

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[10:38 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll come to order. First of all we have the approval of the minutes of December 19, 1983. You may recall that when we had our meeting of January 3, we didn't have the minutes of the December 19 meeting to approve because of some absences and the intervention of Christmas. So we now have two sets of minutes to approve. Is there a motion with regard to those of December 19?

MRS. EMBURY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minutes of December 19 are adopted. What about January 3, 1984? Another motion by Mrs. Embury?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to bring attention to the typographical error on page 2.84, 7a.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Concerning?

MRS. EMBURY: The second page, under Hansard Editor, 7a, "concerning" is a typographical error.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, the "r" left out. Yes, I had that marked. I didn't think that would need a motion.

MRS. EMBURY: No. I'll move the adoption of the minutes as corrected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

Business arising out of the minutes: I checked those minutes, and as far as I'm aware all the business arising out of both sets of minutes is included in the items which you find on the remainder of your agenda.

MRS. PRATT: On that one item about the Legislative Assembly envelopes, you had asked me to survey the members. I sent you the results of the survey, and that isn't on the ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right — with the address. Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: Then, Mr. Chairman, we also had the outstanding item concerning a mailing by the NDP caucus. There's a further piece of correspondence on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but isn't that listed?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. It's listed under 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. The support item is under 4. Okay, I stand corrected. Should we go to that item? Is there anything further you want to do about it? As you all have in your support material, there's

a letter from Mr. Mandelbaum to Mr. Stefaniuk in which he elaborates on his previous letter. My question is, is there anything further that should be done about it?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, seeing as I was the individual who raised the matter and, I guess, went to about three committee meetings in the past to ascertain an explanation from the Leader of the Official Opposition — what we have before us is a letter, dated January 24, 1984, not from the Leader of the Opposition but an assistant to him. The formative paragraph is the second one, where he writes:

On further examination I discovered that Mr. Kowalski was correct and that an attachment referred to an NDP tour. This obviously referred to the tour that was to be undertaken by the MLA's in their capacity as legislators and was not intended to be represented as a Party tour.

My request in the last several meetings was to get an explanation from the Leader of the Opposition and/or the second member of his caucus, Mr. Martin, with respect to this. What we've received to this point in time is a statement from Mr. Mandelbaum simply indicating that I was correct but not providing an explanation as to what might occur now as a result of this unfortunate use of public funds for partisan purposes.

I think I would be satisfied if this committee were to receive from the Leader of the Opposition a letter explaining that this was an error and suggesting to us that it would be his vigilant approach to ensure that this should not occur again in the future. I would be satisfied with that kind of explanation from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're saying that letters written on his behalf by an executive assistant aren't acceptable?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct, as the motion we approved in this committee in time past basically referred to an explanation, by way of a motion from this committee requesting an explanation from either the Leader of the Opposition or Mr. Martin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But of course there are lots of people who have staff, where the thing is done on their behalf by staff.

MR. KOWALSKI: That is perhaps very so. Certainly it happened. It's very traditional in fact that it may happen in many cases. But the reality in this case is that it is two Members of the Legislative Assembly who must assume the responsibility for something that has happened by way of the funds that had been appropriated to them by the Legislative Assembly of the province of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But if the letters referring to the party were sent out by staff people, shouldn't an explanation from the staff person also be adequate?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I've always believed there is a fundamental responsibility point in a parliamentary

democracy that should rest with the elected people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? Is there a motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think we have several motions to that effect. Essentially we've requested an explanation from either the Leader of the Opposition or — in fact I refer to Minute No. 83.367 of December 19, 1983, where it was moved by me and agreed that "Mr. Martin and Mr. Notley be provided with copies of the Minutes of the December 19, 1983, meeting and be requested to supply further explanation".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just by way of discussion, would you accept a personally signed memorandum from Mr. Notley that he approves what Mr. Mandelbaum has said in his two letters?

MR. KOWALSKI: If it has the Leader of the Opposition's signature attached to it, with an explanation as to what happened and transpired, I think that would be satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to assume that Mr. Notley is aware of the previous motion. Is there a further motion now, or is there any further discussion? Just before you came in — I'm not sure whether you heard it or not, Bill — Mr. Kowalski was saying that letters written by Mr. Mandelbaum in explanation of what occurred are not acceptable, that they must be letters from Mr. Notley, signed by himself. That's where the discussion is right now.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's requested to comply with motion 83.367, which was already agreed to by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want another formal motion, or do you want to let it go on the basis of the motion previously adopted at the December 19 meeting?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think we already have a motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I'll write a letter to Mr. Notley, reporting to him and referring him to the transcript of this meeting. Can we go on now?

MR. STEFANIUK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Do you want to deal with Mrs. Pratt's item, which is something that was discussed at a previous meeting and does not appear as a separate item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the wish of the committee?

MRS. CRIPPS: It's old business, isn't it?

MRS. PRATT: There was no decision made on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we are looking at here — they haven't all come to light, but there have been a number of instances when mail has gone out, at

public expense, that was quite clearly intended to serve party purposes. Because of no separate return address on the mail — there is nothing to prevent anyone from adding it to the stationery as it now is; in other words, in some cases these have been more or less circular letters — letters have been returned, and in four or five cases so far, if I'm not mistaken, the Clerk has received these. Of course he has to open them to find out to whom the letter and the contents should be returned. As a result of that, he has been able to discover these uses of public funds for sending out mail dealing with party purposes. If we now change that custom, then we will no longer have this kind of surveillance. Personally, I would prefer — naturally, whatever the committee wants to do is fine. But from a point of view of keeping an eye on the proper expenditure of public funds, we're going to be deprived of one means that has proved useful in the past and, I think, has led on some occasions to refunds being received for the postage involved.

I know you may say that this is a rather odd situation. We have this committee discussing by name or names an occurrence of such a kind in the NDP caucus, whereas in the other cases the names have not been disclosed by the administration of the Legislative Assembly. The reason for that simply is that in those cases the matters were not raised before the committee, so we didn't feel any need for bringing out the names but simply dealt with the thing in the proper way to ensure reimbursement to taxpayer funds.

MR. PURDY: I think that's the proper way to go. But I think every member has a conscience of their own and they should go that way. I know that in our office in 503, we have a stamp fund. If I have a personal letter to send out, a personal stamp goes on it and out it goes. On the letters I send out, I have a stamp with my name on it. I just attach it to the front of the letter for government business. If it's the wrong address, it comes back to Sylvia in 503, and she looks after it.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, first of all I'm not at all sure that the returned mail is the correct way to be keeping track of the political use of public funds. We're onto another issue here in relation to these envelopes and the space for a member's name to be put onto them for constituency business. I think even cabinet ministers use this type of stationery for nonportfolio functions. So from that standpoint, I think we should perhaps look at the approval of this type of envelope.

The other issue which is being brought up is an ongoing problem, I'm sure, in all parliaments. Perhaps what is required is a reminder — perhaps on an annual basis; I don't know — from the Clerk of the Assembly to all secretarial staff in all the caucuses that the use of publicly provided stationery and mailing privileges is to be related to their function as members of the Legislature and not as politicians of whatever stripe. I think that's a better way of handling that problem than the intermittent interception of returned mail.

MRS. PRATT: That would put the onus on the secretaries.

MR. PURDY: I wonder if I could ask Dr. Reid a question on his thoughts. What would you describe as a conflict? If a person has a constituency organization, to whom you send the throne speech as part of your mailing list, is that a political or a legislative duty? You're looking for feedback from a person who resides in the constituency.

DR. REID: Yes, but the mailing lists that we use for items like, say, mailing out the throne speech or the budget speech or the abbreviated summary of the budget document, are a much broader distribution than purely a political distribution. I send them out to a gentleman who I know is not a Conservative supporter, who is the president of one of the coal mine union locals. The fact that somebody may be of the same political persuasion as the member, whatever the member's political persuasion, is irrelevant to the use of the mail for a bona fide function as a member of the Legislature.

MR. PURDY: That's exactly what I was getting at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But a clearer example of that would be the solicitation of memberships or giving notice of a constituency annual meeting.

