

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[9:05 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you there, Mrs. Embury?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes. Can you hear me now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's better. Is Mr. Pengelly there?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Dr. Reid?

DR. REID: Good morning, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great. Now we have present here in person Bill Purdy; the Clerk, Mr. Stefaniuk; Peggy Davidson from the Clerk's office; and an operator from Hansard. We have Alan Hyland, Mrs. Margaret Pratt, Mr. Glen Acorn, Mr. Douglas Blain, Mrs. Shirley Cripps, and I think I'm here too.

So if we could call the meeting to order. We sent notices to all members of the committee, including Dr. Buck and Mr. Martin. We've had no word from Dr. Buck, but a telephone message came from someone on the Official Opposition staff yesterday, saying that Mr. Martin would not be attending meetings at this time, regardless of his status. He wants to emphasize this is not a reflection on the Speaker but rather on the attitude of others of the committee, unquote.

DR. REID: Duly noted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now if we could go to the agenda, which I assume we all have before us, are there any comments or is there a motion with regard to the minutes of the meeting of June 13?

MR. PURDY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Purdy . . .

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, on page 61-83, the Chairman suggests that Mr. Kowalski's motion should perhaps show intent rather than (inaudible) and permit the draftsman to provide the proper training. I'm not sure that's the right word — proper meaning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. There's a possibility that "training" may be correct, because the discussion was in relation to constituency office secretaries, as I recall it, and the proposed authorization for funding their trips to Edmonton was discussed in connection with training for those secretaries.

MRS. CRIPPS: I thought it was familiarization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Another word.

MRS. CRIPPS: There's a distinct difference, though.

DR. REID: The difficulty I have is that the word "training" would have indicated that it was a school.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you settle for "familiarization"?

DR. REID: That's a better word.

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We still have the motion for approval. Are there any other suggestions or amendments?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then taking the motion for approval as including the amendment just agreed upon, are you all content?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The minutes of the meeting of June 13, 1983, are approved with that one amendment.

Most of the business arising out of the minutes — almost all of it, in fact — relates to the orders that we're going to be considering farther down on our agenda for this morning, so if the committee is content, suppose we go on to the next item.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, could I just raise a really small point. I'm not sure whether it's appropriate, but I guess this would be as good a place as any. I received four notices about this meeting, and I just wondered what was the problem in communication that it was felt that I should have the notice at my home and my two offices plus in my book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We just weren't taking any chances. That wasn't done through any oversight, and we thought we'd have to be particularly careful in the case of a meeting consisting of a telephone conference.

MRS. EMBURY: Well, you certainly did a good job. I just thought it's rather a shame. Obviously I haven't made it known that I'm in touch with my secretary in Edmonton every day.

DR. REID: Everybody is, Sheila.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm glad you brought it up.

MR. PURDY: The feds need the postal money anyway.

MRS. EMBURY: I think that's unnecessary duplication. It does cause a little bit of extra work for the staff there, and I think that's really unfair.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, I received two in the mail to the same address.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now that's a little different.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's routed by whatever addresses we had. One could have been sent on to him by the office secretary here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably one was forwarded, Nigel.

MR. PENGELLY: No, they were all from the Legislative Assembly office.

MR. STEFANIUK: Upstairs rather than the Legislative Assembly office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Margaret Pratt has heard what you said.

MR. PENGELLY: Okay.

MRS. PRATT: Duly noted.

MR. PENGELLY: It doesn't bother me too much if you want to do all that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can see what the preferences of the members are. Naturally when you're here in Edmonton when the House is sitting, we won't take such precautions, but in the summertime we thought it was justifiable.

May we go on then to item 4? There are no visitors.

Item 5, the constituency services order. You all have copies of the draft prepared by Mr. Acorn in consultation with Mr. Clegg. Are there any comments on the draft? It's under item 5(a) of your supporting material.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I've got one or two on this one that I should maybe mention, seeing that Glen is at the meeting. On 3(a), rental of office space including furnishings, it does say in the preamble of 3 that the constituency office allowance may be used, but I was wondering on the furnishings. Normally they are provided out of the Government Services pool of spare furniture and desks, et cetera, that are around the total organization of government. I would like to make sure that that "may" means that this is permissive only, so that we don't start getting charged by Government Services for all the furnishing of the various constituency offices.

MR. HYLAND: Wasn't that the problem when we changed the Act before? We had a "may" or "shall" in there, and it tightened it up more than loosened it.

DR. REID: Yes. Previously we attempted to loosen things and it ended up being interpreted as tightening it. I was just hoping that we weren't going to do the same thing again here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I call on the Clerk, followed by Mr. Acorn.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, our interpretation of that clause is that it is permissive. In our estimation it is necessary simply because at one time, through their surplus stocks, Government Services was able to furnish all offices. There came a time, particularly in the southern part of the province, when the stocks were depleted, and we were forced into a position where we had to buy furniture out of the funding that was available. In those circumstances we would have to resort to the allowances to finance the cost of such furnishings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would Mr. Acorn like to add something?

MR. ACORN: First, clause (a) of subsection (3) is in exactly the same form as it was

previously in 54(2) of the old Act. It's true that the subsection says "may be used to pay for", which means that it's permissive. But keep in mind that the list in subsection (3) is an exhaustive list, so that you can't use the constituency office allowance for something else besides what is shown there.

But I think we're missing the point, and I think this is your point, Ian. When will particular furnishings be charged to the vote, and when will they be charged to the constituency allowance? Is that your problem?

DR. REID: Exactly.

MR. ACORN: And this doesn't tell you that.

DR. REID: The concern I have is that if the Government Services pool has run out, then in the first year of any new constituency office there could be a fairly large percentage of the constituency office allowance that has to go into buying the furniture and a given member might find himself short of funds in the constituency office allowance and not have enough in the other two to make it up.

MR. ACORN: Perhaps I could get some clarification from the chairman or someone here. Are these constituency offices furnished from the government stocks of office furniture — desks, chairs?

MR. STEFANIUK: Normally they are. This permissive clause would also allow for such items as are not available from government stocks and may be desired by the member.

MR. ACORN: So that the normal practice would be to get a desk or a chair from the government supplies . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Precisely.

MR. ACORN: . . . and then charge it against the constituency office allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: No. We do not pay government; government lets us have it gratis.

MR. ACORN: Ah. Then I wonder what this was intended . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: It's to provide for those two contingencies, Glen: one, if furniture stocks run out; two, the eventuality that the member desires an item of furnishing that is not available from government stock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would seem to me, too, that there's an implied safeguard here, because no expense of this kind, no purchase of this kind, would be made without the member's request and approval, and he would know at that time whether it was coming out of his constituency allowance. As I see it, there is no danger whatever that a member would ask for furniture, assuming it to come from government stocks, and then find out that it was charged to his constituency allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: There's one more consideration, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, while it supplies us with and does not charge us for the furniture, does charge back to the Legislative Assembly the cost of locating furniture in a given constituency office. The principal stocks are held in Edmonton and Calgary. However, when we're dealing with rural constituencies, we must pick up the cost of trucking that furniture to the given constituency.

MR. ACORN: But you wouldn't charge that moving cost back to the constituency allowance, would you?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes we would.

MR. ACORN: Okay. Well, then, the section doesn't really reflect the practice in that sense.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's a permissive clause as I see it, Glen.

MR. ACORN: Yes it is, but . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: It doesn't state a requirement that the total cost of the furnishing be charged to this allowance.

MR. ACORN: That's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Might I just ask the Clerk whether, in the absence of this flexible provision, there could be dilemmas arising or difficulties?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes there could.

DR. REID: I guess we'll have to leave it in, Gerry. But I think we've made enough comments, and they'll be on the record, to indicate that we have a concern here. Of course my interpretation — perhaps Glen or Bohdan can verify this — is that as well as passing these orders, the committee has the power at any time to amend them.

MR. ACORN: Oh yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quite. Alan Hyland has a comment.

MR. HYLAND: Glen, you said that came from the latest changes to the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. ACORN: That reflects exactly what the . . .

MR. HYLAND: So that would have reflected the change subsequent to the one change that was made to tighten it up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Acorn was just going to tie this in with the Act.

MR. ACORN: I was looking at the old Act, Mr. Chairman, and what you see there in subsection (3)(a) is identical to what was in section 54(2)(a) of the old Act. I had thought, as I think Alan may have thought, that that was the subject of a fairly recent amendment, that this had been tinkered with in 1981.

MR. HYLAND: Just for clarification, is this from the old Act?

MR. ACORN: Well, I'm just saying the same wording is repeated in this draft order. So if we have a problem today, we've had it for at least the last two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we haven't. Is there any other discussion of the point raised by Dr. Reid? Are there any other points that anyone wishes to raise concerning the constituency services order?

