

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[8:05 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else coming that anyone knows of, or are we all here? I haven't counted. Not quite.

DR. GARRISON: Mr. Purdy's not expected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill's not coming?

DR. REID: He can't make it on Wednesdays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Martin is represented, so we might as well start.

As you can see, the first item is welcome to the meeting. Then we have the approval of the minutes. Any comments? Do you agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minutes of October 17 are adopted.

We have a report from Alan Hyland, arising from his having gone on our behalf to the Ontario Legislature on his way to the CPA conference in Nova Scotia. There are some items in there that relate to personnel. I don't know whether you've all had a chance to read the report. There were some qualifications to it that were added afterward, that Alan kindly circulated to all of us. I think you'll find the report itself under 3(a) in your support material. If you think it's useful, I have here a bit of a summary of some of the highlights. The report itself is pretty succinct.

The Ontario Legislature budget is \$30 million, which is \$240,000 per member. That compares with \$152,000 per member in Alberta, a difference of \$88,000 per member — I think that's more than some of the provinces spend entirely on their members — which is 57 percent higher than ours. There's a structural difference there. They have a Board of Internal Economy, which is appointed by order in council and chaired by the Speaker. Their Members' Services Committee is advisory. Alan says he thinks our structure is better than a two-tiered one of this kind. I don't know what other members of the committee might think, but I'm inclined to agree with it.

One thing they do, though, is that their Board of Internal Economy normally meets every second week. That brings up a point I think someone raised a meeting or two ago, that we always seem to have the bottom priority for our meeting times and dates. Perhaps we should consider some kind of regularity for our meetings. I realize that many times they would be very short. The main pressure usually reaches us in connection with the estimates. But if someone has some ideas as to how we might arrange for — perhaps even if it were monthly. Is there any day of the month that we could appropriate to ourselves with a reasonable confidence that we could hold a meeting on that day? Or would you prefer to have a double-facetted schedule whereby we would have one schedule while the House is sitting and another one while it isn't? Just before I recognize Alan Hyland — as you know, the new Legislative Assembly Act permits us to meet by telephone, so it shouldn't be quite as difficult to get a meeting

together outside session. Alan?

MR. HYLAND: My understanding of why they meet so often is that, firstly, there are four cabinet ministers on it and four opposition House leaders, so basically those people are around the Assembly or around Toronto the majority of the time. They seem to handle just about every decision, so they have to meet more often. My understanding is that really not a lot happens without their approval, which has to be routed through the meeting, i.e. the hiring of senior staff or something. They have to approve it, so there's a need to meet a lot more often.

First, I should say that I hope everybody got that stuff I passed around in the House yesterday — the corrections to the report. I sent it to Ontario, and they sent some corrections back. The one that I said at the meeting I found a little strange, if you remember, was that a wife could be hired. I asked that specifically, and I'm sure their first answer was yes, they could, but they corrected that.

DR. REID: They can, but they can't pay her.

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on this question of a regular meeting date?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important. I'd like to suggest that we meet at 9 o'clock the first Monday of every month.

MR. PENGELLY: I don't agree with you on that one, Ken.

MRS. CRIPPS: I won't be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At least he started something.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's what is important: to get the ball rolling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Darned right. Two people said they don't like that idea. I think it's incumbent . . .

MR. PENGELLY: Are you going to drive in Monday morning?

MR. KOWALSKI: I meant Wednesday. I didn't say Monday.

DR. REID: You said Monday.

MR. KOWALSKI: I meant Wednesday. I'm terribly sorry. Wednesday morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But who is it that can't come on Wednesday? Bill Purdy?

MR. HYLAND: I can't come on the first Wednesday. Did you say the first Wednesday?

MR. KOWALSKI: First Wednesday.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think it's pretty difficult to say that we're going to be here on a certain day of every month. I really think it's far better to try to work

our meetings around other things that we have to be in for anyway, so you don't have to come to Edmonton Wednesday of one week and Monday . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't have to come. We can meet on the telephone.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm interested to hear the people who have tried that give their assessment of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel, you've had quite a bit of experience.

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you feel neglected?

MR. PENGELLY: No, I didn't feel neglected, but sometimes it's difficult to hear because of the paper noise competition. Ian has a very soft voice, and if there's much of this paper rattling around you won't always hear what he said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Soft voices sometimes conceal hard words.

MR. PENGELLY: Soft voices, big clubs. Yes.

MRS. EMBURY: I've also been on the conference calls, and I think it's fine for the odd meeting if for some reason you can't be with the group. Naturally it's a little hard to feel part of the group, but it's certainly better than not being there. I'll put it that way.

I'd like to make a motion at this time that during session we meet on Wednesday mornings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Every Wednesday morning or every second Wednesday or once a month?

MRS. EMBURY: As needed. I guess I just can't see coming to a meeting if we don't need it. Right now we have the estimates to do, so one would assume that we're going to have a fairly heavy session. I guess what I'd like as the motion, then, is just to continue as we have been. I'd rather wait and see if we really think we need a regular, scheduled meeting between sessions. I guess you're saying that you think we do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My concern is that we have such a low priority and have such trouble getting a time when we can get a reasonably large representation. I think we should try to strive for not more than two absences.