DR. REID: It's that line, Mr. Chairman, that we have to be careful about, the purely political as opposed to the function as a member of the Legislature. I think Mrs. Pratt is right. The reminders should be sent out to the members, not to the secretaries. Perhaps the secretaries could be reminded of it in case the members forget. But it's the purely political function that is the line. Obviously, almost everything that any member of a parliament does has, inevitably, some political connotation in the whole nature of being a member of any parliament. But it's the purely political that is the difficulty from the standpoint of the use of public stationery and mailing privileges.

MR. PURDY: One question to Mrs. Pratt, on the envelopes. How many envelopes are left with the old insignia on them?

MRS. PRATT: I think Mr. Stefaniuk might have that information.

MR. PURDY: Bohdan, would you have the information on how many envelopes with the old insignia on them are presently in existence?

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't know offhand what the current stock is.

MR. PURDY: I think we should be using those up before we...

MRS. PRATT: We should.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think it's obvious that we would have to exhaust present stocks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If they're going to be — Mrs. Embury.

MRS. EMBURY: I didn't mean to interrupt you, Mr. Chairman. I was just going to ask what the added

cost will be per envelope.

MR. STEFANIUK: There won't be an added cost. As I can see it, we're really printing another envelope. So in fact what we're doing is adding another type of envelope to our inventory. The added cost would be insignificant, simply because — there would be some added cost perhaps, because we would be reducing quantities of each type. But it would be very insignificant. It obviously makes sense that we should exhaust present stocks. To the extent that members wish to accomplish the same thing that would be accomplished by the new envelope, they might well be counselled to follow the practice which Mr. Purdy has described, which he employs at the moment; that is, to identify with a rubber stamp his name on the envelope. Then if there are returns, they are directed to his office and don't go across my desk. Quite candidly, I would be just as happy not to have those returns float across my desk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Is there a motion?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll move that we have envelopes which can identify the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Envelopes which leave indicated space for members' return addresses.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Visitors — we haven't any at the moment. Mr. Heise is here. We have item 10, farther down the list, on life insurance for members. What is Mr. Heise's official position, Gary?

DR. GARRISON: Manager of benefits and salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So if you'd like, we can go to that item now. Then we'll go back afterwards to item 6.

So we're up to item 10. You may remember that there was a motion by Mr. Hyland that insurance coverage as presently afforded to certain civil servants and to ministers be extended to members. As a result you have, in your support material under tab 10, Mr. Clegg's memo of March 19, but that has been superseded because the draft that was included with that has been updated. Have all of you copies of draft five? There's an order there. I think Mr. Heise and Mr. Clegg have gone over it. As far as I can see, it purports to achieve what Mr. Hyland's motion set out to accomplish.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have a concern. It relates to No. 1(b) in this order, where the definition of remuneration means the sum of the allowances provided for — and it lists — by section 39(1)(a) and 39(1)(b), and section 40 of the Legislative Assembly Act. Then it goes on to talk about the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the leader of a recognized party, et cetera. There's one area that has been ignored, which I would like to talk to this morning.

When the new Legislative Assembly Act was proclaimed in the spring of 1983, changes were made in the Act in Section 56(1) with respect to the MLA pension plan, and permitted, in terms of the

recognition of the base salary, those allowances which were paid to members who receive either a monthly or a yearly stipend by way of appointments to boards, agencies, or commissions. We now have that item as a point of principle under the MLA pension plan. Having done that, it would seem to me that those allowances provided to a number of members by way of their appointments to those three groupings I've just mentioned should also be part of the base in terms of the definition of remuneration for the members' group life insurance order.

It would be my suggestion that we add section 43(3) of the Legislative Assembly Act to 1(b), which would accommodate that concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael just came in.

MR. CLEGG: I heard that it was in connection with the pensionable base. I was too late to hear what item Mr. Kowalski wanted to be included.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's dealing with the definition of remuneration, under 1(b) of draft five. I used, as the point of the argument for the principle I wanted established, the fact that last year, when the Legislative Assembly Act was proclaimed, we used as the base for pensionable service those either monthly or yearly stipends that hon. members receive by way of their appointments to boards, agencies, or committees, which has been identified under section 56(1).

MR. CLEGG: It would vary from time to time as members' appointments went in and out. Each member would have a different remuneration base.

MR. KOWALSKI: In essence, that would be correct. Most of them are appointed for a specified length of time, but it is based on either a monthly or a yearly stipend.

MR. CLEGG: So the amount would go up and down with his appointment to boards and commissions.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct.

MR. CLEGG: It's a decision for the committee. I can only comment that it would be very difficult to administer. Each time a member had an appointment which started or terminated, his premium and his amount of coverage would alter.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct.

MR. CLEGG: But mathematically, it can be done.

MR. HEISE: How are these stipends paid? Are they paid on a regular monthly basis or an annual lump sum?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think there are probably two mechanisms for it, but it would be monthly.

MR. CLEGG: They are all paid monthly. The other problem is that they are paid by different sources. None of them are paid by the Legislative Assembly budget. They are usually paid from the budget which funds the committee or the department that funds the committee. Therefore those moneys would be

coming in from different directions to the member and do not come through the Legislative Assembly office control.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct.

MR. CLEGG: The same as with ministers' salaries. In the case of ministers' salaries, the insurance benefit and the payments therefor which attach to a ministerial salary are currently financed by the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would have to rely on members telling us of the fluctuations in their income in that regard, it would seem to me. I don't know whether you'd have to build in a time limit by which they would have to notify us. Otherwise we might have a member come along two or three years later and say, look, my coverage isn't right; I had such and such income; I'm sorry I forgot to tell you.

MR. KOWALSKI: All appointments are made by way of orders in council. I can't recall here; we've had a number of different drafts. But in terms of the time frame being suggested to members that they exercise the option for this life insurance, a similar approach to a time frame might be written in with respect to 60, 90, or 30 days after the appointment by O.C.

MR. CLEGG: Yes, it would be rather difficult if members had a further election on whether or not that remuneration was insurable, because that would add another variable. It is possible. It adds another variable. It would be fairly complex. If it were made automatic that they had to have their remuneration attached and had to pay a premium for it, then notice could be taken of it and the premium could be adjusted accordingly by the staff here. If there were a further option time to elect for each appointment and remuneration from it, it would be rather difficult to administer, because the time for which the appointment would last might not be set at the beginning. It would be difficult to annualize it. If a member is on a board for \$300 a month, we would assume it would be annualized at \$3,600.

It could be managed, I think, if it were automatic that it was added onto a member's remuneration for purpose of insurance. But if there were a further election with respect to that one item, it might make it a little difficult.

MRS. CRIPPS: It would seem to me that if it's already included in the members' pension plan, then it must already be calculated by the Legislative Assembly for the purposes of paying premiums. So it would be fairly straightforward to just include it in the insurance premium. I don't see any major problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that so? Does that affect the pension?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the calculation is not made by the Legislative Assembly; rather, all the agencies that provide any kind of payment funnel all those payments through the Treasury. The Treasury in turn makes the calculation and obviously reports the appropriate amounts to the pension administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, I was ungracious; I didn't introduce Mr. Heise to the committee. I think you've met everybody: Dr. Reid, Mr. Stefaniuk, Mrs. Davidson, Mr. Jeneroux from Hansard; Mr. Kowalski, the Member for Barrhead; Mrs. Margaret Pratt, the chief agricultural officer for the government caucus.

DR. REID: Municipal inspector.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, that's it. Mrs. Embury, Mrs. Cripps, Bill Purdy, and I'm Gerry Amerongen.

MR. HEISE: Pleased to meet you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we can get back into this.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that agencies, other than the Legislative Assembly, that provide any sort of remuneration to members must funnel that remuneration via the Provincial Treasury and must attach to it for purposes of taxation something that we refer to as an employee number for each member. So the real income can be calculated for purposes of tax deductions. It would seem to me that perhaps some administrative function can be established whereby that same information is fed through to the people concerned with calculation of insurance premiums, if in fact those are to be considered as part of income for this purpose.

