

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen] [8:38 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you all have copies in your books. Is your book not here, Ray?

MR. MARTIN: No. I have one in my office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can get somebody to get it. We're going to be referring to . . .

DR. GARRISON: You can borrow mine, if you like.

MR. MARTIN: I have one in my desk that I could get in a minute if I call down. Would it be worth my running down? It would only take a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We'll get somebody to bring it; then we can carry on. Can you arrange that, Gary?

MR. MARTIN: It's right on top of my desk, as a matter of fact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has anyone any idea of a motion about the minutes of the last meeting? I don't think you need to be concerned about business arising; it's all been tabulated and you have it in your books. Apart from that, do you find the minutes acceptable?

MRS. EMBURY: I'll make the motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're following the custom here, Ray, of not requiring seconds. We feel that if the House doesn't, a committee of the House doesn't. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now can we go to Business Arising, under tab 3? The first is Opposition Mailing. There was some question about getting assurance from Mr. Notley; we have it. Unless anybody has any comments, I suggest we consider that item disposed of.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. EMBURY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I thought it was disposed of at the last meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We hadn't got the letter yet, as I recall.

MRS. EMBURY: Oh yes, we did have the letter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then I don't know why it's here. It's Business Arising, anyway; that's probably why it's here.

MR. STEFANIUK: The meeting was in March; this letter was in April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're thinking of is that you might have gotten a copy of the letter.

MRS. EMBURY: I know we dealt with it at the last meeting — to everybody's satisfaction, I thought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hadn't juxtaposed the dates there; that's right.

Request for the Master Insurance Policy: the problem there is that we want to see this policy and perhaps have our Parliamentary Counsel look it over and make sure what the protection is. Believe it or not, we still haven't a copy of the policy, but we have a summary. If you refer to your support material, you'll find it under tab 3(b). I'd still like to see the policy.

MRS. CRIPPS: I can't imagine why you can't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't imagine why there should be any cloak and dagger about it. If the committee wishes, I'll certainly be glad to go after the policy.

MR. PURDY: I thought that was my motion of March 19.

MRS. CRIPPS: Let's reaffirm it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you reaffirm it and re-request a copy of the policy.

MR. STEFANIUK: The committee, as a committee of the House, I believe has the power to summon witnesses or documents. Is that the stage you want to get to now? You've made numerous requests.

MR. MARTIN: What seems to be the problem?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We want a copy of an insurance policy that affects members. We've been trying to get it for months. They first said they didn't want to give it out because it would confuse people, or words to that effect. We insisted and, following some insistence, we got this summary you find in your support material. We still haven't seen the policy, and we find that a little incredible.

MRS. CRIPPS: That you can pay for a policy and not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. It's being paid for out of public funds. If the committee wishes, I will ask the person who has custody of that policy to appear with it at the next meeting. Is it so ordered?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next is 3(c), Reclassification of Senior Staff. Of course this is part of an old story. As a matter of fact, it goes back to December 12, 1980. It has been before this committee and a previous one, time and again. I was frustrated at one time, but my frustration has worn out. We have the Parliamentary Counsel and Law Clerk, who is not classified. I think you've heard the history of this thing more than once, and I won't repeat it unless you want to ask some questions about it. We now have word from Treasury that we may be paying him illegally because he's not classified. We hope we can get him classified at this meeting. We've tried it at two previous meetings of this committee, and it was postponed.

Under tab (c) in your support material, you'll find — there's an awful lot there, incidentally, and maybe

we should have numbered the pages so you could refer to it quickly in your books. There's a memo from Charlene to Bohdan, and that indicates that it's essential that we do this classification. The support material lists some of the history of it. You'll notice a memo from me to Lou Hyndman in 1980, and subsequent material. I can't expect you to review it here because there are 32 pages of this material.

Sheila.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to interrupt you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought you had your hand up.

MRS. EMBURY: I did, but I didn't mean to stop you practically in midsentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm in your hands, whatever part of it you want to deal with.

MRS. EMBURY: I want to ask a question. I'm sorry; I should know this. On an organizational chart, who does Mr. Clegg, that position, report to?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's in a somewhat anomalous position. He's a legal counsel; he advises the Clerk, he advises me, and he advises committees and officers of the House generally. So he more or less has a clientele, you might say. As far as the line situation is concerned, I think we have a chart, Bohdan, that you perhaps can explain.

MR. STEFANIUK: He reports to the Clerk.

MRS. EMBURY: I wonder, then, if the Clerk has a recommendation.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I made a recommendation some considerable time ago. If you look at the document immediately behind Charlene's memo to me of June 6, entitled Senior Officers of the Legislative Assembly, there is some prose. About five pages down is a sheet which is entitled Proposed Changes in Classification and Salary Level. That's the simplest place to see it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It does not cause a change in salary.

MR. MARTIN: Who is not covered now in this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael Clegg.

MR. STEFANIUK: He's the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. MARTIN: What does that mean? It means something to do with benefits and all the rest of it?

MR. STEFANIUK: It means that he's in a limbo status. Some years ago this committee was asked to consider his classification. This committee in turn, I believe, delegated that function to the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices. That committee reviewed and adjusted his salary for a year or two, but came to the conclusion that it did not have any jurisdiction over the Legislative Assembly office. It had jurisdiction over the Ombudsman, the Auditor

General, and the Chief Electoral Officer, but it had no jurisdiction over the office of the Clerk of the Assembly. Therefore it made a final adjustment, and then declined to have anything more to do with this particular position.

The result was that in June 1983, a final adjustment was granted and the position was declassified, if you like. It didn't enjoy a classification, even at that stage. What we have now is a position which is not within the jurisdiction of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices; the position is not classified within the Legislative Assembly and pursuant to the Public Service Act. We have somebody who is virtually nowhere. He's not a contract employee. He's regarded as a permanent employee and gets a regular pay cheque, but he is not classified at all. The Auditor General is saying to us: I don't know on what basis you are paying him.

