

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[9:09 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Nigel.

MR. PENGELLY: Good morning, Gerry. How are you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're all here except Ian Reid, who's overseas. We have a new committee secretary, Miss Ann Conroy, taking the place of Peggy Davidson, who is going to Ontario. So the lady on your immediate right is Ann Conroy.

MR. PENGELLY: I think I've had memos from her.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it Conway?

MISS CONROY: It's Conroy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we could come to order, the first item is approval of the minutes of the meeting of June 20.

MR. HYLAND: I move that we approve the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Alan Hyland. Everyone in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

With regard to business arising from the minutes, a careful search has been made of the June 20 minutes. All follow-up items have been taken out and included in the agenda for this meeting under item 3 with its various sub-items. In addition, in a review of past minutes to see if there might possibly be something that was missed, we found nothing really, except one item that I think we agreed to drop but we didn't record that formally. That's item 3(a).

You may recall a discussion of possible alternate ways of dealing with the broadcasting or televising of the proceedings of the Assembly. The people who did it formerly didn't want to continue. There was an indication of interest by ACCESS, but they said they wanted money. Our consensus was that we wouldn't pay them any money. I made a proposal to them in my letter of August 19, 1983, suggesting they extend the coverage somewhat, notwithstanding no money, and suggesting that that might be a good thing to do, but we've had no further word from the chairman of ACCESS, who has just recently been reappointed. Unless the committee is of a different opinion, it would seem that that matter is finished for the time being. Is it agreed, or do you want to revive the consideration?

MR. KOWALSKI: I notice that there's an exchange of information in terms of letters and paper and the like. Have we ever had a discussion with Mr. Senchuk? When you want to advance an idea or a concept, I always find it much more fruitful to have a face-to-face meeting with people and put the issues right on the table. This matter of television coverage of the House is very significant. I think the people of Alberta are losing something when there's only periodic coverage of the question period and the remainder of the activities of the House are totally

ignored.

What I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that I think it might be in order and might be worth while. Perhaps Mr. Senchuk has a new alternative to how we would look at this since August 1983, and I would like to see it pursued in a direct, face-to-face meeting with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like me to invite him to one of our next meetings to discuss it?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's agreed? All right. Now the question is, which meeting? You may want to consider this later, because the likelihood is that the next meeting is going to be fully occupied with estimates. Do you want to consider it later this meeting? Do you want me to put the timing of the invitation on the agenda of the next meeting?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should have spoken before we all said "agreed". I thought about the budget for the next meeting too. Would you consider having a representative group from this committee — it could be open to anybody — and setting up a separate little meeting. I think some of the members are up here for the trust fund meetings. I don't know how that would tie into your schedule, because I understand you're busy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many are on the trust fund committee?

MR. KOWALSKI: Sixteen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. How many of this group?

MRS. CRIPPS: Three of us; four with Mr. Martin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there's Mr. Kowalski, Alan Hyland, Shirley, and Ray Martin. Would you want those four to act as a subcommittee?

MRS. CRIPPS: Sure.

MRS. EMBURY: And the invitation could be extended to all of us. If we're up here and we can come, fine. How's that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: When would you like to have it? Do you want to have it before we have a meeting again?

MR. KOWALSKI: If that's the approach, would the chairman be attending?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It depends on when. When's the next meeting of the heritage trust fund?

MR. KOWALSKI: There are three meetings every week, so it's ongoing. I think the second week of September is probably as good a time as any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then I would miss it.

MR. KOWALSKI: It could be after that as well. I'm free and open on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: After that I won't be back until October 5. So I'm pretty sure we're going to have a budget meeting while I'm away.

MR. HYLAND: The first week in September?

MR. KOWALSKI: That first week is really tough, if you're talking about the 4, 5, 6, and 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next week's no good?

MR. HYLAND: No, that's no good. We've cut one day out now, haven't we?

MR. PURDY: That's no good for me either.

MRS. CRIPPS: Next week is no good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The week after?

MR. PURDY: The week after is better.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's the first week of September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first week in September, yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's bad.

MRS. EMBURY: Well, okay, let's leave that. It's not an emergency item.

MR. KOWALSKI: No, not at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the thing is that it could affect the estimates. It would be a B budget item, which of course are not popular. Can you hear all right, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: Parts of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you let us . . .

MR. PENGELLY: I'm just wondering how, in times of restraint, we would justify full television coverage of the House, Ken.

MR. KOWALSKI: Again, that's one of those detail questions, but I would like to advance the concept to see whether or not ACCESS is prepared to do something more in this regard.

MR. PENGELLY: I see.

MR. KOWALSKI: We're just entering . . .

MR. PENGELLY: Other than just the question period.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. Let's not dot the i's and cross the t's until we first of all have the discussion. That's most essential.

MR. PENGELLY: All right.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move that we leave it to Ken and Gerry to arrange a time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first week in September's no good?

MR. PURDY: That week's only a four-day week too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: The trust fund has two meetings in one day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you speak up a little? I think that equipment maybe isn't quite as sensitive as it might be for Nigel.

MRS. EMBURY: If I correctly understood what Ken said, Mr. Chairman, it looks like it won't have estimate implications for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MRS. EMBURY: Therefore I would say let's leave it until October or whenever. As Shirley suggested, you two set up a meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then suppose we set it up. In that event we could have the full committee. Ian will be back. He's here most days, I think. So other than a Tuesday, we could likely have the full committee, especially if we met once the House opens. Do you want to leave the setting of a time until a later meeting of this committee, either a September or an early October meeting? Is that satisfactory?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's fine. I don't see any resolution of this before the fall sittings anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that we reached an impasse last time: they said money, we said no money, and that was it. Okay, that was item 3(a).

Item 3(b) refers to minute 84.44 of the June 20 meeting. That minute gives the impression that we're after only one insurance policy — and it's probably my fault that that impression was left — whereas as a matter of fact we were after two different kinds of insurance and two different policies. I'll ask Gary to bring us up to date, because he's been following through on that. Where is he?

DR. GARRISON: I'm right here, Mr. Chairman. All I really have to report is that the accidental death and dismemberment policies were received yesterday. That's one item. The other was the third-party liability insurance. As you can see from your support material, that was received in mid-July. That one has been referred to Mr. Clegg for examination, and I assume that's what the committee wants to do with this other policy as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg has been on vacation most of the intervening time, I understand.

Just a little further background. We were going to have a representative of the government who had custody of the policy come before the committee, because we were having trouble getting the policy. That resulted in our getting the policy. I then made an assumption that we wouldn't need the representative until we'd looked at the policy.

MRS. CRIPPS: Have you had a chance to look at the policy?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We sent the one we received

in July right over to Mr. Clegg, and we've done nothing yet with the one we received yesterday.

Can you hear okay, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I assume what the committee would wish in this case is that we complete the examination of the policies and, as soon as that is done, report to whatever meeting of the committee follows that.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just a question on the side. What kind of take-up of the offer to purchase insurance was there by members?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's life insurance. That's a different one.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, that's a different one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we're talking about here is general liability insurance, which would cover constituency staff, say, in an accident or if they poured hot coffee over a constituent, or something like that, or accidental death and dismemberment where constituency staff are injured in the course of their duties. As I understand it, those are the two kinds of insurance we're dealing with.

DR. GARRISON: That's right. We also received accidental death and dismemberment policies that relate to members, but we didn't directly request that. It came along with the other one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. HYLAND: We're also covered by compensation. There's a separate Act; it's called the MLA Compensation Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item is 3(c). You may recall that at one time we discussed the possibility of the whole committee going to Toronto, Ottawa, and Quebec City to compare personnel policies, especially with regard to senior staff. Then because of financial restraint, it was agreed that Alan Hyland would represent us at Toronto on his way to the Canadian regional Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in Halifax. So I'll just turn that item over to Alan.

Before I do, there was a question of what topics should be covered. A list of topics was prepared. It was sent out to all members of the committee and a copy was given to Alan Hyland. I didn't receive any comments from any members of the committee regarding that list of topics, so I assumed silence implied approval.

MRS. CRIPPS: Are you sure we received copies?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They went out.

MR. HYLAND: I don't have a written report, but I got my notes typed up. I don't know how much we

want to get into it in an overview. It might be as well to hold it till a further date, until I have something in writing, or I can give you the overview now from my notes, whichever you wish — if you want it twice or just once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Might it not be better if we had it once? What's the wish of the committee?

MR. HYLAND: I've got about five pages of notes.

MR. PURDY: I think I'd rather see it in written form first and then come back to the committee for discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That seems more efficient. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, we just agreed that Alan Hyland's report on his visit to the administration of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario in regard to staffing and so on would be circulated in writing for us to read, and then we would discuss it at a subsequent meeting.