I would hastily agree with Mr. Clegg's observation that if it were to be an option whether or not it was to be considered, it would present something of an administrative nightmare. So I think a decision ought to be made one way or the other; it will be considered or it will not.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, there are more difficulties to this than had been thought of. There are some straightforward ones. Those are Members of the Legislative Assembly who are on commissions and are paid on a regular monthly basis and for whom it might make some difference to their death insurance. There are two other groups: those who are paid an annual stipend and, the most troublesome group of all, those who are paid per diem or per meeting. Having been in that category, I know the difficulty it produced for the pension payments when we were scrambling to pick up \$7.50 before March 31 one year.

The small number for whom the amount is significant are the ones for whom the provision might be important. It might well be that for those — offhand I think they number seven — it would be a nonoptional benefit. Speaking medically, the problems of people being able to bounce in and out of schemes according to their medical status would be horrendous. For that reason, if we are going to consider this, then for those members who are on a significant monthly stipend as chairman or member of some board, commission, or agency, it would have to be on a nonoptional basis or it wouldn't work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there not a possibility that just as we're now giving time limits in draft 5 by which they can decide whether they're going to be covered according to the regular coverage or twice as much, couldn't we within the same time limit — and as you'll notice, this applies to newly elected members

and gives them 30 days, one month; I think I'd prefer that to be expressed in days. Couldn't the same kind of option be notified to a newly elected member or a present member saying: in the future, if you happen to get such and such, do you want that included in your coverage, and let it go at that? Then you wouldn't have them, as you say, bouncing in and out.

MR. STEFANIUK: Following on Mr. Kowalski's recommendation and the remarks made by Dr. Reid, there is another question that occurs to me; that is, the irregular payments. For example, members of this committee may receive a special fee should the committee meet at a time other than when the House is sitting. Is it envisaged that such fees would constitute part of the income for insurance purposes? They are irregular.

MR. KOWALSKI: They certainly are, but that was not my intent that those fees are currently calculated for the pensionable service item either. I based my remarks on the basis that's currently used under the public pension scheme, under 56(1) of the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you have in mind, for example, a member who might be on the board of Syncrude?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. Those would be the ones listed in the example by Dr. Reid that would receive either a monthly or yearly stipend.

DR. REID: But not a member of the board of the Alberta Resources Railway who gets paid — I forget what it is; it must be \$100, I guess — for going to those meetings on an ad hoc basis, as called by the president of the railroad.

MR. KOWALSKI: Would that remuneration be calculated for pensionable service?

DR. REID: It is; that's the \$7.50 we were chasing.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, there is a practical problem here. When calculating the pension, one is working retrospectively and you can look at the end of the year at what has been paid. By the end of the year, there is no point in taking life insurance from the money you have earned during the year, because you have survived that year. Therefore it cannot be done retrospectively; it has to be done prospectively in the case of insurance. This is why a scheme that might work for pensions would have further difficulties for insurance purposes. I can see how it would work quite simply for a member who is on an annual or monthly stipend, but it could be very difficult for somebody who is on \$100 or \$200 a day for a committee that may be meeting 30 times a year. He wouldn't know at the beginning of the year how much to get coverage for and, by the end of the year, there's no point buying that coverage because he's survived the year.

I am wondering whether it would be feasible to make a distinction, say, if it is calculated on the basis of monthly or annual earnings, on a regular basis, rather than a rate per meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure that Mr. Heise has been

patiently collecting a considerable number of comments on this discussion.

MR. HEISE: I agree with Mr. Clegg in that it has to be administratively feasible. Right now, the way you have defined remuneration, the income from these sources is regular and monthly, as I understand it, and is basically done through the Legislative Assembly office. It can be easily handled. But when you start getting sources of income that are irregular and, as Mr. Clegg says, you have a passage of time and you don't know until some later date how much the person will receive during that time, how do you really know the amount of insurance, even if the intent is to pay up later on? What if a death occurs during that time? You have difficulties determining exactly the amount of insurance.

The way the program works for employees — and, as you may know, members of Executive Council currently participate — is that there is a regular monthly deduction based on remuneration which is defined for employees as their basic annual salary. That premium flows monthly. At any point in time, an employee or a member of Executive Council knows exactly how much coverage they have in place. I think that's imperative in an insurance type of plan. There are differences, that Mr. Clegg pointed out, in terms of pension aspects where you can allow a passage of time to pay for that service as opposed to insurance where you want to know exactly how much you currently have and always have your premiums paid on that basis and up to date.

MR. KOWALSKI: The recommendation I am providing this morning deals with those identifiable individuals under section 43(1) of the Legislative Assembly Act. It's very, very clear in that section of the Act that it deals with people whose fees are prescribed on a monthly or yearly rate. That's what I'm recommending.

The item Dr. Reid raised was over and above and in addition to that. It may very well be that we're talking about two separate issues, and perhaps taking the two together in one. But I want to make it very, very clear that the recommendation I'm providing this morning, the point that I'm on, is dealing with monthly and yearly rates, which are very, very clearly identifiable. It may very well be that we would want to look at the other item in terms of these other ones, but that's not what I'm suggesting this morning.

MR. HEISE: Could I ask a question with regard to the yearly rates? Is that then paid on an annual basis after the work is complete for that year?

MR. KOWALSKI: It works exactly the same way that the MLA remuneration would be that is prescribed by the Legislative Assembly Act. The other one is prescribed by an order in council, and it's paid on a monthly basis.

MR. HEISE: Further, from what source are these payments made? Is there a separate cheque generated through Alberta Treasury?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're not paid through our

office, are they?

MR. KOWALSKI: No.

MR. HEISE: I think it would be administratively feasible to handle the regular monthly payments, keeping in mind that when a person goes off that committee he would have a decrease in the amount of coverage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Are there any further questions?

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. Kowalski which section of the Legislative Assembly Act he is referring to?

MR. KOWALSKI: 43(3).

MR. CLEGG: Members are in fact paid, pursuant to that section, in some cases on a meeting-by-meeting basis, but we would make the definition for those who are paid on a monthly or annual basis.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the definition for remuneration under the member's group life insurance order, I move that remuneration means the sum of the allowances provided for from time to time by section 39(1)(a) and (b), sections 43(3) and 49, et cetera, as the definition currently reads. We would simply be adding section 43(3) to that definition.

MR. CLEGG: We'd have to add in the amendment the words "monthly or annual remuneration".

MR. KOWALSKI: It should then read 43(3)(b), which covers the rates prescribed at a monthly or yearly rate. That would cover it.

MR. CLEGG: I can draft an amendment to the definition of remuneration which would cover your intent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you find that feasible, Mr. Heise?

MR. HEISE: You would have to make arrangements with Alberta Treasury to handle the premium deduction. Again, by having that incorporated in the definition of remuneration, each member who serves on one of those committees and receives remuneration under 43(3) will have that included in their amount of insurance. There won't be any option in the sense that they can only have their indemnity covered but not this other allowance under 43(3). If they're receiving the allowance, then it's automatically part of their remuneration for defining the amount of salary and the premium deduction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With no option?

MR. KOWALSKI: Correct.

MR. HEISE: If that's the intent, I believe it could be

handled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any further discussion on the motion? In the event the motion is adopted and the changes made, what would your expectation be? That the amended order come back to the next meeting for approval, or do you want to say now that it goes into effect with that amendment? I think we have an effective date of April 1 intended now, haven't we?

MR. PURDY: I have another question on the appendix, but I wanted to get the motion out of the way before we do anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are you ready for the question on the motion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Do you want to go on to the — you said an appendix?

MR. PURDY: The appendix to the order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is what he just amended.

MR. PURDY: I'm questioning subsection (2), under item 3. Where do you pick the years of 36, when a person has to have a medical examination? Other insurance companies are 45, some are 40. Is there some other regulation under the Public Service Pension Act or something that you reflect on this age, or what?

MR. HEISE: The group insurance plan in question is independent of pensions. It's insured with an insurance company; we marketed the plan. That's the age their actuaries tell us is the breaking point, if you like, for a risk-taking factor, in that anything over age 35 they felt they needed the evidence of insurability for that extra one-times-salary insurance.

