

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[8:10 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, we have here, going clockwise starting with Mrs. Embury, the new Whip — and I'll second your congratulations.

MRS. EMBURY: Nigel was first on the phone to me. Thank you, Nigel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ken Kowalski, Dr. Reid — and I'll second those also. Then we have Gary Garrison; myself; the Clerk, Mr. Stefaniuk; and Peggy Davidson. I'd like to express appreciation to the Clerk for having changed his holiday plans so he might be here this morning. We're expecting momentarily that Shirley Cripps will walk in the door.

MRS. CRIPPS: Here I am.

MRS. EMBURY: She was waiting for the entrance.

DR. REID: Right on cue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we might come to order, we haven't any minutes. Peggy was on a well-deserved break. We have transcripts and, if you agree, we'll postpone the approval of the minutes until the next meeting. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no visitors, so we can skip to item 4. The Clerk has provided a final summation of our estimates, under three categories. Perhaps he might explain that document, which you on the telephone won't have before you. We have copies here, and you'll be getting one by mail.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, these documents reflect all the decisions which have been made to date by the committee. The first two pages of the document are a summary of Legislative Assembly overall. It shows an estimate input for 1984-85 of \$12,030,043, which is an increase of 4.05 per cent over the present year.

The third and fourth sheets of paper reflect general administration, which had been presented in a minus position at the beginning. But with the adjustments made, we are now requiring \$4,277,968, or an increase of 1.82 per cent.

The next sheet deals with Legislature committees, which was reviewed and approved at the last meeting. The requirement is now forecast at \$343,334, or an increase of 56 per cent over what has been granted for 1983-84. I hasten to mention that in terms of percentages, that figure will change when, within the next week or so, we will have applied for and hopefully have approved a special warrant to enable us to carry on the committee functions for the present fiscal year. So the percentage increase will be reduced as a result of the special warrant.

The final sheet deals with legislative interns, which program will require \$481,950, or an increase of 51 per cent over the present year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd like to raise a question dealing with the legislative interns. We discussed this

several meetings ago, not at the last meeting. I can't recall all the discussion on that. That's an adjustment from \$246,000 to \$481,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Something isn't right.

MR. KOWALSKI: I can't recall us having the discussion on it. That seems to be — I'm flabbergasted.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm afraid I don't. I think this may have been during a meeting when I was out of the country. I regret I can't shed any light on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under legislative interns, we have payments to MLAs and Executive Council.

MR. STEFANIUK: If we can perhaps hold this for just a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, I might be able to call over to administration and see what we're doing with this particular thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we go on to item 5. You may recall that that was raised briefly at the last meeting. There was mention made of sending Messrs. Notley and Martin copies of the minutes of the last meeting and asking them to comment. But those minutes not yet being available, that wasn't done. I don't know whether there is anything further. Ken, have you got page 370 of the transcript? The second-last paragraph on that page has your statement. Do you want that to go over to the next meeting?

MR. KOWALSKI: Please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, can you hear okay?

MR. PENGELLY: With a little difficulty. It's not too loud, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I got a little subdued.

Next is the draft order for travel expenses, item 6 of your support material. In his explanatory memo of December 29, Mr. Clegg raises three points in the last paragraph on the first page. First he says:

The Committee may wish to consider whether the words in paragraph (c.1)(ii)(A), "and the Legislature" should perhaps read "and the City of Edmonton".

Occasionally MLAs may come to Edmonton without necessarily going to the Legislature, if their work takes them elsewhere in the city.

The second point starts on the fourth line, where he says:

Furthermore, I added in trips from the member's place of employment or business because he might not

necessarily be leaving from home to come to the Legislature or to Edmonton.

The last point starts on the fifth-last line. He says:

It is necessary to allow for this . . .

This is regarding the use of a public vehicle where the member's own vehicle may not be available.

He has worded the order to cover those three points. If you'd like to look at the text of the order itself — sorry, he hasn't. He has drawn our attention to those. If you'll look at the draft order, (c.1)(ii)(A) says:

52 return trips per year between the Member's residence or place of employment [and that's covered] or business and the Legislature . . .

If we follow his comment there, we would be changing that to the city of Edmonton.

Are there any comments?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think it's rather immaterial. I have no difficulty with the city of Edmonton rather than the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should we put that in?

MRS. EMBURY: To my mind, it's very difficult to realize that somebody would not be coming to the Legislature. I suppose it does happen the odd time. They may have another function or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that if it's strictly construed by the people doing the auditing — and besides that, you might be going to a government department which has an office in another part of the city.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, I might mention that I have gone over to the new Ag. Building on the university grounds when I've been in Edmonton, and not gone to the Legislature. But usually I do go to the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's another example.

MRS. EMBURY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed that it becomes the city of Edmonton?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the second paragraph — it's just a drafting thing, but "within the Province" applies to travel; it doesn't apply to paragraph (A). So those words have to be moved. It's not "paragraph (A), within the Province", it's "travel within the province".

DR. REID: It's "15,000 kilometers per year of general travel" within the province, rather than "travel covered by . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Under subclause (iv), at the bottom of the page, I suppose it wouldn't be necessary, in view of the parameters above, to specify the location of the trip. You have the departure point and the arrival point, so it's not necessary.

With those two changes, is that order in order?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just going back to 2(iv), the current reading is:

a single claim for all payments pursuant to this clause shall be made in respect of each calendar quarter in a form provided by the Clerk of the Assembly . . .

I recognize that the remaining words are guidelines I

attempted to outline in terms of the Hansard discussion of the last meeting. The words are:

specifying, for every day for which the allowance is claimed, the date of travel and the distance in respect of which the allowance is claimed.

On the basis of the brief discussion we've just had with respect to item 2(ii)(A) above, where we're simply saying "city of Edmonton" and there's a meaning inherent there, I wonder if members of the committee feel that the remaining words in (iv), beginning with "Specifying" and ending with the period, are really necessary or are redundant.

Perhaps the phrase might simply read:

a single claim for all payments pursuant to this clause shall be made in respect of each calendar quarter in a form provided by the Clerk of the Assembly.