MR. PENGELLY: Thanks for repeating that, Mr. Chairman. I guess it's just the rustling of paper that makes it difficult to hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know who's doing that.

MRS. EMBURY: He's right beside your phone.

MR. KOWALSKI: Go back to bed, Nigel.

MR. PENGELLY: That has to be Ken Kowalski. He doesn't want me to hear it.

MR. HYLAND: There are a couple of items on the agenda that I can deal with from this as they come up. Then I can get the rest in better written form.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that enough for item 3(c)?

Item 3(d), the policy with regard to word processing equipment. That also refers to a minute from our last meeting. We suggested that some draft guidelines be prepared for consideration of the committee, in view of the concern of some of us about standardization. The Clerk prepared a memo that deals with the thing from the point of view of efficiency and the future, and that was circulated to members. Subsequently the Clerk and I discussed it at one of our regular meetings, and it was thought that it would be a good thing to have someone specializing in the field prepare some kind of report on what members want. Bohdan checked it with some of his colleagues, and maybe he'd like to tell you what he found as a result of that inquiry. I think one of them was in Toronto.

MR. STEFANIUK: The method of approaching automation of offices is described very briefly in the memorandum. Unless someone specifically wants elaboration on that, I don't think it's necessary to go into it. We proceeded to the stage where we had received a proposal from C.I.M. Systems Ltd., people

who have done work for us already. We considered their proposal and went back to C.I.M. with the question as to whether they would be prepared to become involved in one stage of a study; that is, the preliminary stage of preparing a questionnaire, distributing it to members, assessing the results, and identifying some possible equipment which could be tested in the various caucus offices. They replied to that in the affirmative. That reply was forthcoming after these books went out. They estimated the cost of their involvement in that preliminary stage at, I believe, \$2,500. I think you have a copy of that proposal, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that Nigel heard that? Did you hear all of that, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: No I didn't, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you tell us what you didn't hear? [laughter]

MR. PENGELLY: If I could tell you what I didn't hear, I wouldn't have any problem.

MR. HYLAND: What about moving that thing into the centre of the table instead of at the edge?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to give Nigel a summary of that?

MR. STEFANIUK: Nigel, I assume you have the documentation with the book.

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: You will note that with my memorandum there is a proposal attached from C.I.M. Systems Ltd. The Speaker and I discussed that proposal and the recommendation which I had made in my memorandum, and we went back to C.I.M. Systems requesting that they estimate for us the cost of their involvement in a preliminary study which would involve all members and the subsequent recommendation of test equipment. They have since come back to us and said, yes, they would be interested in participating in that kind of study, and they estimate the cost of their participation at \$2,500.

MR. PENGELLY: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As your material may show and as you may recall, we found out that in Ontario they faced this same question. They did a study in co-operation with the three caucuses in their House, and came up with a result for standardization. This would be one means of doing a similar thing here: having this consulting firm prepare a questionnaire, sending it out, and then, on the basis of the questionnaire, identifying equipment that might possibly be tried out as fitting the requirements.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I think this may be one answer, but I still think there are other dilemmas that face us now. The way I understood the issue when we discussed it at the last meeting — and I made the proposal. I don't think it has been totally dealt with in the same fashion in the memo that was

sent by the Clerk to you. What I'm saying is that we all identify that we have a problem because we have different systems. But I understood from that last meeting that that was what was going to happen. The members have a right to bring in what equipment they want, because they're spending their own communication allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're spending public dollars and buying equipment which will become public property.

MRS. EMBURY: I understood that was the problem to be looked at. What to do when you get a lot of different equipment like this, how to dispose of it: that was the problem. We've already got the equipment. How are we going to overcome that? To my mind, you're looking at another — I can't imagine anything being resolved within almost a year. The members are already two years into their terms. It seems to me that we're always sort of placed on hold. By the time we gather all the information — it's going to take such a long time. So I think that's only part of this solution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're saying is that we should have tackled the problem sooner, and the fact of the matter is that we attempted to. We attempted to suggest to the government caucus before they put in the AES equipment that they might consider using the same kind of equipment as Hansard, the Clerk's office, and me. The only other kind of equipment we were aware was serving members, that they might match, was the IBM equipment that serves the two opposition caucuses. But the suggestion to standardize at that stage was rejected, in effect, and the result is that we now have made considerable progress towards heterogeneity. The longer we put off solving the problem, the greater the mixture of equipment we're going to have and the more certain that we're going to have a great mixture to dispose of in the end, at possible loss of taxpayers' dollars.

So it seems to me that we either let the thing just run its course, helter-skelter — forget about standardization, forget about any waste that may result — on the footing of freedom of individual choice, or we say, well, we're not going to let this go any further, we're going to get some guidelines as quickly as we can.

I don't know how busy this consulting firm is. Their fee is reasonable, it seems to me. It's covered by our budget; we included that sort of thing in our estimates last year. It seems to me that, depending on the co-operation of the members, we should be able to get a result within some weeks, possibly five or six. That's just off the top of my head. I haven't asked the consultant. Of course I don't know how fast the members will respond.

MRS. EMBURY: I would like to say one other thing. I don't disagree with this, Mr. Chairman. I just don't like some — I really have trouble with what you've said. It is public funding; I certainly agree with you. But I find it a value judgment by people when you say it's been done on a haphazard basis. If you're going to make that statement, I think it has to be stated from the perspective of the whole Legislative Assembly. Yes, members have gone ahead, but I think those members feel they have made responsible decisions.

That's why I find some of the statements in the memo — it's in print: "in some instances, in a very hurried manner". I think that's a value judgment. I think that if you're saying that, if you want this to be — you were talking about public money. Therefore if statements are made about that, I think people have a right to rebut that type of statement. I said at the last meeting that I had been waiting. I spoke to somebody on staff, and it was going to be another year. So how long do I have to wait before I try to tie into something, when I'm halfway through my term? That's all I was saying to you.

MR. HYLAND: I've spent some time with the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you hear that, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: . . . director of administration in Ontario. He outlined what they did, and Bo has outlined it in the memo. I also spent some time with the director of government caucus and looked at the computer and terminals and what they are doing with them. They had the committee, as outlined in the memo. I also have here their request for proposal for a members' offices automation network system. They're quite well advanced, and they were facing the same problem we now face: members purchasing minicomputers for their offices. In the long run, they hope to tie in even the constituency offices with their main computer system, as well as the offices in Queens Park. Right now they have computers in six offices — four in opposition, I think, and two in government offices — as the tryout, as outlined. They have proposals out and are down to, I think, three major companies.

I didn't ask how long it took them to get to that stage. I know they did some travelling to Ottawa, Washington, Michigan, and California to look at their systems and come up with their own proposals. I don't know how long it's taken them, and I don't know if they put a freeze on people purchasing the minicomputers in the meantime or if they just asked them to hold.

But the problem I found: you have the communications budget; you go to buy a computer and, depending on the size of your constituency, some of the brand names like you have here, like the system you have out here — I can't touch anywhere near the cost of that with my constituency office allotment. You'd have to have a lot higher population base, like Bill's, to touch the price of those computers. I don't know what Sheila's base is but I know mine, and you couldn't begin to touch it with that kind. So that's why I went to the kind I got, simply because I couldn't afford to take one of these. I don't know what one of those systems costs, but it's substantial.

In the Ontario thing, they're not paying out of their communications budget anymore. That's a different budget item of the Assembly. As I say, I don't know how long it took them to get to that stage, but they're at the stage where they're calling for a request. The cost is going to be high, because they have to wire the whole building for the computer, as well as any tie-ins they have to have to the telephone system. They feel they have the ultimate system now.

MRS. CRIPPS: I guess I have a question on whose decision it was to purchase AES, because I understand it would come out of the Assembly budget. Is that not right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I think it was the government caucus decision to buy it, and it came out of government caucus funds.

MRS. CRIPPS: We never discussed it in any government caucus that I can remember.

MR. HYLAND: It's a long time ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: We never did.

MRS. CRIPPS: The system we have for government members is, in my estimation, worse than useless. It's broken down so often and has been a problem from the outset. We've only had that stupid system in here two years, and I can't ever remember a time when the darn thing wasn't broken down two or three times a week. In my estimation, whoever approved and purchased it wasted the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three points. On the question of your having a smaller population and hence a smaller allowance out of which you might buy a computer, Alan, I don't know enough about it, but it would seem to me that possibly advice would be available to recommend equipment that was less costly, perhaps with smaller capacity, that might still be compatible and not be the same brand name. I think compatibility of equipment is to some extent progressing quite a bit in the field right now.

