

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[10:13 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have various things distributed. We're now having had some other kind of . . . Okay. We're all set?

MS BARRETT: Yes, we can just move the entire thing and leave. I don't think there are any disputes today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's twice you've tried that in the last hour. How did it go in the last hour?

MS BARRETT: We got out of the meeting early.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did indeed.

Okay, ladies and gentlemen. First off, we have regrets from Mr. Kowalski, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Wright. Thank you. Since we last met, we have successfully made an appointment with regard to the director of administration, so I would like you to at least physically lay your eyes upon Kathleen Bruce-Kavanagh.

MR. TAYLOR: With a K.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With a K.

MR. STEVENS: Welcome.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you.

With respect to the minutes, I understand we have a number of items under Other Business. Any additional things that need to be put in there? I assume that's where we have -- I have one motion here, I believe from Mr. Bogle, to remind all hon. members about constituency expenses, that kind of thing. So that would become (g), Constituency Reminder. There's another one there: constituency office allowance, \$26,000.

MR. TAYLOR: Which one is that, Mr. Chairman? Which minute?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm working from the way they sort of [inaudible]. This is another one: constituency office allowance, \$26,000, communication allowance calculated. That one

would become number (h), just in case it didn't have a name on it.

MR. BOGLE: On the revised agenda, aren't they under both (e) and (f)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if they are, I don't know. That's why I'm raising it.

MR. HYLAND: Under Other Business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; (g) is now (e).

MR. STEVENS: Sounds like school.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And (h) is now (f). Mr. Taylor's motion -- should they go in one order, one ahead of the other, or it doesn't matter?

MR. TAYLOR: I think the constituency first and then the transfer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So that would be the one that starts at staff contracts. That should be the first one, so that becomes (g). Thank you. And the other then becomes (h). I knew we'd all go to H before we got too far involved. And then there may be another one. This relates to an earlier item on the agenda, I believe.

MR. TAYLOR: Are we adding new business to the agenda?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes indeed.

MR. TAYLOR: I wanted, if we could, a discussion about indemnities and expenses, or whatever we call it. The tax -- the expense allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That would become (i), Tax-free Expense Allowance.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't like the word "tax-free." Is that what it's called?

MR. STEVENS: No, it's not. That's very good. I raised that point before.

MR. TAYLOR: That should be deleted from our vocabulary.

MS BARRETT: But isn't it?

MR. STEVENS: No, it's not called that.

MR. TAYLOR: It's not a tax-free allowance. It's an allowance that . . .

MR. STEVENS: It's called an expense allowance.

AN HON. MEMBER: In statute it's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Expense allowance. Maybe there.

MR. TAYLOR: If it is called tax-free, I move that it be changed.

MS BARRETT: He says, jumping the queue on the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (j) on the agenda is we need some discussion with regard to the distribution of passes to the galleries, please. Gallery passes.

MR. TAYLOR: All galleries?

MR. STEVENS: Just art galleries.

MS BARRETT: And that's that mountaineer talking, eh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Any others? Any other flash of creative genius to engender another item? Okay, we'll wait till later. Thank you.

Item 2(a), the minutes of the meeting of February 2.

MR. STEVENS: I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that since I wasn't here on those two days, I think you all went through a tremendous amount, which suggests that I should stay away more.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: Question. [laughter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you seen the film -- at least I liked the title, our Year of Living Dangerously.

Welcome, Calgary Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 2? Moved by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Carried.

MR. HYLAND: Am I the only one voting for it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I saw four votes. That constituted a quorum; therefore it's passed. Thank you.

With regard to the minutes of February 3, what is your pleasure?

MR. STEVENS: May I ask a question about them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, on February 3, page 64.87, subsection (f) on that page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whoa.

MR. STEVENS: I'll wait till you get there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: It's February 3, 64.87 at the bottom, subsection (f) on that page.

MR. TAYLOR: You mean nonsmoking?

MR. STEVENS: Yes, I want to ask something about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. STEVENS: I just wanted to ask, and I don't want to -- Pam, I'm not . . .

MS BARRETT: Yeah, yeah.

MR. STEVENS: I want to ask this. When you discussed this and reached agreement, which I fully agree with, have you considered, Mr. Chairman, or would the services committee consider at some time, not necessarily today, a discussion about smoking in the Legislative Assembly or committee rooms and whether or not we should consider a policy? I'm not suggesting that there should be no smoking in

public places. I'm talking about a policy that would allow us to, if you like, ventilate the question and discuss it. I'd like to raise it.

I think it's becoming more and more a situation throughout the province and throughout the world, I suppose, to discuss this issue. I share the concerns of the smokers, that they feel they are being discriminated against, but I do feel we should discuss it sometime -- our meeting rooms and whether or not we should have other areas for people to take a break and have a smoke should they choose to do so. So if you would put on the agenda, I'd like to see us discuss that, not necessarily to resolve it but to discuss it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough. Agreed? Okay. Perhaps we could do that and bring it forward for our next meeting. But in the meantime it would be a good idea to do some sounding through your caucus colleagues. Okay?

Any other discussion with regard to the minutes of February 3? Could I have a mover for adoption of the February 3 minutes? Moved by Edmonton Highlands. All those in favour of the motion to adopt the February 3 minutes? Thank you. Carried.

Member's Expense Allowance, the first item, 3(a), on Business Arising from the Minutes of the committee.

MR. BOGLE: I don't think there's anything to report, is there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; 3(a). Apparently not at this time.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that when it says "Business Arising," if Nick has asked for a separate agenda item later on, should that come up now? Is that under business arising under this section?

MR. BOGLE: This is Business Arising from the Minutes.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I see. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing at this time, at this moment. All right. Thank you.

Item 3(b). I understand there's a brief report about to be circulated and the reminder that ...

MR. PENGELLY: Business arising from the minutes of our last meeting.

MR. STEVENS: We keep waiting for Mr. Wright. We keep waiting for him to call a meeting, but I think he's calling one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that the one?

MR. STEVENS: He's the chairman. He has to call a meeting.

MR. TAYLOR: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm just maybe a little thick here and slow this early in the morning. But I don't understand why the question of expense allowance -- because I had it way down at the bottom of my mind -- now why wouldn't it come up out of Business Arising from the Minutes?

MS BARRETT: Given that under the circumstances other motions were made.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't mind waiting. I'm just wondering. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I seldom question any of your rulings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you know that I always respond to you with an answer -- a soft answer turneth away wrath.

MR. TAYLOR: 'Wroth,' is it? I thought it was wrath.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, part of the difficulty with this item, if we now revert to 3(a), is that we obviously don't have anyone designated to really bring it forward. It says the committee members agreed ... "Proposed that Committee Members," if you look at the last line of the major paragraph, "return to their respective caucuses to review the matter." Discussion tabled; review future committee meeting.

MS BARRETT: That's true. Future committee meeting -- it's on the agenda for later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's on the agenda for later, and I think with respect to getting through a sizable agenda, it would be useful to bring it later. Okay. Now we have agreement. Thank you.

Now then, circulated to you is the matter of

a brief report from Gordon Wright . . .

MR. STEVENS: The next meeting then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . that the meeting is going to be on March 10 for the subcommittee. They're meeting together with Lorne Buhr from the Legislature Library, who's been working with us in the management audit with regard to technical ramifications. All right. So that's taken as information. That's the first page.

All right; 3(c). Mr. Scarlett, would you like to bring members up to date on what we were able to achieve so far?

MR. SCARLETT: We met with the representative from Pacific Western Airlines. They have agreed to look at the matter of bringing forth a proposal for reducing airfares, and I expect to hear back from him later this week or early next week.

MR. TAYLOR: May I add some discussion to that? It comes to the respect of these frequent traveler bonuses now. I've been looking through the regulations. I was told, I think by Mr. Kowalski, that no way are members supposed to, but I think looking through the regulations, I don't see anything that way, number one. Number two, I know there are some members that aren't aware of it either, so I think this committee should prepare a directive if indeed we are not to take advantage of frequent flier programs. That should be a matter of communication to all the Legislature. Of course, that helps your negotiating no end, too, if you are able to say to PWA that no frequent flier bonuses are allowed. I mean, that's probably 5 percent right there that they do.

I'm not trying to make rules; all I'm saying is that as a newcomer to the Legislature and talking to many other people, even old-timers, some think, I know -- I think there's even a member of the cabinet that uses stickers. I'm not pointing any fingers; I'm just saying that the policy is very unclear. If indeed this committee thinks there is not, and it's clear that there are not supposed to be frequent traveler bonuses used, it isn't well known. Isn't that right? I don't know if we'd want to make that as a new method on the agenda or -- we're now talking about negotiating with air travel -- whether this isn't trying to make a . . . I would move that this committee pass a resolution that no

member traveling on the public purse -- besides members, can we do that for the whole civil service?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we can't do it for the whole civil service. I wonder if we might, with the motion, just for half a moment -- and I'm quite prepared to recognize you with the motion -- invite the Member for Banff Cochrane first, because I think this came up when you were minister for personnel administration. So if we can have some clarification there, then Edmonton Highlands, and then we'll come back to a motion. Okay.

MR. STEVENS: Where there are advantages to travel on one airline or another or where there are opportunities to use one card or another, if it is of benefit to the public service, such as an employee travels on a particular airline and receives a 50 percent reduction in the cost of a hotel and that hotel bill would have been charged to the government, the advantage should be taken of the plan. That's the thing you have to remember. So if there is an opportunity for the public service to benefit by the use of a particular program and it's to the benefit of the public, it should be taken advantage of. If it's to the benefit of the employee, it's clearly a matter of the code of conduct and ethics. In our own case, I think -- the motion may not be fully formed yet, or is it accepted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not quite.

MR. STEVENS: Not quite. In our own case, I would suggest that the negotiations should continue, Nick. If that is part of the negotiation package, it should come back that way for us to discuss before we make a final decision on your motion -- you may want to table it today or move it today -- because there will be some benefits to the government if, in fact, for example, the bonus provides an opportunity to travel somewhere else that one would have had to pay at public expense. But if it's an individual benefit, I agree with you. So my suggestion is to make your motion, and we can all debate it but allow the negotiations to continue to see what comes from those discussions before you conclude the motion -- that's all I'm saying -- because there are some public benefits as well as private.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I agree, because that's a very powerful weapon to use when you talk to an airline: look, we're not going to be flying with our spouse to Paris after we've gone to Calgary 104 times, or whatever it is to Calgary.

MR. STEVENS: I'll go with your spouse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; a little order, a little order. We're talking about a code of ethics here.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm getting to the age where some of these stories help, so don't stop them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff, and then I think if we're going to a motion, perhaps we -- because this is a reporting side of business arising, we can add it as another agenda item and then give a chance to get the motion framed.

MR. HYLAND: Mine was somewhat the same as Greg's, in that if you can build them up and have free trips for nothing when it's all business, it ultimately saves money. I'm wondering if you can frame your motion that we look at it rather than block it off right away, whether it takes a group of us or whatever, and come back with a recommendation at a future time. Rather than just saying no, we should make sure of all the parameters of it, because those using it, even though they've paid the \$35 into it, may use it in the future for travel.

MR. TAYLOR: I suppose if all the credit for the plan went into the administration office and they administered it, it would be all right. But if you were going to do it yourself, that might be putting too much on the -- it would be an administrative nightmare to tell which trips you were taking because you got a credit and which trips...

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MS BARRETT: I just want to respond to that recent statement from Nick. I think what we have to do is assume that there is a means by which we can accomplish a goal of receiving some kind of discount for government travel and assume the honesty of members. I think what Greg has suggested is really appropriate. Let's go for what we can and bring it back.

MR. TAYLOR: You want me to phrase a motion later on, do you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For later in the day, and then you'd get a chance to talk with the other members present. Failing that, we can then take it as a notice of motion for the next meeting too. It's now item (k).

MR. STEVENS: One point, Mr. Chairman. This is a coupon that Pacific Western gave out in the peak flying time during Christmastime. I haven't used this one yet, because I'm saving it for my next trip on the airbus, but if somebody's going down before March 15, they're entitled to use that 10 percent reduction. So that would save the government money should I use it, but if I don't use it, it's gone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would save the Legislative Assembly money.

MR. TAYLOR: I used mine a couple of times. With the old administrator it drove him nuts. They couldn't figure what the hell I was doing flying between Calgary and Edmonton for \$20 less than other people.

MR. STEVENS: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we now have the reporting on that. It started a stimulating discussion, and I look forward to 7(k), air travel motion, drafted by Mr. Taylor and group.

All righty. Item 3(d), Reduction in Gasoline Credit Card Billing. The matter with regard to that one is pending, because we're expecting to get the information back from Treasury in the month of March with regard to the possible use of a universal gasoline credit card. So that's a carryover item.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, was any contact made with Time Air?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, through the Pacific Western people at the same time, because they own a chunk of Time Air.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah, 40 percent. Maybe we should contact them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we've invited them to speak to Time Air as well.

MR. STEVENS: And CP Air.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we stay around long enough, they'll look after the whole system.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: If you look at the rates of Time Air, even a 5 or 10 percent reduction could be quite a bit of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, 3(e), constituency staff travel guidelines. If you're feeling neglected, Mr. Taylor, we have a piece of paper for you. So items 3(e) and (f) are coming to you at this moment.

MR. STEVENS: Just a minute. Isn't that in our book?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. That's the clarification, and that was sent out to your chiefs of staff, so hopefully it got reminded to all of your members.

Okay. Might we go to the next — the memo, the next one, was with regard to the telephone service, and you can see the distribution on that as well, so we trust that you, in terms of your own caucus, have passed that on.

MS BARRETT: Great information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3(g), Members' Benefit Package. Mr. Bogle, any chance to meet on this one?