I throw that out for discussion.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, looking at the paragraph and the comments of the Member for Barrhead, I really wonder if we need to keep track of the details to that level in order to justify a payment. I presume this would be with reference to the Auditor General's people looking at it. Is that correct? I'm not sure that the Auditor General's function is really to look in that kind of detail at the details of the expenditures of the members of the provincial parliament. Considering that it's a signed statement that this number of miles was incurred in relation to my duties as the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Edson, I wonder if we really need to have the date and the actual mileage or kilometrage in that amount of detail.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm trying to think of how we reconcile records at the present time. When a member uses an air travel card — for example, a member who can commute by air between his residence and Edmonton — the details concerning the date, the origin of the flight, and the destination are all recorded. We are required to balance those claims off against the claims for subsistence allowance, which members are provided on a daily basis when the Legislature is in session. The auditors have been extremely sticky with us relative to our reconciling those records to ensure that a member — for example, a Calgary member — who has commuted home during the week and, it is evident from his claims, has left Edmonton on a given evening and returned only the next day, does not claim a subsistence allowance for that day. I wonder if this is what we're covering off.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, the main concern I have about this is that we already have the gasoline credit. The statement comes to the Legislative Assembly office. With that comes the duplicates, I think, of the billing by the gasoline company. The next thing I can see coming is that the Auditor General will be asking the Legislative Assembly staff to co-ordinate the dates for which the kilometres are claimed with the gasoline credit card stubs, and we'll be hiring two more people to go over 79 lists of gasoline credit stubs and lists of kilometres travelled. I really don't think that's the intent of the Act under which the Auditor General functions, and I don't think we should start providing the information. I don't think it's necessary.

I don't think anybody in this Legislative Assembly

is going to be fiddling this sort of thing. Really, this is just ridiculously picayune in the kind of information that is going to be available. If there is any difference between the two lists, how are you going to be able to do anything about it 15 months down the road?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think reconciling gasoline credit card charges against this particular claim is virtually impossible, because the gasoline credit card is used by the member for travel within the constituency and in the member's function as an MLA. The two simply cannot be connected. I don't see that we can reconcile that at all.

MRS. CRIPPS: The gasoline credit card is for a specifically different purpose than the travel allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: The gasoline credit card also covers the member's gasoline purchases if a car is used between the constituency and the provincial capital. What we are now doing is supplementing that by saying, here is an allowance for the use of your car and the wear and tear on your vehicle. But I don't think that a reconciliation is possible at all. The only way the whole thing could be reconciled is to put the total compensation package onto a kilometre basis.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I would be prepared to move that we remove from the comma after the word "Assembly" in 2(c.1)(iv) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The remainder of the last three lines of that page of the draft?

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would mean ending the text with a period after the word "Assembly". Are you ready for the question? All those in favor? Opposed?

DR. REID: Are you in agreement, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: I didn't hear what Ian said, and I don't have the agenda in front of me. You sent me down the last meeting's agenda.

DR. REID: Nigel, the paragraph we're concerned about reads at the moment:

a single claim for all payments pursuant to this clause shall be made in respect of each calendar quarter in a form provided by the Clerk of the Assembly, specifying, for every day for which the allowance is claimed, the date of the travel and the distance in respect of which the allowance is claimed.

The motion is to remove the last phrase: specifying, for every day for which the allowance is claimed, the date of travel and the distance in respect of which the allowance is claimed.

In other words, you would keep track of the number of kilometres you travel over the quarter and put it in as a lump claim rather than detailing it day by day.

MR. PENGELLY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should we have the vote again, the other one having been a nullity? All those in favor of the motion to delete those words and to end the text of sub-subclause (iv) with a period after the word "Assembly"?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the main order with that amendment — in fact, with the two other amendments as well, changing "Legislature" to "City of Edmonton" and transposing the words "within the province", as previously discussed. Is there a motion? Mr. Kowalski. All those in favor? Opposed? I can't see your hand, Nigel.

MR. PENGELLY: I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Could we revert to item 4.

MR. STEFANIUK: May I provide a very simple explanation as to the final page? What we have is a typographical error at the top of the page, where we show LO600, element 07, legislative interns. That should read legislative committees. That is the second page of the committee submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's better.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we're asking for at the moment for committees is \$481,950, which is an increase of 51 per cent over what we have in the present fiscal year to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the estimates were first submitted, they indicated a reduction in the current year of 2 point something per cent.

MR. STEFANIUK: In general administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think there was a reduction overall. We now have an overall increase.

MR. STEFANIUK: There was an increase overall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, right.

MR. STEFANIUK: It was very, very low. I believe it was in the 2 per cent area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we have a greater increase. Would I be correct in saying that it's due to the increased scope of funding for committees?

MR. STEFANIUK: To a large extent.

MR. KOWALSKI: Putting in a realistic figure.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. In previous years, because committee activity was largely unknown to us, we simply asked for a straight \$100,000, and that had become almost a traditional figure. This year, knowing that certain special committees are going to be active through the next fiscal year, we're able to estimate a whole lot more accurately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anything further?

MRS. CRIPPS: That total control, 4.05 — a lot of that is beyond our control because of negotiated wage settlements, I understand.

MR. STEFANIUK: All the MLAs' indemnities and expense allowances, for example, are statutory provisions. There is not a whole lot, if anything, we can do to change the negotiated wage settlements, precisely those that have been negotiated by the office of the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and apply to the public service generally.

MRS. CRIPPS: I was going back to the .96 increase we approved. The difference here is because of . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Those were the figures when we came in with the original budget. What has changed here is the transportation order, as you'll recall, which came in at the last meeting and required an addition of \$172,000, I believe. There are probably other things throughout. But no, the salaries were reflected in the original submission and have not been adjusted by the committee since.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does someone wish to make a motion?

MRS. EMBURY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Embury moves that the estimates as now submitted in total for the fiscal year 1984-85 be approved. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Now, can we go back to item 7. This is one we've carried over for the last three or four meetings, because we were occupied with the estimates. The facts have not changed. The situation has continued in the meantime. The concern is that although he puts in more time, as far as I know, the Editor of Hansard is being paid less than one of the other staff of Hansard. Previously under your support material, you had a draft order that would remedy that. I think additional copies of that were circulated this morning.

MRS. CRIPPS: In the Appendix to Schedule A, why is D. Bennett broken down?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why is which?

MRS. CRIPPS: The salary is broken down into two time periods.

MR. STEFANIUK: Because there was a salary adjustment within the year. We're dealing with an employee who obviously has an anniversary date on February 1.

MRS. CRIPPS: All right. What does that person do when the House is out of session?

MR. STEFANIUK: Which person?

MRS. CRIPPS: The person who is not the Editor of Hansard.

MR. STEFANIUK: That person generally acts as an assistant to the Editor, is in fact the two I.C., supervises staff. The whole question of indexing Hansard goes on. The whole matter of committee activity goes on, such as today. As you know, we

have all the special and standing committees which meet outside of session. That person continues to provide supervision and actual editing work during the times when the House is not sitting.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you.

MR. STEFANIUK: That person is part of what we refer to as the Hansard core staff. As you are undoubtedly aware, when the House is in session we supplement Hansard staff with part-time employees to carry us through that very heavy period. Those employees do not work when the House is not in session.

MR. KOWALSKI: As I understand it, the difficulty in all of this is that, basically, one gentleman is in management and the other person is not in management.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. KOWALSKI: So one person gets the benefit of overtime, and the other one does not.

MR. STEFANIUK: Precisely.