MR. MARTIN: What is the reason you mention 1980?

MR. STEFANIUK: That is when we sought classification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To some extent it's really been a contest between this committee and the Legislative Assembly, and the personnel office. They claimed jurisdiction over our staff. We've always taken the position that under the Public Service Act — it used to be section 2 and became 3, which says: this does not affect the right to appoint and discharge staff of the Legislative Assembly — they had no jurisdiction. When the Legislative Assembly Act was amended, they took out that exception. In effect, our staff is under the Public Service Act and subject to the Public Service Commissioner, but they gave this committee authority to exempt anybody. Therefore we can deal with it under the Legislative Assembly Act, and we can say — I don't think we should purport to put Michael Clegg under the Public Service.

My suggestion is that we pass a motion saying that in all respects his situation will be equivalent to an Executive Officer II (Legal). That recommendation has been made a number of times, going back some considerable time, and there's a draft order here.

DR. GARRISON: It's from last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, but there are two versions.

MR. MARTIN: Have we exempted other people from the Public Service, for instance your position?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. One of our difficulties in considering these classifications was — I answered Mrs. Embury's question a moment ago relative to the reporting procedure. The Law Clerk in fact reports to the Clerk of the House. Yet in order to enable us to pay the Law Clerk what we felt that position was worth and considering the professional status attached to it, we would have had to place him in a classification that was higher than that of the Clerk of the House. Our solution was to suggest that the Clerk of the House, who is now considered a deputy minister equivalent, be taken out of the classification grid and placed in a category which is comparable to the list of deputy ministers and senior officials of the Alberta government, and be paid within a given salary range in that particular group of public

servants. Then we would be in a position to move the Parliamentary Counsel into an Executive Officer II position, which would give us the ability to pay the kind of salary we thought was appropriate to that particular position. You'll see that the range there is fairly significant. We wanted that movement room as well. It goes from \$54,000 to almost \$72,000. The present salary is roughly a little past the middle mark, so we felt we had movement room there.

It was also proposed — and this was to be considered about a year ago because we had these drafted a year ago, as well as the committee orders — that the reclassification would produce no salary adjustments whatsoever. We were simply trying to get our house in order. We fully recognize as well that we have to keep pace with what goes on in the Public Service generally. If a decision were made concerning an adjustment relative to government employees in 1984, I foresee that in all likelihood the Legislative Assembly would stand by the same kind of regulation, policy — whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've tried to keep parallel to the Public Service. I want to be candid with you: this is going to result in an anomaly, but the anomaly is due to the long, long delay and the impossibility of getting decisions on this. The Clerk is now in an Executive Officer I position. If we're going to legalize this situation, we're going to put the Parliamentary Counsel into an Executive Officer II (Legal) position. So as I understand it, he will be in a higher category than the person he reports to.

If we were to adopt the recommendation that was made some time ago, which you'll see on about the seventh of those 32 sheets you have under item 3(c), Proposed Changes in Classification and Salary Level, you'll see that none of those changes — none of them — would result in salary changes, but it would regularize our situation.

MRS. CRIPPS: Why haven't we done it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: People have gone back and forth. They've wanted to consider it. I don't know whether they've discussed it, with whom they've discussed it. If you want to read the whole frustrating history of it, it's in 32 pages under item 3(c).

MR. MARTIN: You obviously have a suggestion on how you'd like to see it done. Following along with it, I suggest that you go ahead and make the case again. It seems to me that all you can do is keep making the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This committee has the authority to pass a resolution to give effect to these recommendations.

MR. STEFANIUK: I hasten to mention, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has resolved the fourth position considered here — Editor, Alberta Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's been looked after.

MRS. CRIPPS: We only have Parliamentary Counsel to resolve.

MR. STEFANIUK: You have Clerk, Clerk Assistant,

and Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Otherwise you get them out of whack. I repeat: this does not result in any change in salary or benefits, either up or down.

MR. MARTIN: To simplify it, what we're asking is that these three positions be exempted from the Public Service Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that they be classified as equivalent to these Public Service positions. That would do the trick. We'd achieve two things. We'd regularize the situation and remove anomalies. We'd legalize the situation of the Parliamentary Counsel, and we don't put our people under the Public Service.

MRS. EMBURY: I guess this is part of what we've been through. I've sat here long enough that I certainly should have been more aware of this issue. Number one, some difficulty is probably created when you're speaking about positions, even though we don't speak about the personalities involved, with the people sitting here. That may be one difficulty. It's very hard, yet we certainly need the expertise of the Clerk for this discussion. I think it creates a problem when we're discussing that position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want the Clerk to leave the room for a minute?

MRS. EMBURY: I didn't say that right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, but I'm prepared to say it.

MRS. EMBURY: I just mention that as a possible problem when . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you care to leave for a moment?

MRS. EMBURY: I didn't ask for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm asking him to leave. I don't want anybody to be inhibited.

MRS. EMBURY: I just raised it because you said it's been an ongoing issue. I'm raising that as one of the possible reasons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because the Clerk has been in the room at the meetings?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes, when this has been discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why I'm saying I'd like to change that right now.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm just raising it. Other people in the meeting may not even agree with me.

MR. STEFANIUK: Give me a call when . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MRS. EMBURY: The second point is more specific. I guess the difficulty is when you're equating these positions to a certain level in the Public Service. That's where my other problem is; I suppose that's my

hesitation. I definitely have to take your recommendation that this is the right place. I guess I don't know the difference, how you equate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will not be changing the salaries of any of these positions without coming back to this committee. We just want to regularize the situation and say that they are indeed equivalents. Legally we made the Clerk a deputy minister — I don't know how far back, at least three, four, or five years back. It was in the previous version of the Legislative Assembly Act, as I recall. His salary is within the range. Any restraint which is being exercised in the Public Service, even if this committee did not approve future salary adjustments . . . Even if they were in lock-step with those three equivalents in the Public Service — deputy minister and assistant deputy minister, we'll say, for the Clerk and the Clerk Assistant, and the equivalents in the Legislative Counsel office for the Parliamentary Counsel — they couldn't get any raises the Public Service didn't get, and the rest of it. If restraint and frugality are being shown there, it will automatically show here.