MR. PURDY: So it comes from the private sector?

MR. HEISE: That's right.

DR. REID: Most of them go through without medical examination. You just fill out the history details, and that's it. It's only if that triggers something that there's a medical required.

MR. PURDY: Okay.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have a question, but it's on the letter. I'll let you finish this first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the effect of the motion we've just passed is to approve the order with regard to group life insurance, with its attached appendix amended as provided in the ... Perhaps I'd better put another question just to make sure. The next question I was going to put was the approval of the appendix as amended, but maybe we had better deal with your question and Bill's before we go on.

MR. PURDY: Mine has been dealt with. It's been answered satisfactorily.

DR. REID: Excuse this private conversation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to push a microphone over there.

DR. REID: Perhaps we should put it on the record, then. There is a difficulty in that members of Executive Council, you, the Leader of the Opposition, and others who may have group insurance — there is some difficulty about the incorporation of the two systems. At the moment there are some ministers who have not taken the optional increased benefits and who may be able to get a second turn around on the indemnity portion of their gross income under this system. That's the point I was clarifying with Mr. Heise. This has to mesh very closely with the present pension entitlements of the members of Executive Council, you, and the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you want to put text in there that would say that these options do not apply to those already under the plan whose option times have expired?

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I'd strongly recommend against that.

DR. REID: That's where the difficulty comes, and this is where we got into problems with the first attempt at this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I understand it correctly, there are ministers who are insured under this plan whose time for exercising their option has expired. But if we put in this order, then those ministers, since they are also members, may now have renewed option periods.

DR. REID: If they decide to take the insurance.

MR. HEISE: That's correct. The way this is worded is that — currently there are eight ministers who do not have any insurance at all under this plan. They were given an opportunity to go into the plan when they became ministers; they chose not to. The intent was that all ministers would have a one-time option. By the way, that's where this varies from employees. With employees the plan is compulsory, they must go in, whereas ministers, and now members, have the one-time option. So by defining remuneration the way you have and also reference to the one-time opportunity, those eight ministers will be given the one-time opportunity again, if you like, only with respect to their indemnity. For the purposes of definition of a minister, they have the amount of insurance based on a ministerial salary. This, of course, does not cover a ministerial salary; therefore, only on the remuneration portion will they again have the chance to decide whether or not they wish to get in this plan. If they do, the amount of insurance will be based on the remuneration as you have defined it here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that bad?

MR. HEISE: From an insurance point of view, insurers always like to say that if you haven't exercised your option when you had the chance, you shouldn't get in at a later date. However, in this case, given that the remuneration is only on the MLA

indemnity part and the fact that you're only giving them all a one-month period — in other words, it virtually removes any what is called selection against the plan. You're not allowing them to come in when they want. In other words, the fear of insurance companies is taking on a bad risk. However, you're saying to these people: okay, we're going to give you another option; you must decide within these 31 days and make your choice. The risk to the insurance company is minimal and can be handled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that mean that the effect of this order would have to depend upon the approval of the carrier?

MR. HEISE: No.

DR. REID: They could still demand the medical examination if they wished. In other words, if the medical status of the individual concerned has changed, the insurer would still have the option of requesting a medical appraisal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the result of a bad medical under 3(2)?

MR. HEISE: The result would be that the person could not get only that amount of insurance, which is the extra one-times salary under optional. However, the person would still have all their basics, plus one-times optional. That's all that can go in without evidence of insurability. So it's only that one-times remuneration that would be denied if the medical proves poor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We've approved the amendment. Is there more discussion?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. I guess it's needed here for clarification with respect to several items in terms of this appendix as it relates to the original motion put forward by Mr. Hyland, that this committee agreed to on December 19. In the motion, Mr. Hyland said that

maximum coverage life insurance plus
maximum optional coverage be
purchased for eligible members of the
Legislative Assembly to be effective
January 1, 1984.

In the appendix, we have item 2(2), which basically indicates the share of the premium payable by the member, and talks about it. Then we have item 3(3), which refers to the optional side. It says, "the premium shall be paid". I don't think I'm being pedantic about this, but there is need for some clarification about the original intent of Mr. Hyland's motion, where it said that the coverage "be purchased". Under the appendix, that is not the case.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, during the discussions that led up to the original proposal and the motion by Mr. Hyland, I think the intent was to make available to private Members of the Legislative Assembly the same opportunities that are available to others, including paying the part of the premium that would be paid by the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other discussion?

MR. KOWALSKI: No. I just wanted clarification that all members understand that, so that we don't have another meeting on this when Mr. Hyland returns and says, hey, what did the group do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there a motion that the . . .

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, before you put the motion on the entire order, you did mention that you would prefer a change, which I entirely agree with: the option should be expressed as "30 days" rather than "one month". I suggest that the committee consider that amendment too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would someone like to move that? Some poor lawyer's just been done out of a fee for a lawsuit.

MRS. CRIPPS I'll so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mrs. Cripps that we change "one month" in 2(1) of the appendix to "31 days". Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered. Are we ready for a motion on the appendix as it stands in draft five, with the two amendments which you have adopted; in other words, the entire order with the amended appendix? Is there a motion?

MR. PURDY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Is there anything further we need to do in this regard?

It's my understanding, then, that this is to go into effect April 1 and that I am to sign the order, on behalf of the committee, with those two amendments made in the appendix. Right?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PURDY: How soon will members be notified? Immediately?

MRS. CRIPPS: I think they have already.

MR. STEFANIUK: Members will receive the order as soon as it's signed.

MR. PURDY: But I mean the forms and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean to notify them that their option time is running?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's already happened for the first go around.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. They've been provided. All members were sent application forms with a covering memo, and then we ran into the snags.

MRS. CRIPPS: How many have responded?

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm sorry, I can't tell you that.

MR. KOWALSKI: The memo may have to go out again.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee that a new notice go out to all the members, notifying them of this order, drawing their attention to the options, and attaching a copy of the order? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that enough for that item of business?

MRS. CRIPPS: I have another issue on item 10. I'm really surprised at the letter that we have in here from Mr. Clegg. I'm surprised that the insurance company refuses to supply a copy of the policy. That's an incredible situation, where the people concerned with...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we still under 10?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: May I just ask, Shirley? Are you referring to Mr. Clegg's memo of December 23 to the Speaker?

MRS. CRIPPS: Right.

MR. STEFANIUK: That really is unrelated to the life insurance for members, but has to do with our concern for insurability of constituency office employees.

MRS. CRIPPS: I recognize that. That's why I didn't raise it during the discussion on the other issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't seem to have that under item 10.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's part of the papers that were handed out this morning. The top document is a memorandum from you to the hon. Mr. Hyndman, dated March 5, and the backup is a copy of a memo from Mr. Clegg to you on December 23.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't got it under item 10.

MRS. DAVIDSON: Is it under your binder, Mr. Amerongen?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. This is it.

Mr. Heise, on behalf of the committee could I express our very sincere thanks, not only for your attending here this morning but for the work that you've done with Mr. Clegg and the excellent way this has been set up.

MR. HEISE: You're welcome. We will now be working with the administration of the Legislative Assembly office to ensure that this is appropriately implemented, and that it goes into [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

This is a different item. This deals with insurance for contract employees. As you may recall, we were interested in two aspects of that, relating mainly to constituency office personnel and as to whether — you may recall that we authorized two trips a year by such personnel to come to the Legislature. The question was that, since they would be travelling on duty, they might not be covered by ordinary insurance. Therefore, were they covered in two respects: one, insofar as their own personal injuries are concerned that might occur travelling to or from the Legislature in pursuit of their duties, and the other was coverage as far as public liability is concerned in the event they were driving and were found to have caused an accident?

We were told that it was all looked after. First of all, with regard to their personal injuries, I have the assurance that Mr. Stefaniuk got from the...

