.

MR. HYLAND: What?

MR. CHAIRMAN: \$23.50. It's not a greenhouse; it's just a bouquet. What is the direction of the committee? Is it your opinion that this comes under the promotional allowance?

MR. HYLAND: I thought that was your decision. If he doesn't like it, he appeals to us.

MRS. EMBURY: That's your decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I say it doesn't. The appeal is now before the committee.

MR. HYLAND: Can I ask another question?

MR. KOWALSKI: We don't know if Mr. Anderson is going to come to us and request an appeal. I hate to be pedantic about this.

MR. HYLAND: He will.

MRS. EMBURY: I think I'm speaking on behalf of Mr. Anderson. I think he would like an answer.

MR. KOWALSKI: Do we have to do this today?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't going to, but somebody decided . .

MR. HYLAND: What happens if we don't deal with it today? A lot of MLAs put flowers in lobbies, et cetera, at Christmastime. Seeing as you're now the judge, what would you say about plants given to senior citizens' lodges at Christmastime and Easter, and that type of thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a little difficulty, because I thought the promotional allowance was intended for things like pins and little souvenir items. That was my understanding. I realize we've gone to honey pots and things like that.

MRS. EMBURY: I thought it was given — well, I suppose you could say that's a specific purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It never crossed my mind that people would be buying flowers or bottles of liquor or whatever.

MR. HYLAND: Could you make a decision on flowers at Christmastime — not to specific individuals but to groups?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to give it some thought. I'd like to give this some thought too, because I haven't seen the invoice.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry. I hate to prolong this; I know you want to go. I would like to very quickly ask the Clerk how the slide/tape show is coming along with the Public Affairs department.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have identified a list of 60 subjects for photography, and arrangements are now under way for either receiving the slides from the film library or photographing what may be required.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have three items, which I can bring up at the next meeting. But very, very briefly: employment contracts; we have a final version in place. I have them ready to hand out, or I can send them to your offices; whatever you prefer. One of the things I should draw to your attention is that there is a specific provision here that is especially designed for the Legislative Assembly which prohibits the giving by the employer or by the employee of notice which will terminate, take effect, on a sitting day or within two weeks before or two weeks after a sitting day. To some extent that would have protected us from what happened when Kelly was taken away from us over there in the other office; in other words, just before, during, or just after a session, when the work is at a peak. A person coming on our staff and signing this new form of contract would not be able to give notice — and you can take any sitting day you want. Even if we sat for one day, they couldn't give notice effective two weeks before or two weeks after or on a sitting day. They can give the notice, but it may not take effect during that time. I think we need to do that because of our special situation.

MR. HYLAND: Can you look into the transfer from one government department and no probation? How does that work out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That really wouldn't concern us except for staff that had come from another government department to us. There's no use our putting it into a contract for staff going from us to another government department.

MR. HYLAND: But coming in. If they're no good, we're bugged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we're not a government department.

MR. HYLAND: But my understanding right now, if a secretary comes in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a standard contract for any staff paid from the Legislative Assembly estimates.

MR. HYLAND: We'll do it later.

If we're going on the 12th, can we go in the afternoon?

MRS. CRIPPS: Are you sure we don't have committee meetings? Is that Wednesday?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, it's the day before caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the 12th there's a meeting with the travel industry by one of the caucus committees at 1:30, but there are no others.

MR. HYLAND: Let's get our name in first.

MRS. EMBURY: Shirley is on Economic Affairs, aren't you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we started at 10 o'clock. Can you manage?

MR. HYLAND: I'm out. I have another one to go to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about 11 o'clock?

MR. HYLAND: It needs to be after noon. The other one will last all morning. But that's my problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It isn't likely to be as long as this, anyway. So when do we start on the 12th? What do you say, Madam Whip?

MR. KOWALSKI: The last time we had this discussion, I thought we basically looked at the second Wednesday of the month. As I recall, at least one member indicated that the hour of 9 o'clock was a good time. If somebody can't make it, we can always adjust our schedules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll get an agenda out. Wednesday, December 12, at 9 o'clock. Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 2:20 p.m.]

This page intentionally left blank.