MR. HYLAND: I'm not sure if we have a low priority or not. I suggest we could tell our colleagues that if they don't attend the other meetings to allow sufficient numbers, then it's their services and their money they're dealing with. If they're not interested enough to get out of bed and attend Private Members' or whatever, to hell with them. They can wait for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're sort of supporting Sheila's motion, aren't you?

MR. PENGELLY: I would support Sheila's motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, we carry on as at present.

MR. PENGELLY: Yes. I don't think we should meet just because it's seven days since we had the last meeting.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I didn't word it succinctly in the form of a motion, but the inherent suggestion was made that we would have a regular meeting scheduled on the first Wednesday of every month at 9 o'clock. Now I didn't say "I move". Perhaps we might want to deal with that first. I think it's very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion from Sheila.

MR. KOWALSKI: But I thought I was first. I thought I had spoken before Sheila. I'm not sure how the chairman would deal with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Sheila's is an amendment, then.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think it's really important, and I think it's a waste of everybody's time to go running around the countryside trying to figure out when six or seven people are able to meet. I think that's inefficiency on behalf of all of us. I hate being bothered by people with three or four or five phone calls — can you come at 9 o'clock on such and such a day or 8 o'clock on such and such a day? That has to be gross inefficiency for your office as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that we have to phone everybody to find out when most people can come, and then we have to phone everybody back to let them know what everybody else said.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's my point.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, speaking to what Ken has said, I think you have to have something structured. We can work it in the opposite fashion. If there is a regularly set meeting every month or every other month, if it is not going to be held we can be notified. I support what Ken says. You know, we all lead rather busy lives. If we can book off that first Wednesday or every other month, whatever we decide upon, at least we would have that structured in there. If we don't have to meet, then you can let us know that there's not sufficient business and we don't have to meet that second Wednesday or every other month or every month. I think we have to start someplace, and that's to have a designated date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think it would be practical if we worked it this way: that we have a designated time and one week before we telephone everybody to indicate to them what business if any there might be, and if people don't want a meeting there won't be one.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what's been said by others, that we need to set a regular schedule. That's the only way we will ever allocate the time for it. I suggest that between the sittings of the Legislature, we meet the first Wednesday of every month, if that's a suitable date for everybody,

and that the Chair confirm, perhaps with one of the government members that are here and with Dr. Buck and Mr. Martin, rather than trying to phone everybody to see whether any of them have a priority item on the list that's available. If there is not and it's a short list, then it can be postponed until the following month. During the sittings I think we should have a regular time every week, as the other committees of the Legislature have. Again, if we have gotten through the estimates in the fall sittings and there's nothing else pressing, that can be an empty slot in our schedules. It's doubtful that we would have to meet every week in the spring sittings, but at least we would have the time allocated if we had to. I think that will work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would Ken and Sheila be willing to withdraw your proposals in favour of that one?

MRS. CRIPPS: Did you say the first Wednesday was out for you, Al?

MR. HYLAND: Unless it's in the afternoon.

DR. REID: Second Wednesday.

MRS. CRIPPS: Second Wednesday, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second Wednesday?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm just trying to figure out why Members' Services has not been slotted in with the other two legislative committees. Wednesday seems to be the day they meet. Private Bills is 8:30 or 8 till 10 and Public Accounts is 10 to 11:30. We haven't got much of a choice unless we do what we're doing now, and that is overlap. I guess we'd meet from 7 till 8:30 or from 11:30 till 1:30. There should be a regular scheduling. Has it never been scheduled?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, it certainly has never been regularly scheduled from what I understand from previous members on the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It never has.

DR. REID: And surely there are enough members of the Legislature that people do not need to be on both this committee and Private Bills. So next spring, when we are reallocating the committees, why don't we make it so that the members of Members' Services Committee are not on Private Bills? Then we don't have the conflicts.

DR. BUCK: To the hon. minister. Are you going to delegate 12 of your members to sit on our side?

MR. HYLAND: You've got 20 over there now, Walter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you think about all this, Walter?

DR. BUCK: First of all, I'm like Ken. And, of course, I'm not really in a position to speak, but I was a rather faithful attender before we got into this little disagreement of last year or whenever it was. Let's make sure that we have important things to

do. Either we're going to make them important, either we're going to make this committee of a higher stature than it is — other than that we're just going to have these social meetings. I don't think any of us really need social clubs. We have enough of those things. I guess what I'm trying to say is let's make sure and really cram what we have to do into the meetings we have. I try to keep my summers sort of to myself and my constituents, so let's not just call meetings for the sake of meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No question.

DR. BUCK: I think we have to set a date which we've sort of agreed upon, and maybe we have to find a day that doesn't conflict with the other committees, Ian. We'll have to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we try the proposal that Ian has made and see how it works. I understand it's for the second Wednesday. So would Ken and Sheila be willing to withdraw your proposals in favour of Ian's? All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. There's the first plus out of Alan Hyland's report.

MR. HYLAND: Are you sure that's a plus?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think so. Second Wednesday. You said the first one . . .