MR. BOGLE: Well, the three members of the committee have met and have agreed in principle to a course of action. We have not had any follow-up meetings either with any of your staff or with the consultants who prepared the original material for consideration, but it is the view of the committee that all members of the Assembly should be treated equally, regardless of age; that any increased premium costs that would be applicable to members aged 65 or older should be borne by the Members' Services Committee; and that for those members who are 65 or older and have the option of accessing other plans or services or programs offered by governments, the members have the option to either access those or to

continue to access the services contained and provided to all members.

Pam or Nick, anything to add to that?

MS BARRETT: Well, I'm not sure how to do it, but maybe, as we previously discussed, a very brief motion by way of approving in principle what we agreed to — which is, I think, in essence equal access — should be formulated for discussion right now. I don't think it would take long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, with due respect, hon. member, I think we've heard that line before. Could I move it to item 7(l) and allow some time for that motion then?

MS BARRETT: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But from the sounds of it there is indeed consensus, and it should be a fairly quickly moving thing.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Item 3(h), Amendment to the Legislative Assembly pension plan Act. At the direction of the committee I have then sent the appropriate memo on to the Government House Leader to have that necessary change drafted.

Okay. Item 3(i), presentation of approved '87-88 estimates.

MR. BOGLE: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, but there were two matters dealt with. One you have just reported on, and that was with regard to the Legislative Assembly pension plan Act. The second was the motion by Mr. Taylor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. That was also conveyed.

MR. TAYLOR: That was moved to new business.

MR. STEVENS: And you advised the Government House Leader to present an amendment?

MR. BOGLE: Has that been done as well?

MS BARRETT: Can I ask for clarification of what we're talking about here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was the last motion on the February 3 minutes.

MR. BOGLE: It's in essence the severance pay, although it's not referred to as severance pay.

MS BARRETT: Oh, right.

MR. BOGLE: The re-establishment allowance.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, 53.87 was one of its times -- 62.87 in your minutes of February 3.

MR. BOGLE: So the minutes should reflect the fact that the chairman has communicated with the Government House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have spoken with him with regard to both items. Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3(i). That has been communicated. That's just a matter of shipping on the estimates to the Provincial Treasurer for including in the budget, so that's been carried out.

MS BARRETT: All regrets noted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Including a number of my own.

Item 3(j), tax implications. Now, you have a memo to that effect from the Member for Edmonton Strathcona, if you'd like to take a moment to read that.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, we've got another notice of motion for this item later on. Maybe what we should do is just pass by.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry it on to that part of the agenda?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it's the same issue and two facets of the same. All right.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. STEVENS: May I ask a question about the blue page, though, Mr. Chairman, or do you want to leave it till later? The minute itself, the actual . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Give me your pagination.

MR. STEVENS: Your pagination 3(i), is it?

MS BARRETT: (j), I think.

MR. STEVENS: Mine's under (i) by mistake; sorry. It should be (j).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. STEVENS: The motion by Mr. Wright that Mr. Bogle's motion be amended is written out there, and I see it's carried. But just above the word "carried" it says, "the implementation of the above to be suspended pending" this investigation. Yet it's my understanding that we in fact have put in place what I'm reading here. Am I not? We've got forms that have come out, the whole bit.

MS BARRETT: You're right.

MR. STEVENS: So what I see here we have not done. Then why are our forms all modified?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The forms have been modified in compliance with the previous motion of this series of meetings.

MR. STEVENS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Had this particular motion on this page been carried -- it was carried, but it had the proviso of awaiting the income tax advice. That advice now says: do not proceed. So the form that went out was amended to reflect the motion that had been carried the previous day, February 2.

MR. STEVENS: This is a different one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this is a different one.

MR. STEVENS: My apologies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But perfectly understandable, because we had two very substantive motions with regard to the same

issue.

MR. STEVENS: It doesn't read clearly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let me just hasten to say that it took me a while to get my head through it.

MR. HYLAND: There was one part that was passed and one part that was held, which made it more complicated.

MR. STEVENS: That's all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then in addition to that, there is probably an amendment to the first part.

MR. STEVENS: Which we'll resolve later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's all part of having fun. All right. So item 3(j) we pick up again when we come back to item 4(b).

Now, one other item coming from the minutes. Members will recall that earlier on in the minutes we had an item that was carrying over with regard to presentation of cheques, government grants, donations, and awards, and so I have a reply from Dr. Mellon, the deputy minister of Executive Council.

This matter was reviewed by Cabinet prior to Christmas. Cabinet confirmed that the procedures in question called for a Minister or Government member to present the benefits in the form of grants, donations and awards issued as a consequence of government programs or policy.

These programs have been initiated and approved by the Government with or without the support of non-Government members in the Assembly. Therefore, the Government, through its members, is obliged to take full responsibility for the delivery of these programs and to respond to whatever comment they may attract.

MS BARRETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that that resolves the issue. I mean, the issue is that there are 83 duly elected members in this Assembly and, particularly in instances where an individual nongovernment member has endorsed a particular scholarship or what have you, ought to be entitled to be the facilitator of

that disbursement in the riding in question. The insinuation of the current procedure is that those members who are not government members are not duly elected members. That's a public perception, and I'm not sure that Mr. Mellon's response gives us, I suppose, the conclusive determination on this. I think that we should be able to discuss this further than what he has provided as an explanation, in light of what's been said.

MR. TAYLOR: Can't we file the letter, so that we can read it through? It seems to have a number of nuances in there. Maybe table it for the next — or is that going on too long?

MS BARRETT: Well, it's gone on for years, so one more meeting isn't going to kill us.

MR. TAYLOR: I would move then that we table to the next meeting and in the meantime circulate Dr. Mellon's letter to all the committee.

MS BARRETT: The longest-standing carryover in the entire book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

All right. We're down to item 4(a) in the binder, Members' Services Committee Order 2/87.

MR. STEVENS: Is this for information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. This is the one that just [inaudible].

MR. STEVENS: Do you need a motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a motion to approve.

MR. STEVENS: I'll move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Banff-Cochrane, thank you. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you.

Now we're back to transportation: 4(b), Members' Services Committee Order 3/87.

MR. HYLAND: If we're going to amend this one, do we want to approve it, or should we amend it, then approve it?



MR. CHAIRMAN: I think on the procedural discussion here that this is the one, Banff-Cochrane, that was passed.

MR. STEVENS: It's a little difficult to put into place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the one that the administration has put in place with a lot of extra . . .

MR. STEVENS: Forms.

MS BARRETT: Nightmares.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we discovered, or at least one of the members of the committee has discovered, that in actual fact there should be an amendment made to this. I think you had this circulated in front of you. Is this the one that's the amendment to this?

MR. HYLAND: Should I move it to get it on the table?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just half a shake. I need the benefit of the combined wisdom of the group here. We have in effect had this previous one in effect and people have been making claims under that. So should we approve that first and then go on and make an amendment . . .

MR. HYLAND: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . which ships it on back? Okay. Well, that's why we're having this little discussion here.

MR. BOGLE: Well, on a -- if we were in the House, I would say a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On an invited point of order.

MR. BOGLE: The order does not accurately reflect the intent of the motion or the discussion that we had in the committee, because as the mover of the motion I went to great pains to explain that we were not attempting to add to the paperwork of either members or the administration, and the suggestion that in order to claim, a member

must "subject to the production of fuel receipts," is yet an overlay that was not in the motion and was certainly not intended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that the underlining there is subsection (iv), the last part of that. Right?

MR. BOGLE: Subsection (iii), the second last line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. Okay. Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Just as a question, would this paper resolve that?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, and subsection (iv).

A question could be raised, Mr. Chairman, about subsection (v), because the motion did not deal with members of the Assembly who, either through their position as a cabinet minister or their appointment as a member or chairman of a board, agency, or commission, are provided with an automobile at public expense. This is indeed an afterthought, although clearly reaffirming the intent of an earlier motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just quickly with respect to subsection (v), I see that that stays, because sometimes you're caught with one vehicle at one end of the province and another at the other.

MR. BOGLE: There's no question, Mr. Chairman. The intent of the transportation and administrative services order is not to preclude a member who has an automobile at public expense from claiming. It's merely stating that a member who is provided with such an automobile is expected to use it and recognizing that in different parts of the province that automobile can only be used for part of the normal business the member has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, and then we should communicate that back to our individual caucus members so that they're aware.

All right. I think in that regard, then, it would be in order to reject MSC Order 3/87 as presented, and then we'll follow that up by moving a new Members' Services Committee order with the appropriate wording in place, and it would be basically to do some deletions in it. All right?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that we defeat Members' Services Order 3/87.

MS BARRETT: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion to reject this MS material? Opposed? Carried, and the record will show the reason why: because it was not appropriately drafted. All right. The Chair now entertains an appropriately worded order with respect to this issue.

MR. TAYLOR: This question about its being defeated by being whether it's appropriately drafted I think is unnecessary. It might be appropriately drafted for the instructions given to the draftee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was not my information.

MS BARRETT: Perhaps not drafted to meet the intent of the committee. I think that's what David was getting at.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't know who drafted it.

MS BARRETT: I don't either.

MR. TAYLOR: But I don't think it should be reflected on the draftsman. The instructions to the draftsman were . . .

MS BARRETT: Oh, I see. Let the record show that Nick doesn't blame the person who drafted it.

MR. STEVENS: It doesn't even follow the minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. "Appropriate" doesn't necessarily . . . It's not an overloaded negative.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move that a Members' Services order be drafted -- and I guess we can't name the number; that'll show up, possibly the same thing -- falling in line with the one we just defeated and putting the amendments in as were circulated so that it properly reflects the intention and the understanding of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. A question for

clarification, then. If we followed through with the amendment as proposed here, the first section, really -- if we put a period in section 2, subsection (iii) after "0-10,000" . . . No, it doesn't work.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that the old order and the amendment just proposed by my colleague from Cypress be passed on to Parliamentary Counsel, redrafted, and brought back later in the meeting today so that we can deal with it?

MR. STEVENS: That's very easy.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe somebody can take it down right away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the same effect as a tabling motion. All those in favour of the tabling motion till later in the day? Opposed?

MS BARRETT: Put it in plain English.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried unanimously.

Okay. Go back to your agenda for a moment. Then this would become item 7(m). L, M, right. We're swiftly running out of alphabet. Now to successfully celebrate the fact that we've gotten to page 2 of the agenda, there's a five-minute adjournment.

[The committee recessed from 10:57 a.m. to 11:13 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, with due respect and deference to all of our observers and guests, I would like them to leave, if they wouldn't mind, please, so that we could move in camera for a short while.

MS BARRETT: Oh, oh.

[The committee met in camera from 11:13 a.m. to 11:57 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we've had a very interesting and very wide-ranging discussion, and a lot of it relates to availability of material. So I understand there is a motion, Cypress-Redcliff, please.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the agenda of the Members' Services

Committee be made available to the press at the beginning of the meeting and that copies of the minutes also be made available as soon as they are passed by the committee. I'm not sure if "passed" is the right word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: Approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Approved. Thank you. Edmonton Highlands?

MS BARRETT: I speak in favour of the motion, Mr. Chairman. I think it's a good consensus-oriented motion that satisfies the needs of the people who have a great interest in receiving that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question. All those in favour of the motion? Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

They may or may not like to see this scratched-out version, but would you like to take my copy, please, Kathy, and get it xeroxed? This has got additions and scratches and all that junk.

MR. HYLAND: Here's a clean one that was sitting for somebody who didn't show, but it's got some misses on it.

MS BARRETT: It's best to use David's, because it will have the additions on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The advantage of this — I think it's best to use my scratched copy, please. If you want to run seven copies, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think all we'd to have to run is the second page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I want the first page and the second page, if you'd like to listen to what I was saying, please. Thank you.

All righty. Other items of business before us with regard — we haven't had any material delivered back to us with respect to Members' Services Committee orders? We do. Okay. But we just moved . . . I believe we're at item 5 on

the agenda, which reads Members' Air Travel Allowance. Is that correct or . . .

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and we do not have anything to report to the committee at this time. So if it could hold till the next meeting, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. With respect to that whole area, your caucuses have been receiving certain memos from myself with regard to the usage in the past year, and I'm sure you've been able to deal with that with your members. Thank you.

All right. Item 6 shows here as being the Fleming report, and in your binder we have there the recommendations from the Fleming report. Now, as pointed out in earlier meetings when I shared with all members of the committee some of my thinking with regard to the whole direction of the administration of the Legislative Assembly Office, it was at that time that I mentioned to you about the Fleming report, knowing full well that the previous lifetime of this committee prior to the election had some working knowledge of the Fleming report because it had been commissioned during the lifetime of that committee.

When I accepted the responsibility of being Speaker and aside from the interesting challenges of the House, there is another larger-sized iceberg out there, in terms of mass, with regard to the operation of the department and all of its component parts. You don't need to get me to give you a listing of all the parts of the Assembly, but just bear in mind that there's about 175 employees plus another group of constituency office secretaries who come under the administration in some terms of relationship.

Anyway, back in June I read through the Fleming report, and it was my estimation that the Fleming report had a number of very important points to make. But then with some discussion and with regard to the whole report process and evaluation, I felt that important as it was, it really left us in the direction that a complete management audit report needed to be conducted by a professional group of management consultants and that while Mr. Fleming did a useful job, nevertheless it wasn't done, in my opinion, in sufficient depth. So with that regard, the next management audit process — I expect to be having the final report

on that delivered to me within the course of the next two to three weeks.