MR. KOWALSKI: And at the end of the year, when you total up for the 12-month period, person B ends up making a few dollars more than person A, and the manager gets less.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right, and the manager has more responsibility and probably puts in more overtime, for which is not compensated at all, than the subordinate. We have no compensation plan for extra hours for management.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's one of the benefits of management.

MR. STEFANIUK: Really?

DR. REID: Everybody notices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not even recorded.

MR. KOWALSKI: To ask for an adjustment of a salary from \$35,700 to \$40,200 is one alternative. The current classification for the Editor of Alberta Hansard is Senior Officer IC. Has suggestion been given to reclassifying that position to Senior Officer IIA, which would bring it a salary frame that would be higher than the current one? Is that an alternative?

MR. STEFANIUK: It possibly is. I'm not sure that in the overall structure — as you know, we examined the overall management structure of the Legislative Assembly and made proposals relative to those. We don't think the responsibilities merit going to a IIA classification, simply because we look at the other classifications and we don't think that position should be up there. We think what we have here, as we have in many areas of the Legislative Assembly, is something of a hybrid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. We have jobs in the Legislative Assembly that are just not comparable to any jobs in government. I think I mentioned to you the first time we discussed this that we had one

situation where we wanted to reclassify a Library employee. What Personnel Administration did at that time, before this committee took jurisdiction over this kind of thing, was go to what they called the nearest equivalent. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, that there were 13 criteria at that time. Two of them fitted the Library job, and that was the nearest equivalent.

MR. STEFANIUK: And we have it throughout. For example, the administrator in the government caucus right now is probably the craziest classification I've ever heard of. I can't recall offhand what the name is.

DR. REID: Municipal Officer I.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's where we have Marg Pratt. We can do that kind of thing I suppose, but does it really make sense to do that? Or should we be making appropriate salary adjustments and leave the classifications where we think they meet more of the criteria? To have Marg classified as Municipal Officer I is, I'm sure you'll agree, just a little ridiculous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the nearest equivalent.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, could I just raise a kind of supplement to what the Member for Barrhead raised. Is it worth considering reclassifying the assistant?

MR. STEFANIUK: You can reclassify an assistant, but obviously you classify the assistant at a lower level than the superior. If the classification results in a salary decrease for the assistant, it's not likely to be accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not only that, technically it's a dismissal. An employee whose salary is cut or who is transferred from one category to another is technically dismissed. That should be negotiated, done on long notice, and so on.

MR. STEFANIUK: And then we get into the whole question of establishing yet another management position. What do we have as a result? The old thing about a whole lot of chiefs and no rank and file.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, this one member on staff who receives more than the Editor — did you not say that was because of the overtime he accumulated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. PENGELLY: My question is: why is this one individual getting so much overtime?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as I know, it's cheaper to do it that way than it is to hire somebody else.

MR. PENGELLY: I see.

MR. STEFANIUK: As well, the workload that we place on Hansard, especially in session, is somewhat unpredictable. We don't have a very steady pattern, and we don't know until that day precisely on which evenings the House is going to sit. We don't know how long the House is going to sit when it does sit in

the evening. So we're dealing with a whole lot of unpredictable or unknown quantities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's true that the work slackens off at certain times when the House is not sitting, depending on the level of committee activity, and we have a much lower staff. But when the House is sitting, the stress that goes on in the Hansard establishment to keep things going is something I wouldn't want to face every year.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of principle, though, I would prefer to see part-time help rather than overtime. I would rather see more people employed than pay overtime.

MR. STEFANIUK: If I may address that suggestion, Mr. Chairman, the great difficulty with that is these jobs require considerable skill, and the training to be provided to part-time people is extremely costly. We have to bring in part-time people to begin the training approximately a month before the House opens. What we find, and have found over the years, is that very often we do not get the same people back, because they're people who are looking for full-time employment. So they take a temporary job with us; they're fully aware of the fact that it's temporary. We provide approximately a month's training to cause them to be able to execute the job. For example, we have them for a spring sitting, which is approximately three months' duration, and then we lose them.

The cost of training is a very, very expensive proposition, especially if we're doing it repetitively. And we are doing it to some extent, but we're trying to keep that down to a minimum. The amount of productivity we can get out of a person on core staff, who has been trained and has the benefit of experience, is considerably higher than the productivity we can get from someone new. So we might be replacing, not with just a part-time position here but maybe with a couple of part-time positions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that when this woman works overtime she is working overtime at her job, which is a highly skilled job. Fortunately she's had a lot of experience at it. To bring in a part-time person to provide that same quality of work is not practical, as the Clerk mentioned. And if you bring in two, then you're not really saving anything.

MR. STEFANIUK: Relative to overtime as well, an acceptable norm in overtime is about 10 per cent. You can see from the figures in the Appendix to Schedule A that we're dealing pretty well in that area of 10 per cent — just a little bit less. Notwithstanding that it is 10 per cent, it still causes those earnings to go above the Editor's.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, is the nature of the work with Hansard such that parts of it couldn't be tendered to the private sector? You speak of the highly skilled work, and I wonder just what it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I see it, if you were to go to tender, first of all you would have great difficulty writing a set of specifications on which a private bidder would bid. Then I think you would end up with hourly rates; for example, as you do in engineering firms, where different staff people would be earning different hourly rates. You would have a very

complicated time-record system to ensure that tax dollars were being properly spent for time that was actually worked.

MR. PENGELLY: I see.

MR. KOWALSKI: Just a couple of questions for clarification. I don't know R. Bubba or D. Bennett. I don't know if one is a male, if one is a female, if both are males, or if both are females. So if I speak in the masculine . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's Bob Bubba and Donna Bennett.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay. I think I referred to D. Bennett a little earlier as a gentleman, and I withdraw that and will refer to her as a lady. That's immaterial to what I want to say, by the way.

R. Bubba's current salary is \$35,700, and he exists within a range of \$32,600 to \$43,020. I take it that Mr. Bubba has not been with us for a long period of time.

MR. STEFANIUK: He has not been in the position of Editor for a long period of time.

MR. KOWALSKI: What was his position before this?

MR. STEFANIUK: He held the two L.C. position, which is now occupied by Donna Bennett.

MR. KOWALSKI: I see. Basically, one of the reasons for his salary being \$35,700 right now is really dealing with experience and the merit principle.

MR. STEFANIUK: Dealing with experience in the management position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He got a promotion which cost him money. That's what has happened.

MR. STEFANIUK: In effect what we did when Mrs. Bishop, the previous Editor, retired was lower the salary considerably from Mrs. Bishop's earnings, which were then in the area of \$40,000. We find ourselves in a difficult position now. As you see with the proposal that we make, it is within range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well within range. Had Mrs. Bishop stayed and had Bob Bubba stayed in his former position, he would now be making more money than he is as a result of having been promoted to Editor. Didn't he start within two years of the beginnings of Hansard?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right. His experience in Hansard approximates eight or nine years.