MR. PURDY: I have one, Mr. Chairman, and that's on page 4, the promotional allowance. I apologize for not flagging this one earlier, but I feel that the \$2,100 written in — and I believe it's written into the new Act — is unfair in some respects when I look at the number of people I represent in my constituency of 26,000 voters, and maybe in Alan Hyland's constituency, where he has 8,000 to 9,000 voters. I think that in the future we should look at that \$2,100 figure and come up with a new formula, something like the communication allowance, so that members have a better, equal distribution of materials.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, hopefully after redistribution, whenever it happens, that'll correct part of Bill Purdy's problem.

There's another part about that particular section. The last word is "constituents", and I have a particular problem in that I often represent the government or the Legislature with out-of-province groups at Jasper Park Lodge. My interpretation of that promotional allowance, subsection (2), is that I wouldn't be able to give any of these things to people who were not my constituents. I suppose that's looking at it in a very narrow sense.

MR. ACORN: In a previous draft, it said "the member's constituents and others". I'm not sure when I got the instruction to take out the words "and others", but I have a notion that happened since the last meeting of this committee. But it can readily go back in.

MR. PURDY: I think it should go back in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not aware of the — not from me, eh?

MR. ACORN: I'd have to check my file, but I definitely got instructions to remove the words "and others".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did it come out of the discussion at the last meeting?

MR. ACORN: I'd have to check the file.

MRS. CRIPPS: Not of Members' Services.

MR. HYLAND: I think we'd better put that back in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to move an amendment, Dr. Reid?

DR. REID: I would like to put the words "and others" after the word "constituents", just to make sure that none of us is transgressing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the risk of being overly semantic, would you also consider changing "to" to "for": as "tokens for the member's constituents and others"?

DR. REID: Yes, I agree.

MR. ACORN: The previous draft used to say "token gifts", and I had instructions to change "token gifts" to just "tokens".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I recall the discussion on that, that that was a slightly grand word for some of these things.

Are there any other comments concerning the constituency services order?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of semantics, on page 1, (3)(c), I'm not sure that all of the members who have constituency offices refer to the person as a constituency office secretary. I wonder if we should have the word "staff" there rather than "secretary". I've a feeling that John Gogo calls his his assistant. I'm not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, suppose we said "a constituency office staff person"?

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. ACORN: Staff member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would mean that there might be several on the staff, wouldn't it? There might be only one. If we say "staff person", it doesn't matter how many you've got there.

MR. ACORN: That's two words?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know it smacks of women's lib.

MRS. CRIPPS: Did we discuss (d)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not today.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't remember ever discussing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it agreed then that in 1(3)(c), "secretary" be replaced by "staff person"?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just pick up on what I believe Bill Purdy said regarding the formula for the promotional allowance. If it's all right with the committee, I'd like to see this issue possibly not die but in the future, at our convenience, if we could just have a discussion on it to see if there are some inequities in that system.

MR. HYLAND: Just a question, maybe to Glen. We've shown the formula and the amount of these communication allowances, and the same with the constituency office, et cetera. Every year then, when we change that amount, we have to amend this order.

MR. ACORN: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: Is there any way to do it without the amount, and have it set by a motion of the committee? Or does that create a problem?

MR. ACORN: It creates a problem, because whatever you do you have to have something. It's called an order in section 45 of the Act, and I don't think you could have a sort of subsidiary document just called a motion and say it was no part of the order. You would have to table that in any event, so it would be easier and cleaner to simply have a formal amendment of the order, when the time comes.

Now keep this in mind: even if the committee wanted to consider a re-enactment, or whatever, of section 3(1) so as to change the \$2,100 to a formula, after the fashion of

the communication allowance, if you make that change within the current fiscal year it's still possible to make that change retroactive to the beginning of this fiscal year. Otherwise, if you do it in the middle of a fiscal year, it could be a little awkward. But just keep in mind that you could change the formula and back date it to April 1, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheila, suppose we put this down for the agenda for the next meeting, and in the meantime the Clerk and I will try to work out some alternatives insofar as a formula is concerned.

MRS. EMBURY: That would be acceptable. I'm not sure I'd even have to see attention that soon. But if that's what you'd like to do, I'd support that if the others will.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have in mind what Mr. Acorn says about our doing it reasonably soon so that it can be back dated, have retroactive effect from April 1 this year.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments concerning the constituency services order draft?

MR. HYLAND: Marg just brought one up: No. (4), on page 2. Are typewriters mentioned elsewhere? It doesn't seem to be in that one. Telephone answering service, dictation equipment, and photocopying.

MR. STEFANIUK: Typewriters are supplied, Mr. Chairman, out of a separate vote.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. That's not in.

MR. ACORN: They're not charged to the allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: No they're not.

MR. ACORN: Then they shouldn't be there.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think this is my last one. There was a discussion at the last meeting — I think it was initiated by Ken Kowalski from Barrhead — about cameras and photographic processing and stuff. I think we decided not to provide cameras, but did we not decide — and I think it's in relation really to page 3, (a), (b), (c), (d) — that the purchasing of photographic film and its processing would be permitted under this order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could ask Mr. Acorn whether the present text covers that.

MR. ACORN: I think I was in error before, because what subsection (4) is talking about are the things that can be supplied to the office without being charged against the allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: Are you talking about equipment?

MR. ACORN: I'm back on page 2, subsection (4). Somebody was raising the business about the typewriter.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Just so that we don't have confusion, we're just temporarily off the photographic item and we're back on typewriters.

MR. ACORN: Is the photographic equipment tied in with some form?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. That's under section (2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we go back to page 3, sub (2).

DR. REID: I remember the discussion we had with Ken Kowalski. I think we decided that cameras were a bit too much, but there was some discussion subsequent to that, that supplies for taking photographs . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we now have in sub (2) the following: a member's communication allowance for a fiscal year may be used to pay the expenses in that fiscal year related generally to the communication between the member and his constituents. It would seem to me that if he used photography for that, sending them out pictures or putting them in newspapers, that's covered. And the list that follows is not exhaustive, because the opening statement says: and without limiting the generality of the foregoing . . . Then we go into some of the example specifics.

DR. REID: Okay. As long as people are happy, then the first line covers it. It was just that it was something we discussed at some length.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments concerning the grant of the constituency services order?

MR. ACORN: Could I just get clarification. Is this matter of the typewriters still a problem?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. ACORN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, you and I spoke on the phone yesterday about a drafting touch on page 3, section 2(2), in the second line. We agreed that we should have the words "respect of" in there so that it reads "to pay the expenses in respect of that fiscal year . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. ACORN: . . . just so there's no confusion over whether the expense had to be actually incurred then or paid then. If the expenses are chargeable to that fiscal year, then that's fine. So this will make the wording consistent with other phraseology earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, the word "that" is being replaced by the words "respect of"?

MR. ACORN: No, it's "in respect of that fiscal year".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, right.

MR. ACORN: So the words "respect of" are inserted after the word "in".

MR. CHAIRMAN: And before the word "that". Okay. Are you content with that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other suggestions concerning this draft order in regard to constituency services?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. STEFANIUK: Could we have a motion to record that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Acorn has noted all of the amendments, and Mr. Hyland has just moved that the order be made with those amendments. Are you content?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill? Did we hear from Mr. Pengelly?

MR. PENGELLY: Agreed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mrs. Embury?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes, I said agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everyone here is agreed as well. So that motion is carried and the constituency services order, which I guess will become Order No. 1, is in effect as of April 1, 1983.

May we now go — incidentally, I should interrupt here with something that I might have mentioned a moment ago. There are some costs necessarily arising out of these orders. We can't do the things we've said we're going to do in these orders without money, and the last item you'll notice, (d), is a request for a special warrant. I assume that you've looked at that and considered the amount of it. It's the better part of half a million dollars, and I think we should all be aware in passing these orders that that request for a special warrant must necessarily follow.

Shall we go on then to item 5(b) of the agenda, the members' group plans order. Are there any comments concerning that order?

DR. REID: I have none on that, Gerry, and I'm going to have to leave the phone for a few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you be long, Ian?

DR. REID: Just a couple of minutes.

MRS. EMBURY: I don't have any concerns on the members' group plans order, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about you, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: I have no concerns either, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about anyone here in the room? Alan Hyland.

MR. HYLAND: On the group life insurance, are we insured the same as senior management or deputy ministers, or are we insured at the rate of an average civil servant?

MR. ACORN: (C) on the bottom of the first page is not life insurance per se. The MLAs are not tied in with the same group life plan as cabinet ministers. Why that is that way I don't know, but it is. This group plan for accidental death and dismemberment is a general plan that I think covers all civil servants, cabinet ministers, and MLAs, but it's not the same thing as the term insurance that the cabinet ministers get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think this is the Len Werry idea. Len Werry, as you may know, lost his life in a highway accident near Edson while he was serving as a minister.

I assume that if we're going to request the kind of life insurance coverage Alan Hyland may have in mind, we'd have to work out some costs, see whether it was feasible and whether we could get approval, and then bring it back to the committee. I assume that would result in an amendment to this order once it's passed.

MR. HYLAND: I thought we had it.