Nevertheless, I also released the report and its recommendations or made it available to those who cared to look at it, to the media, but also the recommendations were copied and sent to all Members of the Legislative Assembly. So with that concern for the department and with regard to the whole working relationship with the Members' Services Committee, I undertook to bring the recommendations back to this committee so that we could together reflect upon them -- those that have been enacted already, those that are yet to be enacted -- and gain mutual advice and direction on the recommendations.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the Fleming report and being on the previous committee when we discussed it, I think if I went back and looked at my comments at that time, I expressed the concern that it would only look at what was existing there and not parameters of improving it. It wasn't looked at in a management type of way but in a legislative type of way. It didn't look at other things that could be done. I would wonder if it's useful to start spending too much time on it again until it could be overlaid with the other study which you just mentioned. Could the two be put together and see if we could come out of that with some recommendations that would truly work and assist us in putting the two together and see what happens?

MR. TAYLOR: I was the one that asked that it be put on the agenda. I did it for a couple of reasons. It would maybe clear the air, because I think the Fleming report seems to be conveniently moved in and out sometimes when we talk about whether we're explaining some of our actions or defending some of our actions. I've nothing against waiting till the final report has come in. This other report, I gather, is going to be handed to Members' Services, is it? That's not my understanding for sure, but I think if we're going to get the other report, this is fine. But in the period between this time and when that comes in, I think, Mr. Chairman, you operate in a vacuum. Of course, you may interpret that the Speaker operating in a vacuum then means that the Speaker has full authority. I would think that it might be wise till these new reports come in that the Speaker

has to just follow, say, 1.10 in the recommendations, which says:

Where appropriate, the Members' Services Committee should direct the Clerk to resolve matters relating to administrative details once policy has been decided and, if necessary, delegate final approval to the Speaker.

I think in the absence of any policy that I've heard from the government or the Speaker's office or this committee, we have a bit of a limbo, using an old biblical term, where there's nothing reigning. You may have interpreted it to mean that the Speaker has absolute authority, and I don't think so. I think the Members' Services Committee has absolute authority. I think either the Members' Services Committee at this meeting has to designate you completely in charge until the final reports come in or that no actions will take place in the administrative or policy or any of the policies touched in this report until they come back before the Members' Services Committee. I just don't like the limbo that's in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, a number of your points really are argumentative.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm not trying to be retroactive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no limbo, hon. member. The Speaker is continuing to act in accordance with the Legislative Assembly Act and Standing Orders, which gives direction for the Speaker to be the chief administrative officer, so I carry out those functions according to legislation. Certain areas indeed do relate back to the interrelationship between the office of the Speaker and Members' Services Committee, and I humbly submit that actually we've been working that in a very positive framework together. So you know, I'm just playing back and forth with you about the word "limbo," but I would intend that after we have adjourned for lunch, I would go through the recommendations, each one of them, and let you know which ones indeed have been put into effect, because most of this is strictly stuff of an administrative nature. But we can come back to that.

Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thanks. Mr. Chairman, I'm continually surprised when I agree with a

government member at this table, but it does happen every once in a while. Although I certainly have no objections to your reporting after lunch about the status of these recommendations, I think I would have a hard time participating in a discussion about the orientation of our committee and its ability to direct you or direct Blake or anybody else who directly and indirectly comes under our authority on occasion without benefit of the most recent report. It's not that I wouldn't like to -- I would -- but I can't see doing that outside of the next report. We've lived this long without that report and with this report and adjustments in between the two. I'm not inclined to support any move to making heavy-duty decisions without all the information in front of us in a way that results in satisfaction to everybody, not just at this committee but the people we influence.

I think it's really important that we don't jump the gun. We could end up -- in fact, if we jump the gun, we spend two days going through this report, and then when we get the next report, we can spend another week going through that, adjusting all of the policies that we may have supported today or tomorrow or whenever, and I don't think any mortal has that much time to dispense freely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't think we can get it done before the opening?

MS BARRETT: No. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I don't. So amazingly enough, I support you.

MR. HYLAND: That's twice in a row.

MS BARRETT: Jeez; miracles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee then giving a direction to hold off until after the other?

MR. TAYLOR: Can I close off right away on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it's not closing it.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, I'll wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you wish to make a closing, fine, but I don't have a direction from the committee.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate -- and as Mr. Hyland mentioned, he was a member of the committee when it saw the Fleming report -- your circulating it to me, to all of us. I wouldn't mind, if you have the opportunity -- this is an alternative -- that you take the recommendations here and have added to those on the right-hand side or left-hand side such words as "done" or "put into effect" or whatever and send it to us. Much of what is in here has in fact been accomplished by the Speaker working with his administration.

I wanted to support you and make a comment with respect to the comments of the leader of the Liberal Party. If one takes the time to read the Legislative Assembly Act and to read the Act that provides for the authority for the Speaker and for the Members' Services Committee, it is clearly the responsibility of the Speaker to act as the head of the Legislative Assembly. It's clearly identified, the things that he or she must do -- in this case, he must do -- on behalf of those responsibilities. It is also clear in the legislation what the Members' Services Committee's role and functions are, so I have no problem with it. I also make this suggestion: if you do choose to follow that idea of letting us know what in fact has been put into effect -- and I agree with the member, Pam, who has just spoken, that in fact on the basis of advice you are yet to receive, you may make further modifications and you will let us know.

I would go so far as to say that the personnel, the organization, and the administration recommendations that you may want to put into effect may be further affected by the appointment and selection of a new Clerk. I would assume that you would wish to work with that officer at some point in reviewing these. I think there is some time yet to go before the final -- or not the final; there's no such thing as final -- before a new organization program is established by yourself working with your staff and letting us know. So I'd just as soon have -- if you want to send a copy of this, Dave, it would save a lot of time -- what's been put in effect.

MR. TAYLOR: My purpose in moving here was not to go through the report with what is recommended or not but to point out that in this hiatus, or this time or period we're talking about between this report and another one

forthcoming, quite clearly the Speaker, within the time the report comes through -- we know that when the final report comes in, there'll be recommendations on how the Speaker is to operate and whether he or she refers back to a committee and what this membership committee's authority will be. All I'm submitting is that we've already seen some happenings take place and that some things could be drastically changed -- people hired, people laid off, people changed -- without the Members' Services Committee having any say in it at all. All I'm trying to say is that I don't believe, if we're going to wait for a report, that in the absence of this final report there should be any drastic changes, any layoffs or hiring -- I'll go that far -- until the final report is in.

MR. STEVENS: That's not our decision.

MR. TAYLOR: Otherwise, we're just turning you loose with a carte blanche. I think a very basic part of this report and the next report will be the interface and the authority of this committee. Does this committee have any authority to advise or veto or second? What is it? Is it an approval body strictly for what the Speaker does or is it a committee that has some teeth or power? I submit that in the absence of that being laid out, that interface being in -- I don't have the exact details, although I still think the Members' Services Committee is the ultimate one, not the Speaker. But we can argue that, even if it's going to be the Speaker, which should be thought out.

Consequently, I'm saying that there should be a freeze on the Speakers' actions. I think it would help them around the staff too, to know that nothing further is going to be drastically done without referring back to the committee. I'm not going backwards at all; I'm looking forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So are we. That's good.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

MS BARRETT: I certainly understand what Nick is getting at. But if I can put it into clearer wording, my impression has been that we have staff and Table officers assigned on a temporary basis. There is a question about whether or not this committee will have any effect on the appointing of a Clerk. There is a

question about what our role will be in working with the Speaker. I think my impression has been that no action will be taken on that matter until we've had a chance to talk in light of the recommendations of the more recent report. So, Nick, it's not like I disagree with you; I do agree with you. I want this committee to have its parameters of operation set out really clearly. My point is that we shouldn't do that twice, and I don't think we should assume that the Speaker is in any way anticipating making decisions on our behalf without our having determined collectively what "our behalf" is, and in that event I can't see doing it twice or three times.

It's a matter of a few weeks, Nick. It's not going to last forever, and we will have a chance -- we're probably going to have to devote a whole day or two just to those reports, so I really urge that we just wait until we've got the report and then deal with it in a really scrutinizing way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I'll come back to you in the end.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat distressed at the way the discussion on the Fleming report has evolved or degenerated, because if we're now talking about the mandate and the responsibility of the Members' Services Committee as it relates to the Legislative Assembly function, I take great exception to the comments made by the leader of the Liberal Party. We are a Members' Services Committee. We are not a Legislative Assembly committee. Our primary function is to review, update, and monitor services provided to the Assembly. We do have a secondary role, a very important role, a role that comes once a year, and that is to review, to scrutinize the budget that the Speaker brings forward for the Legislative Assembly. Our function in scrutinizing that budget is very similar and, in my view, identically parallel to the function the Legislative Assembly has to review and scrutinize the budget of the various ministers. This committee has no more right to interfere with the day-by-day operations, including hirings or firings or other disciplinary action that the Speaker may take with those who report to him, than the Legislative Assembly

has to interfere with the actions of a minister vis-a-vis his department. That's our role, and we should not be trying to expand the role or vary from the mandate. Our mandate is as a Members' Services Committee.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point — okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'll have to keep making the points, because we're going to have to adjourn shortly because I'm . . .

MR. TAYLOR: The whole point of the debate is that it may well be the member's feeling that the Members' Services Committee has nothing to do with the administration or what he calls interfering with . . .

MR. STEVENS: It's the legislation.

MR. TAYLOR: But the point is that this report and the reports coming in are supposed to be meant to be interfacing. How could I be so wrong when a report that was commissioned here a few years ago takes seven different issues and talks about how we handle the administration? This is the question I'm talking about. Does the Members' Services Committee have anything to do with your administration? If indeed after the reports are all in, we vote that we don't have anything, I will accept it. I may not agree with it, or I don't know what I'll argue at the time. But I'm just saying that in the absence — in the absence — of anything concrete coming in yet on what we're going to decide, whether we're going to so-called supervise the Speaker's administration or second-guess it or be a final vote of appeal, that there be nothing drastic done in the hiring and firing or the organization of your department until both reports are filed and we've decided how to do it. Maybe, as Mr. Bogle says, the Speaker is completely in charge; we don't have anything to do with it. That's fine. Then we tell everybody that. But it may well be that the Members' Services Committee want to have some [inaudible]. I'm saying that we don't want to be faced with a fait accompli . . .

MS BARRETT: You're talking about changing the parameters of . . .

MR. TAYLOR: . . . one that in three weeks or

three months from now, in fact we can't change anything with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our guidelines reveal that the duties of the Members' Services Committee are laid out in the Legislative Assembly Act. There was a big change in the Legislative Assembly Act when it was introduced last in '84 or whatever.

MS BARRETT: In '83, I think.

MR. HYLAND: Eighty-three? Something like that anyway. There were a lot more tasks given to the Members' Services Committee at that instance, and that's where Members' Services Orders come from. The Speaker of the Assembly is unique to no other part of government in that he sits there as the person in charge of the House but he also sits there as the minister in charge of administration. So he has the two roles to play, and we can advise him on certain things. At one time, if the Speaker decided something was good for members, be it wrong or right, it could be put into effect and the Members' Services Committee couldn't do a damned thing about it. Now if the Speaker wants to do something, it has to be brought as a Members' Services Order either by us by motion, or if it's brought by him, it still has to be accepted by us. Those kinds of things are out there.

I've discussed, not with this Speaker, that the only place where I had problems and thought the Members' Services Committee should be involved is whether — it's not saying total involvement but involvement in the appointment of a Clerk or deputy Clerk, at least to know what's going on, because those are the people that you have to work with and it has the orientation to Members' Services.

But as far as the other administration, we get very involved in that and we could forget about almost anything else we're doing and be involved in day-to-day stuff constantly. We are supposed to set policy, and that's why I think if we have input in appointing people, it should be at the top level, because they're the ones that help us set the policy or enforce the policy that we set, not on the day-to-day stuff that goes on in a department or a committee or whatever.

MS BARRETT: Sorry to keep jumping back in. It seems to me, though, that what's developing here is that we're recognizing we have specific authority under the current Act. It's possible that upon consensus and upon recommendation we may change the authority of this committee from time to time upon recommending a Bill be introduced to amend the Act. I can't see that we have the authority at this point to override our current mandate, not that I wouldn't like to in some instances. I can see some things here that I've already checked off. I'd love to do it and support it at a table, but I just can't see that legally speaking we have the authority to do that now, and by undertaking it -- presumably even when our recommendations come forward, they have to go into an Act, I suspect, or regulations.

Sorry to repeat the same point; it's just a different angle on what's been said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps by the time we meet again to discuss reports, members might refresh their memories by reading chapter 9 of Standing Orders. There are a number of references there that are under the direction of Mr. Speaker. This goes through from items 102 up to 115. However, in addition to that, of course, the Legislative Assembly Act -- and perhaps you could refer to that again -- division 3, talks of Assembly officers and staff.

First, I'd like to point out that rest assured that this Speaker is not doing anything illegal in terms of running his department. I'm sure that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon knows that from at least two occasions where we've sharply disagreed.

MR. TAYLOR: I've never suggested, and in fact I've been quite supportive of it. I'm just saying that I don't want anything drastic done until we get these two reports done.

MS BARRETT: I don't think we have the authority to direct that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The authority of the Act is different. I'd refer you to section 19(1)(a) and (b). Then under section 19(2) it gives the somewhat narrower constraints on Members' Services Committee as to what can be carried out. I'd just refer that to members; I know that they've got tons of other reading to do. Perhaps we could then go through that when we next

come back to deal with the Fleming report and the other report.

Now for the moment I'd like us to stand adjourned for lunch until an acceptable time -- 1 o'clock? -- because I've got an appointment. Thank you very much.

[The committee recessed at 12:22 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here we go. Item 7(a), recently approved Hansard subscription fee increase.