So we are dealing with a salary proposal that is within the range. We are merely asking for an escalation at this particular time in an effort to bring about some equity relative to the responsibility and to the other employees in the organization.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think the greatest difficulty that all of us around this table would probably have is dealing with the size of the adjustment requested rather than an adjustment. I may be alone in that.

MR. STEFANIUK: Perhaps I could review this very briefly in the hope that it might help. When Mrs. Bishop retired, she was earning in excess of \$40,000.

That was better than a year ago — almost two years ago, I believe. We ran a competition and had a considerable number of applicants for the position. We chose Bob Bubba to become the Editor of Alberta Hansard. In our estimation he was the best qualified from among the applicants we had, especially having considered his experience as two L.C. to Mrs. Bishop.

At the outset we did not want to place his salary in an area where we would have little room for adjustment. We may have been justified in starting him closer to the same salary at which Mrs. Bishop had left, but we did not because we wanted to test him as well in a management position. He has proven to us that he's more than capable of handling that responsibility . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very conscientious.

MR. STEFANIUK: . . . and has gone beyond what I would consider the strict responsibilities of the position. He has considerably reorganized the office of Alberta Hansard, and all for the better. He has entirely overseen the installation of the new word processing system within Hansard. He has assisted the office of the Clerk in identifying computers for installation in our offices and has devoted a lot of personal time to those efforts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's an outstanding expert on word processing equipment. In fact if the government caucus or any of the opposition caucuses want advice in that regard, he's as good a one as I know of to go to — and knowledgeable about the various kinds of equipment.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Clerk: has he been in the position for two years or one year?

MR. STEFANIUK: He's been in the position between one year and two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As Editor.

MRS. EMBURY: That's what I mean. You're looking at his range, and you have a proposal here. Number one, I'm just curious. I know the recommendation obviously has come through you, but did it come from the gentleman in question himself?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you. I'm trying to look ahead, given what we're faced with today. Because I have no background as far as this committee goes, I'm trying to look at what you would perceive as being reasonable. You brought in a recommendation based on the work he's done. It obviously sounds like he's doing a commendable job at this time. But now I'm looking ahead. Is there any standard that you would go by, say, within the next five years or year to year?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. The standard which would apply from year to year for the future would be that which applies to all management employees. As you know, within the last couple of years the amount of increase has been restricted to 6 and 5 per cent. That is the same rate of increase which would apply

for the future, depending again within the range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To some extent that limitation contributes to the anomaly that we have right now between him and the two I.C.

MRS. CRIPPS: But in the past, it has been standard practice to change the range as soon as management reaches the upper level of their salary range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily. It depends . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: We have three proposals here to reclassify the range.

MR. STEFANIUK: Not necessarily. We propose no salary changes in the case of the first three that are listed on Schedule A. What we want to do is very simply straighten out what has been something in the category of a mess.

MRS. CRIPPS: While no proposals for changes are there, we're talking about a considerable increase in the scope of the upper salary range in all three of the other categories, not Hansard.

MR. STEFANIUK: But we're still guided by the limitations that are imposed in any given year by the Personnel Administration office.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty is that here we're talking about the provincial parliament and the fact that it hangs on to the edge of the government employees' set-up but is not part of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We follow them pretty much.

DR. REID: As a guideline. Because the government service got an increase, we gave the same increase to the non-management people. That's what has created the anomaly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. STEFANIUK: But you see, we have to follow government — and that makes sense in most parliaments — simply because we don't want to place the parliament or the government in the position where one is competing with the other. What will result if we have a competitive position is probably a clamoring on the part of the staff to get into one or the other. So we must maintain parity there.

As it stands, we are subjected to considerable pirating — I can think of no other term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Raiding.

MR. STEFANIUK: From government we have had approaches, which were made behind management's back in the Legislative Assembly, to personnel in the Clerk's office at least, a number of whom have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . gone into ministers' offices.

MR. STEFANIUK: . . . gone into ministries. Those approaches were made without benefit of competition.

MRS. CRIPPS: They are also subject to termination at the end of four years.

MR. STEFANIUK: Depending on the position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

DR. REID: I'm aware of what has happened in hospitals to nursing managers, administrators, and other management people since the recent increases in nurses' salaries over the last few years. This is relatively insignificant in dollars compared to some of those episodes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But does one anomaly justify another?

DR. REID: Well, exactly. That's the problem. It certainly is an anomaly to have the second person on the list earning more gross, considering that the Editor does do overtime. This is the difficulty. If the Editor were not doing overtime, I would be quite happy with it. But I know very well that Bob Bubba does overtime, because I see him in this building at eleven o'clock at night.

MR. STEFANIUK: And on weekends.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We really have a good — we're fortunate.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we're really saying is that we retired somebody more than a year ago at this salary level, we put somebody into that position who has ably demonstrated that he can do the job as well if not better, and we're simply trying to bring the salary up to the level where it was more than a year ago for the same position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If Mrs. Bishop had stayed on, we'd be spending this money right now.

MR. STEFANIUK: We'd be spending more than that.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what you're saying, and I would like to support it wholeheartedly. My only problem is as an elected member. It's just very, very tough at this particular time in view of what is still happening out there. I know it's hard to balance these individual concerns with what's happening in the public. I certainly have to understand the issue very, very clearly, because to go back to people who are receiving 0 per cent increases, many of whom are just grateful to have a job, many are still unemployed: this is the dilemma for me as an elected person.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Sheila. I would have difficulty explaining the percentage of increase. I wouldn't have any difficulty perhaps explaining the competency of Bob, but I sort of feel that he knew what he was getting into a year ago. I don't know; it would be hard to justify that percentage increase to the constituency the way times are right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With all the distress there has been in private enterprise, it's doubtful that you have situations where people in a supervisory capacity are being paid less than those whom they supervise.

DR. REID: If they do the same overtime.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have one of the Clerk. When Bob Bubba was appointed to this position, was there a probationary period or anything like that involved in the appointment? Or was it a finite appointment?

MR. STEFANIUK: The appointment to a management position is usually firm; however, it is always understood that there is a year's probation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We knew our man, too, because of his previous experience with us. It wasn't as if we had brought someone in from the outside.

MR. KOWALSKI: I guess we should bring this to a head one way or the other, so I would like to make the following motion: that the salary level for the Editor of Alberta Hansard be adjusted 5 per cent on the base of \$35,700. The 5 per cent adjustment will bring it up \$1,885 to a figure of \$37,585. That would be retroactive to June 6, 1983.

DR. REID: The motion is for 5 per cent in addition to any other increases that are awarded to management people?

MR. STEFANIUK: It's retroactive to last June.