MRS. EMBURY: Could I ask one further question? According to this piece of paper in front of me, the Parliamentary Counsel is at a higher salary level than the Clerk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's a professional.

MRS. EMBURY: That still exists, and you're saying that's acceptable to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has to be. I'm not positive — the Clerk could tell us — but the same anomalies probably exist in Neil Crawford's department. They are specially categorized because of their professions. I think we'd have a similar situation if we had a medical doctor.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Just to bring it up, I move that we exempt the three and bring it in line with what you suggest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Parallel to these recommended categories in the Public Service under the proposed changes in classification.

MRS. CRIPPS: Would you add that that means no change in salaries and the committee still is . . .

MR. MARTIN: We're not dealing with salaries here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not dealing with salaries. It's automatic.

MR. HYLAND: What are we dealing with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're simply dealing with formal classifications — item 3(c), about the seventh page if you'll count them.

MRS. EMBURY: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe Alan would like to ask

some questions.

MR. HYLAND: Does this in any way affect — maybe this was talked about before — the suggestion that we as a committee look at the classification and stuff like that of all our Legislative Assembly staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean perhaps having to do with comparisons with other legislatures and so on?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it won't affect that. It will do two things. We've been trying to deal with this since 1980. All of a sudden we're confronted with the fact that because we haven't dealt with it and haven't categorized Michael Clegg, Parliamentary Counsel, under one of the recognized categories, the question is raised whether it's legal for us to pay him. The proposal we're making here is that we give Michael Clegg a category which includes his present salary and will not result in any change in his salary. But when we do that, we then throw his classification out of whack as far as the deputy minister, namely the Clerk, to whom he reports.

This proposal, which we've had before the committee several times before — at least once — is that we reclassify all three positions with their present salaries. Then we will do two things: we'll legalize or legitimate the payment of Michael Clegg's salary and benefits, and we will remove any anomaly there might be between him and the Clerk, for example, or [inaudible] the Clerk Assistant.

MR. HYLAND: Who's saying it's not legal to pay Mike?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Treasury, and we have a memo in your material. It's the second sheet under 3(c).

MRS. CRIPPS: It's the Auditor General, not Treasury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. That's right.

MR. HYLAND: Is this guy a lawyer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes he is.

MR. HYLAND: This Chaffey or whoever?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Charlene Blaney signed it.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's the Auditor General's office.

MR. HYLAND: Have we got an accountant giving us a legal opinion? Is this guy an accountant or a lawyer? If he's an accountant, I'm a little scared.

MRS. CRIPPS: If he's a lawyer, I'm more scared.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From where I sit, I agree with Shirley. The thing is that we get this sort of direction from Treasury all the time, and we never question whether they've asked a lawyer about it. If we can prove them wrong from the regulations, I suppose we might do it.

MR. HYLAND: Like I said, I just got this thing five

minutes ago. "Since this position is not governed by statutory authority . . ." Just quickly reading that makes me think this is one of the concerns we were looking at when we decided to try to do something with the Assembly staff; that is, not having somebody else tell us what we can do, how we can pay them, if we're allowed to pay them, and which we're allowed to have — i.e., we were trying to remove it from the Public Service and this would be the governing committee. My concern is that if we remove one or three, then we're half doing what we were going to do without looking at it very deeply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would still be open for several reasons. One is that the committee can change any of its orders any time it wants to. Secondly, we're not changing the existing situation one penny as far as salary and benefits are concerned.

MR. HYLAND: I'm not arguing that; I'm just arguing . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: I understood Ray's motion to be "the equivalent of".

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. I should mention another thing. We had a hassle like this about four years ago, when they threatened to cut off the pay of two people in the Library. Remember that? At that time, before they amended the Legislative Assembly Act, this committee had approved the recategorization of two people in the Legislature Library, where we had a really serious situation. The way the economic climate was then, we were going to lose one or two key people. So they recategorized them. For several months — just as, in this case, they haven't twigged to this until now — they were being paid in the category this committee had given them. Treasury found out about it, and around about the 25th of the month — maybe a little sooner than that — I got word that their cheques weren't going to go out. I had visions of these people going to the Journal and saying that their pay was cut off because of some bureaucratic stupidity or something like that. After raising a little bit of fuss about it, they let the pay go through. But there was a clear implication: don't do it again.

I don't know exactly what Chaffey said to Charlene, and I haven't asked her. I don't see anything threatening in this memo, but I don't see any reason that we should allow the anomaly to continue, especially when it doesn't cost us a cent.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't see any problem with it.

MRS. EMBURY: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan, I don't know if you heard the motion by Ray Martin that we follow the recommendation and that we categorize those three officers — we've looked after Hansard; you may remember that.

MRS. CRIPPS: Not that categorize them; that we equivalently . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That we give them status equivalent to the classifications in the Public Service as set out in these proposed changes which are under

item 3(c) in our books this morning. That's the motion.

MR. MARTIN: Then we have all four of them in that position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hansard Editor is okay. He's only there because of another anomaly. One of his staff was getting paid more than he was because of overtime.

MR. HYLAND: He wasn't getting paid for his overtime.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

MR. HYLAND: I'll abstain, because I just don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Visits to Other Legislatures: you may remember where that was at. We were talking about the possibility of the committee's going to Ottawa, Toronto, and Quebec City to get some idea of how they handle their parliamentary staff, how they're categorized, what degree of independence they have from government, and that sort of thing. As you may recall, we worked out some proposals, which I circulated among the committee. Subsequently we started to look at it a little more closely, and I think there was a general feeling that because of frugality and so on, we should try to deal with it in a more economical way.