As far as the choice of equipment in the government caucus is concerned, I don't know whether you recall this but this system we have here was chosen on the basis of very careful study. We scrutinized the contract very carefully, took out some items that we thought were not favourable, that favoured the leasing company too much. We then suggested that perhaps we should also check the contract with regard to equipment that was going into the government office. We also suggested that they look at NBI instead of AES, but it didn't happen that way. The AES equipment was in there. I don't know what's in the contract; I haven't seen it. As I said, it involves taxpayers' dollars which are budgeted through this committee, even though there is a choice among those who use those dollars as to how they may be applied.

With regard to the allegation of possible hastiness in purchase, that may or may not be an accurate description. The fact of the matter is that at least one member, as far as I know — and there may have been others — put in equipment and found out afterwards that it did not have communications capability. The likelihood is that if the equipment had been selected on the advice of an expert instead of on the advice of someone who was selling equipment, a so-called sales consultant perhaps, the chances are that that deficiency in the equipment would have been discovered before it was bought.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment on that subject, please. Yesterday I attended the exit conference following the audit of Legislative Assembly financial records with auditors

who have just concluded the audit. They raised some questions with me relative to our purchasing procedures and noted that during the last week of the fiscal year 1983-84 — that is, the last week of March 1984 — several members had obviously made decisions to acquire equipment and other commodities by effecting transfers among their various allowances. They noted that that equipment or other commodities were decided upon during that last week of March, as I say, and that in effect delivery was not taken until the new fiscal year, 1984-85, and that payments were effected in 1984-85. The fact is that payments totalling in excess of \$80,000 were made in 1984-85 for decisions to purchase which were reached during the last week of the previous fiscal year.

The auditors have now directed us to go to the Provincial Treasurer and determine whether the Provincial Treasurer will want to reverse several accounting entries, in effect causing that \$80,000 expenditure to be charged against the current year's budget rather than last year's budget.

With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I think that supports the statement that decisions were made hurriedly in some instances. They were made during the last week of the budget year.

MRS. CRIPPS: They might have been working on that decision for six months.

MR. STEFANIUK: As you said, in some instances we are faced with decisions — this is not by any means suggesting that this happened in all instances — which result in acquisition of equipment which is presently sitting in members' constituency offices and has not yet been used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you hear that, Nigel?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Bo, I think the discussion you had with the auditors yesterday raises a point in terms of how budgets are decided and utilized that's traditional in a parliamentary democracy. It is not at all uncommon — I really emphasize that — in this kind of system, the British parliamentary democracy, to see in the last month of a fiscal year the utilization of funds that have been budgeted for under the approved guidelines and everything else. In fact there is a provision that clearly allows, for decisions made in the last month of any fiscal year, those items to be purchased and paid for in the first month of the following fiscal year. In my experience as a former deputy minister, I saw that happen with millions of dollars of things. That's not to suggest for a moment that there was a hurried decision.

Quite clearly in the last week of March 1984, I made a decision to purchase an Apple II computer for my constituency office. It was something I had started studying in the fall of 1983, and I finally made that decision in the last week of March 1984, because I wanted to see exactly how many dollars I would have left in the other two allowances that were made available to me. Because of the smallness of the population that exists in the constituency I represent, I was confronted with the dilemma of being unable to make a purchase of all the equipment I wanted in one fiscal year. So I purchased part of it

in the last fiscal year and part of it in the first week of this fiscal year. That was a predetermined decision that I made six, seven, eight months before, and I spent a great deal of time talking to a number of other people before finally arriving at the kind of purchase I wanted to make. That is common practice, that has been traditional practice, and there's absolutely nothing wrong with that. If an auditor feels uncomfortable with that, so be it. He can point it out all he wants, but he also has to point it out in perspective, in terms of traditional practice.

If the suggestion is made that a member might have said, "Look, I haven't used any of these things," and somebody comes along and says to him, "Well, you'd better use it now or you're going to lose that money, and it's going to be returned to general revenue," I suppose there's always the possibility of that sort of thing happening. But I think the integrity of most members is that they may very well plan and plan and plan and basically work toward that end. Certainly in the case of the Member for Barrhead, that's exactly what his strategy was. And the same with my communications allowance: if I want, it's my choice and my decision when to put out a pamphlet to my constituents. It may very well be in the last week of March in a particular year; it's my choice as to the best possible time. I could just as easily put it out, I guess, in the first week of April and then go 12 months without it.

But I think there is another point of view that has to be put on the table with that. Should the auditor wish to raise that in Public Accounts, I think a large number of members would be quite prepared to point out the reality of the situation and the reality of the system. I look forward to any further discussion with any auditor on this point because, knowing full well how the system functions in this province and in all parliamentary democracies, there's nothing uncommon with that. An \$80,000 expenditure on the basis of the total budget doesn't surprise me at all.

Now that's nothing to do with the quality of purchases or anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's the essential point, I think, what Ken just said last. It's well known and human nature that we tend to do things as we get close to deadlines, especially if we're extremely busy. But the nub of the thing would be the quality of the decision that was made to choose certain items. I think that would be more important than the time the decision was made. In other words, if you bought everything in March and you bought what you needed and you bought it well, I think that is quite a different thing from rushing into things in March that haven't been previously considered and buying equipment that subsequently isn't used. So it seems to me it's the quality of the decision that is made, the quality of the choice, rather than the timing of it, which relates to the essence of this question as to whether or not we're going to standardize.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, I have to leave you now for the same reason I'm not attending the meeting in Edmonton, and that is a commitment to meet with the county school committee. So if I can have your permission, I'll hang up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you do, have you anything to say on this topic under discussion?

MR. PENGELLY: No, but I'm listening with great interest. I'm a computer illiterate; I really don't know what you're talking about. I'm one who hasn't installed one of those yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Without agreeing with your last statement, thank you very much.

MR. PENGELLY: All right. Good-bye.

MRS. EMBURY: I'll try to restrain my remarks, Mr. Chairman, so I'm not in a debating position with you. I think we're trying to identify the concerns that we can look at and therefore do something about. I don't think it is just the quality of those decisions, because again that's a judgment and, until a member is here to defend himself, shouldn't be an accusation. But I do think what we're saying is that besides the realities of the situation with both points of view, there may be a political overtone. You said that it's responsibility for public funds, but I think it's what appears to be a political issue. I say that in all good faith. But when you hear the talk in this building alone about decisions that are made by members, that's what is very frightening to my mind. The talk is in the building, so if it goes beyond the building and that's misinterpreted, I think that's a problem too. So I think there are a lot of implications about this.

But we're only talking about computers. Last time we said we would have global budgets from the different caucuses per se, and it would be one amount that was designated to the different caucuses. Therein lies one concern. If we're still in a period of restraint and have to be very careful and responsible for how we spend the dollars, one of my concerns is replacing equipment. It's sort of tied in with this, but I'm even looking at typewriters and whatnot. I guess therein lies one dilemma. On one hand you're allowing people, i.e. caucuses, to make decisions about how money is spent, and yet eventually all this equipment can come back to the Legislative Assembly. Being in a period of restraint, we're not supposed to increase our budgets. It's very difficult to look at replacement value of equipment that's used. So I'm just wondering if it isn't a very, very broad issue that has to be considered. How do you even replace equipment in times of restraint? As I understand it, it has to be a B budget item, and those are very hard to come by in our budget system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that where we're at is, do we try to standardize — not standardize; this will not compel members to spend their dollars in a certain way, obviously. They may say, look, we don't like that standardization proposal, and we're not going to follow it; or if you're going to cause me trouble on buying a computer, I'm going to use my money for something else, maybe rent one or get the services of one. The point is whether we should attempt to make available to members as soon as possible, some proposals — these were guidelines not orders we were talking about — which would assist members, since individual members don't have funding for commissioning studies and we have the possibility of having this advice obtained from one source for sharing with all members. The question is, should we proceed to develop these guidelines and then share them with the members? What happens

after that is another question entirely.

MR. KOWALSKI: I guess one of the interesting things about this whole discussion — and I very much appreciated Mr. Stefaniuk's memo, notwithstanding the comments in the first paragraph. But basically I guess I would feel much more comfortable if I knew — there are 79 Members of the Legislative Assembly, and I guess around 41, 42 are considered private members — how many of those private members have already made an acquisition of some of this so-called computer equipment. If more than half have already made it, I'm not sure what a review to try to standardize at this point would really accomplish. I know that when I was undertaking the research to purchase the equipment I have, I sat down with the director of administration in the Office of the Clerk on more than one occasion to try to get her best advice with respect to what other members were doing and what I should be looking at in terms of an attempt at standardization. In fact the one machine and unit that I finally arrived at was done in consultation with a number of other members who had a similar one. I asked them: how do you feel about it, is it working well, and is it positive? They said yes, that's the one we would encourage you to purchase. So there may already have been something along that line. I recognize as well that other members have different types of equipment.