MR. TAYLOR: I thought we had number 6. We have to dispose of that, don't we?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, all right; fine. I thought we'd disposed of that.

MR. TAYLOR: I was going to make a move that we table further discussion on the Fleming report until the other report referred to by the Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ernst Whinney report.

MR. TAYLOR: Do you want to refer it by name or just say the other report?

MS BARRETT: We'll just say hallelujah.

MR. TAYLOR: . . . the other report presently in preparation on administration, be filed also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

7(a). If you look at your minutes, 7(a) basically is the advice that we can't do anything with it until the next year, but . . .

MS BARRETT: In light of the recommendation from Parliamentary Counsel, I move that our prior decision to increase the Hansard subscription rates now be effective April 1, 1988, as opposed to the original decision, which was April 1, 1987. I know it's going to mess up our estimates, but . . .



MR. CHAIRMAN: My only question: about April 1. Could we make it effective January 1?

MS BARRETT: Sure. A friendly amendment: January 1, 1988.

MR. STEVENS: Well, what's the normal billing date, because that's what . . .

MR. McDOUGALL: It might be better if we put it "at the time of the next billing," Mike, right? Because it was already well under way when I got over there. So why don't you just say, rather than try to put a date on it, "the next billing."

MS BARRETT: A friendly amendment to reflect a billing change to be effective at the next time of regular billing for future Hansard subscriptions.

MR. STEVENS: Excuse me. Does that cover, Chairman, the ones that haven't been billed? Does that leave that then as our . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're still on current rates.

MR. STEVENS: Well, then . . .

MS BARRETT: No. The intention of my motion, Mr. Chairman, is that everybody be billed equally at all times. In other words, for the current fiscal year people be billed according to previous rates; for the upcoming fiscal year when the Hansard billing commences, it reflect our decision to increase the Hansard subscription rates. Thank you. Well done, Greg. Question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the call for the question. All those in favour, please say aye? Nobody is in favour; they wave their arms instead. Okay. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you very much.

7(b), Response from Treasury re Financial Responsibility of Printing Budget Documents. You have that before you. Following along the direction of the committee, I sent notification to the Treasurer. You have there the response.

MS BARRETT: I'd like to know if anybody can tell me which of the 1986 budgets resulted in 29,500 copies of the Budget Highlights

requested by your office in 1986. Was it the April or was it the July?

MR. STEVENS: It says right there, April.

MS BARRETT: Does it say April? Where do you find April?

MR. STEVENS: Page 2, fifth line. Fifteen thousand were the later. Am I not right?

MS BARRETT: Oh, sorry; that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I don't know the answer.

MS BARRETT: Can I have a subsequent question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. I thought you were just taking a deep breath.

MS BARRETT: Good for you; thank you. No medical jokes at this time permitted, Dianne.

Were a similar number of Budget Highlights printed after the July budget? Does anybody know?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rod believes so.

MS BARRETT: It's a staggering amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we might continue with leaving the material in the estimates but all of us with regard to our individual caucuses trying to keep a tighter rein on the number of these documents, if that is what you decide to do.

MR. BOGLE: I move that we table this item to our next regular meeting. I do so with intent. I believe we need to spend some time on the issue, and I don't know that today is the appropriate time to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Motion to table. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. In the meantime it stays in the budget.

MR. McDOUGALL: We're already committed.

MR. BOGLE: I know that. That's why I said: why discuss it now? We're really talking about next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7(c), billing procedure for school photo sessions. Mr. Scarlett and perhaps Blake, would you like to update us?

MR. SCARLETT: Okay, the procedure: when the member receives the invoice from the photographer — for example, we have an example of Mr. Fox's under 7(c) — the administration will divide the cost in half, so that our administration would cover \$52.50 or whatever it works out to, half of this, from the money passed by the Members' Services Committee. The members' allowance would be charged for the other 50 percent until such time as all the money is used up that was given to administration, at which time a notice will be sent out to the members notifying the members that from hereon in 100 percent of the costs will have to be covered through the allowances. There is \$20,000 set aside for the photographer.

MRS. MIROSH: That's not what we passed.

MS BARRETT: I agree. That's not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. First off, Banff-Cochrane.

MR. STEVENS: I was just going to ask Rod, Mr. Chairman: the invoice will be reviewed for the content so that it will be in accordance with the decision of the committee? That will be a sitting fee and a certain size or type of photograph? All other additional things required by the member are at the member's ...

MR. SCARLETT: That's right.

MR. STEVENS: Okay. I mean, that's my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's your understanding at the moment.

MR. TAYLOR: This is probably ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; I've got a whole list of people. Thank you. Highlands, Taber-Warner, Glenmore, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MS BARRETT: It was never my understanding that there would be some kind of limitation put

on the Leg. Assembly portion of cosponsoring the costs associated with the leg. photos. Given that previously when a budget item used to appear under public works, I believe, there was no limitation, I would object strenuously, as an Edmonton member that has classes in here constantly, to that kind of limitation that was being suggested by Rod. It's not my understanding that we assumed that in our motion. And remember that Edmonton members and those near Edmonton are the ones who absorb the greatest amount of cost on this program. I think it would be really discriminatory to do that, really discriminatory to put that cap on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we need to check in our estimates. I think we have a maximum figure that's in there. But I know the sympathy of the committee was indeed towards Edmonton members and region in particular, that they would use up that thing first. But once you've hit the figure that's in the estimates — okay, now ... Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: I have to echo the remarks made by Pam. We have not, as I recall, discussed a limit, and although there's a budgetary limit — and they are estimates — we believe that's the figure that's appropriate. But if indeed we go over the figure, we find the dollars someplace else, but we don't arbitrarily penalize members who are using the service, because it works in reverse, Mr. Chairman. Pam has just mentioned that she and other Edmonton area members will utilize the service quite regularly. Some of us have one, two, or three groups coming in per year. I think the Member for Cypress-Redcliff would be very upset and annoyed if he found that when his first class came forward, the money had all gone and he's not even entitled to his proportion.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: The first in four years.

MR. BOGLE: So the intent was clearly that we split the costs between the member and the committee, and if the dollars we budgeted aren't sufficient, then I believe, sir, it is our responsibility as a committee to find the extra dollars.

MS BARRETT: Touche.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, our administrative side will have to keep us apprised of how close we're getting to the end of that particular pot, but the way I've been watching various caucus budgets being spent, I don't think there's going to be any room left in any place to try to cover these kinds of things. Sorry; editorial comment.

MR. TAYLOR: My comment is just the same as Mr. Bogle's, the minister for Milk-Warner.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wherever the airport is.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, wherever the airport is. I can't remember. It's got a long runway. It goes to two towns.

MS BARRETT: It's called the Milky Way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Isn't that where you were going to put the head offices of Lochiel?

MR. TAYLOR: That's true. In the middle, so it gets run over.

I think it's just a budgetary item. It wasn't a limit. It's not cast in stone. If we go over that amount, we go over that amount and we have a deficit budget.

MR. STEVENS: Oh, Liberals!

MR. TAYLOR: Big spenders. I don't think it was ever intended that that budget, as in other areas, was the best calculated estimate. We're not going to draw and quarter somebody who's wrong in the estimate and cut off Mr. Hyland's school that comes all the way up here from coyote country to get their picture taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That seems to be the understanding developing.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think that previously Public Affairs allowed \$25,000 and that covered the cost, as near as we could understand. Now we're talking \$40,000, because we've got \$20,000 in the Legislative Assembly budget and half from members' allowances.

MR. STEVENS: We're okay.

MR. HYLAND: So unless we get one big run ...

MR. TAYLOR: I forgot. By the way, you can take the surplus back ...

MR. HYLAND: We're looking at \$40,000.

MS BARRETT: The costs really went up too, though, Al.

MR. HYLAND: Did they?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as long as there's money left in the members' communications allowance too. I mean, that might not be there.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I think the consensus is that we hadn't predetermined a limitation, should it be met. No one expects it would be, but I think that's the consensus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So that's helpful direction. Now, there's another aspect to this as well.

MR. SCARLETT: Visitor services have indicated that at the present time there are classes coming forward where the member has not requested a picture and the classes have expected a picture because it's been tradition in the past. So they have just been informing the classes that because of budget restrictions the member has not requested a picture for the class. This was a reported item from visitor services. I don't know if there's any direction on how the members would like that handled.

MR. TAYLOR: There's a democratic answer for that: blame the government.

MR. BOGLE: Well, if in fact examples do exist where a class is in Edmonton and a member has allegedly refused to authorize a picture, I believe it's incumbent upon the Speaker or the assistant to the Speaker to notify the said member to ensure there hasn't been a breakdown in communication, because I'm not aware of any members -- there are occasions when a member cannot be present when the class is in the capital, but I'm not aware of any members who have said to a class, "You can't

have a picture." I'm concerned that there not be a breakdown in communication, and there may well be in that . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I did the other day, but I told them my name was Bogle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That fits in with our information that it was Westlock-Sturgeon. All right. But that's right; we would try to get visitor services through us to do a double check.

MR. McDOUGALL: Wouldn't it be easier just to do it automatically rather than have to go back and forth?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. McDOUGALL: Why not just lay it on? It's automatic unless they tell you not.

MR. SCARLETT: It's an authorized expenditure out of Members' Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then it's coming and authorized out of his communications allowance, and if he doesn't want it from there, so be it.

MR. McDOUGALL: It seems to me that it looks like a lot of extra checking.

MR. BOGLE: The original motion was to pay for the entire cost from the committee, and the Member for Edmonton Highlands requested that it be amended, so we split it fifty-fifty. Right?

MS BARRETT: Yes. Is there a question?

MR. BOGLE: No, not a question; just a fact.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't see it being a whole raft of people, but I appreciate the point of all the extra workload going on.

All righty. May we go on to 7(d)?

MS BARRETT: Yes, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps with regard to 7(d) members might take that issue away, the memo from Parliamentary Counsel, and then we can come back to that one at a future meeting,

because it has ramifications for all constituencies. Okay?

MR. BOGLE: Would it also be appropriate to have the Parliamentary Counsel meet with the chiefs of staff of the various caucuses? Because there are so many things that are coming at us that are really administrative, and I want our people who handle administration to look at it and give us advice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be great, because we're finding that our organization is getting somewhat swamped.

MR. BOGLE: Well, several of the motions we'll deal with later today will help to bring them out of the swamps.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a point -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton Highlands and then Westlock-Sturgeon.

MS BARRETT: I just want to comment at this point that I'm in favour of allowing constituency office managers and staff to become employees, and I agree with Bob: let the chiefs of staff with Parliamentary Counsel work out the details and the flexibility provisions of that and report back to us. Our caucus is very much in favour of doing this, but we want to do it properly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: It was just a point of information, Mr. Chairman. One of the operative definitions that's usually used by the tax department -- I don't see it mentioned here, and I just wanted it as a point of information -- is whether the job held is a primary job. In other words, it's usually acceptable to be considered a contract if the person is already working at something else, is mainly employed somewhere else, and this is a sideline. Then you can call it contract. But if this is their main source of income, you're not going to get away with calling it a contract, no matter what. And that seems to be missing from this information. A primary source of income is what the tax department will claim.

MS BARRETT: Good stuff for chiefs of staff to

look at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that would be another item.

MS BARRETT: Yes. It's a good item for chiefs of staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we have these two here. We'll make a note of that. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Is this the time your constituency allowance motion comes up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Soon, soon. Very soon.

May we move now to 7(e), which is members' allowance, '86-87.

MS BARRETT: I don't have anything in my book.

MR. STEVENS: It's right here.

MR. BOGLE: It was a motion that was distributed this morning, dealing with the current 1986-87 members' allowances and any allowances in fiscal years hereafter. The motion reads:

The Chairman write to all Honourable Members to remind them that charges for constituency expenses that exceed the total of the Constituency Office Allowance, the Promotional Allowance and the Communication Allowance, in the fiscal year, cannot be paid out of any other budgetary item and are the personal responsibility of the Member, unless the Member chooses to return goods received for credit within thirty (30) days of the new fiscal year.

The intent of the motion, I think, is quite clear. While we have the ability to transfer funds from within those three allowances, a member cannot spend more than is in the combined total and then transfer that deficit to the next fiscal year. We are allowing, though, in the event that there's been a mistake either in arithmetic or in the purchase order in some way, a 30-day grace period in which time goods can be returned so that the books can be balanced so that when you begin the new fiscal year, you're starting with a clean slate.

MS BARRETT: Speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is identical to the principle we established after some newly elected Members of the Assembly inherited what were substantially deficient budgets with respect to promotional and communication items. I think there's only one way to clear up this matter. Where it has been silent is stated explicitly, and this does that.

MR. TAYLOR: I have a couple of questions on this. It's more to get more information; I like the general thrust of the Bill. But it's going to be very difficult — at least, this is my first year — to come up to a neat year-end, to budget to the penny, to come up to zero. As for goods, I can see that; you can overbudget. I buy too much paper, too much typewriter ribbon; I can return it. But I think it should be meant to say "goods and services." In other words, if I contracted too much of a service, payment could be paid back.

I just find it very difficult to be able to gauge perfectly to the end of the month to the dollar what it would be, so I would like to have the option to choose to return not only goods but services received for credit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How are you going to return services?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, the services would just be usually a PR firm or something for public relations. You're paying ahead anyhow, so if it turns out that you've paid them \$1,200 or something to design a brochure and you've only got \$1,100 in the kitty, you can get a \$1,100 job — that's all — and return \$100. In other words, I'm talking about goods and services. "Goods" usually implies that you've got a pile — I don't want to be too technical, but "goods" means to me something I can put my arm around and carry away or somebody else can put their arm around and carry away. [interjection] I'm talking about the design and that type of work that goes on.