MR. PURDY: I think the reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that they consider the cabinet full-time and the MLAs part-time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know there are some MLAs who would disagree.

MR. PURDY: Well, I don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Assuming there are no comments on the draft of the members' group plans order, may I have a motion that the order be made in the form in which it now stands?

MR. PURDY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Purdy. Mr. Pengelly?

MR. PENGELLY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Reid, are you back? No. Mrs. Embury?

MRS. EMBURY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And how about around the table?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

MR. STEFANIUK: And that becomes Members' Services Committee Order No. 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. May we go on to the transportation and administrative order, item 5(c) of your agenda.

MR. ACORN: We haven't heard from Michael Clegg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just found that I was remiss in not bringing Michael Clegg's . . .

MR. ACORN: He's not on the line, I take it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, he isn't. Michael Clegg isn't on the line. It was going to be

complicated and costly, so I had two discussions with him yesterday. I got two comments from him, one of which I mentioned when we were discussing the constituency services order, where he thought of the possibility of including the words "out of money appropriated to that purpose by the Legislature" in section 1(5). I think we dealt with that. He has two suggestions.

MR. ACORN: We didn't make an amendment to the section. We didn't discuss any amendment to the section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. ACORN: I would have thought, with respect, that that was gilding the lily. Of necessity, the money comes from the supply vote, and you wouldn't have to state that there. It can't come from any other source.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So we'll leave our approval of that order undisturbed.

Now, going back to the transportation and administrative services order, Mr. Clegg's comments were firstly in regard to 1(1)(b)(iii). He suggested the inclusion, in regard to the authorizations for chartered aircraft service, of a modifying expression "with reasonable convenience". In other words, the member would be required to use a scheduled air line service where it could be used with reasonable convenience. He considered the possibility that if the scheduled air service caused a near impossibility for a member, it was totally inconvenient, the member might still be justified in taking a chartered aircraft instead of a scheduled one.

If you'll look at 1(1)(b)(iii), I think Mr. Clegg's comments will relate to the context.

MR. STEFANIUK: You would, in other words, add the words "without reasonable convenience".

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, "with".

MR. ACORN: I think what he wants is: if the trip could have been made with reasonable convenience on that day by way of regularly scheduled air service. Am I correct, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's the understanding. So it would then read: the use of the service for a trip on any day, either to or from the destination referred to in subclause (2), shall not be allowed if with reasonable convenience the trip could have been made on that day by way of a regularly scheduled air service.

Is there any comment on that proposal by Mr. Clegg?

MR. ACORN: Is that where he suggested the insertion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, he didn't. You might find a better place.

MR. ACORN: I had suggested after the word "made".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On the computer screens, we've just changed it to after the word "made". Are you content with that suggestion?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The second proposal Mr. Clegg made relates to 1(1)(d), near the bottom of page 2. In order to get around what he perceives to be an unnecessary

restriction, he suggests the removal of the words at the end, "by way of a separate business line", because he thinks there could be situations where a member might use a line that was already there.

MR. PURDY: You'll have to run that by me again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you see the words that are suggested be struck out: "by way of a separate business line"? He thinks those may be unduly restrictive.

MR. STEFANIUK: Some members may not wish to have a separate line but may simply wish to use their existing line. Is that what's being said?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Have you any comment on that, Shirley?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, probably. It may already be a separate business line.

MR. HYLAND: In your case, you want to put another line in for yourself.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, I have my own phone.

MR. HYLAND: This wouldn't allow you to do that.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the recommendation by Mr. Clegg, because there's no way I'll have another phone in my house. It's hard enough to answer one phone, without two. Yet it would be used as much for my MLA work. I do think that would make it less restrictive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments concerning that proposal?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'm back. Was this not with reference to having the possibility in the member's home, if they wished, of having a telephone, that they would not have to use the credit card for a long-distance call but would be able to do DDD?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. But with those words there, Mr. Clegg perceives some restriction on that. It seems to me that the words are restrictive, and if we take them away there's more flexibility.

DR. REID: Oh, I see the problem. In that instance, yes, I'm in agreement with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So is it agreed that we adopt Mr. Clegg's recommendation?

MR. HYLAND: So it would then say "a separate line".

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the clause would just stop after "residence". Are you content?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments or amendments you'd like to propose to the transportation and administrative services order draft?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, one small concern has to do with 1(1)(c), and I think it's covered. The vehicles supplied to you, Grant Notley, and Frank Appleby — I believe it says somewhere "in accordance with the terms of provision of vehicles to ministers of the Crown", or something like that. Does that mean that this sub (c) would prevent the

three of you having these things provided? It says "if they relate to the operation of a Member's privately owned or leased". That pretty well excludes those three government vehicles. I can only think of the three: yours, Frank's, and Grant's.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would seem to me that it does, and the Clerk is of that opinion. What do you think, Glen?

MR. ACORN: Yes, it does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blain and Mr. Acorn agree.

MR. BLAIN: A vehicle provided to you is not privately leased.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. Those vehicles you referred to, Ian, are not privately leased.

MRS. CRIPPS: On (2)(c), I'd like to see alignments included, because anybody who does a lot of driving on rough roads traditionally has to have a number of alignments. I've had three in the last two months.

MR. HYLAND: You have to stay out of the ditches, Shirley.

MR. BLAIN: Doesn't "including labor" cover that?

MRS. CRIPPS: Would "labor" cover that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I think labor only in relation to the named items is covered there.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think Shirley is getting into the other thing we still have to look at, the other discrepancies in transportation costs. What she's talking about, to do with wheel alignments, is getting on to maintenance and repairs. I think that there we're getting into some other problems. Perhaps we should discuss them another time.

MRS. CRIPPS: You don't think that an alignment comes in with servicing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Most or perhaps all of the items that are there now relate to materials that are provided for the operation of the motor vehicle.

MRS. CRIPPS: And labor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but labor related to those materials.

MR. HYLAND: Labor related to oil changes, et cetera.

DR. REID: That's right. I think that was put in in reference to oil changes, actually, to make sure that the labor putting the oil in was included. When we get on to things like wheel alignments, we're talking about other repair type items and the cost of operating. I think we should have a good discussion sometime, perhaps at the next meeting or the one subsequent to that in the fall, about the total difficulties experienced by some members in relation to transportation costs.

MRS. CRIPPS: I guess my problem is that I don't see an alignment as a repair. I see it as a service job, the same as changing oil.

MR. HYLAND: But if you follow that through, then you can almost class tires the same way.

MRS. CRIPPS: No I don't, because tires are a purchased item, but the alignment is a service to keep the . . .

MR. PURDY: I disagree with you, Shirley, because you can start looking at tune-ups and things like that, then. Alignment is wear and tear on the automobile, the same as a tune-up is, putting new plugs and points in. We get \$600 a month allowance now for part of that expense, and I don't think we should be . . . We should have the discussion at a future date, like Ian said, but I don't think today is the time for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the members of the committee be in favor of our placing this on the agenda for the next meeting? If we don't reach it, it can go over to the following one, as Dr. Reid suggested. In the meantime, it seems to me that it would be appropriate, perhaps, if Shirley and some of the other members who are affected in this way by driving over bad roads, and so on, might come up with a proposal. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, if you're all content on that point, are there any other points with regard to the draft of the transportation and administrative services order?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, one more — maybe it's a typo. On page 3, 1(2)(a), the provision of credit cards: should there not be one to cover the item we were just discussing? Should it not read "the things referred to in subsection (1)(a), (b), (c), and (e)"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is it agreed?

MR. ACORN: I think that's just an omission, just a boob.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is general agreement here. Are you who are listening in all agreed that we change the last part of sub (2) on page 3 to read "referred to in subsection (1)(a), (b), (c), and (e)"?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments regarding this draft? Might I then have a motion saying that this order is made with the amendments that have been agreed upon just now.

DR. REID: I'll move it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Dr. Reid. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. The order is made.

MR. ACORN: Could I just ask a question? I'm going to withdraw, unless you have something else you want me to stay for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not aware of anything offhand. We're going to be discussing a

couple of other draft orders.

MR. ACORN: I haven't had any involvement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right, and it may be that the committee may agree with them in principle and ask you to draft them. We'll see when we come to that. You don't need to be here for that, though.

MR. ACORN: Okay, sure. I just want to clarify something. I had thought that at your previous meeting you had made MSC Order No. 1/83. Now, was that on the mileage allowance, or the kilometrage allowance, the 18 cents, or whatever it was? Do you have a formal order on that? I'm sure you do.

MR. PURDY: It was just a motion.

MR. BLAIN: I'll get the book.

MR. ACORN: I just want to make sure these numbers are correct, because I'm going to get these three orders back in your office this afternoon — maybe this morning — for signature. When are you leaving your office?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not before some time around noon.

MR. ACORN: Okay. I will try to get these back to you by messenger, so that you can sign them. They will be dated today. I just need the right numbers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about this motion? Can that properly be called a motion, or is it an order made under authorization given to us by Bill 67?