But if we're asked to make a decision on standardization at this point, with more than half the members already having made a decision, it seems to me that the Clerk was actually correct in that last paragraph, that it really may very well be too late. In that case, it seems to me it could very well be redundant. I wasn't here at the meeting of June 20, so I don't know the basic reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't you think, though, that if we take that position, we're saying that the problem is there; it's quite large already; we're going to let it get bigger, and we're not going to do anything about it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Please don't misunderstand me, because I don't subscribe to the theory that there's a problem. From the very outset, I don't agree with the premise that there is a problem. The fact that I make a decision to purchase something and Mrs. Embury makes a decision to purchase something different is not a problem to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not while you're buying it. But we're concerned about the long-term interests of the Assembly...

MR. KOWALSKI: And so am I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... and, if you want to say, the taxpayer.

MR. KOWALSKI: And so am I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members come and go, even the most durable ones. We're concerned about being left with a heterogeneous collection of equipment that we don't know what to do with and that probably isn't worth upgrading because there's only one item of this and one item of that and so on. Mind you, there's

another side to it. If we want to learn from experience, the bigger the variety of equipment we buy the better. But if we want to take advantage of other people's experience and expertise, it seems to me that puts a different light on it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, as Mrs. Embury pointed out very correctly at the outset, I think one has to be careful about subjective statements in this regard. I'm not so sure that the decision I made is not the most correct. I can't quantify that at all, because I don't know what the future's going to read. For people to suggest that we're going to have a problem several years down the line suggests to me that there's a bit of crystal-balling going on there. I'm not aware of any of the equipment that has been purchased by any member right now that has been ridiculed by the so-called computer experts as being useless. Now if that is so, I wish somebody would tell me that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody is talking about ridicule.

MR. KOWALSKI: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The statement that was made was that it's sitting in somebody's office not being used because it doesn't do what it was thought to do.

MRS. CRIPPS: How do we know that?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's possible. I can't comment on that because I've had no evidence to suggest that.

MRS. EMBURY: It's a fact, I think.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think a statement was made here earlier today relative to the equipment that is installed in the government members' caucus. Some description was provided of that particular equipment. While I don't have an appreciation of the type of communications facility the members might be inclined to use from their constituencies and the equipment which they have purchased, to the equipment which may be located here, it seems to me that that indeed may be a desirable feature. Members may want to be able to employ the equipment which they have located in their constituency offices to communicate with the equipment that is located in the government members' caucus offices for purposes of either transmitting information to or receiving from. It seems to me that a study would at least tell us which of the equipment that is in place at the present time has compatibility features. We know that different brands of equipment are compatible. We know, for example, that the NBI equipment which is located in Hansard, the Clerk's offices, and the Speaker's offices is compatible with IBM, which is located in the two opposition caucuses at the moment. That wasn't because anybody planned it that way, I suggest. That was simply a question of luck, because those caucuses decided independently as well to acquire equipment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words the old Social Credit caucus.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And when the NDP became the Official Opposition, they went along with it.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we are seeing in the marketplace today is what I refer to as translation equipment, a third piece of equipment which causes two previously incompatible pieces to become compatible because it translates the language of the software from one to the other. It's becoming increasingly complex; there's no question about it. If members are content with what they have at the moment, then obviously a study is not necessary at all. But it seems to me that earlier today I heard that the members around this table are not content with the performance of the equipment which is located in their caucus office.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, that's one reason I went to my own computer upstairs; the one we have in the government members' office is just not effective. The system is down more than it's up. I don't know if the auditor was looking at my purchase last year, but I made that decision six weeks before and would have made the payment before April 1; I think the payment was made April 7. However, we had to wait for the equipment to come in. I bought mine on a mass order through TransAlta Utilities. I think I saved the public purse something like \$6,000 on the purchase of my computer that's upstairs right now, and it's compatible with — it's got the modem on it; it can be tied into your system or the Clerk's system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'll be able to access the Library.

MR. PURDY: I could access the Library if I want to put the modem in, but I don't think I have to or want to right now. It's for personal use and constituency use. I don't have a constituency office per se, so I don't think I have to worry about another machine in a constituency office someplace in the constituency. I believe the system I have, the DECmate by Digital, is compatible. If we're going to embark on any study, we should be looking at that particular company at the same time. We had a bit of problem with the printer on this machine here just recently, and DEC was on the scene immediately to rectify the problem. We know that at other times with the machine we have upstairs we've had to wait for service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one?

MR. PURDY: The government caucus one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The AES.

MR. PURDY: Yes. We've had to wait for service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a perception that has crept into this discussion which, if we sit back and take a look at, I think isn't valid, and that is that we're trying to impose something on somebody. We're not. We're trying to develop guidelines; that's all we're talking about. We are not getting ready to say: Ken Kowalski, you buy that equipment or you don't get any bucks. We're not saying that. We're saying, should we assist the members in their choices by developing these guidelines on the basis of what

the members themselves would say in a questionnaire as to what they expect of their equipment? That's all. If someone is sensitive about whether certain brands would be recommended — and I don't know whether this is possible or not — we could perhaps ask the consultant to avoid doing that and simply list what the capabilities should be. Then members can choose whatever brands they want that will have those capabilities.

Another advantage of this is, as you've already indicated, Ken, there is a considerable amount of experience right now with this equipment. By proceeding with this simple proposal, which I'm sure has generated a lot of useful discussion, we have a practical means whereby the members can share each other's experiences with the equipment that's already in place. The only thing is that if nobody wants to bother with it, if the committee objects to a questionnaire going out to the members, we've got other things to do and we'll forget about it.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I guess the problem I'm having is that I'm not sure it's going to even look at solving the problems. Maybe we have to identify the problems. I think what I as a member have wanted to know — I tried, and maybe I did it the wrong way and stand to be corrected on this. I'm sure it's up to a year ago, and Bohdan can tell us when the equipment came in. I tried to ask and I heard that it was possible there was going to be a pilot project, having some MLAs use this. As I said, I haven't seen it. I realize that we now have a change of staff, and that might create a delay. I guess what all members would like to know is: what can this system do; what models are compatible with it? To me we're asking relatively simple — I don't think members know or understand how tying into the system would eventually help them, besides as you say to access the Library. Frankly I don't think that's a major priority with many MLAs right now, but I just speak for myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's only an example.

MRS. EMBURY: Yes. I know it would be terrific; I quite agree with you. But I think we can move beyond the study and say, look, the system is now in place, or you're at such a stage with your system, and these are the things it can do.

Then the other problem is still, what are we going to do? You said that we're not asking members to do it; we're only offering guidelines. But then what are we going to do with the equipment that already has been purchased?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a problem. Perhaps the question is, are we going to take a small, reasonable step to see whether we can hold that problem where it is rather than have it aggravated.

MRS. EMBURY: I submit that it's a major — I guess what I'm interested in learning is what you do with all your other equipment when it becomes obsolete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think we have that kind of proliferation or variety.

MRS. EMBURY: I quite agree. When they moved

from the horse and buggy to cars, that might have been done easily. It's an ongoing problem, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're talking about typewriters, desks, phone-answering equipment, and things like that, and we don't have that kind of problem. The thing is that we're talking about self-standing equipment in regard to the other items, where the equipment is complete in itself and doesn't depend on intercommunication. Whereas here you may want to have access to the Clerk's Office from your constituency office; you might want to have access to the administration office for some reason or other. I can't think of all the examples.

MRS. CRIPPS: I want to go back to the discussion on the decision to purchase, the last week. I know I didn't purchase any, because I really don't know what I need and what would suit my purposes. But I do know that a lot of members agonized over equipment for a long period of time and did a lot of studying. We discussed it extensively. I live on a farm, and we spent all summer planning to harvest a crop. Last week the great white reaper came in and we've changed our decision. Decisions may be made on the spur of the moment, but those decisions are usually based on long-term planning and some forethought. I guess I see the problem as being the kind of equipment the staff in the Legislative Assembly is working with. I'm told that the secretarial staff is using typewriters, which in today's technology are outdated for effective communication purposes. I have to ask the question, is it a function of the Legislative Assembly to provide modern, up-to-date equipment for the secretaries throughout our offices? According to your memo, the opposition have a very expensive IBM ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I told you that story. There's a special story to that. They were the first ones to do it.

MRS. CRIPPS: But how come? How come, if one area of the Legislative Assembly is served with IBM communications equipment, my secretary or Bill's or anybody's is using other equipment? I think the variance of equipment within the Legislature is a major problem, not in our offices but within the Legislature. Then I think members would be perfectly willing. I think Sheila is interested in tying in, and possibly Ken, but if there's nothing in our secretaries' offices in the Legislature that we can tie into, then we're at loose ends. I think that's a decision that has to be made first. How are we going to replace the typewriters that the secretaries are using, and is that a function of the Legislature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a separate heading for that. I don't know what that discussion is going to be. Sheila indicated that there was some urgency to have a meeting to discuss this item, and I told her I'd put it on the agenda. That's where we're at, but what the background of it is, I don't know. It's here, and I was hoping we would get through this item rather quickly so we could spend plenty of time on that concern.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we table this and go back to our respective caucuses and

determine if the caucus actually wants a study done to see what needs may be out there for the members that haven't taken advantage of computers for their offices.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think the overriding question though, Bill, is our offices within the Legislature, Sheila's point and Ken's too on how we replace the equipment that's here.