MR. STEVENS: Well, I understand the member's suggestion, but I'm not comfortable with it myself. "Goods" are goods that are actually received and delivered. The preparation of a brochure that's not finished and is not delivered would mean to me that the supplier would normally be given, unless there was an advance

payment . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, that's what I'm talking about, when you're paying for design.

MR. STEVENS: Okay, but you would not normally return the advance payment if the service hasn't been delivered, because the advance payment is the thing that took you over your budget. That's what I'm concerned about. I'm not so sure I follow where you're going on that, but if it's goods that are delivered and can be returned, I think that would be helpful to the member. But services would, I think, lead to some questions of "Well, just give me half the bill now and half the bill later" type of thing, and I'm not sure that's what we're after with this motion.

MR. TAYLOR: I still really think that — we just went through a lot about administration here. I still don't see what's wrong, if you've overbudgeted, with taking it off next year's administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a separate fiscal year.

MS BARRETT: I'll tell you what's the matter with that. What's the matter with that is that you don't know . . .

MR. TAYLOR: You might lose an election, you mean.

MS BARRETT: That's right. You don't know what kind of problems you might inherit if you're a brand-new member replacing somebody who did that. I don't want to be in that situation, and I can well imagine that you wouldn't either or you wouldn't have liked to inherit it in the first place.

MR. TAYLOR: But this doesn't solve the damn thing because . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, this is not dialogue. Please wait until one person finishes and then we'll have the response, because they might make some other interesting arguments for you to disagree with.

MR. TAYLOR: I was trying to get rid of them one by one before I forgot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

MS BARRETT: I have to admit defeat in the face of that compliment. That was it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Westlock-Sturgeon, thank you. Sorry.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't know we'd plumbed the depths so quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not question period, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: What's bothered me is that we don't hold an election in a budget year. I mean you're still going to have that problem with somebody running — if you hold an election in June, the guy or the girl could have spent everything. It could be June and yet, pro rata, when you come back in office — in other words, are we going to have somebody month by month by month, in case there might be an election, seeing whether they're overspending or underspending? I think we're getting administratively bound up here. I really don't see the concern of overbudgeting without taking out . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: With due respect, Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, for the accounting side of the Legislative Assembly Office operation, at this end of the year we start getting people who think they've got more money in their budgets than they really do have, in spite of the almost daily printouts that are available from Legislative Assembly Office. Then they end up overspending by \$1,000 or \$2,000. That's going to come out of their personal pocket, because it's out of this fiscal year and they'd better . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Unless it could be returned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless they can return it, yes.

MR. TAYLOR: That's why I come back to goods and services. I mean, I don't think it matters how the hell you get it back as long as you get it back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, our problem is that it's very difficult to get it back, believe me.

MS BARRETT: For clarification, I'd like to illustrate how it could work in a way that's unfair. If the end of your fiscal year is March 31, which it is, and if you decide that you're going to blow your wad for a massive publication that costs more than it ordinarily would and you have an election that's called in April, you've been actually able to do something that other members may not have been able to do. Not only that, but the political effect is different. It's unequal, in other words, and of course any new member might inherit a deficiency without this provision.

MR. BOGLE: I just want to make one point. It's in response to Nick's remark about services. I think the operative words in the motion, Nick, are "goods received." If it's a service that has been received, you can't return it. In other words, we're not talking about a prepayment or a contract that spreads over two fiscal years. It was really a comfort sentence in the motion so that if a member has inadvertently overspent his or her budget by \$500, they have the ability to return \$500 worth of pins or other goods so that the books are balanced. That was the intent. I'm trying to be sympathetic with your concern, but I don't see how a service can be included in the motion, because once the service has been given, it's been paid for; you can't return the service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A final -- okay?

MR. TAYLOR: No, I'm fine. I've thought of a way around it anyhow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As always, our administration will be keeping a careful, vigilant eye. Thine adversary, the devil, will stalketh about where [inaudible].

MR. TAYLOR: This one will be so admired it will be copied by all 83 members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you.

Item 7(f) is another motion, which was distributed.

MR. BOGLE: Item 7(f) is a motion which has

been distributed.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the constituency office allowance of \$26,000, a communication allowance calculated at .7850 cents times the number of electors divided by 1.5 households, and the promotional allowance calculated at \$2,163 per member with .721 cents for each constituent in excess of 14,000 according to the most recent census list for provincial electoral districts of Alberta be combined, under one program, in respect of each fiscal year, to become the members' services allowance, effective April 1, 1987.

A few moments ago the chairman made reference to some of the onerous work that his staff had been doing as a result of, among other things, Members' Services Orders. The purpose of this order is twofold. It is to lessen the workload for the staff by combining into one budget or allowance the three allowances. The dollars contained within the allowances stay exactly the same as those dollars we have earlier approved, so we are not increasing the allowance per member. We are trying to make the system more flexible, and by having one allowance, each member will receive his printout on a monthly basis and it will be easier to calculate from that the various expenditures the member has. It will take effect April 1 of the new fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And then if you have, say, approximately \$45,000 in it and you've blown it all by July, tough beans.

MR. BOGLE: You're out of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS BARRETT: I'd like \$45,000 here for Highlands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just talking. High priestess, that was a fulmination. Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker used to accumulate his for four years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fat chance. It must have been some other Speaker. Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Banff-Cochrane.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. I take pleasure in seconding that. I think it's a very good idea. It simplifies administration and gets to the core of the thing anyhow, because we were sliding things around so. I think that is a very sensible thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. STEVENS: I just want to ask the mover if the formulae which are within the purview of the committee would remain for review from time to time.

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

MR. STEVENS: It's not the intention to remove the formula?

MR. BOGLE: No, the formula is implicit. All we're doing is taking the bottom line and bringing the three figures together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. There was a call for the question. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed, if any? Let the record show the word "unanimous." Thank you.

All right. Item 7(g). Mr. Taylor, for Westlock-Sturgeon:

that the staff contracts relating either to caucus or constituency offices may be adjusted with up to 12 months retroactive effect as a matter of administrative policy, where the Caucus or the Member considers it necessary.

Is that the motion you wish first?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Mostly, Mr. Chairman, in speaking in support of it, really payments now for all personnel services are retroactive. You pay at the end of two weeks or two months, or whatever the payment period is, anyhow. So it's a case of how far retroactive you go. Also, you may have as a constituency — all of us in politics have employees or contractors that are basically volunteers that really may perform extra duties that you hadn't perceived in your contract or your employment when you did it, and as you get nearer the end of the year, when

your budget is more under control, you may want to give them fair restitution for it. It may be sort of understood that indeed if there is anything left in the pot for their extra work, you will try to use it.

Also, because you're not sure of your budget and how things are going out, you might have made a double type of contract with them. That happens often in business, where you have a basic salary and then, if the business does better or there's more cash flow, you come back with a supplement. In other words, you may well say to an employee or contractor: "Sure, I'm not paying you to a level I would, but I want to do this, this, this and that. I've got a brochure, I've got this, and I've got that, and if there's any money towards the end of the year, I'll try to come back closer to what would be your amount. In other words, you'll get paid in two shifts."

Those are the basic reasons. It seems that in fact most payments for services are in arrear or an adjustment, and I think this just formally recognizes it, makes it much easier for the administration to carry it out; there's no question then of what is or what isn't, how far we should go back. I think 12 months retroactive within the budget period expresses something that would facilitate the administration, that recognizes the [inaudible] payment of personal contracts anyhow.

MR. STEVENS: I have two questions, and I wonder — one might lead to an amendment. I assume the mover would not find the phrase at the end of the motion "and funds are available" inappropriate. In other words, if this were to be approved, the funds would have to be available in either the caucus or the constituency . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, that would be in the budget.

MR. STEVENS: Okay. So a friendly amendment then, "and funds are available," would be in order?

MR. TAYLOR: And the 12 months wouldn't mean that you could go back farther than your budget either.

MR. STEVENS: No.

MR. TAYLOR: It's up to 12 months, if you are



in agreement then.

MR. STEVENS: Well, that was my second question, Mr. Chairman. The second question would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: First, universal consent to the friendly amendment "and funds are available."

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. MIROSH: If funds are available.

MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MRS. MIROSH: If funds . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Is that better than "if funds are budgeted," or "if funds are available"?

MRS. MIROSH: You could be at the end of your budget and not have any money.

MR. STEVENS: And make that decision then.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, yes. Sure; I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That's the first point, Mr. Stevens.

MR. STEVENS: The other point, Mr. Chairman, is if I could just ask for the phrase "as a matter of administrative policy" and ask: is that essential to the motion? In other words — maybe there's a purpose for that. It's nice to see the Parliamentary Counsel here. Maybe he could answer that.

Finally, we have a practice in the government of Alberta, in our own negotiations on reviewing senior officials or opted-out or other appointments. Many of them are dependent on particular dates, whether the date of a contract has expired or the date of someone's advancement, but it's been held up pending others. And there's been no hesitation on the part of the government -- we're not talking about the Legislative Assembly -- to either make those adjustments retroactive or to . . . Of course, our arbitrators in that case have -- no, "have to" -- usually recognized that. So I have no difficulty with it. But is the 12 months

necessary? Now, if you're saying that's a maximum, I'm comfortable and will support the new motion.

MR. TAYLOR: It says "up to 12 months." That's a maximum.

MR. STEVENS: Do you need that? You're saying that's a . . .

MR. TAYLOR: That's a maximum.

MR. STEVENS: Okay. Could I have that explained, Mr. Chairman, the other phrase, unless the mover can . . .

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the phrase was put in to make it clear that there is no legal impediment to a retroactive adjustment to the contract, and it wasn't being provided as a matter of more by an order but it was being recognized by the committee, or would be recognized by the committee if they passed this, that retroactivity is sometimes a fact of life. Most public service settlements are in fact retroactive because of the time taken to determine what rates will be. But we put those words, or somewhat equivalent words could be used, just to indicate that we're not establishing, not purporting to establish, a law or a regulation. It's not necessary. The retroactivity is legally possible just to make a statement of opinion about its administrative propriety.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I would be very much in favour of this motion. I feel that it would allow members to give that staff member an opportunity to do other work extraordinary of their originally hired duties, and thus it wouldn't set a precedent of a salary for that job description. So if that person were hired as a secretary and then did other jobs outside that secretarial work, you're not looking at giving her an annual increment, rather recognition of that extra work.

But I do feel strongly that there should be a cap on it. I guess if you have \$10,000 left over in your budget, are you going to give it all to that person? Shouldn't there be some some sort

of a restriction as to the number of dollars that we should give?

MR. TAYLOR: I would figure that. If you're looking at me, I would think that the wisdom of . . . If the MLA is prone to overpay somebody, whether retroactive or not, that's going to happen. Everyone is going to try to utilize the money to the maximum of their ability. This just gives you the facility to do it. Twelve months is not going to stop you from paying too much to somebody, so I think it's an entirely unrelated matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS BARRETT: I think Dianne's on to something really good, although I'm not sure we'll solve it at this meeting, and I'd be prepared to support this, subject to further thinking about how to protect against that, because I think that's important. A lot of bad politics could be developed on that basis, and I wouldn't want to see that happen. And I wouldn't want the public to perceive us doing that. I think that's really important. So I think that if we pass this, we should individually resolve to bring it back later with some kind of provision after having talked about it.

But I have another concern, and that is the 12-month retroactivity. I'd rather have that retroactivity to the commencement of the fiscal year in which the policy was to be enacted, so that we're not talking about . . . Oh, that would be automatically prevented just by the end of any fiscal year, wouldn't it?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, that's right. It automatically goes into the fiscal anyhow.

MS BARRETT: Okay, I'll drop it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you aware there would also be the other limit invoked by common sense as well as the legal aspects? I assume that you can't . . .

MR. STEVENS: No, I think there is a valid point there, Mr. Chairman. Twelve months is 12 months, and you could have dollars left in this fiscal year and apply it just by saying, "Here are \$3,000 for those 12 months that you have worked." It has nothing to do with the fiscal year. Be careful. I think there's a valid

observation there, if that's what is meant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You also have the problem of when the contract was initially signed.

MR. STEVENS: Yes, exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can't run that back. That's why I was trying to insert a phrase about common sense.

MR. STEVENS: It may need additional thought here.

MS BARRETT: Without actually making the motion, maybe we could consider tabling this — unless I see really strong objections facially, I'll do that — until we've had a chance to work through this a little bit better. I mean, we'll probably meet soon again anyway.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, you know it's not the end of the world to table it; it's just, Mr. Chairman, that we've spent quite a little time on it. Twelve months and funds available — it all automatically goes in. You can't go back past your budget period. The funds for 14 months ago are not available. The funds for even three months ago are not available if your fiscal year started more than three months ago. We've spent some time and we've talked to it, plus all the votes. I really don't see the problem. Mind you, the committee can do what they want.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, might we have a short coffee break?

[The committee recessed from 1:45 p.m. to 1:50 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, ladies and gentlemen. Okay, we have the motion before us. There might be another comment or two to be made about the staff contracts relating to either caucus or constituency offices.

Forgive me, folks, may . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I think these are . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it's all right, Nick. I'm just waiting for a conversation over there to cease. If it doesn't, it doesn't. Now, is it all right if we continue?

MR. TAYLOR: Pay attention or we're going to give you the background next time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was trying to read this so . . . You fellows earlier were complaining that you couldn't hear what the motions were, so I want to be absolutely clear on this one.

. . . staff contracts relating either to caucus or constituency offices may be adjusted with up to 12 months retroactive effect as a matter of administrative policy, where the Caucus or the Member considers it necessary if funds are available.

Now, that's the exact wording we're discussing.

MR. TAYLOR: That's with the friendly amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: I would suggest that — I can't amend my own amendment, or I would make it a . . .