What we have on tap right now is that Alan Hyland is going as a delegate to the CPA conference in Halifax, and he has kindly agreed to stop off in Toronto and bring us back a report. Are your travel arrangements made for Ottawa and Quebec City, or just Toronto?

MR. HYLAND: I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will know. Could you ask . . .

DR. GARRISON: I just phoned him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. To drop off and bring us back a report — unless you want to change that, I don't think it requires a resolution. If you want to change it, then we need a motion. We're getting the most for the buck if we do it that way.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, further to the suggestion that Alan will visit some other places, I think we need a meeting of either a subcommittee if not the whole committee to decide what sorts of things we want to find out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS. EMBURY: It's one thing to send Alan down there with what he perceives, but I think we should establish some format so we can — I'm sure a lot of this information has been gathered already. I think we could surely do some clarification by telephone.

But I think Alan needs — so I suggest that we get a subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we do it this way? As you know, we have difficulty meeting; we run into conflicting priorities which often outrank us. I'm suggesting that what we might do is for the Clerk and perhaps myself to make a suggested list of topics and circulate them among the members of the committee. If you would then like to change them, you could let me know. If you think it warrants a meeting, you can let me know and we'll call a meeting. Then, going by whatever comments we get from you on that list, we can add to it, change, take off, and so on. Alan, you of course will be getting a copy of the list yourself, because there may be things on there you don't want to do. That could be a basis. We could try that in Toronto, and depending on what the committee decides afterwards, we might want to try the same thing in Quebec City and Ottawa. Is that all right?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, we can go to airport parking, for which you have — this is one that's been hanging around for a while as well. It's under 3(e) of your support material. You first have a copy of the minute, since it's business arising out of the minutes, and then you have the questionnaire of the Clerk. It's just gone out recently. I don't know if the replies . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: It should be "or", shouldn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where's that?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm just talking to Sheila about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it in the memorandum of the 13th?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where would it be?

MRS. EMBURY: I can just go through it quickly if you want, since I love filling in the blanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we take it item by item, because otherwise we have to go around the table and fill it in for everybody. The first question is:

Are parking expenses to be reimbursed  
— only during periods when the  
Legislative Assembly is in session?

MRS. EMBURY: I suggest the last one is what we meant.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

— whenever a Member incurs parking  
expenses while in the service of the  
Assembly?

MRS. EMBURY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any dissent from that?

MR. HYLAND: With one exception. If it's committee work, it can be covered through

submission of receipts, right? Part of it is covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you would agree with the third alternative under item 1 provided there would be no duplication.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we can go to 2. Is it to be one or two there?

MRS. EMBURY: The understanding I had, Mr. Chairman, was that it was the first one — parking at airports, period. I don't think we included railroad stations and bus terminals at all in our conversations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be a good reason for excluding them? I can't see the bus stations coming in too often, and maybe not the railway stations either.

MRS. EMBURY: I can't see them either. They certainly haven't come to our attention at all, so we just used the airports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you think about the second alternative? I think that's going to be a little hard to audit. If a member goes to a picnic in his constituency, is he doing official duties?

MRS. EMBURY: No, we didn't agree with that. We liked the first one — parking at airports, period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other discussion about that? Any dissent? Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Going to 3, do you want to have provision for recording the dates on which the parking — I'm not exactly sure that's an administrative thing; maybe the Clerk can explain what the concern is there.

MRS. EMBURY: Yes, we agreed with it anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would seem to me that if you could get the dates, you should.

MRS. EMBURY: We should have the dates. If you park at the airport, your receipt normally tells you the date, so we think that's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can see one thing behind this. If the Clerk or Charlene or somebody goes after a member and says, we need the dates, and he says, what the hell for, they can say, the Members' Services Committee said so.

MR. MARTIN: Are we saying "yes" there?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's "yes".

MR. HYLAND: If they don't keep the dates, they don't get the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. How should the claims be

submitted — item number 4.

MRS. EMBURY: I ticked monthly, but I guess it so much makes a difference in our way of life when you're in session and when you're not in session. When we're in session, some of them will have them every week, so you'd think monthly would be easier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think quarterly is a little long. They'll be forgotten, and the items will be so old that neither the member nor the administration will be able to check back on them.

MR. HYLAND: But if you go monthly, you might have only one in a month during the summer.

MRS. CRIPPS: It should be flexible. I can't see why we should tie anybody down.

MR. HYLAND: It would cost us more to write the cheque what it would to pay this out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supposing you said that they were to be submitted in a certain way but paid quarterly or monthly?

AN HON. MEMBER: At their convenience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Promptly.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think we should be flexible.

MR. HYLAND: If somebody goes into the Calgary airport and stays for the week at Park N Jet at six bucks, you're looking at 30 bucks. You're going to be pretty damned careful about not losing that thing when you're going to get paid for it. You're going to look after it. I think you could wait a month or two. Most of them are happy that they get paid, let alone that they have to wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR. PURDY: I move that we have the members submit monthly but that they be paid quarterly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

MRS. CRIPPS: Do they have to remit them monthly or can they submit them quarterly?

MR. MARTIN: The key thing is not to tie them up with a lot of red tape. If they have to pay it quarterly . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. As a matter of fact, submitting them monthly means they would get them out of the way, instead of having them pile up with the papers and getting lost.

MR. MARTIN: I think the key thing is how they pay it, because you don't want to have much red tape and cost at that end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So is Bill's motion okay — submit monthly and pay quarterly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, excuse me for going back. But this says "submit"; it doesn't say "pay". So we're talking about paying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know. We're changing the text. We're sort of straddling two ideas here. Okay?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you're aware of number 5? That is a possibility. So if we come back, we hope we've taken the edge off the surprise. Okay?