MRS. CRIPPS: When is it up for review?

MR. STEFANIUK: June 1, 1984.

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

MR. STEFANIUK: Nigel didn't vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I didn't hear him vote, and I couldn't see his hand.

MR. STEFANIUK: Does the committee wish to address itself to the other proposals that are listed on Schedule A?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Just as we were getting into the budgeting process, we had a proposal by Dr. Reid that we might look at the Hansard Editor's position during the budgeting process but that we should look at the other two after the budgeting process was over. We've just completed that.

DR. REID: Were there not three suggestions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. There were four altogether.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, if I can address this, my understanding is that the greatest anomaly we have is that the Parliamentary Counsel is not in any classification whatsoever at the moment. This dates back to a prior committee. I'm not sure if it was Members' Services or Legislative Offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Both.

DR. REID: I'm not sure who made the decision. There was discussion about it, and there was a salary that was fixed. I think that is an anomaly relative to the provincial service, unless it was purely a contract

position.

I certainly think that the Parliamentary Counsel should be put into some classification. In the event that the present incumbent leaves, we want to know what we are offering to anybody to replace him. For one, I think we should get into a classification. Whether Executive Officer II (Legal) is the right one or not is a highly academic question. I wonder if there has been any consultation with Mr. Stevens' department about the responsibilities of this occupation compared to any other occupation of a lawyer in the public service.

The other thing I wonder is: is the Parliamentary Counsel regarded as being a one hundred per cent full-time post? In other words, is there any provision whatsoever for doing legal work outside the Legislative Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been a full-time post. The work varies somewhat — not nearly as much as the work of Hansard, and to some extent the Clerk's office as well — as to whether the House is in session or not. The traffic very much increases shortly before the House goes back into session, but it is year-round work. The Clerk, the Chief Electoral Officer, myself, and — if I'm not mistaken — the Auditor General go to the Parliamentary Counsel for advice. I should think most of that work would occur outside session, in addition to which every now and again he's helping us with our work, and members have certain year-round requirements. They go to him when the House is not sitting.

DR. REID: The other question is: has there been any consultation with Mr. Stevens' people about the responsibilities?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, there has. There has been considerable consultation. The truth of the matter is that Mr. Stevens' people have some difficulty with this classification. The classification which is proposed compares with the classification provided to Legislative Counsel in the Attorney General's department; in other words, Peter Pagano and other senior lawyers within the Attorney General's department. The difficulty that Mr. Stevens' organization has with this proposed classification has to do with the fact that there are no subordinates in this position; in other words, there are no other lawyers to be supervised. So Mr. Stevens' organization would prefer a classification that is lower than the one which is proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think it has ever gone to the minister; I'm not sure.

MR. STEFANIUK: We're dealing with the department as opposed to the minister personally. That is a fact: they would prefer a lower classification. Their contention is that there are no lawyers to be supervised, whereas in the case of Peter Pagano, Legislative Counsel, and other senior counsel in the Attorney General's department, the question of supervision does come into play.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That raises the question: when is a lawyer or, for that matter, a doctor — a surgeon, for example — rendering a more valuable service? When he is personally applying his skills to patients or clients, or when he is supervising what other lawyers or doctors are doing for their clients or patients?

Good morning, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: Good morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Nigel Pengelly on the telephone, and he will be glad to know that you've arrived.

There's a difference of opinion there. I think that a highly qualified surgeon or lawyer is of far more value as a surgeon or lawyer than he is as a manager, and consequently the absence of management functions for the [Law] Clerk of the Legislative Assembly — and I'm glad we don't have any, because it would mean a bigger staff — is not significant at all. In fact, if anything it might point the other way.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think the last little bit of discussion has really looked at the Achilles' heel of bureaucracy period: in essence, management is paid according to the number of people supervised rather than the ability of the manager in the particular position in the office. That's typical of bureaucracy worldwide. It has been the cause of most of our dilemmas today, and unfortunately it will forever be the cause of our dilemmas. So from my own personal opinion, having been a member of the public service, I resisted that argument, I fought with it all the time; I consistently lost.

However, there is a question here with respect to the Parliamentary Counsel and, I guess, the classification of most of the people who work under the Legislative Assembly. I think it's unfortunate that we consistently have to compare the people and staff that are associated with the Legislative Assembly with other members of the public service in the province of Alberta. Surely there has to be an alternative that would allow us to compare staff of the Legislative Assembly in other jurisdictions, in both Canada and perhaps the British parliamentary system. There must be some guidelines that one can apply. I wonder where those are and where they might be in terms of this discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's difficult to do, as the Clerk can tell you of the studies and comparisons we've done.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, for the committee's information, we have looked very, very carefully at one model which we think is ideal. It exists in the parliament of the province of Ontario, where an entire classification system has been worked up for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It is different and separate from the classification system of the Ontario government. We have all the documentation. We would probably be delighted to see a similar system instituted in the province of Alberta and to establish what we consider appropriate qualifications for every single position within the Legislative Assembly of Alberta which would, in our estimation, be necessarily different from the classifications that are applied by government. By so doing, we think we would be in a position to eliminate classifications such as Municipal Officer I for the administrator of a caucus. We could properly write a job description and classify that type of position, and attach thereto an appropriate salary, considering the responsibilities.

So we would very much welcome the opportunity to establish a Legislative Assembly classification

grid.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, one of the items we have on this agenda is No. 11. If there is no immediacy to resolving the item we are currently discussing, it would seem to me appropriate for all members of this committee to receive some of this information from the Clerk with respect to the situation in Ontario. If it does come about that under item 11 on the agenda we eventually make our way to Queen's Park, we continue the discussion of this matter and, sometime through 1984, address the whole question of the classifications of the Legislative Assembly. I take it that there is not an immediacy to this matter today.

DR. REID: No salaries are being changed.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, there are no proposals for salary changes. By making this proposal, we are simply attempting to straighten out something that has been hanging in limbo and kicked around for a number of years.

MR. KOWALSKI: Then let's address the whole issue rather than just parts of it.

MR. STEFANIUK: If this committee would undertake to study that, we would be delighted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have the whole issue here in front of you with this listing of three positions. As far as information from other Legislatures is concerned, we have it yea high. This is not a new thing.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, not long ago we had a very interesting visit from our confreres in the New Brunswick Legislature. I think they learned a lot from that meeting. We may be Albertans, but I think we may be able to learn a lot from legislators and equivalent committees or organizations in other provinces. Perhaps we educated the New Brunswick members somewhat, but perhaps we could be educated ourselves. The item the Clerk has mentioned of the organization in Ontario — it might well be time that we look at that type of organization in Alberta. Rather than at the moment addressing just this issue on reclassifications, still within the classifications in government service, perhaps that's what we should be doing.