MS BARRETT: That's okay; you don't have to. As it's been explained, the "if funds are available" friendly amendment, which I think has been agreed to, is part of the motion by virtue of the fact that we do operate on fiscal years. It's assumed, then, that the retroactivity must be related to the fiscal year. If that's the case, the motion is in order and we can go with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And no cap.

MS BARRETT: No cap.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hear a call for the question.

MR. BOGLE: Before we do, I want to know if this motion is in order, if there are any problems from a legal point of view, from the departments' perspective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legal first of all, Parliamentary Counsel?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, this motion

doesn't specifically authorize or forbid anything really. It phrases a statement of opinion by the committee about administrative policies, a direction to the department about how it will administer contracts. As I mentioned before, the actual issue of retroactivity — it is neither illegal nor contrary to general government policy. What is in here is essentially a statement of what is often done, with an additional restriction of 12 months. I doubt very much whether 12 months is often reached in a retroactive settlement with any contract. They're mainly less than that. And the addition of the words "if funds are available" is of course important, but essentially they are really redundant because you can't make a payment unless the funds are available. There are authorities over us which would prevent that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You might not be able to make the payment, but you might still get the request.

MR. M. CLEGG: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Administratively, Blake, have we got some of these things outstanding?

MR. McDOUGALL: This would allow us to take action with outstanding items. The only concern that was expressed to me by the Auditor General's staff is how it might be perceived; in other words, going along at a certain level of payment and then there is a sudden increase near the end of the fiscal year and then the salary drops again, you know, to another level. That was the concern that was expressed to me. But this would alleviate a number of problems in our area.

The only other thing in connection with the motion as it stands is that it was said that it's understood that this is within the fiscal year. It might be a little nicer if it was stated, but as long as that's understood.

The other thing: does this takes effect immediately?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As of this date.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, just following along with my colleague's question, I want to leave our officials with the understanding that it is as worded, as direction, as our Parliamentary Counsel has said, because — and

I'll tell you why -- if you draw a line called the fiscal year, and if you say it's February '87, and you wish to pay a retroactive payment -- call it \$1,000 -- for 12 months, it would be out of the '86-87 approved allocation. Correct? If it's now April '87, we're in a new fiscal year. There may well be funds available, but you may wish to make a payment of six months. I hope the administration will not say that you can have one-sixth of that because the fiscal year began on April 1. And that's what I want to be clear, that what we're doing in this motion is up to 12 months if funds are available and if that's the decision of the caucus or of the member, period. I don't want to have it come back to us with someone making a decision in April and the administration says that you can't do that because it's a fiscal year.

If the funds are available, they will be available. This group will have approved those. They are before the House shortly. So the words "fiscal year" are bothering me. If some people are putting an interpretation on it, that's not what the mover has asked. He's asked for the opportunity to have up to 12 months retroactivity if funds are available and the caucus or the constituency has that funding, period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification. The necessity for having the motion now is because we're coming to the last part of the current fiscal year. Groups want to expend the total funds available to them, so they want to spend X number of dollars between now and the end of March. But then once we get to the new fiscal year, they no longer have access to the funds for bonusing that come out of this current year. But then they would be working ahead in the next fiscal year, if that's what they want to do, and that assuredly would fit in with the fiscal year.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, let's say I have a constituency secretary who began last May. It is now May of '87, and because of what has happened, I wish to reward that person with new duties a sum of money. I wish it to be retroactive to May of 1986; it's May of '87. I don't want the administration to say, "No, you only have two months retroactivity available to you." That's what I'm trying to say. I think that would be an error. That's not what the motion has proposed.

MR. McDOUGALL: The funding would be from that. I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be from that current fiscal year. But if you really want to do it in terms of back to last May, then hopefully we'd get it done before this fiscal year.

MR. STEVENS: Of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish I could say "of course" to all the members and know it would happen.

MR. BOGLE: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried.

MR. TAYLOR: The second motion, Mr. Chairman, along that line maybe has more import to smaller caucuses than the others, but it gives us along the line of what Mr. Bogle has already moved, where we are enveloping the whole constituency allowance. I'd like to have the freedom -- and I think many would like to have the freedom, as far as I can ascertain -- of being able in effect for the constituency contract with the caucus to supply some services, particularly in the fields of promotion and communication or whatever it is. I can see from administration's point of view that there might be some concern if all the funds of the constituency were transferred over to the caucus, but I think there's a sort of tentative and easy way.

I think some people might argue that we should be completely free to transfer as much as we want to caucus, but I think maybe an initial start now, something in the order of 25 percent. I must admit that if I were left to my own devices, I'd think it's up to the constituency. If the MLA wanted to contract 100 percent of the work to be done out of the caucus office for payment, that would be their business, but maybe we shouldn't go that far. To begin with, I would say 25 percent. The point behind here is to allow the constituency, if they so wish, to let the caucus do some of the work for them.

MS BARRETT: I don't think I support the motion, Mr. Chairman, and I'll tell you why. It's because it provides for unequal support for caucuses on the basis of what the individual

members are doing within their constituencies. The constituency operating allowance and the whole fund is designed so that you can have a constituency office and serve constituents in a fairly direct way. If you start permitting a direct transfer between the two, what you end up doing is skewing the effect of the caucus budgets as determined through our debates. Now, I don't have to tell people that I think we got the worst short end of the stick when it came to budget debates on caucuses that I could have possibly imagined.

Aside from that, the fact of the matter is that some of us operate constituencies to the maximum, to the hilt. I don't just speak on behalf of Highlands, which is a deadly office to run. If we had 10 staff, we couldn't keep up. I think it would be really unfair, just because I have a really busy constituency office, for me to be denied the opportunity to transfer funding which I wouldn't have into fixing a caucus budget that I think came out skewed after all those debates we had in here. I think it's really unfair. It penalizes those people whose constituents demand a lot of their members and those members' constituency office staff. I think it discriminates against those who have made a point of being constituency-oriented MLAs as opposed to those who might be more legislative-oriented MLAs, and I think it screws up the whole process of having gone through all these estimates and all these fights. You know, I don't want to have to go through that fight again. Everybody knows how I feel about it. If we pass this, I'm going back into that fight. I think it's way too unfair. It completely unbalances what semblance of balance we've got left.

MR. TAYLOR: It says "to permit."

MS BARRETT: Yeah, and that's just it. Those who don't have the funding available in their constituency offices wouldn't be allowed to, because our money is going completely and exclusively to operating the constituency offices. By that permitting, what that means is that all members whose constituents don't demand an awful lot out of their local offices then have greater ability to put money into research, which is extremely important and which has already been severely amputated, against those whose constituents are so demanding by need that the work gobbles up our

full constituency operating allowance. No way; uh-uh. You can vote on it, but I'm opposed to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder ... Ladies and gentleman, I have to take an urgent phone call. Could we take a five-minute coffee break, please?

[The committee recessed from 2:04 p.m. to 2:10 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we were interrupted so rudely by myself leaving, Edmonton Highlands, you were on this motion.

MS BARRETT: I've said all there is to say. I think it's unfair, and I'm not going to vote for it.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion carries.

MR. TAYLOR: It's getting more like a committee all the time.

MR. BOGLE: Bow Island split on that one.

MR. TAYLOR: That's all right. You can be against me and still be considered bright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to go on public record that I believe what we have just done as a committee very seriously undermines the responsibilities of the individual member and, as indeed a servant of the decision of the committee, will carry through with it, but I think it is an encroachment upon the independence of the individual member.

MR. TAYLOR: Which one are you talking about? The last one or the last two?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last one.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Item 7(i), Mr. Taylor. Expense allowance, was it?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I have a motion that affects not only that. I think it was more than that. Is it indemnity and tax allowances?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Because the motion I have is very . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's your issue, so I don't know what you . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Sure. I'm sorry. I just thought that that's what you were writing down. The question will have to wait till it's defeated or passed. I'll read it.

MR. STEVENS: Was this a surprise one? We had the other ones ahead of time.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm moving that during the 1987-88 budget year only, members be paid 90 percent of their indemnity, subsistence allowance, and statutory salary for that year. Statutory salary, if I understand correctly, is the word for what is paid to cabinet ministers.

The point behind that is -- I think that although we started over the last year and our salaries have been under debate time and time again, consistently we've stated that first we took the statutory or what you call the Miller report raise, which I supported. I had already voted for a cut moved by the Member for Edmonton Highlands, a cut in indemnity a while back. But I feel that this is something that we can't put behind us, because as the government has now come in with cuts in the budget and then as the budget is becoming more evident of what their plan is for the next year, I think it behooves us to have a good, sober second look at our own salaries and our own allowances, because the conditions have changed since six months ago.

There is no question that many of our public now, many of our institutions -- whether they are schools or whether they are disabled, whatever it is -- nearly every segment of our economy has been asked to take retrenchments and cuts, and I think we can no longer remain deaf to what we're hearing out there and that we have to set an example. And I'd like to see it as an all-party example. I don't think it should be something that necessarily has to be partisanship or something in the House, but I think we can set an example on this committee by recommending to the House that we take, in effect, a 10 percent cut. We're only taking it

for one year. All I'm talking about is suspending just for the next budget year and we go right back into the same thing next year, if conditions and the things move around as fast as the government hopes and many of us also wish, because no one likes the hard times in agriculture and oil that we now have and the job shortages.

Many people out there are taking cuts, and this is not a question of what we are worth. I've always been one to argue that. I've been an elected member now; I know that every one of the people around this table, regardless of what party they are, works a lot harder and for a lot less than they would get in any other field. It's not a case of being paid what we are worth, although people might have different ideas. I think it's a case of setting an example, being one with the troops. There's an old saying from the last war: you had to sleep and share the lice and the bad food with everyone else, otherwise you weren't a leader, and I think it's time that we went out and shared it with the people of Alberta. The things have come back, and by that I know a 10 percent cut doesn't even approach those that are unemployed and those doing a lot worse, but certainly I think it is some move and expression towards trying to live in harmony with our electorate out there.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting that we suspend for one year only, the budget year only, and be paid 90 percent of the indemnity, subsistence allowance, and statutory salary for that year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Parliamentary Counsel, is this motion in order?

MR. M. CLEGG: It couldn't be effected, Mr. Chairman, if it were passed. No, it's not in order in that regard. It could only be taken as an expression of opinion by this committee, because the only portion of this motion that the committee could actually carry out would be a reduction in the subsistence allowance. The other items are fixed in legislation and this committee could do no more than urge the government to introduce legislation to effect this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I know we can't debate it out of order, but I think any

suspension is in order. It's not moved . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, hon. member. We could probably have another coffee break in a short while. If you'd like to take advice with the counsel, that would certainly be appropriate.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But as distributed it's not debatable. Thank you.

Gallery passes. There is a memo here which comes as a result of a discussion between the head of visitor services plus security people plus the Sergeant-at-Arms, and it's a whole matter that's been out there for some period of time. It's the matter of distribution of passes to the gallery. So I give you a moment to read through that, please.

MR. BOGLE: While we're reading this, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware that people could carry briefcases and parcels or suspicious looking articles into the galleries at the present time.

MR. STEVENS: Sadly, they are doing it, Bob.

MR. BOGLE: Is that correct?

MR. STEVENS: Yes. I think it's wrong. Sadly, they are.

MR. TAYLOR: They didn't three years ago. It's just the last year that they've done it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've asked Rod to get the Sergeant-at-Arms, in case you have any other questions that we might want to address. But it certainly is highly irregular and it certainly is not the case in other Legislatures. It's a very foolish thing. Yes?

MR. STEVENS: Just while we're reading from it, are we saying — I think Bob's question is well-meaning — is there a proposal that there be a room where purses and briefcases could be checked? Because that's part of the problem. See, a woman tends to carry a purse and a briefcase or not. A staff member may have only a briefcase. And there's a problem determining who is staff and who isn't. It's a problem. Are we going to provide that kind of a

checking service or just let them look into the bags or go through a zipper?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's not a proposal to go through any kind of electronic surveillance device at this time, because I think that's all a question that's begged by further study of security at large. But it certainly is a matter that if you do request that briefcases and so forth be deposited, then you do have to find an area to do it, either up on that fourth floor or by the main entrance to the building, where there are indeed areas where we could develop storage facilities and it still would look aesthetically very satisfactory. When the Sergeant-at-Arms comes, he'll tell us briefly what they do at the moment about that kind of thing.

But it's the twofold thing. It's the bringing of bulk objects, no matter what they are, plus the safety of fur coats and all the rest of that. We had hoped to put storage lockers, fur coat facilities, and coat facilities outside the entrances to the main galleries, but we haven't got enough money so we didn't do it.

The other major problem is this matter of passes, and this might be one way to at least try it for a while, in the issuing of the pass thing, so that now that we do have a better communications system built from the House to the front door, when we have additional spaces there in the gallery, we can indeed say that yes, there's plenty of room, so some more folks can come up, and we'd do the issuing of passes.

MR. BOGLE: When the Sergeant-at-Arms comes in, possibly you could ask him to share with us how the House of Commons and other Legislatures deal with the question. I sense in what is proposed that the present system of a member issuing the pass would be discontinued, and I am concerned therefore about people who travel some distance to see their MLA and to see their Legislature being turned away at the door because they're not, for whatever reason . . . I'd like to see what other options are available, including limiting the number of passes on a per member basis and letting the member and his or her caucus work out just how many, in relation to school groups who are coming and others. But I'm very concerned about a loss of input that currently is there by the individual member re his or her constituents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would still have a system in place whereby you could still have those passes for your constituent that was coming, but it would be double-checking between your secretary and the persons in charge of the pass-issuing desk.