MR. ACORN: This is an order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These three are orders; no question. But you raised the question as to whether the resolution on kilometrage — for want of a better word — is to be classed as an order, perhaps Order No. 1.

MR. ACORN: If it's not numbered that way, fine. I just wanted to make absolutely sure there was no error. That one would have been made under section . . . Excuse me, I'll find it.

MR. HYLAND: Don't get kilometres tied up with weights. You saw what happened to that brand new \$40 million airplane that didn't have fuel gauges.

MR. PURDY: That was a motion I made.

MR. ACORN: But it was a formal order. It's one that is made by the Speaker — ah, so it wouldn't be an order. It's made by the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right, so we don't include it.

MR. ACORN: Okay.

MR. BLAIN: We have made two orders: one, Members' Services Committee Order No. 1/83, employment contracts order; the other is Speaker's Order No. 1/83.



MR. ACORN: So there's a separate sequence.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. ACORN: So the three we dealt with this afternoon are two, three, and four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is everyone content with that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to ask Mr. Acorn anything before he takes his leave?

MR. ACORN: Ask him when he's going on vacation. Tomorrow.

MR. HYLAND: That's why he wants to get it back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Shall we go on, then, to item 5(d) on the agenda, the request for special warrant. There's one little note of explanation — oh, I didn't thank Mr. Acorn before he left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He's still here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, there he is. I'd like to thank Mr. Acorn on behalf of all of us for his assistance.

Now, going to the memo of Charlene Blaney dated July 4, which is . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Did we not have to do the last one?

AN HON. MEMBER: That's what we're doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is 5(d), the special warrant. It's described on three lines; perhaps that's what put you off. You see, these three lines all deal with (d).

If I might just make an explanatory note. In item 3 of Charlene Blaney's memo, there is reference to sessional indemnity. That should be subsistence allowance. And the reason for the \$25, of course, is that \$50 of it is already in the budget.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I only have one question about this tentative estimate of special warrant. It's on item 4. There it lists the same 61 MLAs as the 61 MLAs for the increased subsistence allowance during the sitting. I'm not really sure in my own mind that I had envisioned the members of Executive Council and the Leader of the Official Opposition, who are essentially paid as full-time people, getting those additional per diem subsistence allowances. One has to presume that they are involved with Legislature/government business all the time, because they are paid as full-timers.

MR. PURDY: Ian's right on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It sounds right.

MR. HYLAND: I don't think so. I don't think that's the way we worded it, though. Even if that was the intent, I don't think the wording was that way.

MR. STEFANIUK: The difference in numbers between 61 and 79 is very simply those members who represent Edmonton and immediately adjacent constituencies. But there is

nothing to compel a minister of the Crown to be resident in Edmonton, and he could well be travelling to Edmonton on business relating exclusively to the needs of his constituents. In those circumstances, this subsistence allowance might well be payable to him.

MR. BLAIN: Certainly the other subsistence allowance is.

MR. STEFANIUK: The other subsistence allowance is payable to him, the one which applies to his being here for purposes of attending the session. This is an extension of that allowance, to enable him to make trips totalling 24 additional days in Edmonton for purposes of taking up business concerning his constituents.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing the point Bohdan is making. What I'm saying is that during the discussions we had in the Members' Services Committee and subsequently at the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and during the passage of the new Legislative Assembly Act, I'm not at all sure that our concept was that those people who were essentially involved full-time with the Legislature or the government — that would be you as Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition, the ministers, the members of Executive Council. Because of their occupations, those people are usually in Edmonton more or less the year round. I know we pay them the sessional subsistence allowance, and that's to try to help with the living expenses and the fact that many of them do retain double residences. I think there are only two or three of the ministers from outside the immediate Edmonton area who do not retain a residence in their home constituency. I think Dick Johnston is one and Greg Stevens is the other. The others are all retaining residences in Calgary, Peace River, Smoky River, or wherever it might be.

What I'm wondering is what the other members of the committee thought of the discussions we were having, because I didn't envision these 24 extra days covering people who are paid as members of Executive Council or at the equivalent income.

MRS. CRIPPS: I agree with Dr. Reid's assessment of the discussion we had.

MR. HYLAND: I'm just wondering, though, Mr. Chairman, was that in the orders we just passed, or is that in the Act? And how does it read? Because it's more than just a motion here.

MR. STEFANIUK: The question of the 24 additional days is still an item to be decided upon. It appears as item 8(a) on the agenda. What we have done here, for the purposes of estimating the extra moneys which would be required, is to group everything and provide one total. But that particular program is still subject to approval by this committee.

MR. PURDY: But if you look at section 41 of the Act, it says:

Subject to subsections (2) and (3), where it is reasonably necessary for a Member to live in a temporary residence in or near Edmonton for the purpose of carrying out his duties as a Member, the Member may claim and be paid an allowance . . . of \$75 a day for . . .

And then if you look down at subsection (3) of 41,

A Member is not entitled to receive payments under subsection (1)(b) in respect of more than 24 days in any year.

So what Charlene has done is take it as section 41 is written.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's in the Act.

MR. PURDY: She's quite correct in doing that.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, seeing that I brought up this red herring and it's in the Act, I suppose we just accept that it can be charged by any member who is not a resident of Edmonton and the immediate surroundings. That includes members of Executive Council, the Leader of the Official Opposition and, if you as Speaker didn't live in the Edmonton area, it would include you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It might not, because of the suite upstairs.

DR. REID: I suppose we had better make Mr. Notley and members of Executive Council aware of this.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, one basic point occurs in this. This is the Members' Services Committee, and what this committee does, it does for all members. No minister would be a minister if he wasn't a member.

DR. REID: That's the point I was picking up on, Doug. In the Act, it says: their duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. That includes all 79 people, unless they live in the immediate area of Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't suppose the authorization will allow for double billing, anyway. That's not meant to be — I meant duplication.

DR. REID: On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I'm content to let this estimate ride at the moment, depending on what else we might add to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that if we do let it ride, it will still allow us to work it out in a practical way with the members of Executive Council.

DR. REID: And Grant Notley, because he's the other one. In the legislation, we have now essentially tied the salaries and benefits of the Speaker of the Assembly and of the Leader of the Official Opposition to that of a member of Executive Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments with regard to this calculation of Charlene's?

MR. PURDY: Yes there are, Mr. Chairman. I don't think she's taken into consideration the extra \$25 per committee meeting. There are the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, this committee, Legislative Offices: all of these. I think she has to take those into consideration.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that funding would come out of the committee budget. At the moment our committee budgets are completely shattered, in light of what's going on with committees, with the special committees that have been formed. Mr. Blain is discussing budgeting with the chairmen of those committees, and he will subsequently come up with a revised estimate for committee requirements.

MR. PURDY: That's fine, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments concerning this memorandum of July 4 by Miss Blaney?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been moved by Mrs. Cripps that we make this request for a special warrant. Is there any further discussion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That motion is carried.

Now, could we go to the next item, item 6. We have an anomaly in regard to the Clerk and the Law Clerk or Parliamentary Counsel, in that the Clerk, who is a deputy minister, is the only deputy minister, as far as I know, who is on the classification grid, and the Law Clerk is not.

If you've had a chance to look at your supporting material, I think you'll see some of the reason for bringing up these two items.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I had a good look at this last night, and there appear to be two concurrent anomalies. First of all, Mr. Stefaniuk is on the grid; secondly, Mr. Clegg is not on the grid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's true.

DR. REID: Now, I note that Mr. Clegg was taken off the grid by another standing committee of the Legislature. Not having my copy of the Legislative Assembly Act and everything else here, nor my statutes of Alberta, I'm not exactly sure just how the new Legislative Assembly Act . . . In the drafting process between the white paper and the final thing, I know we took some things back to the Members' Services Committee that had been tentatively put over to the Committee on Legislative Offices.

This is a pretty complex thing here. We're not just talking classifications; we're talking salary levels. Having read very carefully through the material Bohdan produced, I'd like some more time to look at this and see what implications it may have before we (inaudible) because once we do it, it's going to be awfully difficult to undo again.

MR. STEFANIUK: May I comment? Mr. Chairman, I draw the members' attention to copies of two letters which appear under item 6(b) and are signed by the chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices. One of those letters contains a statement relative to having fixed the salary of the Law Clerk effective April 1, 1983. The second letter quotes a resolution which in effect says, we no longer wish to hold jurisdiction over the position of the Law Clerk of the Assembly, and give that back to the Committee on Members' Services. In effect, then, we have the Law Clerk in something of a limbo, because he is not classified pursuant to the Public Service Act and he is no longer under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Legislative Offices.

It seems to me, then, in respect of that particular position, that we really have little if any choice but to immediately classify that officer of the Assembly pursuant to the public service grid. The suggestion has been made to classify him in a position which parallels some lawyers in the public service of Alberta, particularly in the Department of the Attorney General.