Since there are no financial consequences for the three people concerned, perhaps the Member for Barrhead is right. Rather than do it on another ad hoc basis just now, do it properly with some reasoned thought. It has no financial consequences for any of the three people concerned. This is a commitment that we would address the issue; this is not a postponement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but this sort of thing has been going on for maybe six years.

MR. KOWALSKI: With respect, Mr. Chairman, the members of this committee have not been on this committee for six years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but the records and the information are there. With great respect, subject to re-persuasion, I doubt whether we would get a great deal of further enlightenment by travelling to other

Legislative Assemblies to get that same information over again, and possibly get it updated somewhat. Some of it by now is probably a year or two old.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't think that was what the member was talking about. He was talking about taking the bull by the horns and making a decision on the status and classification of people involved with the Legislative Assembly. I think this committee has taken the bull by the horns in a number of cases, and I think we're prepared to do it again.

MR. KOWALSKI: I certainly don't mean that we have to go to Ontario to get this information; not at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're the only ones we know of, aren't they?

MR. STEFANIUK: Ontario, Ottawa, and Quebec are probably the three models to look at in terms of a parliamentary organization as such. We have considerable information on file; we would be only too happy to share that. We've been talking to the other jurisdictions about their organizations for some years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've been holding back on it.

MRS. CRIPPS: We don't want this much; we want one page.

MR. STEFANIUK: Agreed. It's easily summarized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Even summarized, you're not going to have time to read it.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I said. We want one page.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have model job descriptions for every single position within a parliament. As I said, from a management point of view we would welcome the opportunity to establish a classification system for Legislative Assembly employees which would be separate and distinct from government.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, it looks like we're kind of reaching agreement around the table. It's just Nigel who hasn't commented yet. I have had a concern for quite some time. The Clerk has mentioned one position in the Legislature that he feels needs to be looked at. I've even had a concern with regard to secretaries' positions, where when you reach the top of the level the only way to change it is a reclassification. Of course we always know what that means.

So I think I'd like to support what the other members have said. I guess it means that sometime we have a little study session based on the information you have. Then we can go from there. We'll probably find out we have some more questions after that. But since you have the information available...

MR. CHAIRMAN: This kind of thing we're dealing with here would not be tolerated in a government department. To have this kind of disorganized, unclassified, heterogeneous collection would not be tolerated in any government department. It's something that would have been settled years ago. The trouble with the horns of this bull is that they're

wearing out. It has taken so long.

DR. REID: We've got a new matador.

MRS. CRIPPS: Which just goes to prove that de-horning a bull doesn't necessarily make him a better bull.

DR. REID: That's the farmer speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But then you lose your handle. The committee wants to take it by the horns. I can't suggest any other appropriate parts of the anatomy that would substitute for the horns for what the committee has in mind.

DR. REID: I could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, were you about to make a motion?

MR. PENGELLY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not fair to the secretary of the meeting.

MRS. EMBURY: You're moving the bull are you, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: I agree with Sheila's and Ken's statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would someone like to move that we put it over to the next meeting, and in the meantime we'll provide you with the information, encapsulated as much as possible? One of the reasons I invite such a motion is that there is no way it is going to be done before next fall if it isn't done before the House reconvenes.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion. I don't know if you saw it, but the 1983 Canadian Legislature comparative study is now out. Are we getting copies?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There will be a copy for each member.

DR. REID: It might help us with this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure it deals directly.

MR. STEFANIUK: I have the book; we have a number of those studies now. We'll go through the material, plus the material we've received directly which is not contained in the studies, and try to encapsulate it, and distribute it to the members of the committee.

I personally would certainly welcome the committee's undertaking to consult with other Legislatures on this subject, particularly with Ontario, Quebec, and the House of Commons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For example, there is Mr. Fleming, who is the director of administration for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. We could possibly invite him to attend one of our meetings. We could consider the same with regard to an equivalent person from Quebec City or Ottawa.

DR. REID: I think we should do it and do it properly and do it once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Assuming we're not going to be meeting within the next two or three weeks, we'll have the information in summary form — in simple, stark terms — and then bring it up at the next meeting and see if you're ready to deal with it then. Is that all right? Is that agreed, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now going to item 8, you have support material, and you may wish to refer particularly to page 399 of the partial transcript that is part of item 8. There was a suggestion made near the top of page 399 that the preparation of a memorandum on the topic might await initial discussion by the Clerk and the Workers' Compensation Board, and I don't know whether there has been a chance to hold such a discussion.

MR. STEFANIUK: There hasn't been as yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other discussion of item 8?

MR. STEFANIUK: There is the memorandum from Mr. Clegg, which is at the top of that pile.

MR. KOWALSKI: In essence, according to Clegg's memorandum — further extension of our discussion the last time we met. In Clegg's opinion, the provision for coverage when travelling from the constituency office to the Legislative Assembly may very well be covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's third party liability, not injury to constituency office staff which might occur travelling between the Legislature and the constituency office, as is indicated in the first paragraph of Mr. Clegg's memo of December 23.

The third paragraph is an assurance that the policy "covers employees who are on short-term contract such as Interns, Researchers and project employees". We have it verbally that that extends to constituency office staff. That troubled me a little. Verbal insurance coverage isn't worth much. So we asked for a copy of the policy, and you'll be astonished to read at the top of page 2 that these policies appear to be classified, because they are afraid that government departments that get copies of the policies may misinterpret them. There it is. I suggest that this committee could run the risk of misinterpreting the policy and that we should insist on getting a copy.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So for the next meeting, we'll pursue that item further and will get a copy of the policy. At an early opportunity the Clerk — who, as I said, has interrupted the commencement of part of his proper vacation to be at this meeting — may have a chance between his return from vacation and the next meeting, depending on when the next meeting takes place, to fit in a discussion with an appropriate person on the Workers' Compensation Board.

Can we go on to item 9. This item has not been around quite as long as some others. Alan, do you want to talk about that?

MR. HYLAND: I phoned two coffee outfits in Medicine Hat; I figured the price would be about the same no matter where it was. Coffee is between 55 and 60 cents a pouch; I assume it depends on how much traffic you have in your office. At a couple of pouches a day, if you're open four days a week, it would be about \$228 a year per office. I don't know how many constituency offices there are.

MR. STEFANIUK: In excess of 60.

MR. HYLAND: That would roughly be the cost.

MR. STEFANIUK: But wasn't there a suggestion at the last meeting, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Appleby be communicated with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't recall; that could be. We have his memo of October 25, the first item under tab 9.

MR. STEFANIUK: I believe there was generally a consensus that this ought to remain the personal expense of the member where it applies in a constituency office, but that a member of the committee might undertake to discuss the matter further with Mr. Appleby, who raised the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's another way of dealing with it. If you just consider that it's constituency office supplies, then it could come out of the constituency office allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right, if a claim were put in for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It wouldn't require any extra funding.