A number of points, Oscar, and I think people will just ask them directly, but it's basically with regard to this: what's now the case about checking of briefcases, parcels, and purses of course.

MR. LACOMBE: Well, we don't check purses, Mr. Chairman. What happens is when they show up with a briefcase, parcel, or whatever, they're requested to leave it outside. If they don't, then we ask if we could look at the contents or whatever. And if it's just papers and this sort of thing, they're allowed to take it in.

MR. STEVENS: You do look then?

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, but if they won't open it, then we do not permit entry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on that point first -- purses and stuff like that. We'll come to passes in a moment.

MR. BOGLE: Okay.

MS BARRETT: It occurs to me that one of the reasons we increased security here was the shocking event that took place a few years ago in which a minister's secretary was killed on the job, and I wonder if by changing the location of this form of scrutiny, you're limiting the ability of security at the main door from preventing weapons from entering the building. And the other thing I wonder about is -- I'm generally in favour of it -- would this procedure hold true during night sittings or is it just for peak hour operations?

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, what happens -- no, it's on 24 hours or whenever the House is in session, 24 hours at the front door. What would apply there, Pam, is that the security people would still do their job scrutinizing people coming in.

MS BARRETT: And still check for weapons?

MR. LACOMBE: Yes. They challenge everyone at the door. They say they need a pass, so they

send them upstairs. Another reason it was increased was on account of Quebec.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, that's right.

MR. LACOMBE: So that's another reason we have the added staff in the galleries.

MS BARRETT: A supplementary question. Does that mean then that if someone were to come in with a rucksack or a briefcase -- are they checked at the door for weapons possession the minute they walk in?

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, and they're requested that they leave the parcel there or the rucksack or briefcase or whatever.

MS BARRETT: I see. So this would be like a secondary search?

MR. LACOMBE: That's correct, yeah. And our people would then be scrutinizing this. What happens is the front door security do the check, request that that person leave that sack there. If they don't want to -- there's something valuable -- then they say, "May we go through it, please," checking for weapons or whatever. Then again, our people would do another check at this desk where we would issue passes, and whilst the pass is being issued, the location of the two security people is such that they can observe this person getting a pass. It's a method of just slowing them down a little bit in case he has a bulge or something. Then you slowly pull him aside away from the House and say, "Excuse me, sir; may we talk to you for a moment, please?"

MS BARRETT: One final supplementary. As Bob was inquiring, does that still leave us with the ability to at least preauthorize someone to be in the gallery?

MR. LACOMBE: Oh, by all means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just half a shake. Let's finish suitcases, purses, those things, and then let's focus on the pass thing so that we don't . . .

MS BARRETT: Fine.

MR. STEVENS: I'm just not quite clear -- please help me, Oscar -- if a large purse or a



small purse is treated the same as a briefcase?

MR. LACOMBE: No. Purses are difficult.

MR. STEVENS: Purses are difficult? Why?

MR. LACOMBE: Well, women have a lot of personal things in there, and my people are all men mostly, except for one woman, and I can only stretch her so far, one female member of the security staff. But we can certainly make it a policy.

MRS. MIROSH: They do it at airports.

MR. STEVENS: Well, I recall, if I'm right on this, two events in Canada recently. One was the lady in Ottawa who threw a bag of blood down on the floor, or excrement.

MR. LACOMBE: That's correct, yes.

MR. STEVENS: And I believe there was an incident here where a lady did something as well, but I'm trying to think, Oscar, if that's since '79?

MR. LACOMBE: No. Anything that was tried we caught in the gallery before it happened.

MR. STEVENS: Dropped down there.

MR. LACOMBE: Before it fell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this point?

MR. BOGLE: On this point. I have been sitting in my place in the Assembly with the false sense of security, I guess, that it was not permissible to take a briefcase into the gallery. I am concerned about that. I think a briefcase hurled down, hitting a person in just the right way, could cause severe spinal and neck or back injuries.

MR. LACOMBE: I agree. But we had to leave it to a certain degree of flexibility. That you can appreciate, but that could certainly be implemented.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I guess the difficulty arises with the woman's purse. But surely we can make a distinction with a briefcase, and there's no need for anyone to have a briefcase in the

gallery.

MR. LACOMBE: That's correct, other than that he may have some very important papers in there. This is what we have run into.

MR. BOGLE: Well, what's he doing bringing them in here? Take them down to a members' office, opposition or government, and lock them up.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd have you know that the leader of the real opposition for some years had to carry a briefcase in and operate out of it.

MR. BOGLE: We're doing our best to get you back in that position.

MR. TAYLOR: Don't rent out that office in the front wing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got a few more things on our agenda, as always, so . . .

MS BARRETT: Yeah, we do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. No briefcases to the gallery. We can agree on that, because they can leave them somewhere else.

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

MS BARRETT: Or alternatively, they can open them up and do what I used to do as a staffer: grab the papers out of them and carry them in. That's the main thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. Take the papers in and leave the briefcase out. Okay.

All right now, might we deal with the matter of the pass concerns and how it might be made to operate? I think, Oscar, if they could voice their concerns and then you answer them all at the end, please.

MR. LACOMBE: Sure.

MR. STEVENS: Bob had a question about whether a member is being denied . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Taber-Warner first.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the present system, as I

understand it — what's in practice is that the member signs the entry, and then entry is still dependent upon availability of access in the gallery, so that if you have a number of school groups and so on, your guest may not get in until the school groups have left.

MR. LACOMBE: That's correct.

MR. BOGLE: How would what is proposed alter the present system? Can you just walk in? So that I understand, does the member still issue the pass in the first instance, or would the pass be issued at the desk by security staff? You see, we've just had this memo handed to us, so I'm not sure I completely understand the process that's being suggested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then if you take us through the process as you see it, and then we'd have questions to that.

MR. LACOMBE: What would happen now is that we would suggest that you would phone down to visitor services or security and we would issue whatever number of passes you required. If you just went down to security, we would then just issue them there without your phoning us or whatever.

The second part — would you just repeat the second part, please.

MR. BOGLE: It was so I better understood what you were proposing. I think you've answered that okay.

MR. LACOMBE: Then the security staff, which would be situated right at the top of the fourth floor — you know where the railing comes around? We would have a desk there at the top of the staircase, and we would check people over here as opposed to checking them by the doors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one quick thing. You have to remember that we've now moved visitor services, that they're now on the fourth floor. Their office is just 12 feet outside where this desk might go.

MR. BOGLE: The second thing that I had asked before Oscar got in the room was a quick comparison with how the Parliament in Canada and the other Legislatures handle this issue.

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, that's how they handle them basically. It's all issued by and controlled by the Sergeant-at-Arms. Security comes under the Sergeant-at-Arms; his staff issue the whole works, all passes.

MR. BOGLE: In the House of Commons?

MR. LACOMBE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the member can call over to security . . .

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So they make that the focal point, that your secretary phones to one location, whether it's the Sergeant-at-Arm's office or visitor services. They still then set aside the passes for your member, for your visitors. So they're there, and then your people come over to that desk and physically pick them up.

MR. LACOMBE: See, where it improves it is that they're issued from one spot. We know basically how many seats we have available in all the galleries. They're not issued by this gentleman or that gentleman, that lady or that lady, which is the case now. They're coming from all over and no one knows how many seats are available. They don't know how many school children are in. We have that information from Visitor Services. Each day there are going to be 80 schoolchildren at a given time, so we know right away how many seats we have.

MR. BOGLE: Oscar, would the style of the card change, or would you still — although in this case you're not having the member's signature on the card. I guess what I'm asking is: would you have preimprinted cards, or is there something there to identify the constituency?

MR. LACOMBE: Sure. We could just have a white card, the same as we have now. Your secretary would call down and we'd say Cardston or Lacombe or wherever, giving them that identification.

MR. BOGLE: It seems to me that that is the system that is used in the House of Representatives and the Senate in Washington,

D.C. If I remember correctly, the card is issued by the security people, but the card indicates the representative or the senator who has authorized the entrance.

MR. LACOMBE: Right. Yes, we could do that; that's not an inconvenience.

MR. BOGLE: That's right. It's a souvenir.

MR. STEVENS: They would still keep that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sure.

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, they request retention of the cards, and we say, "By all means."

MS BARRETT: I'd like to recommend, and see what your response is, Oscar, that we still deal with the same cards but we have the ability to sign them and give them to the person that we're authorizing to come in and that they then go through the central system. It's more of a personalized service. A lot of people keep those things as souvenirs, and it doesn't preclude the secondary level of control or whether it comes to organizing the number of people actually in the galleries or their security control. I think that leaves us with the option — I mean, it's not necessary, certainly. Phoning down can be just fine, but I would prefer being able to preauthorize, in other words, in writing.

MR. LACOMBE: Yes, this is what I was going to suggest. We could get some cards from you presigned, or Mr. Taylor or another gentleman or whoever. We could just keep them in a file. That way it's still personal insofar as you're concerned. You're performing a good service to a constituent, but we have not lost control.

MS BARRETT: Right on.

MR. LACOMBE: I'd certainly go along with that. Mr. Chairman, would you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes; easy enough.

MR. TAYLOR: There is some value in waiting at times. All my suggestions have been covered. That's the way the House of Commons does it. You have a file for every MP and already presigned. They phone in, because you must phone in, in order to get your priority.

The only problem may well come if there's something like a budget night event where you have the MLAs all trying to -- then you'd say on the phone, "Sorry, we can't hold any more than two," or four or however many.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Innisfail?

MR. PENGELLY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I think Oscar answered my question. I just wondered how he would know how many seats were available if the MLAs were going to be able to sign and give those things to him. But if they're going to be in a central office, signed, there wouldn't be any problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So do we have a maximum number that I as an MLA can check in?

MR. LACOMBE: Why don't we just go with the seats that are available?

MR. STEVENS: It really depends on the day, doesn't it?

MR. LACOMBE: Yes. Normally we don't have that problem. It's just during question period. There is a predetermined number of schoolchildren that is decided by the Speaker, so many seats for the staff, and then we have to work out the rest.

MR. STEVENS: Chairman, when Dianne is speaking, I'll have 40 people watching, but if Bob's speaking, you've got lots of seats.

MR. TAYLOR: In my case, as long as you have 40 people listening instead of watching.

MR. STEVENS: I was just teasing, Bob.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that seem to . . .

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And of course we can adjust this as we're going along, but I think it gives us a better chance to try to have a better idea of what's really happening. As stated in the memo, one of the basic things that's useful there is that it allows us then when other people come to the door to allow them to come up.

MR. HYLAND: Let's try it for this session and

see what happens.

MR. STEVENS: I just want to say that it's a good idea and I'm glad we're going this way. Could I ask you, Mr. Chairman — it may be more in your purview, but while Oscar's here. The numbers of schoolchildren and the timing of their visits is all co-ordinated by visitor services. Do we have a maximum number of seats so there is at least a certain number of public seats available? I raise that because if they all come together, I see them upstairs being asked to move out and that really does bother me. I don't mean that the schoolchildren should be denied, but do you have a process for making sure there is some kind of a balance?

MR. LACOMBE: Well, what I'm supposed to do — and the Speaker has given us the following instructions. There will be, I think, 75 or 80 seats set aside for the schoolchildren. We have 108 and 109 respectively in the galleries. That will leave 25 for staff, mostly on the members' side, because it's ministers' staff that go in there. Then we'll have for the public on the other side, which would give us, depending on how many staff, because it's normally just the EAs...

MR. STEVENS: So if you had 120 schoolchildren but there were lots of seats, you might let a class go in. You might.

MR. LACOMBE: Yes. This is done by visitor services. They can phone them.

MR. STEVENS: Okay. You don't have 160 seats given to school kids and there are 40 people standing outside that missed the opportunity. Okay. I appreciate that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we'd do then is cut the group in half and run them in for part of the time and then recycle them fast. You see, part of what we're doing is having to work with a new configuration of the galleries and do this work-through. It's also very useful that we're having a better opportunity to work co-operatively with visitor services as well as the Sergeant-at-Arms and security.

The one other thing that would be very evident to everyone is that there's no standing room in this House anymore except for the security guards. That also applies to the

media. There are 22 seats provided up in that gallery. The sound system is incredible up into all four galleries now, so there will be no excuse for anyone standing in the media gallery, or EAs or whatever standing up. They'll all be invited to sit down.

MR. STEVENS: It might be helpful if you sent out a little note to the cabinet about that. We're already getting one, are we? I mean the cabinet and the leaders?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it was part of my discussion with the House leaders earlier today, about the seating.

MR. LACOMBE: Just to put you at ease, I've presently got the visitor services and my security staff doing the fire drill so that we'll know exactly where we're coming from in the new configuration up there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm glad you mentioned that, because during the course of the spring sitting, I'm going to have a fire drill in the middle of the afternoon, because we don't know where we're going. We'll issue the exit routes and we'll do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we do it as second item in question period one day?

MS BARRETT: He just said Tuesday or Thursday.

MR. PENGELLY: Since I've moved up to the fifth floor, I was wondering where the fire escapes were. There's one window beside my desk, and I haven't had time to crawl out there yet and see what [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we've now moved visitor services away from here. This now is a fire exit corridor. Nigel, you're quite right.

MR. PENGELLY: No, that's on the fourth floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, this is from the fifth floor, right here. We've now opened up this hallway again as a fire exit. The glass offices are used as changing rooms for the pages, but the rest of the hallway is now open as a fire exit.

MR. PENGELLY: Oh, on the fifth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it's part of the problem. We're going to have to redo the whole fire thing for this building.

MRS. MIROSH: Is it just a surprise? We'll all just find the nearest exit and go for it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we'll issue an exiting sheet beforehand.