MR. PURDY: There's another item.

MR. STEFANIUK: Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, concerning some of the points Mrs. Cripps raised, I think it's well known, as was mentioned earlier at this meeting, that agreement had been reached relative to global budgeting within the caucuses. The fact that the opposition caucuses have IBM equipment, which happens to be NBI compatible, results from the fact that the then Social Credit Official Opposition made a decision within that caucus to acquire that particular type of equipment and requested that a transfer of funding be effected within their budget for a capital expenditure. That was in fact done; they were accommodated.

The difficulty we hear about at the moment, in accommodating staff within the Legislative Assembly and within the caucuses, is this: members have individually acquired various types of equipment, and there is some dissatisfaction expressed by the staff because they feel they are being treated differently and not uniformly. Some members have seen fit to use their allowances to buy a word processor. Other members have seen fit not to use their allowances for that purpose and have retained the traditional typewriter. Within that group of members who have acquired equipment, there have been varying types of acquisitions. Some have performance abilities which, I gather, are superior to others. I don't know; I haven't assessed them. But there appears to be this competition, if you like, this tendency now to draw comparisons relative to the generosity of some members as opposed to others and to the consideration for staff of some members relative to others. That, I suggest, exists.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's another factor, talking about staff, and that is that most of the equipment requires a certain amount of familiarity to use. It would seem to me that that could be a factor in possible standardization and staff being transferred around from one member to another or from one part of the caucus to another.

MR. KOWALSKI: The comments made by Mr. Stefaniuk are right on. In fact I've got a little trouble even with this discussion because you've had the two phraseologies, computers and word processors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're using computers loosely.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay, because it's really under 8(a). To me that's the nuts and the bolts of the whole discussion and one I want to come up with a proposal for. What Mr. Stefaniuk has said is dead right. If there's any concern that exists among members, it's the fact that one has done a certain thing and one has done another. But to me that's a different kind of

issue from the one we've been talking about for the last number of minutes. Maybe the suggestion made by Mr. Purdy just to defer this one at this point — maybe it will become clearer when we get down to 8.

MR. HYLAND: Just a point. If my understanding of the Ontario setup is right, the amount of money they get to operate their caucuses covers research and a number of other things. It excludes secretarial and equipment. I may be wrong in that, but I thought their equipment was paid for by the Assembly — typewriters, desks, word processors, computers, the whole business. It's not an item, and they deal with at least twice what we deal with per member, including cabinet ministers. They get allowance for that.

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't think the situation here differs very much, Mr. Chairman. When the members were provided, for example, with typewriters, telephone answering equipment, and other equipment for their constituency offices, that funding was not charged to any of the members' allowances. Rather, this committee instituted special funding for that purpose. So I really don't think it's a question, unless under item 8 on the agenda the decision of this committee is to make that a caucus responsibility. Otherwise, if equipment needs replacement, if there's a move to provide all members with word processing equipment in their offices here or in the constituencies, then that's a general administration funding item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we have a motion to table. Is it agreed? Did you say something, Shirley?

MRS. CRIPPS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to make sure whether or not the motion to table is agreed to. Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

MR. HYLAND: With the condition that you have to report back.

MRS. CRIPPS: That wasn't my understanding. We're just tabling it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, can I make a suggestion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: If we could move to 8(a), maybe the two conversations would somehow get tied together and there'd be some clarity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not knowing what the conversation will be under 8(a), I will now agree with you.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think they will kind of flow one into the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's quickly, if we can, go through the intervening items. Or do you want to go

directly to 8(a)? What's your preference?

MR. PURDY: It depends how long it takes, because I've only got three-quarters of an hour left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I actually should be out of here in 15 minutes, but I'm going to stretch it.

MR. KOWALSKI: My limit is 10:45.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you want to do?

MRS. EMBURY: Move to 8(a), please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, move to 8(a). Sheila, I have your name beside that one.

MRS. EMBURY: I alluded to it under the previous discussion, Mr. Chairman. Maybe it got lost then. I did make my point clear. I think there is a similarity when you're — equipment is equipment is equipment. We're fast moving into this dilemma, the same with computers, and this is why I was wondering what you do about typewriters. But you said it wasn't the same, so I'll bow to Mr. Kowalski, who can speak on this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure what the problem is. The word I got was that there was a problem with regard to replacing equipment, so I put it on the agenda. But what the nature of the problem is, I don't know.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think I have to take off from what Mr. Stefaniuk said just a few minutes ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That comes to it?

MR. KOWALSKI: It'll flow right through that. In essence what we've had happen here, I think, is a massive change in technology. You've now gone from the basic electric typewriter that most offices have, to the memory typewriter or, I guess, the word processor. I want to be very careful here that I don't confuse anybody. I'm talking about the memory typewriter. What has happened in the past year, in the government caucus at least, is that one or two members have quite correctly used one of their allowances to purchase such a machine and brought it in here to the various caucuses. That has caused problems. You have competition between secretaries and a whole series of other things.

I have several concerns with what has happened. First of all, I believe that equipment is the responsibility of the Legislative Assembly per se. If there's to be an updating or replacement of equipment, then in essence it should come via a mechanism that would be set up under the estimates of the Legislative Assembly. Secondly, I think it's important that we in fact make the leap from the simple electric typewriter to the memory typewriter, the word processor so to speak. I think that's something we should take a look at. In fact we have taken a look at that. I've spent considerable time over the last several months talking to the former director of administration about this problem, about what type of typewriter we might even want to take a look at. We've gone so far as to basically get a recommendation from her that one type of

typewriter might be compatible with the needs of the various members.

So by way of discussion this morning, what I think is really important, and would like to suggest we address ourselves to is the replacement of these typewriters for the offices of all private Members of the Legislative Assembly. That will include the opposition caucuses, if they don't have them. In terms of the information that has been provided to me at this point in time, I guess we're looking at about 19 or 20 different typewriters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For all private members, including the opposition?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's my understanding in terms of the research that has already been done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there are about 19 typewriters in use for all three caucuses.

MR. KOWALSKI: Nineteen or 20.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. KOWALSKI: Basically you have two or three MLAs to a typewriter, so to speak. Figures that we arrived at in terms of information given to me by Miss Blaney before she left is that we're looking at about \$3,500 for each of these particular typewriters we looked at. It was a Xerox Memorywriter with certain compatibility. What I wanted to do today is basically draw that to members' attention. If there is one item that comes under this whole subject matter, that is really the specific concern and the item I'd heard about in talking to other members. In the case of the one, two, or three members who may have purchased it out of one of their various allowances, I think that's a secondary issue that we just deal with by itself.

The first question is, should we make a replacement decision for this equipment across all caucuses? Secondly, would the funding come under a Legislative Assembly vote rather than a caucus vote? Thirdly, there has been some work done on this in terms of which machine is correct. If it's the feeling of the members that we should hire a consultant to come out with proposals in terms of which machine is best, that's okay with me. I have no problem at all with that, but I think we should be in a position to make a decision with respect to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I understand this correctly, it would mean this committee would decide — and let's leave aside for a moment whether the funding is A budget or B budget — that a certain kind of typewriter, possibly a Xerox memory typewriter, should become standard throughout the offices of members, opposition and government, and that henceforth only such typewriters be bought so as to minimize possible jealousy among the staff and make sure all members are equal insofar as typewriter capacity is concerned.

MR. KOWALSKI: I would never use a word like "henceforth" or anything like that, but the general intent is that if we do have a morale problem among staff, I think one of the ways of rectifying or correcting it . . . A more important item in all of

this is replacement, and updating the quality of the equipment. That is more important. That's the primary issue. The others are all secondary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think I'm beginning to see the problem. I wasn't aware of it previously. Is there a proposal arising from that and, if so, what's the proposal?

MR. KOWALSKI: The proposal basically is that we make a decision to purchase whatever the needed number of those memory typewriters is, henceforth. How we arrive at the proposal to purchase — we could have an invitation for tenders from competitors. That's an administrative matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once you've decided on your specs.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right. That's an administrative matter. I think the advice of the Office of the Clerk would be very important to receive. The decision I'd like to see today is that we basically decide to upgrade the equipment to a memory, word processing stage. I want to be really careful about these words, because I'm talking about a memory typewriter. I'm not talking about a whole big computer that's tied in here, there, and everywhere. I understand that some of these machines do have compatibility in talking to one another. But the real thing is to enhance the ability of the secretary to become efficient with the letter-quality typewriter. It's a letter-quality printer. Unfortunately I neglected to bring my other little file with me.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know to what extent a study has been concluded. Mr. Kowalski made reference to studies.