MRS. CRIPPS: Whoa. If we come back to what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we come back later on and say: we've run out of bucks; we need a special warrant to cover this. That's what paragraph 5 says.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, I beg your pardon. I'm looking at number 5 here. Okay, fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't know how this is going to work out. It's new.

Number 4. Have visitors had any concerns?

MR. HYLAND: Have we handled this now? There are no more problems with this? We don't have to make another motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On airport parking? Are you aware that we need to?

MR. STEFANIUK: As far as I see, now that the direction has been given there will be an order prepared for your signature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is that all right?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Are we going to do a separate order than transportation then? Initially we talked about having it part of the transportation order.

MR. STEFANIUK: It will probably be an amendment to the transportation order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then it will all be under one order.

MR. HYLAND: I have one more question — effective date. I was under the impression initially that the effective date was the budget year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good question. Do you think people would be able to find vouchers? Do you want to take it back to the . . .

MR. MARTIN: I think we'd have some difficulty.

MR. PURDY: I think we'd better go with July 1.

MR. HYLAND: Most of them have been keeping their receipts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the expectation that we would get off it.

MRS. CRIPPS: When did we pass the original

motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion was a request to the Clerk to sound out the committee.

MR. HYLAND: March 21, [inaudible].

MR. PURDY: That's five years ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's when the hassle over airport parking started. But this questionnaire of the Clerk's results from the proposal of the committee. We just weren't able to work it through while the House was sitting.

MRS. CRIPPS: But the questionnaire also results from a former motion that we do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. I think it's always been accepted in principle that this should be done. It's the mechanics that have caused us the problem. We tried to include it with credit cards, and we also tried to get airport passes and things. We got frustrated at every turn by the Department of Transport or the city of Edmonton or somebody. So this gets around it.

MR. HYLAND: If we go back even beyond April 1 — I don't know if it's in the specific motion but it was in the discussion on the transportation payment for mileage, where Ken and I specifically said and agreed that parking would be included. Then we ran into a problem about how we would include it. People read that and are under the impression that it started April 1.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, did we have an amount in the estimates for the transportation allowance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't recall that we did.

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. PURDY: Yes we did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did we?

MR. STEFANIUK: Amounts included four specific programs. This was not one of them.

MRS. EMBURY: In view of the fact that we're unclear at this particular time as to what is actually documented in writing, as to when is the appropriate date, and in view of the fact that it was not an item in the estimates and that we therefore really have no idea as to how much it's going to cost — although I feel that many members have the anticipation that it was going to start April 1, due to those circumstances I'd like to make a motion that it start July 1.

MR. PURDY: I'll support that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

MR. PURDY: One question on that. You'll have to amend your order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we'll have to revise it.

The request for the Canadian Encyclopedia: there was a suggestion made that the Legislative Assembly provide a set of the Canadian Encyclopedia for each MLA. There was some thought that we could get it at a discount price of \$99, prepublication. It has been discovered that that's not been provided in the arrangements. Therefore, if we were to order it at the prepublication price, it would cost us \$125 a member.

MR. MARTIN: I strongly suggest that we don't do this. In a time of restraint, I think we would look foolish. If we want to buy it, we should — the same as anybody else. I'm sure there will be a copy in the Library for all members' use. So I move that we do not purchase . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reason it's here is that a member made the recommendation and we said we'd consider it.

MRS. CRIPPS: I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.  
Word processing equipment.

MR. HYLAND: That's got to be against civil rights, isn't it, when you have to go to university to get a bargain?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right, especially after the taxpayer pays 85 to 90 per cent of the cost of your education while you're at university.

MR. HYLAND: Especially when you can buy it direct from the publisher for that kind of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For \$99 you can't.

MR. HYLAND: The schools can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but individuals can't. Except I'm one of those crooks who went to the U of A. But I'll let you look at my set. We've ordered it.

MRS. EMBURY: I was wondering how many sets you can order. Is it one set?

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many at \$99? I don't think I can wholesale them.

MR. HYLAND: I sent my cheque when I got that first letter, and they sent it back, asking if I was a member of the alumni. I didn't even know what the hell that meant. I had to look it up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You know, Alan, even if you were an alumnus, you might have to look at a Latin dictionary to find out what that meant.

I think I've briefly mentioned in the past this item on standardization. We started off with the then

Social Credit caucus putting in IBM equipment, about \$25,000 worth. That was then added to so both opposition caucuses could have access to word processing. Subsequently, after long and very considerable study by both the Clerk and Bob Bubba — not to fault the Clerk, but I think Bob, because of his position in Hansard, is pretty much an expert on word processing equipment. In any event, we decided to get NBI equipment for Hansard. It is now in place. It's doing very well. It's saving us money, incidentally. I did suggest at the time that the government caucus should seriously consider getting the same kind of equipment so it would all be compatible. There was some hesitation about that, and I am not sure whether the government caucus went AES or not.

Likely the word processing and information processing equipment is going to increase in quantity and numbers, and we thought it would be a good thing for this committee to consider whether, without doing anything drastic, causing any earthquakes as far as present equipment is concerned and certainly not causing costs, we shouldn't be giving serious thought to standardization. The reason I brought it back again on the agenda is that I have periodic meetings with the Deputy Speaker, and this was one of the concerns he raised at the last meeting I had with him. It's item 6 of your support material.

I wonder if it would be useful — if you're reluctant to come to any decision on it, we could carry it over to the next agenda. But what I thought might be useful would be an indication that, wherever possible and practical, the committee favours standardization. I think we could go that far without causing any ripples.

MR. PURDY: There are a number of things that should be taken into consideration. The present setup we have now in 503 — what's the term of the lease? Number two point is that there's no money in the '84-85 budget, so it's a non-issue right now as far as I'm concerned. The third point I make is that I'm one of the members who has bought my own word processor out of my communication allowance, and I'm quite happy with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've done the same for my office here.