MR. STEVENS: So we're supposed to learn it perfectly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we'll give notice. I think we also need to do one at night, when there are no lights.

MR. STEVENS: God, you're a challenging person.

MRS. MIROSH: Turn out the lights and hit it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not here to see a whole bunch of our nice members get fricasseed.

MS BARRETT: Well, in case it's important and to expedite moving along in the meeting, I move that we adopt the recommendations in the memo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Oscar, are you okay?

MR. LACOMBE: All clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Good. Great.

MR. LACOMBE: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. TAYLOR: See you around, Oscar.

MS BARRETT: Yes, Oscar. It was nice of you to drop in.

MR. LACOMBE: I always like to visit hardworking people.

MR. TAYLOR: Next time bring your own bottle.

MR. STEVENS: That's in the Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. A motion on air travel. Item (k).

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I had this redrafted, as you requested. You may want to dispose of it in a hurry. The argument still applies that I made to you earlier. Knowing the retentive memory of some, my words must be burned into their memories, so I won't repeat them.

MR. STEVENS: Wow! What a relief.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, this committee indeed has a responsibility to report to the Legislature on any changes that the committee feels may be appropriate in the indemnity, and we have a responsibility, according to the present legislation, to set the expense allowances. As this motion was presented this afternoon without any advance consultation, which is not customary the way we've been operating lately...

MR. TAYLOR: You've had this about four times, haven't you?

MR. BOGLE: ... I would move that the motion be tabled to be discussed at our next regular meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion to table. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion carries.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm not going away in a sulk, Mr. Chairman; I have a meeting downstairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I thought you were involved in the next motion.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, dear. What's that one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have item 7(k), something to do with air travel, and I believe during the day you and the Member for Edmonton Highlands were going to draft...

MR. BOGLE: We do have the motion on the members' benefit package that has to come back...

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's the one.

MR. BOGLE: ... that Mr. Taylor, Ms Barrett,

and I are involved in.

MR. TAYLOR: But that's to come back.

MR. BOGLE: No, it's here.

MR. STEVENS: It's all ready to go.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Let's go.

MS BARRETT: That's our motion to approve in principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the over-65 one. All right. Does everyone have a copy? No. At that end of the table there seem to be some missing.

MR. BOGLE: Shall I read it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: Members' Benefit Package.

Be it resolved that:

If any premium payable all or in part by a Member, in respect of the Member's participation in a benefit plan established by or pursuant to an Order of the Committee, is increased by reason of the Member being over a certain age, the amount of the increase shall be paid out of public funds and not charged to the Member so that all Members who participate in the Plan in the same way pay the same premium.

The intent of the motion was shared with members earlier today, which is: to ensure that all members are treated equally, all members would pay the same premium. If indeed a higher premium is required for members 65 years of age or older for a certain benefit, then the difference between that which is charged to all members and the higher premium cost would be borne by this committee.

MS BARRETT: Speaking in favour of the motion briefly, I think that the principle here is really important. It's true we don't have the figures worked out yet, and I'm sure we can all agree to report back at a later date, but the fact of the matter is that when we're elected to the Assembly, we should not be discriminated against by virtue of our age one way or the other. It just so happens that I believe that

that's an across-the-board rule that I think should be applied more generally in society, and if I'm going to put my money where my mouth is, I'm willing to use this as an example as well as support it in principle.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question. All those in favour, please signify. All those — carried.

Mr. Taylor, with respect to your leaving, I wonder if I might ask you to stay for just one minute. I would invite Blake McDougall just to give a quick rundown on the increased number of transactions, workload, with respect to the Legislative Assembly administrative section, just for general working knowledge as to the kind of pressure that's going on.

MR. McDOUGALL: Mr. Chairman, I've recently received a workload increases report from our new director of administration for the period February '86 to February '87. In brief, the number of paid invoices during that period of time has increased 15 percent in volume, and we estimate that there will be a further increase in the workload of approximately 15 percent over the period previously mentioned. As well, there has been a significant increase in the number of purchase orders that have been processed. Do you wish me to comment any further?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was one more figure there. Where's that one? Okay. This increase with regard to constituency offices, it's gone up 34 percent. Constituency secretaries, it's increased 77 percent...

MR. STEVENS: What went up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The number of transactions. So it's just the flavour that there's a heck of a lot more having to happen over there.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't think there's any question. The people of Alberta put an opposition. They want to see a little more action in there. I think it's going show up in more things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, if the trend

continues, I'm sure you'll allow me to impose a 15 percent surcharge on the Liberal caucus to help do the offset of all the paperwork and administration we have to do on your behalf.

MR. TAYLOR: We've already had an 18 percent surcharge put on by Mr. Kowalski and Mr. Bogle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't get that. Okay. Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, as the chiefs of staff of our various caucuses will be meeting with administration on the matter in any event, could I suggest that the agenda be developed in such a way so that if there is information that can be passed on to our respective chiefs of staff about ways that we can assist the administration, then I think this is the way to do it. I would hope that we could regularize discussions between various officials who work for or report to you, Mr. Chairman, and the chiefs of staff of all the parties who are working and trying to assist their respective members. Hopefully we can assist. I appreciate what you're saying, and the very essence of one of the motions put forward today was to help streamline the process. I am sure there are many things that can be looked at and considered, and we would like to know so that we can be of assistance.

MR. McDOUGALL: Just in conclusion, I know that six weeks is a very brief period of time to reach general conclusions, but there's no doubt in my mind that at the present time that area is understaffed and that we will have to take some appropriate action in the future to strengthen the unit. As I say, that's a general observation at this time, but in my experience with other organizations, the amount of overtime that they're having to work to keep up with the orders that are coming in and so on and the number of wage people they have to bring on to complete the work -- you know, we've got a problem.

MR. BOGLE: Mind you, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that once we've passed April 1 and we're into a new fiscal year and legislators are busy in the House and spending less time in their offices, that's going to change as well.

MR. McDOUGALL: It could be.

MRS. MIROSH: You'll have nothing to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should be so lucky.

MR. McDOUGALL: Well, I've got two jobs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's right. Remember, he's got two jobs.

MS BARRETT: Well, I'd like to comment on what Bob had been saying with respect to the chiefs of staff getting together with Parliamentary Counsel and the direction that goes to them. I certainly have no objections to working in a consensus-oriented way to help streamline the process, but I would want the proviso attached and understood that that co-operation keep in mind the needs of the various caucuses and the constituency offices; in other words, so that we're not making compromises to the detriment of our ability to function. I'll try not to make potshots about our cuts in budget, but it's pretty bejrabers awful as it is, and if we had to face more administrative work on our side in order to alleviate it on their side, we'd go through the roof. As it is, we're working way more hours already, and I wouldn't want to see that done at the expense of -- and I'm positive that it wasn't your intent, but I wanted to clarify so that the directions went out in one voice. Am I right? Was I right?

MR. BOGLE: Well, I don't know why you would think anything else. I'm a little bit surprised that you'd even think of reading that kind of innuendo into it. It was meant to be helpful, certainly not to be that . . .

MS BARRETT: No, it wasn't innuendo. I wanted it to be really clear that we don't have to . . . In other words, here is an example, if I might, for 30 seconds. The person who runs the Highlands constituency office has a real need to be paid on a twice-monthly basis. Because of the formula that we currently use, that means it has to be actually processed twice by the department under Blake's administration, and I would hope that we would be able to keep into account that sort of technicality. That's what I'm getting at.

MR. BOGLE: That's the human aspect.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: No question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

I have one last thing on the agenda: travel, the Members' Services Committee order.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the redraft of Members' Services Order 3/87, and I think it's right. I've read it. Others have read it. I believe it's made the appropriate changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So everyone now has a copy of this one? And we believe this now incorporates what was the will of the committee.

MR. BOGLE: Could we just look at it for a moment and move on to the other agenda item and then come back to this, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, or we can pause at this one if you want.

MR. BOGLE: Just pause for a moment.

MR. HYLAND: Okay, we're ready.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And it's still known as Members' Services Committee Order 3/87?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. I thought we could use the same number because we rejected . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the second page date would be changed to March 3. All right. You've all got that? Page 2 now changed. And in the interim period people were paid according to what the old formula was until this one comes into effect today. That's the way it goes — more paperwork; sorry.

MS BARRETT: Oh, a question on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we can't make this retroactive.

MS BARRETT: But you see, given that the other one, which was essentially the same, was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Drafted incorrectly.

MS BARRETT: Yes, but had been in effect until today, and given that we've replaced it with one today, is that necessarily true? I mean, it doesn't matter to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's an interesting point, because what we removed was just the matter of the production of receipts.

MR. HYLAND: We haven't changed the principle of the thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You have to still add in that the order is effective February 2.

MR. BOGLE: When we passed our original motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the order is effective February 2, and then this still would occur here: "Passed at Edmonton the 3rd day of March." All right?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

MS BARRETT: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Any other items of business?

MR. BOGLE: Date of the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Date of the next meeting.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that our next regular meeting take place on the first day following the end of the spring sitting of the Legislative Assembly; further, that the Speaker may call a special meeting of the committee during the session if necessary.

MR. STEVENS: First day following or first date?

MR. BOGLE: Yes. So what I'm saying is that our next regular meeting shall take place on the first day following the end of the spring sitting. So if our spring sitting ends on Thursday, we would meet on Friday. If we conclude on a Tuesday, we'd meet on a



Wednesday. If in the interim the Speaker is petitioned by members to hold an emergency meeting or he feels one needs to be held, he certainly has the prerogative to call a meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And if the House concluded on a Friday, we'd meet on the following Monday.

MR. BOGLE: I thought of that downside, that members would either have to stay over or come back, but it's a 20 percent chance, one day in five.

MS BARRETT: I actually don't agree in principle, with the exception of one thing, so I have to speak against it and possibly we can amend it. Given the earlier discussion about the Fleming report and the subsequent report which we would be dealing with and given the Speaker's indication that a Clerk of the Assembly, in his view, ought to be in place by summer, given that we don't know how long session is, and given the questions about the role of the Members' Services Committee in helping the process of establishing — or any of the legislative committees — who that Clerk might be, could I recommend that we actually allow, at the call of the Speaker, as a friendly amendment, to have one meeting at his convenience sometime after that second report is available, so that we can go through that and determine then if other meetings with us would be necessary?

MR. BOGLE: Pam, wouldn't the second part of the motion satisfy that? "The Speaker may call a special meeting"; i.e., to discuss the Fleming report?

MS BARRETT: Well, no. My amendment would be: will the Speaker call that meeting following his receipt of that report; in other words, with the request that that meeting take place; in other words, so that the request is in there.

MR. BOGLE: Well, all this motion does is establish when our next regular meeting should take place and authorize the Speaker to move in the interim if he so desires or if members of the committee petition him to. My difficulty is because we're going into a session, most of the workload of this committee is now behind us.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. BOGLE: We've gone through the budget; we've gone through various services for members; we're now putting on different hats.

MS BARRETT: Yes, I understand.

MR. BOGLE: We're going to become more political because we're in the Assembly. That's the last time this committee should be meeting, trying to deal in a nonpartisan way when we're all in a very partisan way.

MS BARRETT: But you see, the motion that we dealt with to table that discussion that Nick was trying to have us deal with — I think the intent was that we be able to resume sometime soon and go through that, go through the reports. He's obviously got some questions about what the status of this committee is and stuff like that. Well, I'm just trying to follow up on the intent of that motion.

MR. BOGLE: Pam, as you rightly pointed out during our discussion this morning, to follow the intent of the Fleming report requires a legislative change.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: And I doubt very much that this committee is going to entertain that kind of a recommendation and try to push it through this spring. We've run out of time. We don't have time to do that.

MS BARRETT: I don't disagree. Maybe I'm . . .

MR. BOGLE: I think the worst thing that could happen is when we're sitting in the Assembly, to have a committee meeting to deal with something that leads us down another path.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask a question then of you, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS BARRETT: Was it your intention to proceed with the appointing of a Clerk by July?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes; summertime, whenever that means. The previous appointment of a

Clerk was done by the Speaker, period.

MS BARRETT: That's right, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, you asked me a question. Let me finish, please.

It's been my understanding about the way that I work with this committee to be as mutually consultative as possible, and I don't intend to change that approach. With regard to when we would be developing the job descriptions for Clerk and Clerk Assistant, we've held off developing that until we get the final report in on the Ernst Whinney audit. Then I can see no problem with proceeding to do the public advertisement across the province and across Canada for those two positions and then narrowing it down; this is where it is in my mind at the moment. We would have the personnel administration office involved in that and doing some of the preliminary culling of the applicants. Then when we get it down to a shortlist, I would then see having perhaps the three or five on the shortlist come and sit in with this committee. Then I would invite you individually to submit to me your reactions to the three or five. On the basis of that, then I would proceed to make the appointment of a Clerk. The same thing with the Clerk Assistant. That's the process as I envision it.

MR. STEVENS: Far more than you're obligated to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Far more.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I thought that was something you'd said a long time ago, and that was why I was saying maybe we should meet again prior, but if that's still your intention, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And on the other point, I think the motion as stated allows me the room to be able to come back and do that, because I think in terms of the Fleming report and the Ernst Whinney report — the portions of it that will be made available — it's far better to have a special meeting in that regard so we can deal specifically with that. I think also there's a lot to be said that we hold that in camera, because it's got other kinds of ramifications in terms of individuals, I suppose, but we'll have to leave that as an open-ended question.

MR. STEVENS: You won't be able to come then.

MS BARRETT: I accidentally stayed through this current one too, Greg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The motion before us. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried.

Motion to adjourn? Cypress-Redcliff. All those in favour, please vacate your positions and run for the hills. Thank you all very much.

[The committee adjourned at 3:03 p.m.]