MR. STEFANIUK: What we have in fact, Mr. Chairman — and it's attached to this sheaf of papers — is a copy of a memorandum of February 23, 1984, from L.D. O'Neil, contract analyst, to Mr. Clegg. The second paragraph of that memorandum states very clearly that they are protected. Committee members may recall that there were some directions that we look at workers' compensation, et cetera. It would appear that that is unnecessary in light of this assurance we have that, in effect, our employees are covered by the general policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's just a question there. Is it the kind of insurance that would replace income, as workers' compensation does?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Clegg is still here. I wonder if he would care to comment on that.

MR. CLEGG: I don't know, is the quick answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Getting paid for personal injuries is one thing, of course. But under workers' compensation you don't get general damages, you get loss of income.

MRS. CRIPPS: My main concern is that we would not be provided with a copy of the insurance policy if we wanted to look at it. I just question how the government, as the purchaser, and the Members' Services Committee, as the directive in that purchase, are denied access to an insurance policy which we presumably are purchasing. I certainly wouldn't buy an insurance policy I can't look at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's a unique situation. The Clerk can correct me if I'm wrong. My recollection is that we were told that that information was not given out because there was a risk of it being misconstrued by people who didn't understand it.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, they have said it's not their policy to give it out, and so far we have requested it. I am certain that if we demanded it, it would be forthcoming immediately.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay. I just wanted to raise the point, because I think it's a principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Members Services' Committee wish to pass a resolution requiring that we be given a copy of the policy?

DR. REID: Given the assurance by the people concerned that we're covered, that's all we need. We will have fulfilled our obligation by doing that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But surely we should know the nature of the coverage.

DR. REID: We don't know the nature of the coverage on other people any more than we do on these people, but we've been given the assurance the coverage exists. I don't know how far the responsibilities of this committee go. I don't think they go down to the nitty-gritty of insurance policies. We've been given an assurance by the people who handle this for the public service in Treasury. I'm prepared to accept that assurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must say, very candidly, that it is utterly unique in my experience that anyone would be covered by any kind of insurance and not be able to get a copy of the policy or the coverage. Insurance policies are drafted by human beings, and occasionally they have errors in them. I'm not suggesting there are any errors here, but it just seems to be incredible that there should be secrecy about insurance covering staff who are to some extent the responsibility of this committee.

MR. CLEGG: And the staff are requested to pay for it without being allowed to see it; just another thought.

MRS. CRIPPS: The other aspect is . . .

DR. REID: Are they paying for it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't know they were paying for it.

MR. CLEGG: No, not in this particular case. But I think that policy of not revealing these insurance contracts covers other forms of insurance which employees do in fact pay, like the general life policy.

MRS. CRIPPS: The question of whether it's personal accidental coverage or workers' compensation type coverage remains outstanding, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm curious to see how it compares. Ordinarily I'd look at the policy, but . . .

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, at one meeting I believe we said that hopefully, in the future — I'm not sure if the total committee or a smaller committee of our committee was going to look at some of the policies. Could we not refer this to that time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To what time?

MRS. EMBURY: To the time when the committee is going to look into a number of the policies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't know we had that in mind.

MR. STEFANIUK: I wonder if Mrs. Embury is not referring to the committee's intent to discuss with other legislatures various systems of benefits and so on. That may have been all-encompassing. I don't recall offhand — I may be mistaken — if there is specific reference to insurance policies.

MRS. EMBURY: It wasn't an explicit reference to insurance policies. All I'm saying is that the decision at this present moment as to whether or not we want to see the policy could be deferred.

MR. KOWALSKI: The [third] paragraph of the memo Mr. Stefaniuk referred to has a statement:

We again suggest that we would welcome yourself and/or any and all representatives of the Members Services Committee to visit our office and review the insurance policy along with any other insurance policies we have purchased on your behalf.

I think I'll go along, basically, with what Dr. Reid has indicated. Let's have some of the people associated with the Legislative Assembly take a look at this and report back to us. I don't know why we need a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a member of the committee, not as chairman at the moment, to have to go to somebody's office and make a snap judgment as to what's in a document is a very unsatisfactory way, and it would never be tolerated in the commercial world.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I certainly cannot disagree with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we decided to stay there long enough to copy the documents out by hand. Would we be stopped?

MR. KOWALSKI: I doubt it.

MR. PURDY: How long is that going to take? Have you seen an insurance document before?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems ridiculous to have to do that.

MR. KOWALSKI: My view is that we request one more time. If it doesn't come, then we demand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone opposed?

MR. KOWALSKI: If you need a hired gun, I'll go with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered.

Now, can we go back to where we left off on the agenda before we skipped up to item 10.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a dissenting vote to last the motion that occurred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. REID: I think we have too many things to do besides looking at insurance policies that may be many, many pages long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, nobody was going to ask you to look at them personally. I'm happy to look at it, or ask Mr. Clegg to. That would be more welcome.

The draft order regarding the mileage rate is the next item, item 6. I think I sent this material out to the members on February 24. [inaudible] Is it on the topic we just discussed?

MR. CLEGG: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, all right. Perhaps we can go back to that. Mr. Clegg has some information on the topic that just ended up in Mr. Kowalski's motion.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't able to speak to Miss O'Neil because she's not there, but I got some rather surprising information from them. It just shows how compartmentalized some departments are. He said that their answer to us related only to liability to third parties and not liability to our own employees. In other words, when she was saying that they are all fully covered, they meant they are all fully covered with respect to their risk to third parties. If Miss Smith from the Ponoka constituency office runs over Mr. Jones, that liability is covered. But liability to herself for her injury, death, dismemberment, or accidental injury is covered by a different insurance policy, which comes under Mr. Heise's responsibility, which is the public service accidental death or injury policy. He said that their advice wouldn't cover that issue, nor would it cover loss of earnings, which would come under workers' compensation.

So Mrs. Cripps' question is very much to the point. It seems to me that the answer we've received from the analysis people failed to make it clear to us exactly what risks they were covering.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. Well, Mr. Kowalski has moved that we again request to look at the policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Am I right, then, that we now go to Mr. Heise for that copy?

MR. CLEGG: It appears that there's more than one policy involved. It is the policy which covers third party liability which we would get from Miss O'Neil. For the policy for ordinary accidental death and dismemberment we'd go to Mr. Heise, and to workers' compensation for their coverage with respect to loss of income. So there are three sources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless the committee disagrees, we will go after the relevant documents with regard to all three. Okay? Have we lost Mrs. Embury?

MR. PURDY: Mrs. Embury has gone. She'll be back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think we were on item 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. STEFANIUK: The draft order has been

circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing there, very simply, is that last fall an amendment was made to the Legislative Assembly Act. This mileage allowance is no longer dealt with as a Speaker's order on the recommendation of the committee but an order by the committee. In order to cover the gap, we need this new order which is attached to Mr. Clegg's memo of February 21. Section 42 of the Legislative Assembly Act is amended.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise an item. There are five pages attached to item 6. The fifth page clearly identifies what the intent of the motion was that we approved on an earlier occasion. It's just super. It's excellent, and it covers everything else. After that, I get really confused about the other four pages we have. So perhaps I might make the following comments and refer to the memo of February 21, 1984, from Mr. Clegg.

What Mr. Clegg has put in his memo, I think, is a misunderstanding of what the intent of this whole motion was. First of all, it seems to me that the appropriate section of the Act that we're dealing with is section 45(c). The intent of this was not simply to cover expenses incurred by a member who serves on a committee. The intent was to provide a mileage expense related item for 52 trips a year to Edmonton. Section 42(1)(c) of the Legislative Assembly Act refers to members serving on a committee. That was never the intent. Section 45(c) points out that this committee has the authority to make the recommendation with respect to this.

The second item is that there was never any intent of having this come into effect November 30, 1983. The intent always was to have it come into effect April 1, 1984.

MR. CLEGG: The sole purpose of the order I have put before the committee is to replace the Speaker's order that was made earlier. That Speaker's order became inoperative on the passage of the Legislative Assembly amendment on November 30, 1983. On November 30, 1983, the earlier order by the Speaker which provided for the kilometre allowance ceased to have legislative authority, and the authority for that order was placed back in the hands of the committee. All this order that I have drafted does is to re-enact by the committee what was earlier enacted by the Speaker's order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a question as to whether we should be under section 42 or section 45?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Very much so.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, my understanding of this is that the last two pages — at least in the sequence that I have — being Members' Services Committee Order No. 2/84, is a valid order under the amended Legislative Assembly Act of the fall of 1983 and that that applies to the travel allowance of 15,000 kilometres within the province and the 52 return trips from the constituency to the city of Edmonton per year.