MR. PURDY: On that third point, if members want to go that route, I think they could look at standardization but they should also look at where they can get the best deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only thing is that the administration of the Legislative Assembly is responsible for this equipment. It is bought out of public funds. It is public property. The question is, are we going to look ridiculous down the road if we have 15 different kinds of word processors bought out of public funds and doing more or less the same work for a considerable number of members? I'm not suggesting that we should change anything that's been done. That would waste money. But I think it would be good if — for one thing, we have readily available, neutral expertise in the person of Bob Bubba. By no means do I wish to stretch my slimy tentacles into anybody's business. The thing is to be practical. It seems to me that we're just creating a foolish

situation where we're going to look ridiculous if we've got, as I say, 15 different kinds of equipment, all bought out of the public purse, not compatible, dealing with who knows how many maintenance services and going to who knows how many places for replacement or additional parts or supplies. All those things come into it. It seems to me that if we're responsible for administration, we should try to have a tidy administration.

MR. PURDY: However, when I bought mine I had to prove to the Clerk's office that the one I bought was the best deal for the dollar spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough. One fault of standardization is that one outfit makes all the mistakes as well as getting all the benefits.

MR. MARTIN: What you're really talking about is co-ordination among three — if we can save money there should be that co-operation, but ultimately each caucus is probably going to make their own decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I see it, the difference it makes to us is that if you decide that we're not to be concerned about it, that we'll just let everybody go their merry way and we won't have any problem at all, it will be much nicer for us, except if we have to hassle with the aftermath. But if you think that standardization is worth favouring, then of course we wouldn't insist on it but we would try to bring some persuasion to bear, as we did in the case of the government caucus.

MR. HYLAND: A couple of things. Firstly, a couple of us in government caucus have taken on the task of trying to decide what we want, finding out the things that Bill is talking about, trying to decide what's needed and that sort of stuff. Ken is one of them, but he's not here today. That puts us at a bit of a disadvantage. I think the days of the plain typewriter are rapidly disappearing. We may need a word processor; to do the job you may not need something that sophisticated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's another feature to it; that is, eventually you may want to plug into central sources of information in the Library or in Hansard. If the equipment isn't compatible, you can't do that.

MR. PURDY: Most of them are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. My equipment is compatible with Hansard and with the Clerk's office, and occasionally we find that convenient.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I have just three points to make. I think what you're saying is tragic, and it's like a snowball situation. It keeps running faster and faster and we keep trying to slide into it and put a stop on it, just because of the issue and what's available. Number one, I think I've heard for approximately a month — maybe I'm exaggerating — about the new equipment in the Clerk's office. I realize it does take time to work out and everything, but I heard a verbal proposal a long time ago about doing an experiment. I've never heard anything more about it, so I think that somehow we're missing a flow of information back and forth about whether that is a

possible idea and when it should be looked at, at least the planning. What happens is that I think MLAs are aware that there's some big piece of equipment in this building, but they don't know anything or much about it, without taking their own initiative to go and look it up and find out how they can fit into that system. That is one dilemma.

As has been mentioned, I believe we have the equipment in the government members' offices that is on a rental/purchase basis. The other thing is that one thing I would like to do is have the compatibility between my office in Calgary and the office up here. Because I have a computer in Calgary, that definitely means looking at the hookups and things like that. I would like to know how easy that is to arrange. I guess there's a concern about telephones, the costs and things like that. Who's going to pay those costs? I think we really need to know those things and how it affects this building, if it does, or what the problems are if we move to that. That's urgent. I think that's overdue already for what we need to know. Maybe it is already available.

Lastly, I think you've identified a real concern, and I kind of empathize with what you're saying. I can just see the Clerk some day sitting at his desk, piled high with all the used computers and word processors and whatnot, and thinking, what do we do with it? I wonder if we shouldn't somehow start to think of a policy. It will take a lot of thought. I can't think of anything off the top of my head, only to say that maybe it should be looked at as — the MLAs, whether they retire or stay or whatever, buy it out or something. I don't what would be practical.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the rental is practically a purchase. Don't you rent it for three years and pay a dollar, something like that, and then get the equipment?

MR. STEFANIUK: It depends on the contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right, but some of them are like that. I think the ones we have are.

MRS. EMBURY: I think we should just establish something, because you've identified a very good point. Let's anticipate some possible solutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may return the compliment, I think you hit the nail right on the head. That's why this is on the agenda, for us to start to consider it and to consider whether you want to start to formulate a policy. If you like, we could ask the Clerk — he hasn't anything to do anyway — if he would perhaps get together with Bob Bubba and draft something which might be a basis for discussing a policy.

MRS. CRIPPS: In answering the questions Bill and Sheila asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. PURDY: Why you're saying that Bob has expertise in this is because they've got one computer up there. He's not an expert, is he?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, by no means. He's been studying this and reading the literature for years. I

don't say he's an expert because he's got a system there. Incidentally, there is some information available to members on this, because in the Hansard report he covered what they did.

MR. HYLAND: I've got a lawyer friend who spent a lot of time deciding to buy a computer, and now he's more confused than he ever was. They spent hours at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can be confused buying a car. Is that all right? I'm going to have to leave reasonably soon.

DR. GARRISON: Do you want to deal with 14?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's an easy one. Could we skip down to 14? We were asked to extend the contracts of five of the eight Legislative Interns for the months of July and August. I first canvassed the advisory committee, and they were 4 to 3 against it. I had misgivings about it myself, although from a personal point of view, wanting to provide employment for people and so on, I was in favour of the idea. Then we canvassed this committee, and we found a majority — I think it was 7 to 2 against it, if I'm not mistaken, or 6 to 2 and one somewhat undecided. So on that basis, I turned it down. This is just a matter of either approving or disapproving that by a motion of this committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move we stand by your decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion?