DR. REID: I presumed that was the classification area you'd been looking at. The difficulty I have is that I'm not sure, when we amended the proposed Bill, just how much we took back to Members' Services that in the draft Bill had been put as a responsibility of the Committee on Legislative Offices.

MR. STEFANIUK: That particular position had never been formally assigned to the Committee on Legislative Offices. It fell there almost by accident, and that committee

dealt with it.

MR. PURDY: Could I comment on that? As a member of the Legislative Offices Committee, we dealt with it. Then we had to rescind the motion the next day, because we had thought that the Law Clerk was under our jurisdiction but on advice from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, we found that it wasn't. That was the reason for bringing it back to this committee.

MR. HYLAND: Then your first motion on the 18th about his salary is null and void, too.

MR. PURDY: I think that's right, because we rescinded the motion the next day.

MR. STEFANIUK: I have nothing about the motion having been rescinded.

MR. HYLAND: Which motion was rescinded?

MR. PURDY: I wasn't at the meeting. Maybe Doug can tell you.

MR. BLAIN: No, the motion wasn't rescinded.

MR. PURDY: It wasn't, then?

MR. BLAIN: Not on his salary.

MR. PURDY: I stand corrected, then.

MR. BLAIN: His salary was established, and then a subsequent motion referred him back to the Legislative Assembly Office, because the terms of reference for the Legislative Offices Committee deal only with three offices: the Auditor General, the Chief Electoral Officer, and the Ombudsman.

DR. REID: And only those three salaries, not any other staff equivalent to Mike Clegg.

MR. BLAIN: That's correct, yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, we had this anomaly come into place as a result of having that committee consider the Law Clerk's salary. The Law Clerk, who is a subordinate of the Clerk of the House, should have his salary determined by that officer if we're going to parallel at all what is done in departments of government. An order in council and the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration determine the salary levels of deputy ministers, and those deputy ministers in turn determine the salaries for senior management within their jurisdiction or departments. What we are trying to do in this particular case is to bring about a parallel status with the officers and senior management of the Legislative Assembly.

In our estimation, in light of the decision made by the Committee on Legislative Offices, the classification of the Law Clerk is now an administrative matter. The salary has been established for 1983-84, and it's a question of simply classifying that officer. We have examined what classifications are applicable to other lawyers, professionals of public service, and feel this is an appropriate classification considering the duties and responsibilities on a year-round basis. We propose simply to move ahead through the normal administrative channels to provide this classification for the Law Clerk of the Assembly.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, if he doesn't come under the classification of that group,

is the raise they gave him and the wage it is set at actually legal?

MR. STEFANIUK: This salary level fits into the range of salaries applicable to the classification which we propose.

MR. HYLAND: So in order to get the salary legal, you have to get him into a classification to make sure.

MR. STEFANIUK: Right.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, a question to the Clerk, regarding the motion passed by the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices: has the Law Clerk now been paid for the month of June on the new increment?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right. That became effective, and the paperwork has been processed to pay him at the salary rate established by the Committee on Legislative Offices, back to April 1 of this year, which is the date at which the committee made the adjustment effective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ian, there's a history to this, which I wouldn't want to take the time of the meeting to give in too much detail. The problem arose originally because of the Law Clerk being underpaid in relation to more or less equivalent people in the Attorney General's Department. On November 14, 1980, the Members' Services Committee passed a resolution instructing the Speaker to take steps to classify the Law Clerk to Executive Officer II (Legal). We ran into some resistance or problems with the Treasurer. Eventually, with the concurrence of all the caucuses — I spoke to the government caucus and the opposition caucus, as well as the individual members of the opposition who weren't in the Social Credit caucus — it was agreed that the matter would go to the Committee on Legislative Offices. The Treasurer, who supported that move, decided to recognize what the committee did in relation to the salary.

It came before that committee on about three occasions, I think, after having been before the Members' Services Committee on about six. That committee declined to deal with the question of placing the Parliamentary Counsel in a category; instead, they dealt only with the question of salary.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think this is where we got into the problem, and that's why I said at the beginning that we have two anomalies running concurrently, one person who is in the grid and should be classified like any deputy minister according to those — I think there are seven classifications running up to Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should say that if these two changes are made, they will not result in any present changes in salary.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, what I was going to say is that the other one, the Law Clerk, is not in any classification at all on the grid.

I notice from the briefing material that was sent that the original suggestion was that the Law Clerk be classified as an Executive Officer II (Legal), and the suggestion is now being made, in the second paragraph on page 3, that the position be upgraded to an Executive Officer I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That recommendation was made on November 14, 1980. Perhaps I could get the Clerk to bring us up to date on that.

MR. STEFANIUK: There was some resistance to the classification at the Executive

Officer II level on the grounds that there was no subordinate staff to supervise, other than a secretary. Having regard for the objection raised in connection with that previous recommendation for classification, I looked at other lawyers in the public service and at their classifications, and recommended a classification one level lower, that being Executive Officer I, having regard at the same time for the fact that the salary, which was adjusted at April 1 of this year, fits into that classification grid.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I have to be excused.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Purdy wishes to be excused. Is there any other comment regarding this proposal?

DR. REID: I have no problem with the classification of the Law Clerk at Executive Officer I.

The other one that is down here — it says here that the Clerk is recommending that the Clerk Assistant be reclassified to Executive Officer I. Where is Mr. Blain at the moment? Is he in a state of limbo as well?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. Mr. Blain is classified pursuant to the public service classification grid at the classification Senior Officer II-C. However, in my estimation the Clerk Assistant occupies a position which parallels in government the position of assistant deputy minister, if in effect the Clerk is a deputy minister. Since for the most part assistant deputy ministers are classified at the executive officer level, and since in my estimation that position should parallel in classification the position of Law Clerk of the Assembly, I have recommended that he be reclassified to Executive Officer I. Again, there is no need to consider a salary adjustment at this time, having regard for adjustments which were already made effective June 1, 1983.

DR. REID: So what you're saying is that at the moment Mr. Blain's salary is sitting in the Executive Officer I range anyway, not in the other one.

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, it sits in both.

DR. REID: That overlap between one level and another.

MR. STEFANIUK: Both would be applicable, but I think this classification level would most certainly be more appropriate to the position.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have two questions. If the salaries have already been adjusted and Mr. Clegg's salary is in keeping with Appendix 3, as I understand it, and if there is going to be no change in the salary, why the urgency in making this change now, when a number of members are not actually present and when we haven't had much discussion on the whole situation?

MR. STEFANIUK: With regard to the Law Clerk, simply because at the moment he has absolutely no classification. He's in limbo.

MRS. CRIPPS: What difference does it make?

MR. HYLAND: It's questionable if he fits into the salary that has been given.

MR. STEFANIUK: Now that the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices has relinquished any responsibility in respect of the Law Clerk, the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration are in a position to come to the

Speaker as the minister responsible for the department, or to me as the deputy minister, and to question the authority under which we are paying the Law Clerk a salary at all.

DR. REID: That isn't so much a concern of mine, because I don't think they would do something quite so ridiculous, considering it is in a state of limbo subsequent to the motion passed by the Legislative Offices Committee until we get this snarl straightened out.

Mr. Chairman, we're getting into some things I didn't have a chance to consider before, because I was looking only at the documentation I received yesterday. I wonder if we shouldn't put this business aside and make it a major item of business at the next meeting of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on that?

MRS. EMBURY: I agree with Ian, thank you.

MR. PENGELLY: I agree with Ian. Yes, I would like to look at it further.

MR. HYLAND: Can I ask one question, then? If that causes some troubles, how do we get around the fact, other than a motion from this committee, that the status quo be maintained until we can get it sorted out? It does leave Bo and Michael in an awkward position. If we do it that way, if we consider it later, can we get by with having a motion, with copies sent to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and to the Provincial Treasurer, saying that because the problem was given to us with two weeks' notice from the other committee and we want to talk about it and look at it a little further, nothing should be done, they should remain at the status quo, and nothing should be tinkered with so we can get through this.

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't think we need a reaffirmation of the status quo; we have it. Should we run into difficulty, I expect that if need be we would have to be prepared to go as high as the ministerial level in Treasury and Personnel Administration, and of course the Speaker, to make some interim provision.

MR. HYLAND: That's why I'm wondering if a motion from the committee sent to the ministers right off the bat would do the trick, instead of waiting until we get into a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, a motion saying that the Members' Services Committee wishes to have the present salaries continue for the time being. Is that what you had in mind?

MR. HYLAND: Until we have time to deal with it.

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, there is no administrative problem there. It's not necessary. All three salaries are established, all three officers are on the payroll, and the only time you would run into a problem is if you attempted to remove one from the payroll.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's why I couldn't see the urgency of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we did have a situation some years ago where the Members' Services Committee approved the reclassification of two people in the Legislature Library, and we had a last-minute emergency when about three or four days before payday, they threatened not to continue to pay them. I intervened with the Provincial



Treasurer, and finally the pay cheques went through.