MR. STEFANIUK: That was the question from Mr. Appleby. It's a question of this committee expressing itself on whether or not that is a legitimate expense. The question arose as to claims and stocking coffee supplies centrally, as we do stationery supplies and that sort of thing. If the committee wishes to pronounce itself on a policy, we'll apply it.

DR. REID: I'll make a motion that items such as coffee in a constituency office be personal items and be paid for by the member out of their tax-free allowance under the indemnity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you hear that, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: No, I can't. If the members would please put the microphones a little closer, it would probably solve the problem.

DR. REID: It was me who made the motion, Nigel. I was suggesting that items such as coffee in constituency offices be personal items paid for by the member out of their tax-free allowance under the indemnity.

MR. PENGELLY: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion of that motion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor? Opposed? Carried. That means you can't do it during election campaigns.

MRS. CRIPPS: You can't use your office during election campaigns anyway, so it doesn't make any difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The feds do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We don't.

DR. REID: It's very specific.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 10, subscription rates for Hansard, Votes, and Orders. That's a carry-over from a previous meeting. The main question here is Hansard subscriptions. Members may recall that arising from that, there was a discussion of postal charges for Hansard. Perhaps we could deal with them one at a time. They are interrelated, but we can't resolve the postal matter on our own. We're going to have to deal with the post office people on that one. But we can resolve the Hansard subscriptions rates on our own.

On the second page of the support item under tab 10, you'll see what the rates are in some other jurisdictions.

MRS. CRIPPS: I thought somebody made a motion on that.

MR. HYLAND: I thought I did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was a motion, but I don't think we proceeded with it, because we got into . . .

MR. HYLAND: We got talking about postal rates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd like to make a motion. I move that we do not adjust the Hansard subscription rates for the 1984-85 fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Incidentally, these subscriptions are on a calendar year basis. Therefore I suggest that any motion relate to calendar years.

MRS. CRIPPS: I want to ask what the difference would be in subsidization if we doubled the rate.

MR. KOWALSKI: Eight hundred and eighty-six dollars; 434 people have subscriptions.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's the subscription to the Bills, which presently stands at \$2.

DR. REID: There are two items on this memo, Mr. Chairman. The Hansard, which is the record of the provincial parliament: I'm quite in agreement with the Member for Barrhead that we leave the subscription as it is. I think the other one, subscribers to copies of all Bills introduced in the House, where we do it for \$2 a year, does need some adjustment. One is the record of the provincial parliament, and the other is a service provided to municipalities, lawyers, and all kinds of other people, presumably for their purposes.

MR. STEFANIUK: If I may clarify, Mr. Chairman, there are two comparisons. A service that we provide at \$2 per year is provided in New Brunswick

for \$110, in Ontario for \$50, and in Saskatchewan for \$25. A service that we provide for \$15 a year, that being Hansard, is provided in British Columbia, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Yukon for the rate of \$30, \$40 in Nova Scotia, and \$65 in Ottawa. The \$2 service is . . .

DR. REID: Ridiculous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should put in a fee that makes it worth while to put it through the books, because it costs us more than \$2. We have Mr. Kowalski's motion with regard to Hansard subscriptions. Are you ready for the question on Mr. Kowalski's motion that for the 1984 calendar year, Hansard subscriptions remain unchanged? All those in favor? Opposed? Carried.

Now we can go back to the mailing of the Bills.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, in relation to Bills, if somebody purchases a Bill the price is much greater than if they take a subscription to all Bills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we charge for copies of Bills?

MR. STEFANIUK: Not copies of Bills, but of Acts. That is not our bailiwick; that rests with the Queen's Printer.

DR. REID: But that is the only comparison I can think of.

MR. STEFANIUK: I believe the minimal charge is 25 cents.

DR. REID: I think it goes up to as much as \$2.50 for some of the large ones, like the municipalities Act and the School Act. When you look at the rates in other provincial Legislatures, which presumably have similar workloads and numbers of Bills per year, the lowest of the other ones that are mentioned in the memorandum is \$25 a year, in our neighboring province of Saskatchewan. Even that probably scarcely recovers the cost of entering it and depositing the money. Certainly at \$2, we're running at a loss. We'd be better to charge them nothing and just ship them out.

MR. STEFANIUK: Precisely.

DR. REID: I would be prepared to move that the annual subscription for copies of all Bills be increased to \$50.

MR. STEFANIUK: That also includes Votes, which is the daily official record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you hear the motion, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes I did.

MRS. CRIPPS: If someone orders one Bill, what would be the cost? Is there a prorated cost?

DR. REID: This a subscription service we're talking about, to all Bills . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: And Votes and Proceedings.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to support the motion at this time, but I would like the committee to consider that we look at this item again next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on Dr. Reid's motion? Those in favor? Carried.

The next is item 11, travel by members of the committee to other Legislatures. I think the more significant part of the support material is at the bottom of page 379 of the transcript.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll move that the chairman undertake to look at a communications trip with another Legislature for the purpose of discussions between the members of an appropriate committee, similar to ours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to extend the possibilities or alternatives to a trip that might include several legislatures? It might be more dollar wise to do it that way.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, I would. But I would leave it at the ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: To work up a proposal?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: At the last meeting, did we not agree that there should be two of them during the 1984-85 fiscal year, and we budgeted money for those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. KOWALSKI: So in essence you're asking the chairman to come up with two proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Specifics.

MR. STEFANIUK: I just want to clarify, Mr. Chairman, that when Mr. Purdy asked me on behalf of the committee to have something worked into the budget, it was foreseen that a single trip eastward from Edmonton would take in perhaps Ontario, Ottawa, and Quebec City, and thereby eliminate the need for separate trips.

MRS. CRIPPS: I agree.

MR. STEFANIUK: And that another one might be undertaken to the west coast, so that points in-between would be covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been moved by Mrs. Cripps that the chairman prepare a proposal in this regard for consideration by the committee. Is there any further discussion? Do you all agree? Carried.

Parking at airports: this is another one of those perennials. It's not quite as hoary as the classification one, but it really is a perennial. We've tried every which way to enable members to cover this with credit cards. It would seem that I'd have to acknowledge that as circumstances presently are, and seem likely to be in the foreseeable future, the idea is impossible.

MR. HYLAND: Not quite, not according to this memo I got from Charlene that the manager of Park

N Jet confirms the availability of a parking pass for corporate accounts, which we never were able to have before. I understand we certainly can't get it in the parking here or in the terminal in Calgary, but Park N Jet will provide it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Where's Park N Jet?

MR. HYLAND: Just north of the airport in Calgary.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's long-term parking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that most of our traffic relates to the Edmonton and Calgary airports.

MR. HYLAND: This is Calgary.