MR. MARTIN: I'm one of the two, so obviously I'd have to vote against expansion of contracts, but I recognize the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of things that bothered me the most was that when we had our estimates approved by this committee, it was understood that we would be returning the funding for July and August. It was on that basis that they approved annual sums; otherwise the money wouldn't have been there. It was only a technicality.

MR. MARTIN: What is the difference from last year? Just because of that motion? Because we did extend for about one month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We made an exception last year, and it was of questionable regularity. But it was of very, very minimal consequence compared with the \$15,000 it would have cost us this year. It would have cost us \$24,000 for the whole eight and \$15,000 for the five, plus the little fringes.

MRS. CRIPPS: My reason for supporting your decision is that I'm not sure the extension would be useful in terms of amount of work that needs to be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't assess that; I don't go into offices and see what they do. But ordinarily, being responsible for the program, I would have made the decision on my own, and I did make it on my own. I was asked, it was objected to, and I consulted the advisory committee. The only reason it came before

this committee was that I didn't want to appear to be obdurate when somebody said to me, you should at least ask the Members' Services Committee about it because they're the ones who approve the funding for the interns. It was on that basis that I took it to this committee. I felt it would look too stubborn if I didn't.

Are you ready for Shirley's motion? All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

The next item, number 7, is simply an inquiry. As you can see, we have a memo from Bill Kreibom. Security arrangements are still being made and changed without consultation with the members' representatives of this committee. At one time this committee asked to have a representative on the security committee, and that was not answered for a large number of months. Finally we were told there weren't any changes. It's a parliamentary question. We're not looking for work, as I keep saying over and over again. But we have this memo from Bill Kreibom. I'm bringing it to your attention so that if the members in the annex have any comments with regard to it, we may have to take them under consideration. If you would like to observe the operation of this system a little longer, we can carry this over to the next agenda.

MR. HYLAND: I guess we've had our arguments directly with what's been going on. Some of the members have held meetings with the minister responsible, to try to iron out some of the difficulties. For example, one time we couldn't get back in after session. It was locked up tight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Insofar as it affects members, regardless of where they sit in the House, I see this as a concern of the Speaker. It's always been my concern, and it will continue to be. Although I perhaps lack practical jurisdiction, I'm still concerned. If there are any things of that kind that members are concerned about, I'd like to see what I can do about them, to the extent that I can do something about them.

MR. HYLAND: Supposedly the system that's there now should work. We should be able to get in there anytime we want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we deal with it as an information item and leave it? If there are concerns, you can let me know. Is that all right?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 8 is very simple. The Ontario Legislature produces this comparative study annually, I think. A suggestion was made that we distribute it to all the members. That involves some cost. There was another suggestion made: instead of distributing it to all the members, get one for each of the opposition caucuses and maybe several for the government caucus. To what extent do you think that will be used? There are copies available to borrow; I think they're in the Library. I'm not sure if I have any extra copies.

MR. PURDY: There's a copy in my office. I don't know where it came from.

MR. HYLAND: I thought the system before was to provide copies to Members' Services Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you have them, haven't you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was a suggestion that we go beyond that.

MR. MARTIN: You're covering your latest suggestion, because you have opposition caucuses and a number of people from the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was a request that reached us, and I agreed to take it up with the committee. If you think the distribution that's gone on so far is adequate, we'll leave it at that.

The next item, 9, is simply a report item. You may wish to take it up with your respective caucuses. It's a matter of proper and prompt vouchering of expense items that arise in connection with members' constituency offices. That's where the real concern is, as I understand it. We're trying to tighten up on it, not to cause the members any problem but to avoid problems and also to get the Auditor General off our back in this regard. We would prefer him not to include it in his next report. Is there anything more you want to say about that, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item is also very simple. Tom Lysons had a supply of pins and things stolen. The question is, from whom was that theft committed? Was it committed from him and does he have to replace those items, or was it committed against the Legislative Assembly? Who bears the loss? I doubt this is going to happen very often.

MR. MARTIN: You mean it happened in his constituency?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've forgotten where it happened.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, it happened here.

MR. PURDY: The parking lot at his apartment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan says they broke into the car.

MR. MARTIN: We're talking about pins and things like that?

MR. PURDY: It was a collection of pins he had, and I don't think it should even be before this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't know it was his own collection. I thought it was . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: No, no. It was stuff to take out to the constituency.

MR. PURDY: But he also had pins and jackets of pins stolen, and he had a camera stolen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but he hasn't mentioned those.

MRS. CRIPPS: He's not talking about that; he's just talking about the government material.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's mentioned his supply of pins that he has for distribution in his constituency.

MR. PURDY: Well, he said \$6,000, and nobody has that kind of allowance in a constituency that size.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know.

MR. HYLAND: When we changed our rules about lumping it — and he doesn't have a constituency office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know exactly how much it was in pins, and I'm not making a request that we pay for it.

MR. HYLAND: Six thousand.

MR. MARTIN: It wasn't \$6,000 of legislative stuff, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I doubt that.

MRS. CRIPPS: But some of it was legislative stuff that he was taking to his constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could have a similar situation in constituency offices. Do we have theft insurance there? Bohdan, do you know?

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we should look into that, because that's public property.

MR. PURDY: I was told that I would have to insure my computer that I bought, that's in the building here, through the Clerk's office as an item.

MR. MARTIN: As a part of your budget.