MR. HYLAND: If you don't employ anybody, now is a good time to cut staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We seem to have a consensus in favor of putting this well up on the agenda for our next meeting. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, we'll do that. I take it that relates to the Clerk and the Law Clerk or the Parliamentary Counsel, items 6(a) and 6(b).

What about items 6(c) and 6(d)? Are you ready to deal with those?

DR. REID: Maybe we should look at these all together, because here we have the problem of the results of the restraint on management salaries, haven't we? I think that's essentially what it is, Bohdan.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, 6(d) is, where we're dealing with the Editor of Alberta Hansard. In effect, we have support staff earning more than management at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your wish with regard to item 6(c)?

MRS. CRIPPS: Hold it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been moved by Mrs. Cripps that it be held over till the next meeting.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think I can apply that to 6(c) and (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Cripps has moved that items 6(c) and (d) also be put over to the next meeting, high up on the agenda.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I just make one comment in respect of 6(d)? I feel that that particular situation is a very important one. My fear is, although I have no indications to that effect at the moment, that I could have a manager within the Legislative Assembly wishing to relinquish his management position because he would be able to earn more money in a subordinate position. So while I don't by any means suggest to the committee that they need to look at it today, I emphasize the need to look at that particular case very soon.

DR. REID: I agree with Bo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the Clerk is saying, in effect, is that if the manager is making less than the assistant manager, the manager may want to trade places with him.

DR. REID: I wouldn't blame him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we go on to item 7, this possible move? You have a copy of a memorandum from Harry Hobbs with your support material, under tab 7. There are really two main features to this move, one of them involving Hansard and the other not.

As has been pointed out by the Clerk and by the Editor of Hansard, we can't move Hansard before the fall sittings anyway. They have the word processing equipment which they were supposed to get, and it's being installed. Some wiring changes have been made. I think the equipment is supposed to be on stream by the end of this week, and there wouldn't be any possibility of changing them over to the Annex before the fall sittings. So we have to leave that one in abeyance in any case, and that will give the committee members further time for consideration.

However, with regard to moving the staff which is now in 220, the situation is not only different, it's also more urgent. I don't know if any of you have been in there recently, but I would be inclined to defy anyone in the public service to find any situation in the public service where staff are working in similarly crowded circumstances. It's next to intolerable. This proposal would result in those staff people moving to the Annex, and the space being taken over by the Library, which is also critically short of space and of course must stay in the building insofar as access by members, ministers, and staff is concerned — at least for the time being.

I'm suggesting that the members of the committee might wish to consider those two aspects of the proposed move separately. Mr. Stefaniuk has some further comment in that regard.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the proposal for the moves actually includes the administrative staff of the Clerk's Office, Alberta Hansard, the research staff of the Legislature Library, and another section of the Library, which is presently located in the IBM Building. As mentioned by the chairman, these negotiations took so long that it is in fact too late now to think in terms of moving Hansard into the Legislature Annex prior to the fall sittings. That would have to be accomplished after the House rose this fall.

However, the proposal would call for the Library research section, which is presently located in that same building where the Mirabel restaurant is, the one additional section of the Library which is in the IBM Building, and the Clerk's administrative staff, all moving to the Annex, if at all possible prior to the fall sittings.

The other urgency that ties in with the Clerk's staff is that we have budgetary approval from the House, and previously from this committee, for the engagement of two more people, one to deal with computer installations, the other to deal with the scroll program for the members. Our situation is such that we simply do not have the physical space in which to place those people. Consequently, we have not been able to put them on stream at all. We would like to be able to do that as quickly as possible, and to that end we hope that the committee would concur in the proposed moves as I have described them.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, when I read this documentation I was opposed to the move of the Legislative Assembly staff, because personally I use the Legislative Assembly staff far more than I use the Library staff. If it's important for somebody to be convenient, I think it's the Legislative Assembly staff, and the Acts and the information that's required therein, especially when the House is sitting.

But upon reading Charlene's support material, she's listed the advantages and disadvantages. It appears that maybe they do need more space. So I would concur if the rest of the committee does. But I think it is important that the Legislative Assembly staff be fairly readily accessible to the members.

MR. STEFANIUK: There is no question that there are two sides to the coin. There are the advantages and the disadvantages. I imagine those members who are presently located in the Annex will be very happy about the move. Those members who are presently located in the Legislature Building might not be quite as happy. My own preference would certainly be to maintain all the staff in this building. Certainly that allows me closer contact with that staff, and I feel that I would be at some disadvantage

and would have to take some steps to compensate were the staff to move to the Annex. But I frankly see no alternative in light of the absence of any additional space being made available to us here.

MR. HYLAND: There just isn't the space in this building.

MR. STEFANIUK: There simply is not the space. And so long as current policies prevail relative to maintaining others in this building, I'm afraid that we really have no alternative. The environment in the offices known as Room 220, which are occupied by Charlene Blaney and her support staff, is absolutely impossible. I feel that it has a detrimental effect on productivity, certainly on morale. There is no opportunity for privacy. You know that the Director of Administration must have the ability to discuss privately certain problems, matters, questions, with members particularly, and I think that all members are well aware of the size of her so-called private office. It is nothing more than a glorified cubicle and allows for one other person to be in there with her at any one time, and certainly no more.

I regretfully see no alternative but to recommend that the move proceed.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, does this thing about the Legislature Annex, as we now call it . . . The projections are pretty obvious: the question of private members' support staff that I hear, in addition to what has already been authorized, and the different ideas that members have — I can really see the day when the Legislature Annex will include the offices of all the private members. On that basis, the movement of some of the Legislature staff and others across there would be logical. I don't think it's realistic to anticipate that we will be able to (inaudible) private members' offices in the building. As you all know, some of the offices that private members have at the moment are not really all that adequate either. When one looks at the offices that are available on the seventh floor in the Annex, there's no doubt about the suitabilities for members of a provincial parliament of those offices compared to some of the ones in the Legislature Building.

I think what we have to do is anticipate that there will be further moves over to that Annex, and that's why it's now called the Legislature Annex. On that basis I think we might as well go ahead with what is proposed as being really stage two of what will be an ongoing process.

The point I really want to address with Mr. Chairman in his capacity as Speaker is that since we've made a great fuss about now relating the Speaker of the Assembly to being the equivalent of a minister of a department of government, I'm wondering — and this is a philosophical point, and therefore I'm going to drop to first names. Gerry, in view of the fact that we have now made the Speaker a quasi full-time position as a head of the equivalent of a department — and I know your sensitivities there — is it really necessary for items such as this, which are to a large extent administrative, to be decided by the Members' Services Committee as opposed to being discussed by it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see the point. But as a matter of principle I've always thought, especially since the creation of the Members' Services Committee, that where something affected members so directly it would be only prudent and fair to bring those matters before this committee as being representative of the interests of all the members in relation to facilities to perform their duties. There's no question that the ideal situation would be to have all the members and all of the members' and the Assembly's support staff located in this building, so that it would fulfil truly the function of a parliament building, as is happening in most jurisdictions, although there are exceptions in places like Ottawa, where they have the Confederation Building for some of the members.

But there seems to be an established policy that there will be no change made in this also being an Executive Council building. So we are faced with this situation that

the Clerk has described. It affects the access of members to some of their services. It will help some in the Agriculture Building; it may hinder some here. And of course members being in the Agriculture Building during sessions of the House has its own drawbacks, which are offset to some extent, I guess, by having better space over there.

It's just one of those situations where I would hesitate to agree to something so directly affecting the members without at least having some discussion of it by this committee.

DR. REID: That's essentially the same stance I was taking. It is essentially an administrative matter but should be discussed by the committee. It was just the words in his remarks — I think Bohdan said something like we need a decision by this committee. Unless we actually inspect the space and facilities that the research people and the Library have, and the other library staff in the IBM Building, and had a close look at Charlene's place, which I did just last week by accident, I don't think that we can really make the decision on an informed basis, but we should have the input on behalf of the members of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we go this far: can we say that among the members of the committee, insofar as the move affecting the Clerk's staff is concerned, there is no opposition to the proposal contained in Mr. Hobbs' memo?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to any of these, because first of all I think the Hansard people, with their word processing equipment, in actual fact need more room than they can have in their current space. There's no doubt about the Legislative Assembly support staff. Another thing is that it makes much more sense to have the Library research facilities in the Annex than to have them across in the Mirabel building on 109 Street. I'm in agreement with all these moves. I was just questioning the committee having a decision-making function as opposed to an input function.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's a consultative thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's really a consultative thing and, as I say, I think I'd be subject to justifiable criticism if I didn't consult about it.

DR. REID: I think you would.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, have you any comments?

MR. PENGELLY: No I don't, not at the present moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about you, Sheila?

MRS. EMBURY: No, thank you. I appreciated the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And what about around the room here?

MR. HYLAND: I was going to make a motion, but it appears that it's a general discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not necessary. Certainly I'm aware of the feelings of the committee in this regard, and we can proceed to deal with at least the first stage of the move.