MR. KOWALSKI: With Miss Blaney.

MR. STEFANIUK: To the best of my knowledge, I suggest that some members have placed word processing equipment in their constituency offices. We know that for certain. Some members have requested a communications facility with this building. Obviously they would like to be able to receive information from this place at their constituency offices and vice versa. So the question arises in my mind: if we don't address ourselves to that question now, how soon will that arise and will the equipment that is being recommended at the moment, the specific brand name, be able to accomplish that immediate — in some instances, I suggest — requirement of some members?

I suggest that there is some need or desirability for a communications facility, not only from the constituency to the member's office here but from the constituency to a larger data bank. Off hand, I have in mind committees. Some committee chairmen, for example, may find it advantageous to receive minute drafts in their constituencies, having returned there from a meeting which was held here, and to be able to alter those drafts in their constituencies and return them to this place, again via word processor transmission. I think that's probably a problem that's going to confront a large number of members in the very near future and

affects some already.

So I revert to the recommendation concerning the study and suggest that perhaps it would be in order for an expert in this field to take the material which Mr. Kowalski has already prepared in the form of research on the subject, consult with all members of the Assembly relative to their needs, and perhaps arrive at a final recommendation, bearing in mind some of the unique requirements that exist at the moment, which may become more general or more universal in the foreseeable future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, if I'm not oversimplifying your proposal, it's that we start now to ensure that all members' secretaries have available to them Xerox memory typewriters or whatever. Right?

The next question arises, assuming that to be the thing that we're heading for and disregarding at the moment whatever the opposition might say about it — they're not represented here through their own choice — how do we go about funding it? Do we ask for a special warrant?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's one alternative. It's an alternative I have no problem with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or do we put it in our forthcoming estimates and wait until next April to implement it?

MR. KOWALSKI: That is a subject matter that I think we could spend a little time on. From my perspective, I have no great difficulty at all with the special warrant, depending on the timing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we need a proposal.

MR. KOWALSKI: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we're going to go for a special warrant, as you know, the first things we have to work out are the amount and the reasons. It seems to me that we may have a couple of problems there. Will this involve reimbursing those members ... I don't know. Let's suppose some members have already put in Xerox memory typewriters, or the kind of memory typewriter we may eventually end up standardizing with, and suppose they bought those out of constituency office funding, as I have done with my NBI here, even though I use it for Speaker purposes. Will the proposal include a reimbursement to those members so they will be on the same footing as other members? Otherwise we have some members with memory typewriters which they bought out of constituency office funding and other members who have in effect had extra funding and still have their constituency office funding intact. If we're going to talk about equity, is that going to be something ...

MRS. CRIPPS: We're talking about another budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: In fact in the opening remarks I made, I identified that as a secondary issue attached to the whole question. Of course if the decision to purchase was made in last year's budget, we can't do that. If it was made this year, in the 1984-85 budget, that leads to another decision. In order to make that decision, we'd have to know if anybody has done it

this year. It may not be a problem at all.

I think I'd like to say one other thing at this point in time. Mr. Stefaniuk has, I suppose, a more futuristic look on this than I have. I basically said that I think the first priority in terms of this is upgrading the equipment in the Legislative Assembly, in this building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you're specifically talking about typewriters.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct; very, very specifically talking about memory typewriters.

The second phase, of course, is that if we want to tie it into constituency offices, that brings us to another decision level here. I would rather build the foundation and worry about the roof later. It may very well be that there's some advantage to basically saying, okay, then you're going to have to do something in your constituency office as well. I guess that would almost double the need capacity, in terms of the number of machines, the dollar expense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many constituency offices have we?

MR. STEFANIUK: Something in excess of 60.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course some of them are ministers.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. Some are ministers, and some are multiple offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that we need some kind of effective proposal on the table, unless there's some further discussion or exploration of the topic. From where I sit, one of the things in the back of my mind is, how do I deal with this insofar as the opposition is concerned?

MR. PURDY: I think with Ken's proposal we're looking at a figure around \$70,000.

MR. KOWALSKI: Less than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're looking at how much?

MR. PURDY: \$70,000, less — if you go out and buy 20 of those memory typewriters at \$3,500 a piece, you're certainly not going to pay \$70,000. You're going to pay something less than that on volume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. And besides that, haven't we got some already?

MR. KOWALSKI: There are several that do exist. The other thing is that ...

MR. HYLAND: The members may want to take them to their constituency offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. KOWALSKI: I want to be very, very clear about what I'm talking about today. I said basically here, machines in the Legislative Assembly. There will be no right for a member to take that machine off his desk here and take it to his constituency office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. But I'm saying the ones that are already here.

MR. KOWALSKI: To me that's a minor point we can deal with after the more major; that's a detail we'll work out.

MR. PURDY: I guess the other point I'd like to ask now of the Clerk is, do we have the funds in this year's budget, '84-85, to make the purchase of \$70,000 or whatever the figure is?

MR. STEFANIUK: The simple answer is, no we do not, Mr. Chairman, because we were instructed in preparation of the '84-85 budget to keep it extremely lean. As you know, our general administration budget in fact shows a slight decrease over the preceding year. So there's virtually no padding in general administration.

MRS. CRIPPS: But we've only expended 24 percent as of the end of July. Why would that be?

MR. STEFANIUK: We're dealing with peaks and valleys.

MR. HYLAND: Don't forget you've got your last month where everybody buys stuff.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's got nothing to do with general administration.

MR. STEFANIUK: In general administration we're affected to a large extent by when the House is in session. Our expenses rise considerably when the House is in session as opposed to when the House is out. We have to bring on extra sessional staff when the House is in session, so the manpower element is expended considerably more when the House is in session than when it's out.

MRS. CRIPPS: We've already had the April-May.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we still have the fall sittings and the first part of the spring sittings ahead of us in this fiscal year.

MR. STEFANIUK: Our finding, too, is that the demands of the members for supplies, for example, accelerate considerably when the members are here in session. So we go through a very real peak and valley situation. There are certain times of the year when it looks like we haven't spent money. Then that will suddenly accelerate to the point where we worry about it. But in looking through the detailed worksheets, we know what has been allocated to each item, based either on zero-base budgeting or previous experience, and we can fully anticipate that the entire budget will be expended unless something unforeseen happens. I'm in no position to predict that.

Insofar as funding for this equipment is concerned, if it is taken on a leased basis, then it could very well constitute an increase for 1985-86 in what we refer to as element 350, rental of property, equipment, and goods. If it's an outright purchase, we have another element which calls for purchase of office equipment or data processing equipment. Those elements exist, so we don't have the need for preparing a B budget

item as such. What in fact would be shown would be a significant escalation in an A budget item over the previous year. So that's the answer to the question of how we would handle it if it came out of 1985-86. If it's a question of moving before that, then obviously the only alternative is a special warrant.

MR. PURDY: May I make the suggestion that we instruct the Clerk to obtain information from the various suppliers of these memory typewriters and bring us a submission for the next meeting.

MR. STEFANIUK: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. STEFANIUK: Will Mr. Kowalski's study enable us to in fact already address the suppliers or will the committee agree, in the event that we find it necessary, to engage in a further study?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the study you have is reasonably complete, we'd just be replotting the same furrow.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's really as a result of consultations that were done with most of the secretaries in the government caucus on the basis of experience with the machine in question, the capability of the machine in question, and the like, and consultation on this with the director of administration and other people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't gone to Olivetti or Smith-Corona or IBM?

MR. KOWALSKI: No, it was looking at the capability of a particular machine in terms of other equipment that was here.

MR. STEFANIUK: Then there's the question of the opposition caucuses, in an effort to treat everyone fairly.

MR. PURDY: Okay. What I'm saying with the proposal for the next meeting is that we can deal with it at that time.

MR. KOWALSKI: Perhaps I could share the information I have with the Clerk, and prior to the next meeting we'd come back with a statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the motion is that the Clerk make inquiries concerning the availability and prices of memory typewriters and that in that he have regard for information already in the possession of Mr. Kowalski. Is that the motion?

MR. PURDY: Good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have we got time to dispose of these intervening items? Items 3(g), 3(e), and 3(f). I believe we ended at item 3(d). We didn't conclude that discussion. There's no motion or anything.

MR. HYLAND: We tabled it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS. EMBURY: I don't know why we can't look at 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you want to go to 5 next?