MR. PURDY: That's right, as part of my budget. That should be the same with typewriters or any other equipment in constituency offices in various locales in this provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should we then look into this question of insurance of these items, see if we can cover thefts that way, and report back at the next meeting? Maybe we can give you a report as soon as it's ready. The next meeting may be a while away, and you'd probably want to read it before you get here. Is that all right?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Photographs of visiting students, 11: that's very simple. We have heretofore been taking black and white photos. From time to time, the suggestion has been made that we take colour photos. There was an impression that the colour photos would be cheaper. I'm not sure that's correct. I think the black and white ones are cheaper. Again, we brought this item here because a member asked the committee to deal with it. One of the reasons that black and white is favoured is that

it's easier for the local newspapers to reproduce the pictures of the classes, if they want to. So the question is whether you want to make a change from black and white to colour.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm afraid I have to speak to this item just because there's quite a difference of opinion on it. Some are quite satisfied with the pictures and think the students like them and that they are acceptable to a newspaper. But others feel very, very strongly that it's a very chintzy picture, to put it bluntly, for a child to keep for as long as he wants, of his one and possibly only visit to the Legislature. I was just looking frantically there to see if there are any such costs. I understand that this is one area where we've done some limiting of picture-taking just to have a watch on the budget. I understand that only school groups that get to go into the Assembly have their picture taken. If they happen to come when we're not in session, they don't get their picture taken. So I guess there's been some budget-cutting, which obviously has been a wise measure in view of the economics. But I would still like to have some money — here's a figure; what's this \$27,000?

MR. MARTIN: That's what they're paying now.

MRS. EMBURY: It would certainly complicate it if you've got to have both films available or something. But I wonder if we could not get a report back from the people that do this or something, so I can take it back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean as to costs?

MRS. EMBURY: Costs and the viability of the service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to mention that there's another possibility, and that's to give members a choice. But to administer that and find out ahead of time and tell the photographer what kind of film, and then if he has a day when he's got some classes that would be black — well, maybe he could do it with two cameras, because he'd have film in his camera.

MRS. CRIPPS: I've never seen a picture in the newspaper yet, so I really don't think the black and white for the purposes of newspaper is a valid argument. The argument may be valid on the difference in cost, but I really don't think colour pictures and black and white pictures are that much different in cost nowadays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have we got comparative figures of costs? Bohdan, do you know?

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm not sure. We'd have to look up our records.

MRS. CRIPPS: What I suggest then is to get comparative figures of costs. Also, I would like you to do an assessment and maybe get tenders for pictures year round. I really think it's unfortunate that pupils that do not have the advantage of attending the Legislature while it's in session, when they have a distinct advantage in seeing the Legislature in session and often meeting their

members as opposed to the ones that come at other times of the year, don't have the picture. If we're tied in to one photographer and it's very, very expensive to take pictures at times other than during session, I think we should do some evaluation of what we can get and what can be supplied, and give us some comparative costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to have that information circulated before the next meeting?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry to delay this. Could you also include — one suggestion was some little light cardboard frame for the picture, just to see what that would add to the cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we report to the members, should we append a question to the report and ask whether their preferences are for black and white or colour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In fact you might want to take it up with your caucuses and see what the consensus is. Item 12, Payment of Catering Expenses.

MRS. EMBURY: We can table that if you want, in view of the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to get the member angry.

MRS. EMBURY: I'll speak to Norm. I'm sure he'd understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Employment Contracts: we're working on that. We're trying to produce a standard form of contract, for reasons I think we've explained at previous meetings. The thing is that occasionally there can be some cost involvement or administrative problems. The Parliamentary Counsel is producing possibly three different forms. We'll circulate them and see what you think of them, because we would like to get some standardization. They're all paid out of the public purse, and there's no reason why some should be handled one way and some another.

The one on the 1985-86 estimates: we have not yet received what we usually get, although it's not binding on the committee — the Treasury guidelines with regard to next year's estimates. We normally start this process sometime in July or perhaps August, after we get that memo from Treasury, because we know the members want to have that in mind when they deal with the estimates. Partly this will have to do with the next meeting and what happens in between. Are there any suggestions?

MR. MARTIN: At the call of the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So we'll just let the thing go for the time being, and then we'll get in touch with you when we start getting a little bit

concerned about dealing with the estimates. What about your staff? Will they want some direction about starting to prepare estimates?

MR. STEFANIUK: Those normally come from Treasury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They can advise us, but they can't instruct us. Suppose we wait until we get some word from Treasury. If it appears to be taking a long time and looks as if it might get us into a problem with regard to the preparation of our estimates, we'll raise a concern via memo to the members of the committee.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm just wondering what you're even thinking about. Would you prefer July? Do you want August?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last year we were the last ones in. I know there were some exceptional circumstances. I'd like to see us get our estimates completed and approved by this committee just as quickly as the government departments.

MRS. EMBURY: That still doesn't help me. I'm sorry, sir. I'm asking if, knowing the time frame — I'd just like to have an indication, due to scheduling, if you're thinking of early September, late August . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: As to when we start dealing with them? If we're going to wait for this thing from Treasury, I have nothing to say about it. I don't know when that's going to come.

MRS. EMBURY: It doesn't come at a sort of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not at a fixed time as far as I can recall. Do you recall, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: It could arrive in June or July.

MRS. EMBURY: Then what do you anticipate for a meeting? A three-hour meeting, half a day, a full day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We probably would have several, because after that we'd have to have time to prepare our estimates. So should we let the thing abide until the end of July? Is that all right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Date of the next meeting.

MRS. CRIPPS: You know that we have a committee — we want to take a look at last year's budget and the implications, and we're working on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We normally give all the information, don't we? Normally when we bring in the estimates, we have last year's figures here as well.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm talking about the application, but that's just for information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How do you mean the application?

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, the government members want some input to what happens with our budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, they'll have it. There are seven of you on the committee. I'm not sure if I'm missing . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm talking about the application of last year's. But we'll leave that. You go ahead.

MR. HYLAND: You're talking partially about the item we were talking about before. The standardization of equipment is what you're talking about.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that right? Thank you very much. I'm sorry to have to talk and run.

[The meeting adjourned at 10 a.m.]