Shall we go back to the agenda? We have an item, 8(a), which indirectly is tied in with a previous item that we've already dealt with. If you'd like to have a quick look at

your supporting material, perhaps we can consider that.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think that this item was essentially dealt with by the final amendments that were introduced in the Legislative Assembly Act, and were passed on whatever day it was — June 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just about by necessary implication, would you say?

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we let it go at that?

DR. REID: I think so. I think it's really dealt with now and the discussion we had earlier on today.

MR. STEFANIUK: We also now have, Mr. Chairman, the approval of the budgetary requirements to support this type of program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: The only thing remaining, as I see it, would be to draw up a policy statement relative to this program for inclusion, one, in the administrative procedures manual of the Assembly and, two, in the members' guide, which has been provided to each member of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By Mr. Blain.

DR. REID: Apropos of that, Mr. Chairman, seeing that Mr. Blain and Mr. Stefaniuk are both there . . . It could be indicated in the members' guide — I was speaking to Charlene; that's why I was in there — and she had had, I think, one member start putting in for these per diems, and had been doing it day by day by day. That's producing an incredible workload for the amount of money that's being handled. Perhaps we should look at the possibility of saying it should be done month by month or quarter by quarter to minimize the paper handling and the issuing of cheques.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would I be correct in assuming that to institute that practice would not require a resolution of this committee?

DR. REID: I don't think it does. It would just be an advisory in the members' guide, I would think. I could certainly bring it up to the government members' caucus.

MRS. CRIPPS: On that point, Ian — sorry, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: It's going to cost how much for cheques? So it's costing . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, we're just very simply into doing perhaps seven or eight or nine times what we could do once.

MRS. CRIPPS: On that point, Ian, is it necessary for members to keep track of the days they are claiming, or the 24 days in any one year, in order to be able to justify the receipt?

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, there is a statutory provision allowing you to claim for up to 24 days in addition to the sittings of the House. But as with receipts for the expenses which

a member might incur during sittings of the House, we would counsel you to maintain your personal records in the event of an audit by the Department of National Revenue.

MRS. CRIPPS: Then that communication should go out to the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we do that?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think we could include it as a note with the information going into the members' guide for the members.

MRS. CRIPPS: Not officially, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: The wording in the Act was changed specifically, so it didn't say expenses, or something like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the committee is agreed, could I ask Mr. Blain to make suitable changes to the members' guide and then send them out to the members?

DR. REID: Yes. I think that's the best way of handling it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Can we go on to 8(b)? We have shared with you the answers we've received. Two of them, I think, are in handwriting because they were received on the telephone. We've shared those with you to show you what the reaction has been from the members to the proposal by ACCESS and to the question generally of funding television in the House. I don't know whether you want to go into that further today, but let's see what the members have in mind.

MRS. CRIPPS: I've gone through the letters, and I interpret the feeling as being not in support of having ACCESS film just question period at least, and maybe not any of it. I guess I'd just like to reiterate that I'm totally opposed to unilateral coverage of question period. It's an absolute farce, and it's only an opportunity for the opposition to use it as a means of, I guess, embarrassing the government — at least that's what they usually try to do — and I don't believe that it bears any realistic resemblance to the importance of the proceedings of the House. I would be in favor of ACCESS having House coverage if it covered House business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All of it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. The other stations are covering question period, and I just don't feel that that bears any resemblance to the importance of the Legislative Assembly. If ACCESS is going to be an educational tool, certainly question period isn't the educational part of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I sent you a memo on this subject. I think it's included in the bibliography attached.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

DR. REID: But I've thought about it since then. I've been watching during the last sitting of the Assembly what is actually put over the commercial television stations. In

actual fact they put over nothing to do with the sitting of the Assembly; nothing other than the question period.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right.

DR. REID: They have put ministers in the hallways, and they have the various commentators standing around parts of the building or outside it if it's a sunny day, but the only time that the Assembly itself is shown at work is during the question period. If ACCESS is going to provide coverage of the Assembly, I would like to change the memo I sent, to say that the ACCESS coverage should specifically exclude the question period, which is covered by the commercial stations, and that it should show the work that goes on in the Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

DR. REID: If it's going to be an educational tool, it should show how laws are written, debated, how items are discussed in the Assembly on motions or private Bills. In other words, it should be a tool to indicate to the public that the running of a parliament, provincial or federal, is a very serious business, that it's done with propriety, that it's done with a lot of thought, and that people just don't spout off and throw quips at each other. In other words, if ACCESS is an educational channel, is going to educate, let's educate the people of the province, in particular students, to what a parliament is really involved with.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, would you entertain a motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Surely.

MRS. EMBURY: I would like to make a motion that we do not consider that proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ACCESS proposal?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes. We recommend that it not be considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you go so far as to say that the matter should not be discussed any further with ACCESS?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes, thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think perhaps we should explore possible alternatives?

MRS. EMBURY: Not at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You want the question dropped totally.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm just moving that we do not pursue it with ACCESS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want it pursued at all? The reason I'm questioning is that your motion is going to indicate something that we in the service of the Assembly must do or not do, and I think we should be clear about it.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address this to Sheila. Would Sheila have any objection to discussions with ACCESS on the lines that I was speaking about, that they be specifically excluded from covering the question period and that if they want to provide one hour of coverage a day, it should be from 3:30 to 4:30 or from 11 to 12 on Friday; in other words, it would be the hour succeeding the question period?

MRS. EMBURY: I guess, judging from all the responses that the Speaker received, Ian, one of the largest concerns is economics, and . . .

DR. REID: I'm not talking about us paying ACCESS to do it. I'm talking about if ACCESS wished to do it as part of their programming.

MRS. EMBURY: I realize that, but the other feeling that I'm gathering is that the money for ACCESS comes from the government. The way I read those memos, I understand that some of the people really do not want that. So that's why I made my motion at this time.

DR. REID: ACCESS is running programs in any event which presumably involve cost (inaudible) the Legislature where the actors are unpaid, the production staff is minimal, there are no sets required, and there is a relatively fixed camera. I imagine the cost of producing one hour of the Legislature time is probably no greater than producing an hour of other television education programming. That's what I was wondering about, Sheila; in other words, if ACCESS does it within their present budget.

MRS. EMBURY: I don't know, Mr. Chairman. Obviously my motion didn't go any place because it wasn't seconded, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't need seconders. I was going to say that if you wanted to restate it on the basis of your discussion with Dr. Reid, I'd put the motion.

MRS. EMBURY: Well, I was going to say that in view of the different points of view — and I don't know how long you plan on meeting today — possibly this item could be deferred to another meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is everyone agreed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ian?

DR. REID: Yes. I'll agree to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Are you agreed here around the table?

MR. HYLAND: I'd like to see it dealt with, but then that makes a tie vote.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would like to see it dealt with on the basis of Ian's proposal that we discuss with ACCESS the possibility of actually covering the hour following question period. I believe that has merit. But I certainly don't think question period has any merit.

MR. HYLAND: Because you're infringing on private channels that are supposedly carrying it, and that's commercial.



MRS. CRIPPS: I don't care whether we infringe or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I see the substance of the discussion, it might lead to a motion that we discuss with ACCESS the possibility of their covering the House outside the question period.

DR. REID: That's just my own personal feeling, Gerry, but I don't know if the committee will support me on that. In the memo I sent in February I was indicating a mix of coverage, but having watched what happened, I don't think there's any need for ACCESS to cover the question period. And the other channels covered nothing in the whole spring sitting. The only other thing that was covered was the budget speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we don't need a motion if you all agree. We'll just go back to ACCESS and discuss the possibility of coverage outside the question period and then report to the committee. Is that all right?

DR. REID: Within their existing budget.

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, without any funding out of Legislative Assembly funds.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Can you discuss that with the Department of Education, who fund ACCESS, to put a little pressure on them?

MR. HYLAND: ACCESS is totally . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: How are they funded?

MR. HYLAND: They're funded . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: By both departments.

MR. HYLAND: They're administered by the board, of which the Minister of Education is a member.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. It doesn't come under Education. Doesn't that come under Utilities and Telecommunications?

MR. HYLAND: Bob Bogle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was some direct involvement by the departments of Advanced Education and Education, but of course they have to have a substantial degree of independence in order to be licensed. The federal government won't license a provincially owned . . .

Shall we go to the next item, which I believe we've also referred to previously: 8(c), secretarial training vis-a-vis constituency offices. I think we've dealt with that.

DR. REID: That was dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless there are further comments, we'll go to the next item.

MR. STEFANIUK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. We've dealt with it in terms of including the provision under the committee's order, but again it's one of those items for which a statement will have to be prepared for the members' guide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Does the committee agree with that proposal?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: So that's saying your secretary from your constituency office could take two trips a year to Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: What about — we've discussed briefly the reverse, about secretaries from here going down, but the two together can't exceed two a year.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, one of the items here, however, is the question of the funding, which is appended to the other documentation under item 8(c). The funding, so far as I can determine, has not been previously provided for. So you have an estimate of \$19,938 for this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which is, as the Clerk mentioned . . .