Those two pages do not apply to the item under

discussion, which is a new order — I don't know what number it would be, Members' Services Committee something/84 — which will replace the appendix which is on the third or fourth page, which was effective November 30, 1983, to set the allowance for legislative committees at 18 cents per kilometre. By the time that was made, the amended Legislative Assembly Act had come into force, and therefore that should have been an order of the Members' Services Committee and not of the Speaker. That's the narrow point we are on. We need a replacement for the order of the Speaker on the allowance for legislative committees. It does not affect the other item, which is covered by Members' Services Committee Order 2/84.

MR. CLEGG: That one, the 2/84, remains in force.

MR. KOWALSKI: Oh, okay. I got very confused looking at the two contained in the same one. As Dr. Reid has pointed out, the last two pages in that section are, I think, absolutely correct in terms of the intent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. With that clarification then, are we ready to deal with this as yet unnumbered order, which deals with the 18 cents per kilometre, subject to the conditions specified in section 42 of the Legislative Assembly Act?

MRS. CRIPPS: The reason it's dated November 30 is because that's when the Act was amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CLEGG: That's the date the Speaker's order was effective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would say effective as of November 30.

MR. KOWALSKI: I so move, if we need a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Kowalski. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Reclassification of senior staff: the committee wanted a report. The information was gathered, and the Clerk is ready to explain it.

MR. STEFANIUK: The committee had requested some brief background information as to the procedures employed by other legislatures, primarily Ottawa and Toronto ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just interrupt for a moment? Mr. Clegg is not aware of any other items on the agenda for which we would need him here. Could I say that we thank him for his assistance and for the drafting? Thank you.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the committee had requested some information as to how other legislatures, primarily Ottawa and Toronto, deal with

personnel matters. With the pages that are inserted under tab number 7 is an excerpt from a report that was given to me by the Director of Administration following visits with those administrations in 1982, and probably best describes in a firsthand manner just what happens and with whom the responsibilities lie in those Legislatures. I believe the committee wanted this information as a preface to the possibility of holding meetings with those particular legislatures or parliaments sometime later in the year.

Perhaps the members of the committee could look at this information at their leisure. If there is need to amplify, we'd be happy to do so.

MRS. CRIPPS: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll carry it forward to the next meeting. No objections? It is so ordered.
Number 8.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. STEFANIUK: Under 8 we simply inserted sections 42 and 43 of the Legislative Assembly Act, because some question had arisen relative to claims for expenses of committee members attending meetings of committees at a time when the Legislature was not in session — particularly, I believe, with claim for the fee of \$100 for a day when the member was required to travel to the site of a committee meeting. The question was: is the fee payable for a travelling day as well as a meeting day or any portion of a travelling day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we haven't dealt with exactly the text under section 42. Heretofore, when the committee met at a time the House was adjourned, a per diem committee fee was paid to the members. It's conceivable that if the committee meeting starts at, say, 8 o'clock or half past eight in the morning and the House is not sitting, so members aren't here, a member from farther away than, say, the confines of Edmonton, might start earlier and spend all or part of the previous day travelling to the meeting. He also might be looking at the material that is so generously provided by the Clerk's office and preparing for the meeting.

As you'll see in section 42(1)(a):

an allowance of \$100 a day for each day on which he attends a meeting of the committee or is otherwise engaged in the business and affairs of the committee.

That same expression recurs in 42(1)(b)(i); that's the living expense allowance.

So because it's a departure from the custom of past years in regard to these — in fact, in past years I don't believe it was claimed — the question is: what should happen, what's the view of the committee, as to the application of section 42 to a situation where a member may spend the previous day partly travelling and perhaps partly preparing for the meeting, reviewing the material?

MRS. CRIPPS: It's legitimate.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might outline the approach taken by another chairmen of other similar committees — that chairman being myself — on at least two occasions, one dealing with the select committee on surface rights and the other dealing with the select standing committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. When an occasion occurred in those committees that a meeting would be held early in the morning and it required a member to become involved on the previous day by way of travel or by way of study in terms of preparation for the agenda the following day, I certainly did approve, by way of that phraseology of "otherwise engaged in the business and the affairs of the committee", submissions from hon. members with respect to per diem and the expense related item. I think it's a bit much to ask someone to get up at two, three, or four in the morning and be present here in Edmonton for an 8:30 meeting without recognizing that there is some wear and tear on the individual, and the like.

I throw that into the discussion on the basis at least of the experiences of another chairman and two other committees.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to back up what the Member for Barrhead just said. When I was chairing the committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I myself submitted statements for the work I sometimes did on a Sunday in my office or in Edmonton on a Sunday, because the meeting started in the early morning hours of Monday and I live three hours from Edmonton. I accepted and signed for statements put forward by other members of the committee for the same work and the same costs. I'm quite sure the intent of this is that private members of the Assembly who do additional work on behalf of the other members of the Assembly be covered for their expenses and the per diem for the days they spend on that work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion?

MRS. PRATT: I've had a couple of questions raised with me by secretaries who've been asked to claim these expenses. It actually reads here, "if he is required to obtain accommodation . . ."

MR. KOWALSKI: That's for the second item.

MRS. PRATT: Yes. And it amounts to \$75 a day "if he is required to obtain accommodation . . ." So if a member just comes up for the day, he can't claim \$75.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. That only applies to (b). The way this is set up, it can't apply to (a).

MRS. PRATT: No, just to (b). Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to accept that as clarification from the committee. I realize we're not a court of law to interpret the law; nevertheless I did want to get some other views on it, because it was a departure from what I had previously done and I didn't want to make that departure either without

informing the committee.

DR. REID: I think you've got the opinion of two amateur judges, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on (b), though: "an allowance in respect of his living expenses . . ." That wouldn't pertain to a member who ordinarily resides in Edmonton, would it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't see anything that would imply that a member could claim the same living expenses twice. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm thinking of an out-of-town member who has an apartment here. A member in Edmonton? No.

MRS. CRIPPS: A member whose ordinary residence would be in the city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but you see the concluding words of (b):

if he is required to obtain accommodation by reason of his absence from his ordinary place of residence on that day . . .

So if he's in Edmonton, he's at his ordinary place of residence and he doesn't qualify.

MRS. PRATT: And he can't claim the \$75.

MRS. CRIPPS: So an Edmonton resident would not normally be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I'd say that goes right to the city limits.

DR. REID: That's essentially the same situation, Mr. Chairman, as the per diem allowance during sittings of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Is that enough for that item?

Item 9 relates to a discussion we had concerning the possibility of the committee, or members of it, travelling to other legislatures to get information relating to various matters involving administration of the House, staffing, and so on. You may recall that I spoke to all of you — I'm not sure if I ever spoke to Dr. Reid about it — and I got a variety of opinions. The members were in favour of pursuing this possibility.

Mr. Purdy is here to express his preferences, which I noted down. He'd prefer it to be in the fall. He wasn't certain that we needed to go to Ottawa; he preferred that we should go to Toronto, Quebec, and Regina as being more pertinent to our concerns, and possibly B.C., that it be done by the entire committee, and that possibly there should be a briefing before such a trip is undertaken so that we would agree on what we would look for and who would be responsible for various subheadings of the topic.

Mr. Kowalski said either June or in fall before the fall sittings. His preferences were for Quebec City, Toronto, and possibly Regina. I think he would be content whether it would be the committee or a subcommittee, and he also agreed with the need for the briefing.

Mrs. Embury isn't here. She preferred June or

early September, or before the session in October. We should avoid conflict with the Senate Reform Committee. She suggested that a program of these visits might be spread out over a period of two years, that we include Toronto, Quebec City, and Regina, and that it should be the whole committee.