MR. STEFANIUK: This relates only to Calgary. The difficulty we have in Edmonton is that that kind of facility is available at Edmonton International, but of course the vast majority of our members use Edmonton Municipal, where that kind of facility is not available.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, is there any way that this could be considered under our new travel allowance, whereby it would be a case of obtaining the receipts and then submitting those as expenses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of the tax considerations, we've been trying to avoid having members pay for those things at all or having them charged to members and reimbursed. But if those are put aside, there's no problem in paying against vouchers, provided the payments are authorized.

MR. HYLAND: Why I thought about Park N Jet was simply because you didn't have to handle it. I know you have to be there a few minutes before. It isn't inside, but you can plug in your car if it's wintertime, which is better than you can do here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many airports would that look after?

MR. HYLAND: Just Calgary.

MRS. CRIPPS: Edmonton wouldn't be the kind of problem that Calgary is anyway. As I understand it, it's the members coming in who have the major problem of leaving their vehicle for an extended period of time. Isn't that right?

MRS. EMBURY: Sorry, you missed me there. Which is the major problem?

MRS. CRIPPS: Calgary would be the major problem, because the people leaving Edmonton for most purposes wouldn't have to leave their car for an extended period of time.

DR. REID: Some members do.

MR. PENGELLY: They could leave their car at the Legislature and then be reimbursed for taxi fare.

MRS. CRIPPS: But the taxi fare would be far less than, say, someone leaving their car at Calgary airport for a week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quite.

MRS. CRIPPS: And the people coming in from the rural areas, especially into Calgary or Lethbridge, would have no alternative. I don't know if Lethbridge charges.

MR. HYLAND: No, and the Hat charges 75 cents a stay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?

MR. HYLAND: I don't know, Sheila. What are your ...

MRS. EMBURY: There's certainly no doubt that it's a concern. Again, it's restricted to certain members. The purpose of this committee seems to look at policies that will encompass the concerns of all members. I think what we've done with the travel expenses is a perfect example of where we took a concern that seemed to be specific to certain members of our Legislature and we managed to encompass all. I think that was very well done.

I would like to see that this issue still be considered. The problem is to interpret it into a policy that would be applicable for everybody. You would be looking at extremes, I guess, where some people from rural areas may be flying to Calgary or something like that. Isn't that what we have to do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that we should try to achieve equity so that certain members don't have undue burdens that other members don't have.

MRS. EMBURY: I really do empathize even more with the members from southern Alberta than with my urban colleagues from Calgary. I think they have a terrific burden. I know for a fact that the number of persons who drive to Calgary and then take the airbus have a parking problem. Isn't that right, Alan? You could maybe speak for ...

MR. HYLAND: The amount of times I drive into Calgary and leave a vehicle there may be two or three times a year. But I know there is Mr. Musgrove and Mr. Alger.

MRS. CRIPPS: Steven Stiles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: George Wolstenholme, over and over again in the last parliament.

MR. HYLAND: They have no way of somebody bringing them in or getting a ride in. They have to bring a vehicle.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's possible under the new Legislative Assembly Act, but perhaps the Clerk or you could look into the possibility that we establish a policy that the Legislative Assembly establish corporate accounts, where possible, at airports for parking by members. I don't know how it would be worked with the operators of those parking facilities. That would apply to all members. What I'm not sure is whether that is within the parameters this committee operates under. Sorry, Nigel. I wasn't speaking up again.

MR. PENGELLY: That's okay. It's not a problem I have too much anyway.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, first of all to address Dr. Reid's comment, pursuant to the direction of a previous committee we did investigate the airports where this might be possible. We found it was virtually impossible to obtain universal application of a charge plan, particularly in Edmonton. We did find a couple more airports in the south where that would have been possible. But there's considerable difficulty in doing that, obviously.

What occurs to me is that perhaps the transportation and administrative services order, which was approved earlier today, might be extended. Under the provisions of this order, we're already going to reimburse the member with a direct payment for distances travelled and the use of a private automobile. If the committee is concerned about the parking charges which apply and has now made provision for 52 return trips between the residence of the member and the capital, could that order be further amended or could we be given authority to look at the possibility of amending that order further to provide for the inclusion of parking charges as part of the transportation costs?

MRS. EMBURY: I think it would be appropriate to move that the Clerk of the Assembly undertake to look at changing the transportation order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To cover airport parking.

MR. KOWALSKI: Expenses incurred in airport parking.

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

Other business: there is one item that isn't listed, and that is in relation to gallery passes. Our supply is running low, and we're going to have to reorder passes. The question is whether the committee would like to look at the administration of the passes. As it is now, the passes are all administered through the Clerk's office. They are not numbered, as I recall, or are they?

MR. STEFANIUK: No, Mr. Chairman, they are not numbered and are administered only to the extent that the Clerk's office orders the supplies of blank passes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And hands them out to members. Occasionally a member may have some particular thing in mind that he or she wants to raise or say in the House, and of course will want a block of passes. Once in a while such a block of passes might even lead to a sort of demonstration in the galleries.

There are various ways of dealing with passes in various parliaments. I recall some years ago visiting the Dutch Parliament, where the pass was very carefully preserved by the visitor and had to be turned in when the visitor left the building. If they weren't all turned in, they started looking in the building for who was lurking there. There's a different system in the House of Commons, for example, and in the Legislative Assembly in Ontario, and so on.

The question is whether this committee wants to give some thought to that. It relates to security and, consequently, it's not the sort of thing you would perhaps want to put all the details of which in minutes or ...

DR. REID: Transcripts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It's just a question of whether you'd like to go on with it. It is possible for passes to be issued with very, very little record — no record, in fact — of who issued them or whether they're being issued with a view to organizing a demonstration of some kind.

MRS. CRIPPS: Do they all have to be signed by the member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: But they're not being picked up — or are they being picked up when they go into the . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, our own security personnel receive the passes when they visit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS. CRIPPS: And the member who signs them is responsible for the conduct of those people in the gallery?

MR. HYLAND: It doesn't say so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The name of the person to whom the pass is given is not shown on the pass. It could be handed from person to person.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that at least some of the members of this committee should meet informally over coffee somewhere to discuss this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other business? The date of the next meeting?

MR. KOWALSKI: Are there any pressing matters that you would want to bring to the committee's attention, Mr. Chairman? We have only a few that are outstanding on this agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there's anything that couldn't be put away for a month.

MR. HYLAND: It would take that long to get some of them if you're going on holidays.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's just for the balance of this week.

DR. REID: Perhaps we can leave the date open — at the call of the Chair, after due consultation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right; at the call of the Chair.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, are you braced for a motion for adjournment?

MR. PENGELLY: Did you set a date for the next meeting, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was decided that it would be at the call of the Chair. Of course, we'll consult with the members before establishing the date. You're content?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did I hear you move adjournment?

MR. PENGELLY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.]

This page intentionally left blank