MR. HYLAND: Wasn't that to come out of constituency office budget?

MR. STEFANIUK: If that's where you want it.

MR. HYLAND: It seems to me there was something . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Out of the constituency office allowance?

MR. BLAIN: That was the proposal, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought it was going to come from that.

MR. STEFANIUK: All right. If that's where it comes from, we need no additional approval other than to acknowledge, as we have in the order, that this type of funding may come from the constituency office allowance.

MR. HYLAND: Under 83-205, on 8(c), moved by Mr. Kowalski that acceptable provision under the constituency office allowance be the travel cost of a constituency secretary to travel from the constituency office to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. STEFANIUK: This item is here, however, Mr. Chairman, because this committee had requested that the administration prepare an estimate of the costs, and so here it is.

MRS. CRIPPS: So this is just an estimate of the cost.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right; broken down by each constituency, Shirley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say something regarding that item, because I wasn't at that last meeting, and to add to the clarification that Alan raised. Frankly, I thought it very generous that it was set at two trips to start out with. So I feel a little better now that I know that it will be up to the individual member, because it does come out of the constituency allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are you content then?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: You have to take it out of it; that's what the minutes said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. Now, item 9, interparliamentary relations officer. That is really just an item of information. The amount of activity that is going on and the workloads of various members of the staff of the Assembly are such that this is something which we should consider either for the near term or long-term future, and so that material is included as an item of information that perhaps could be brought up again at a future meeting.

DR. REID: Okay.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other business anyone would like to raise?

MR. HYLAND: I think John Gogo tried it some time ago, and I'd like somewhere in the next few times we have the Members' Services Committee to talk about life insurance of the Members of the Legislative Assembly — review that. The comment was made that it's not a full-time job. It may not be. In some respects it may be, but on the other hand you can get killed just as easily coming and going if it's a full-time or part-time job, and I think it's time that this should be reviewed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the accidental death coverage. Life insurance would mean death unrelated to . . .

MR. HYLAND: I guess what I'm saying is that, unless my understanding is wrong, I find it difficult for MLAs to be considered under senior management and senior management to be receiving such things as life insurance or whatever and we don't. I guess it's just a pet peeve of mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would it meet your proposal if we were to work up some detail in regard to it . . .

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . such as possible costs for various levels of coverage?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, if the members wish to be informed as to what goes on, first of all in the public service, we can certainly bring forth the information relative to the programs which prevail in the public service. We can also easily obtain information relative to provisions of that type of benefit which may be made in other

jurisdictions. Given that information, perhaps the members can then decide in which manner they wish to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right?

MR. HYLAND: Totally acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any other business?

DR. REID: Can't think of any at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HYLAND: I'm thinking of the one that Ian suggested, and I'm not sure if next time we'll be ready for it, but sometime along the way we do have to look at Shirley's problem with regard to the cost of automobiles and operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's been noted.

Could we go to a discussion of dates for the next meeting, and might I make some suggestions. I was going to suggest first of all that we consider the week of September 5; as a second alternative, the week of August 29; and as a third, the week of August 1. In view of what we have dealt with today, I think the remaining item that, depending on the members' view of it, may have some urgency is with regard to staff.

MR. HYLAND: The week of September 5 we already have heritage trust fund on the Tuesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not quite as tied down as we might have been in the past to members being in Edmonton anyway on other business and tacking on a Members' Services meeting, as long as we can have them by telephone as we're having them today. I doubt that the next few meetings will be nearly as long as this one. We've really covered a lot of ground today.

MR. HYLAND: The other date you gave was the week of August 29?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The week of August 29 or the week of August 1.

DR. REID: The week of August 1 is out for me, Gerry. I'm very mobile that week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That was my third. The second one was August 29 and the first one was September 5. That would give us more time to work up some of the items of information that you've requested today.

MR. HYLAND: There are two days of heritage trust fund, Tuesday and Wednesday, of the week of August 29.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then could we take a serious look at the week of September 5?

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, the week of September 5, the social services committee meets on the Wednesday, and that means we'd probably have to come up the day before anyway, so . . .

MR. HYLAND: The heritage trust fund is on the 6th, Nigel.

MR. PENGELLY: Okay.

MRS. CRIPPS: What about the morning of the Wednesday?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about Wednesday morning, September 7?

MR. HYLAND: I'm tied up. The 5th is the holiday.

MR. STEFANIUK: Right. The 6th is Tuesday, the 7th is Wednesday. Wednesday morning? When does the heritage fund meet? In the afternoon?

MR. HYLAND: I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many days will the heritage trust fund meet? When they meet on the 7th, will they carry over to the 8th?

MR. HYLAND: No, they're not on the 7th.

MR. STEFANIUK: They're on the 6th by itself. So it's a question of the social services committee on the 7th, when Nigel has to be in. Nigel, what's the time of your meeting?

MR. PENGELLY: We're meeting two delegations, one at 1:30 and one at 3:30.

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, maybe Wednesday morning, if you're in for the 6th, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: I'm not here. I've got another meeting in Calgary that day.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't know what I've got. My book's upstairs.

MR. HYLAND: You may not get everybody here at the meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm reluctant to suggest the 7th when we already know of one member who won't be able to be there, being Alan Hyland. It almost appears that we're not going to get a full house no matter what date we pick.

DR. REID: What about if we go back into that last week of August? What's the problem there?

MRS. CRIPPS: That's out. Two heritage trust fund and . . .

MR. HYLAND: What's the problem with the Monday? That's not a holiday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: August 29.

MRS. CRIPPS: I always go to Drayton on Mondays.

MR. HYLAND: What about September 1, the Thursday, if we have to be in for two days?

DR. REID: September 1 is out for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: September 1 is suggested.

MR. STEFANIUK: Ian says it's out for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought he said October.

MR. HYLAND: You said it was out didn't you, Ian?

DR. REID: Yes. September 1 I'm in Banff?

MR. HYLAND: Why would you want to go to Banff when you could be in Edmonton that day?

DR. REID: It may be okay. It could always be a conference call from Banff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about September 7 in the morning?

MRS. EMBURY: It's looking good for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, what do you think?

MR. PENGELLY: The 7th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. In the morning.

MR. PENGELLY: I'm coming up there for social services delegation meetings anyway. If I could get them all in one day, that would be great for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we said ten o'clock on the morning of September 7? Then Nigel wouldn't have to leave too early.

MR. PENGELLY: Well, I can be away by 7, or come up the night before.

MR. BLAIN: We have a committee meeting in Lethbridge on the 7th, if there are any members of this committee on the Workers' Compensation committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Workers' Compensation committee is meeting in Lethbridge on that day. Is anybody involved?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. BLAIN: I don't think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We've had Nigel. Ian, have you expressed yourself about the 7th?

DR. REID: I'm not sure about that week. I think the week of August 29 is better for me. I may have to switch my plans anyway. If I'm not around, I'm not around.

MR. HYLAND: I won't be around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a toss-up between you and Shirley, it seems to me, Alan, in the two days we're discussing.

MR. HYLAND: If we go to Thursday, then Ian's in trouble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MRS. CRIPPS: What's the 7th? What day of the week?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 7th affects Alan.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's a Wednesday, Shirley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's got a meeting in Calgary.

MRS. CRIPPS: Are we on Heritage Savings Trust Fund that day?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's the day before.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's okay with me then.

MR. STEFANIUK: You're okay. It looks like you've got a majority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should we try for the 7th? It seems we run into the fewest conflicts there. What do you say, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: It doesn't matter to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And Ian, you're not sure?

DR. REID: No. My schedule isn't fixed yet for those couple of weeks; that's the trouble. If I'm not around, I'm not around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Sheila's okay.

MRS. EMBURY: That's as far as I know at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Shirley is okay. Well then, suppose we try for that, and if Dr. Reid has an unavoidable conflict . . . Well, the majority of the members are in the government caucus. If there's going to be any change from the 7th, could they work it out among themselves?

DR. REID: Yes. We'll get back to you if there are going to be changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. HYLAND: What would we be looking at as an alternative? Probably Thursday, the 1st.

DR. REID: It looks like it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'm going to be away from August 7 until the following Friday, the 12th, and I'll be away the latter half of September. But outside of that, I'm totally flexible. Can we let it go at that then? Tentatively we have it for Wednesday morning, September 7, subject to a possible consensus developing otherwise. Is that all right?

DR. REID: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I just request of the members who are meeting by telephone today that at the earliest possible opportunity they return their meeting books to us so that we might prepare them for the next meeting.

DR. REID: Okay.

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, we'll do that.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank Bohdan very much. I got my book sent down from my secretary, and it really is well done and extremely helpful; it's so well organized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great. You got only one of them, Sheila? You didn't get three at three different addresses?

MRS. EMBURY: Thank goodness, I might have really complained about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is no other business, then . . . We have a motion from Alan Hyland that we adjourn. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.]