MR. HYLAND: The one on photographing students. One thing that came up a while ago was what to do instead of giving a student just a picture. And this is what government members in the Ontario Legislature do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

MR. HYLAND: I think that would be — I can give this to Bo, and maybe he can get a quote or something, because the price . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is another basic question on this, and that is whether this committee wants to deal at all with photographs of school groups that are provided to the members to distribute, because someone has sort of taken the thing out of our hands to some extent. The photographer who was doing this for the past while has been superseded by — who did that? Government Services?

MR. STEFANIUK: The work is done by Garneau Studio under contract to the ministry responsible for public affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. They've gone ahead and signed a new two-year contract.

MR. STEFANIUK: No they haven't. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was told they had.

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, I'm not aware of that. My information is that the contract is about to expire, and I attached a very short, one-page memorandum to the file under that item — what is it on the agenda?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 3(f).

MR. STEFANIUK: The last sheet of paper under 3(f).

MR. HYLAND: Would it help if I talk to the minister responsible for the Public Affairs Bureau about this and then bring it back, instead of dealing with it in now?

MR. STEFANIUK: The information I have is from the Public Affairs Bureau.

MR. HYLAND: Your information says it could probably be even less cost for colour than for black and white.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. That's what they tell me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the second time we've been told that.

MR. STEFANIUK: And that's the question that I

think was raised: should the visiting school groups be provided with colour as opposed to black and white photographs? The question that came following that the last time it was raised was the desirability of colour photographs compared to black and white, because oftentimes they were used for publication in newspapers, and it was felt that black and white was better for that purpose. So I think the decision is really in the form of a recommendation from this committee to the Public Affairs Bureau, if in fact they are going to continue to administer and fund the program, as to the preference of the members. It is another question as to whether the Public Affairs Bureau would be willing to undertake the production of some kind of presentation folder or whether that should be funded separately by the Legislative Assembly and provided to the Public Affairs Bureau.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest that maybe this doesn't have any immediacy. My information is that the previous contract ran out on July 31 and that Public Affairs has signed a new one-year contract with another studio.

MR. HYLAND: I would be prepared to make a motion that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's my information. So my first question is: do we want to tell Public Affairs that henceforth this committee wants to deal with that because it's a service to members and this is the Members' Services Committee?

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't think it's a service to members. It's a service to the schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you don't want to deal with it, let's take it off the agenda.

MR. HYLAND: I would be prepared to make a motion that because of input and question from members, the Members' Services Committee recommend to the Public Affairs Bureau that if there's no additional increase in cost, we would sooner have the pictures of visiting school groups taken in colour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We got information two or three years ago that colour pictures were cheaper, but the concern mentioned was that some of these pictures are published in the weekly newspapers in the country, and that black and white pictures are . . .

MR. HYLAND: You're dealing with one picture out of that bunch. When there are 30 kids, you get 30 pictures. One may end up in the paper. I've had three groups in and none has ever ended up in the paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know which members raised that concern, but it was raised.

MR. HYLAND: If it's going to cause debate, I'll withdraw the motion. People have to go, and I think there's one other item we should get to.

MRS. CRIPPS: In view of the extensive discussions members have had with Members of the Legislative Assembly, I request that we ask Alan to contact

Public Affairs and find out exactly what they've done and raise with them the concerns that you know of that have been raised with members of this committee; i.e., colour and, secondly, the possibility of pictures when the House is not in session.

MR. HYLAND: They agreed to that, of course.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, they agreed to that. Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: Will you raise with them the question of that folder?

MR. HYLAND: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We had an item dealing with the payment of catering expenses, 3(g). We had a bill submitted by one of the members to reimburse some catering expenses in the sum of \$121.70. We had it on a previous agenda but weren't able to deal with it, so it's been carried forward. I wrote a memo to that member, in effect apologizing for not having dealt with it previously, and sent a copy of it to Mrs. Embury on July 10. I should perhaps have sent a copy to all members. What I said to that member was that this matter was brought to the attention of the Members' Services Committee on June 20, and there seemed to be a general reluctance to include accounts for meals or food in authorized expenditures made out of the communications allowance. Then I mentioned the fact that we previously had a member who asked that coffee for the constituency office be included, and we turned that down. But I also assured him that I would be bringing this up at this meeting. There it is.

MR. PURDY: What's the background on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just simply that we got a request; you've got a copy of it.

MR. PURDY: What was this?

MRS. EMBURY: I'm trying to remember, Mr. Chairman. I think that it . . .

MR. HYLAND: He brought some people to the Legislature, a group from a native community I think.

MRS. EMBURY: I was talking to him, and I can't even think of what example I used. We did say we wouldn't supply the coffee in our constituency office. But I think it arose, and I must have said to him that we do pay expenses. If I have a meeting and decide that the rent and coffee for a group is included — the doctors, or something, in my riding — I can bill that to my communication allowance. So I think that's where it got a little muddled. That's why he submitted it.

MR. STEFANIUK: I have a note on one of my copies of the invoice, Mr. Chairman, which might clarify the circumstances. It says: Garden River school students over at Haultain building; tour of building; took them for lunch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a members' constituency services order which relates to all three categories of funding, and I think that's the one that perhaps makes them interchangeable. We can't find any express authorization for this kind of spending in that order. So if the committee wants that kind of spending included, that order will have to be amended.

MR. PURDY: I think members have some responsibility. If they want to take a group of students or a constituent out for supper, lunch, or breakfast, they should be incurring those expenses themselves.

MR. KOWALSKI: I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed then that we not approve this item for payment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. There was the theft of some items from one member, personal items and presentation items mixed. You may recall from the previous discussion, we have not yet — the matter was referred to the Parliamentary Counsel and, as I mentioned, he's been away. He attended a conference, he hosted a conference and, in addition, he had vacation. He's on vacation now, I believe, and we have not yet got his report. So this is included in your agenda only for the purpose of letting you know that it's being attended to.

We had item 3(h), the employment contract for contract employees. That is also a report item. A contract was prepared. I went over it fairly carefully, made some comments for a redraft, and that redraft is in the hands of the Parliamentary Counsel. This is for the purpose of engaging contract employees. Unless there's some discussion on that, we can consider that as having been reported on.

There's a question there that relates directly to that, and it also arises from the work of Mr. Clegg in this regard. That is, in order to adopt this form of contract for contract employees, as I understand it, we need an order of this committee exempting those employees from two orders in council. You will see in your supporting material under item 3(h), a draft order prepared by the ... It's toward the end of the support material.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I think I'd want time to review the standard agreement form and what the exemptions mean explicitly before we look at that, because I think we want to get it out of our hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that a motion to defer it to the next meeting?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

MR. KOWALSKI: Just for clarification on that. These contracts or clauses you were talking about don't include our constituency secretaries, do they?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. We have a very brief, simple

form of agreement there, which is basically a fee-for-service type of agreement. I think you're all familiar with those, because you as members recommend the employment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no visitors, and now we have the question of the estimates. They're in the course of preparation. I expect that by September 7 we will have received practically all of them, and unless you want to discuss the estimates — there's a B budget item which is farther down the list — we can just note that for information and keep it in mind when we schedule the next meeting. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. CRIPPS: Except that I have some specific questions I would like answered for the next meeting, because we haven't had time to get to it this meeting. Number one, has the Legislative Assembly staff been expanded in the current year since the move over to the other building? I keep hearing rumours, so I want to know if the staff has been increased, by how much, and at what salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may remember that when we discussed this, we realized there was going to be some increase in work and time because of communication between this building and the administration office. The Clerk can tell you the extent of that.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I want to know. What is it costing us for the move over to the other building, in increase in staff, in renovations, or whatever? I'd like to know if there have been salary increases for any staff to do with the Legislative Assembly budget, and how much. I think we agreed on a certain percentage and I'm hearing differently, so I'd like that information provided.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, on the first question, relative to an increase in the number of staff, we have no authorization to increase the number of staff, because the number of staff is approved in the current year's budget. There's no possibility for us to increase unless we come back to this committee and ask for an increase in staff. So the answer to that is no.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: The messenger that we have going back and forth is a shared proposition between the government members' caucus and the Clerk's office. So it is a position that existed previously, and we are now simply sharing that position. We have one person doing the work that two may have done before.

Insofar as increases are concerned, there have been no increases at all granted to any management staff. There has been no public service announcement about any increases, so management staff has not received any increase whatsoever. Insofar as line staff is concerned, to the best of my knowledge contracts have not been settled, although there has been an opportunity on anniversary review date to increase to the next category. Insofar as

contract staff is concerned, there may have been adjustments to contract staff salaries, and we can produce that information if you like.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay? Now would you like . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Excuse me. May I just receive clarification from Mrs. Cripps? In the event that a contract has been renewed, do you wish to know the difference in amount from the previous contract?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, because if a contract person receives an increment and then an increase, in my estimation that's an increase.