Mr. Hyland, who also is not here, preferred two weeks in June or early in the fall or late summer. He was opposed to midsummer. He wanted to include Regina and suggested that if any members of the committee go to the CPA conference in Nova Scotia, that visit might be extended to cover a dual purpose. He also agreed that it should be spread over two years.

That's about it. We've worked out some costs; the Clerk had the figures. I think we're at the point where we might have to make some decisions. If we're going to do this kind of travelling, we can save a lot of money by arranging airfares ahead of time.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, we did work out some costs. Incidentally, in our costs we included Ottawa on an eastern jaunt, pursuant to a discussion the Director of Administration and I had with you which pointed out that in spite of Ottawa being a considerably larger organization than we are, they did revamp their administrative structures not too long ago by introducing to their force a director of administration in the person of a Mr. Silverman, under Madam Speaker Sauve, and that it might be extremely beneficial to look at what is being done in the federal Parliament.

On the basis of travelling from Edmonton to Quebec City to Ottawa to Toronto and return to Edmonton, using an excursion rate — we had to arbitrarily provide the travel agent with dates, because these rates vary from date to date; we arbitrarily took a mid-June date — we have fares on an excursion basis of approximately \$600 per person, which compares to \$900 using regular economy share. So we save a third by travelling excursion and employing weekday travel.

MRS. CRIPPS: That includes everything or just the fare?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's just the fare, Shirley. The duration of the stay: if it was seen that there were to be two days spent in each location — you see, we can only work excursions from here to Toronto, which would be the common point. Then you have to go on regular fares from Toronto to Quebec City, Quebec City to Ottawa, and back to Toronto. You can't work them all the way through unless you are going to and flying back from the same place with no stopovers, and that provides for the increase. But it's obviously still cheaper to do this than to go to all of those destinations separately.

Considering what's happening right now in the accommodation industry and the fact that there is some competition — we're even seeing it in Alberta — we could probably pick up rooms in first-class hotels for somewhere around \$50 a night.

DR. REID: The Hyatt in Montreal is now \$60.

MR. STEFANIUK: Is it \$60?

DR. REID: That's the Hyatt.

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, there you have it. I had occasion to go to Calgary recently, and whereas a year ago we couldn't touch Calgary for under \$90, I managed to get a room at the Delta Bow Valley for \$45, and it was extremely comfortable.

In any event, that is the picture. If we were to consider a stay of two days in each location, plus travel time, I expect that we would probably spread this over approximately eight days in total, because there is a weekend involved.

MRS. CRIPPS: What if we flew on Sunday and came back on Saturday?

MR. STEFANIUK: That still wouldn't give you the two days in each location, Shirley. If you flew on Sunday, that would indeed be practical. You would presumably get into Quebec City on a Sunday night, spend Monday and Tuesday in Quebec, and travel Tuesday evening to Ottawa. You would want Wednesday and Thursday in Ottawa; there are a lot of people to go through, particularly the boards of internal economy, with whom I would think formal meetings ought to be arranged, plus perhaps spreading out beyond that in meetings with individuals. Getting into Toronto on a Thursday evening would only give you Friday and, for practical purposes, I think we know what Fridays are like. I suggest that meetings could be arranged to some extent on Friday but would likely have to be carried over into Monday to make them practical. To begin with, most Houses right across the country sit on Friday morning; I think that's the practice everywhere. I wouldn't think that members would want to meet with a delegation when the House is sitting, nor would they care for a meeting on a Friday afternoon when they're all anxious to get back to the constituencies. So I'm suggesting that there is a carryover to the following week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which would perhaps mean going on a Sunday and coming back on a Wednesday.

MR. STEFANIUK: Coming back on a Tuesday evening even, or sometime on Tuesday.

DR. REID: Can you get the same cheap fare on a Sunday flight? I think it's slightly more expensive.

MR. STEFANIUK: There's about a \$30 difference right now. That \$600 should be considered an approximate fare, in any event. As I said, we picked dates arbitrarily and these were June dates. If the committee should decide to try to travel in September, the situation may be different.

MR. PURDY: June is out for me, Mr. Chairman. I can forget about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In keeping with what several members suggested about spreading it over two years, we could perhaps include Ottawa, Toronto, and Quebec this year, and perhaps Regina, Vancouver, and Victoria next year.

MR. STEFANIUK: In that particular case, Mr. Chairman, we have no excursion fares available to us for Regina and Victoria. The regular economy fares

are near \$260 and \$296. But in the case of Regina, for example, it may be practical to use a government aircraft, which I suggest would reduce the cost very considerably. Owing to the proximity of Regina, as well as possibly Victoria, it may be practical to travel one morning, spend only one night, and return the following evening. So there are economies which can be effected there. Depending on where the government fleet is, as I said, it may be practical to attempt to employ that facility for that type of short run.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments?

MRS. CRIPPS: If you flew to Vancouver and took the ferry to Victoria — can you not get excursions to Vancouver? I know you can't to Victoria, but there are all kinds of . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: I think PWA is offering some sort of discount on business-class travel to the coast, but those are details we could look at. As I said, it occurred to me that using a government aircraft, if that were practical and one could accommodate the committee, might be the cheapest way to do it. We've done that in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, it's unlikely that I'll be going on the trips in any event, so that means one more seat on the government aircraft.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's the question of whether you want staff.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think that what is important, Mr. Chairman, is to perhaps identify the most desirable travel time. Obviously it will take some arranging with boards of internal economy at the other end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be any preference perhaps for sometime between mid-August and mid-September?

MR. STEFANIUK: I hasten to mention that when we're in the summer period, similar to ourselves, if those legislatures are on a summer break, it's not likely you'll find their members around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the fall sittings have often opened the Wednesday after Thanksgiving, which this year would be October 10. That would perhaps indicate picking a time between the beginning of September and the opening of the fall sittings or the meetings that are held preparatory to the fall sittings.

MR. KOWALSKI: I wonder if members would have a concern about perhaps going at the conclusion of the fall session, which might be the first week in December.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: I say that again from a selfish reason. In the month of September we're essentially fairly heavily into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and there are a couple of members on the Members'

Services Committee that are members of that committee.

MR. PURDY: That's going to be restruck now, so we don't know who's going to be on it.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's true, we don't.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would prefer early September.

MR. KOWALSKI: I said December. Did you say September?

MR. STEFANIUK: What about June, Shirley?

MRS. CRIPPS: June is fine with me.

MR. KOWALSKI: June's fine with me too, if it doesn't conflict with the Liberal convention.

MR. STEFANIUK: It seems to me that many Houses still sit in June, and it occurs to me that the likelihood of catching members who constitute boards of internal economy might be better in June.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But that's out for Bill.

MR. PURDY: I'm out, but I'm one member of the committee; that's all.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would really hate to stay over an extra four days for one extra day of discussions.

MR. STEFANIUK: We could see how practical it would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There wouldn't be anything amiss, it would seem to me, with one or two members leaving earlier and coming back.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think it's really important to go; it's really important to meet these people. But if we had the opportunity, as you outlined, to be in Toronto on Friday and do what we could on a Friday, if someone wants to stay over till Monday or Tuesday — quite frankly that . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: The only thing I'm concerned about, Shirley, is being able to meet with their board of internal economy; that is a key body. Maybe what we should be doing is looking at priorities here and saying, which board is it most important to meet with? In light of the fact that we're on regular fares from Toronto onward anyway, what we should do is go to Toronto first and spend the first two days there, if that board is top priority — and I'm suggesting, with all due respect, that it's probably the best model in the country — and then determine which of Ottawa or Quebec has a priority, and perhaps reduce the numbers, so the full committee might have the benefit of the best board, if you like.

MR. KOWALSKI: From my perspective I would rate Toronto, Quebec, and Ottawa in that order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd agree with that.

MR. KOWALSKI: A time perhaps in June would be convenient for me, but I would like to check my

schedule and get back to you, or someone, in a day or two with respect to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you do that? Suppose we telephone all the members, because we're now down to only four of us here, and ask them for times in June. I hate to just go right into June, knowing that Bill can't make it, but it looks as though we're going to run into more conflicts at other times that have been suggested. Suppose we get in touch with the people in Toronto, Quebec, and Ottawa, and see who's available to meet with us during the month of June. Then we'll report back to you. Is that all right?