MR. STEFANIUK: Okay. In other words, what I'm to be clear on there, Shirley — I know that a new series of contracts were effected with government members' researchers. Do you want me to draw that comparison?

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh yes. I want everybody. I want the Speaker's staff, anything that's in this number — is it 5?

MR. STEFANIUK: Fair enough. When do you want the comparison? What period of time do you want the comparison to cover? From when to when?

MRS. CRIPPS: For the budget year '83-84.

MR. STEFANIUK: So you want to know what increases or changes were effected during the '83-84 budget year. Is that right?

MRS. CRIPPS: And for '84-85 — to the current one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've dealt with '83-84 in our estimates.

MR. STEFANIUK: Okay. You want '83-84 compared to '84-85 figures which may have been altered thus far.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we have a B budget item for the Library. I'm sure that you have . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Whoa, just a minute. I thought that included — has someone replaced Charlene?

MR. STEFANIUK: Not as yet, although a person has been selected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A person has been engaged.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: Selected or engaged?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Engaged.

MR. HYLAND: Who?

MRS. CRIPPS: What's the difference between replacement and engaged?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The person hasn't started to work yet. Charlene hasn't been replaced.

MRS. CRIPPS: My question was — engaged.

AN HON. MEMBER: When does this person start?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not definite. That person is presently working for AGT. It's a question of wanting to get him in place as quickly as possible because we're facing the fall sittings, and that's a heavy traffic time. There has to be some familiarity.

MR. HYLAND: Could one ask at what wage he was engaged?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. STEFANIUK: \$41,400 annually.

MRS. CRIPPS: What was Charlene getting?

MR. STEFANIUK: It's within that range that Charlene was paid, but Charlene was paid lower. I don't have that figure.

MR. HYLAND: Thirty-two or thirty-three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Likely.

MRS. CRIPPS: From the point of view of loyalty of staff and long-term employment, I fail to understand why somebody would be paid more — this looks like about \$9,000 — than Charlene, who had been here for years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When Charlene left, she said that whoever replaced her would have to have more formal qualifications than she has, and that was reflected in the advertisement we sent out, in the job description. We engaged executive search from the department of personnel and went through the applications. I think five were interviewed, including one present staff member, and the best one was selected. It's within the range.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't question that it's within the range. I hope whoever is engaged is worth the extra \$9,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We hope so too.

MRS. CRIPPS: But I have my doubts, because in my estimation Charlene did a superb job of administration in any dealings I had with her. In order to improve upon that, in order to be worth \$9,000 more, he would have to be mighty good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the evaluation we got with the assistance of the executive search branch. This is a job of increasing complexity, and we're very thinly staffed in the Legislative Assembly. There's really no fat, considering the amount of traffic and the kinds of services members get here compared with what they get in other provinces.

MRS. CRIPPS: I guess that's my comment. The fat seems to be the \$9,000 difference in initial price. If he proves after six months or after two years that

he's worth \$42,000 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he doesn't prove, then of course he has to go. He's on probation.

MR. HYLAND: But he's \$9,000 higher to start with.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: So there's no proving it. Can we get on to 6?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've started on 6 pretty well.

MR. HYLAND: I guess my opinion on 6 was made known to you in the memo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I got your memo and I replied to it.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. I just got it yesterday. I still haven't changed my feelings. As I said in the memo, I agree that the director of administration is an administrative job. In your memo you tied the Clerk Assistant to assistant deputy, and I have heard you say many times that the Legislature is indeed different from government and that part of our desire to look at classification on our own is because it's a unique situation. I don't think we can classify Clerk Assistant to ADM, because it is somewhat unique. Besides serving you and the Clerk, he has to serve committee chairmen, for example, and other general members. If my research is right, I understand that back a few years ago when he was appointed, Mr. Blain was picked by a committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not really. He was picked with the assistance of executive search, and then his appointment was discussed with the committee. There could have been a motion. I don't recall. I didn't look it up.

MR. PURDY: My information is that the Members' Services Committee had input to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They certainly did. I can remember what some of them said, as a matter of fact. There's no question about that. But I don't recall to what extent or who decided what. There could have been a motion.

MR. HYLAND: I guess what my problem is — we just faced it here. We didn't know there was a director of administration hired. As you all know, rumours move around this building continually. You hear a rumour that there was and a rumour that there wasn't. So people come to us as Members' Services and say, who did you hire? We say, we don't know. I'm not saying that we should have been involved. I think we should have been notified, but that's something that's passed. Let's deal with this present one. This is a whole different situation from the director of administration, at least in my view. Maybe others have other views; I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's part of the same hierarchy, and the Clerk and I are responsible for the

performance of that person. My position is set out fairly clearly in that memo.

MRS. CRIPPS: What was the involvement last time, Bill? Do you remember?

MR. PURDY: I wasn't on the Members' Services Committee; this is from other members I have discussed it with.

MR. HYLAND: As I said, I'm not saying the whole committee should be involved. I suggested maybe a portion. There may be three or four who have input. But it's up to the committee, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a question whether it's up to the committee. The question is: to what extent am I as the minister of this department going to be responsible for line staff? I have that responsibility.

MR. HYLAND: I guess where you and I disagree — and I'm not sure "disagree" is the right word — is that I'm wondering if that's line staff; I'm wondering if that isn't a parliamentary position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's both.

MR. HYLAND: Sure. The division of the two is my concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you're right. It's both.

MR. PURDY: How does the selection of the Clerk take place? The same?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk is appointed by order in council.

MR. PURDY: Right. But there's still a selection process, and I thought Members' Services had input to that, when Bohdan was brought on stream.

MR. STEFANIUK: I didn't face the Members' Services Committee. I was called in for interview. First of all, the Speaker, on travels to where I was then located, met with me. Subsequent to that, I was called to Edmonton for interview, and I faced the Speaker and the head of executive search for the public service. That was the extent of the selection panel that I faced. I don't know what transpired before, after, or between.

MR. PURDY: I guess basically I'm agreeing with what Alan is saying. I don't know if I want to be sitting down face-to-face on an interview thing, but I would certainly like to see some involvement of this committee on a short list, because we as members have to work with the individual. I think we've had a good choice in the present Clerk and in Doug Blain previously. I always got on well with both gentlemen. But I emphasize that I know we have a role to play for the rest of the members of the Assembly.

MR. HYLAND: I stand to be corrected, but in my conversations with the director of administration in Ontario, I asked how he and the Clerk, et cetera, would be hired there. They have a different setup, but we're talking about the same level of person. I

don't know how they got down to the short list, but I'm sure he told me that he was ultimately hired by the board of internal economy, by more than one person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk? Rod Lewis?

MR. HYLAND: The Clerk or the director of administration or whatever.

MR. STEFANIUK: There was no board when Rod Lewis was hired. He's been there for a thousand years.

MR. HYLAND: I'm talking about the present, what would happen now. They would come before the board. The board would make the ultimate decision, and it's different from our committee by quite a bit. Maybe I got the wrong understanding. That was my understanding of what would now happen if the Clerk Assistant, or whatever they call their position, were replaced.

MRS. CRIPPS: Are you recommending, though, making the ultimate decision or input to the ultimate decision?

MR. HYLAND: I don't know. I'm not sure what the new Act would say about the appointment of . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: It's a standing order, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: It's a standing order? So then it has to come to the committee.

MR. STEFANIUK: No. I think the standing order is very clear. It says that the Clerk of the Assembly will be responsible for all officers and staff of the Assembly, subject to such instruction as he may receive from time to time from Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: So you, not the Speaker, would appoint the Clerk Assistant?

MR. STEFANIUK: The Speaker may make the instruction, and I would not presume to make that appointment without consultation with the Speaker, because I feel that that is implied in the standing order of the Assembly. But I think it would perhaps help the committee to know where we stand at the present time in this particular process. The position was advertised, as I'm sure all committee members are aware.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one are you talking about?

MR. STEFANIUK: The Clerk Assistant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: As were both. But the Clerk Assistant's position was advertised nationally. It produced 269 applicants. To date, all of those applications have simply been acknowledged, telling the applicants that the large number will cause some sort of delay in evaluation of all the applicants. It was intended to retain the services of the executive search branch of Personnel Administration to assist in the evaluation of the applicants and to arrive at a

list which should be interviewed.

From among those 269 there are five or six who are presently employees of the Legislative Assembly, and our feeling generally is that each of those who is an employee of the Legislative Assembly at the moment . . . Before I go any further, I hesitate to carry on because one of the applicants is sitting in this room. I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that applicant might be excused during the course of this discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No problem.

MR. STEFANIUK: Because we are dealing with a selection, Mr. Chairman, may I also suggest that the system be turned off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

[The committee moved in camera at 11:12 a.m.]

This page intentionally left blank.