MRS. CRIPPS: Good idea.

MR. KOWALSKI: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. There is one thing that is a bit urgent.

MR. PURDY: On that date in June, I think we should also be looking at the prorogation of our House too, which could be the first 10 days in June. I would urge the committee to look at something a bit further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Later in June.

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: When we arbitrarily looked at these booking dates we looked at mid-June, thinking that was reasonably safe.

MR. PURDY: But you could have accommodation problems. You have to look at the Liberal convention that's going to be in Ottawa from the 14th to the 17th, or whatever it is; you have to stay away from those dates.

MR. STEFANIUK: We had Toronto on the tail end, but in light of that and in light of what has just been said about priorities being Toronto, Quebec, Ottawa, we could show up in Ottawa after the convention, at which point they'd probably be happy for the business because it will have created a sudden void.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We've covered item 10. Item 11 has been drawn to my attention. On the motion of Mr. Kowalski, we passed an amendment to the remuneration of the Hansard Editor. But what we did not make clear at the time was whether or not that would interfere with the ordinary increases we have usually been passing on routinely, that have been made effective with regard to the public service.

Consequently we have a proposed amendment to the order with regard to the Editor; you have it under item 11. Look at the appendix. Paragraph two means that he gets dealt with like everybody else — the Clerk, the Clerk Assistant, and so on — with regard to the order. If that's in order, there are two ways of giving it effect. One is by adding it to the previous order, and the other is by rescinding the previous order and putting this one in its stead.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what happened at the January 3, 1984, meeting. Did we raise his salary 5 percent over and above what other

increases may be necessarily coming?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. STEFANIUK: That was retroactive in order to accommodate the situation whereby we had subordinates earning more than the Editor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You remember the discussion.

MR. PURDY: I wasn't at the meeting of course to have my point of view put forward at that time, but I argued at previous meetings that the 5 percent should not take place because of the economic situation we are into. Secondly, the subordinates working for him are on an overtime basis, and we get into that in management. Wherever you look you have a manager making less money than a subordinate because of the subordinate's extra benefits in a contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that the order was passed, after some very considerable discussion — not as much as we had about insurance this morning — and we should clarify the situation so the Hansard Editor will be in the same category in regard to possible future adjustments as are the other members of the Legislative Assembly staff. That's the only purpose of bringing this up at this time.

MR. STEFANIUK: In effect, I think what it does is eliminate the need to bring back that particular salary to the committee on an annual basis, and to allow the Speaker to deal with it along with all other management salaries, pursuant to the guidelines provided by the Public Service Commissioner. That's what this subsequent order would in fact do.

MR. PURDY: I have no problem with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We get guidelines saying that you can give merit increases to such and such a percentage of your staff up to a certain limit, and so on. So we fit them all into that. If this amendment is not made, we're going to have that whole ball of wax having to come to the committee each time. Is there a motion?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll do it by way of a new order. Is that understood?

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As set out here in the support material. Okay.

This next item is very brief. It's just a matter of clarification. If you look at item 12 in the support material, there was a motion made by Mrs. Embury to look into the transportation administration order to include payment of airport parking expenses, but we need some guidelines. Is there any indication of how far you want to go or what you want to achieve?

MR. STEFANIUK: May I raise some questions that I

specifically noted relative to this, Mr. Chairman? What we need is some amplification of the intent of this parking provision. Among the questions that would help us in drafting that order are, is there to be universal application of the parking expense to all travel; that is, when the House is in session, in the case of the 52 return trips to the capital, in connection with spouses' travel and committee travel? Is there any limitation to be set on the length of stay for parking purposes; in other words, for the length of use of the parking facility? Is there any limitation to be set on the dollar value of the parking within a given time frame or during any fiscal year?

What I have in mind is, would you please give us some direction so that in fact we don't have perhaps a situation where a member from the south leaves his car at the Calgary airport for three months.

MRS. CRIPPS: Would you please list those questions? We will undertake to talk to the members who are affected and find out what would be the best service for the members affected. I think those of us here are not affected by airport parking. If you would give us those questions, we'd undertake to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll circulate the three questions just asked, to all members of the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: It seems to me that there were more than three questions.

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, there are numerous provisions now for transportation. The question is, where are these parking privileges to apply? For example, are we concerned only with a member travelling to Edmonton during session? Are we concerned with other trips?

MRS. CRIPPS: My understanding is that we're concerned when a member must fly to Edmonton for any reason and has to pay very expensive parking fees at the airports. If you give us those questions, we'll come back to the committee.

MR. STEFANIUK: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is one item which is quite important and which I had to put under "Other Business". I don't think it's controversial, and it came to me quite late in the year. The Committee on Legislative Offices has foreseen the need of further travel, beyond what they had previously identified. They asked if we would include in our estimates an additional \$6,000. I circulated that information.

What happened was that we took a chance on this committee approving that item and passed on our estimates, because last Friday was the deadline for printing. So we took a chance on the committee approving the item, and we sent the estimates in with that additional item included, on the understanding with the Provincial Treasurer that it was subject to the approval of this meeting.

MR. PURDY: I could just add, Mr. Chairman, that that particular \$6,000 is for a trip for three members of the committee to go to the Helsinki conference for the Ombudsman, which is the latter part of June

and the first part of July.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's not what it says here.

MR. PURDY: Unless they've changed it.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move that we approve that addition to the budget.

DR. GARRISON: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should mention that I did survey all the members in a preliminary way by telephone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MRS. CRIPPS: There's the memo we have. I'll move that we approve that additional budget item.

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

MR. PURDY: I'm at a bit of a loss now, because this was discussed at the last meeting I was at and that's what they were wanting extra money for. But I guess they may have . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: They may have worked that into a previous budget. There was also the consideration, when the budget was being considered by this committee, as to this committee's role in scrutinizing the budgets of other committees. I think it was generally conceded that it was a formality that was going to be gone through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have the motion by Mrs. Cripps that the budgeted item for committee travel be increased by \$6,000. Is there any further discussion?

MR. PURDY: I ask that my remarks be taken out of the record regarding that, then, because I have given the committee wrong information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: About Helsinki?

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And what about the motion by Mrs. Cripps? Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's everything we have of an urgent nature. Is there any other business anybody else wishes to raise?

MR. PURDY: I'd like to raise the conference coming up in Nova Scotia. I don't think its chairman has ever given priority to the Members' Services Committee to be delegates at that or — we usually pick them at large. I thought maybe we should discuss that: that we are a Members' Services Committee, that we are serving members of the Legislature, that they be given first preference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were going to raise that this evening. It's on the agenda for the meeting of the CPA advisory committee this evening. I'll take that thought to the meeting.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'd like to say that I think it's really important that members who have never had an opportunity to go to a CPA conference have first preference over members who have already attended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The topics very often recur from one conference to the other. That underlines what Mrs. Cripps just said: there should be a change and all the members should have a chance to share in discussions of those topics with their colleagues from the rest of the country.

Is there any other business?

MRS. CRIPPS: Number 12, a transportation order to include airport parking: I imagine it would come into effect April 1. I would certainly be willing to attend a special meeting to see that we get that in place prior to that date if possible so it is effective.

MR. STEFANIUK: We'll list the questions for you very quickly and get them out to the members of the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we add to the memo when we list the questions a further question saying, how soon does the committee wish to meet to deal with that topic. Is that all right?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That probably resolves the next one, which is the date of the next meeting.

MRS. CRIPPS: I know that is of grave concern to the members who are affected by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. It's been so unfair all these years. It bothers me.

If there's nothing else, does someone wish to move adjournment?

MR. PURDY: Yes, to move adjournment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry it's taken so long. As you know, we had that question of insurance, and we didn't reach one item of the business too fully. I'd like to thank everybody, because it certainly helps us in our work here when we can get matters dealt with by the Members' Services Committee.

[The committee adjourned at 12:38 p.m.]