MR. HYLAND: No, but are you sure another meeting is a plus?

DR. REID: It will only be held in actual fact if it's really needed, but the date is allocated.

MR. HYLAND: So you hold that date.

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Going farther on in the report, there is some information about caucus budgeting that might be of interest: an unconditional allowance to the caucuses of \$11,300 per member, a research allowance to the caucuses of \$12,000 per member, and research support — I don't know what the distinction is between those two — of another \$5,500, making a total of just under \$29,000.

The next point is right on the main purpose that we wanted Alan to go to Toronto on our behalf for, which is that the Legislative Assembly staff are classified by the Board of Internal Economy. That was one of the questions we had in our minds when we discussed Alan going to the Ontario capital.

Another point that comes out of the report is that in addition to having their researchers they also have a library research service, as we have.

I thought it was interesting to see that each member has a secretarial assistant, who can be paid up to \$27,000 a year. I was a little jealous about the money they have for furnishing their offices. And the constituency office funding, in case you want to make comparisons: with a limit of \$10,500 for rent and \$1,260 for postage and almost \$26,000 for staff, you have a total of \$37,600 per member for

constituency offices; I guess some members there as well as here have several offices.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Hyland. How do we compare with Ontario, member to a constituent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The number of voters per member?

DR. BUCK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was a comparison in the paper the other day.

MR. HYLAND: I don't know if I can answer that. I think it's about the same as ours, where the cities are higher and some of the rural areas, the northern ones, are lower.

DR. BUCK: They have only 125 members, don't they?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

DR. BUCK: For how many people?

MRS. CRIPPS: 8.2 million.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think the point Walt is on — this is very interesting information. I think we can use it as an information base, but it's a classic situation that we have all the way across Canada in so many things. You can't compare — what was the term, Walt? Oranges and oranges?

DR. BUCK: Round red apples to round red apples.

DR. REID: First of all, I think they have over \$50,000 per member. Also their Legislature sits for considerably longer out of every year than ours does. You can't make a straight comparison and pick out things that appear to be to our benefit without looking at the other side if it. I think it's useful information when we are considering things, but I don't think there's any other Legislature that functions exactly like ours does. The numbers that are involved — I understand there was a correction on the size of caucus that is entitled to any benefits. Once they get to a minimum number of 12, they then get the support for a caucus of 30 — that type of thing. You can't switch that information over to our Legislature, certainly not currently. That's why we have to make allowances for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I wouldn't suggest that we get into lockstep with them, because we simply can't. There are too many other variables.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, along that line. This does bother me, so I would like to express my views. I am afraid that maybe what we are doing, not willingly, is really trying to provide services to our constituents in lieu of being paid a decent salary as MLAs. As I say, I'm just hoping that's not what is happening unconsciously. It's almost comparable to that stupid report that came in from Judge Tevie Miller, where the Premier got \$5,000 for a clothing allowance. How asinine. Pay the Premier what he's worth — \$200,000 a year or whatever it is — and let him buy

his own bloody clothes. It's the same thing here. From the time I started being an MLA, when we had nothing, we're now getting where we're going to be budgeting tens of thousands of dollars in support to do our job as MLAs. Maybe if we got paid \$48,000 a year for being MLAs rather than all this support staff that we're accumulating around us, it may be a saving for the taxpayer. As a practising politician, I know that's politically unpalatable. But I'm just afraid that we're starting to build big bureaucracies around our offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to monopolize any discussion, but it seems to me that there's one problem with that. If we structure it the way we have it, and the money is clearly earmarked for expenses, then it goes for expenses. If we increase our salaries, we pay part of it to the feds by way of income tax, apart from any political acceptability there might be. We've striven to make sure that money that is paid out on behalf of members for services or by way of expenses should definitely be indicated in that way and, if possible, shouldn't go through the members' hands. We had a sad experience in that regard in 1972 and 1973.

Another thing which — we have mailings. It's quite interesting; they're allowed 200 first-class mailings a year on one subject plus three constituency mailings.

MR. HYLAND: I'm not sure I meant that. I think I meant 200 first-class letter mailings on one subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I said.

MR. HYLAND: First-class letters on one subject. Not 500 or 700 but 200, and the next time might be two or three days later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How would anybody police that kind of thing and make sure they weren't dealing with the same subject in four or five mailings?

MR. HYLAND: It's more the honour system than anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next point that I took out of the report which I think may be of some fairly direct interest to us is that they started off with a pilot project, giving computers — word processors, I assume — to six members. Subsequently, since Alan's visit, that has been extended to all 125 members. So it would appear that in addition to all these other allowances, they are being provided with word processing equipment for 125 members, which would of course include the ministers.

MR. HYLAND: Theirs is a little more than word processing too. It's more a computer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I expect that they'd have intercommunication.

MRS. CRIPPS: Is that within their constituency offices too, or just ...

MR. HYLAND: That's the long term. I think the letter said that so many constituency offices in the city were going to get it, and the others would over a

period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't mean to preclude any discussion. I just thought it might be helpful if I were to go through it quickly by way of summary, in case it was some time since the members had read the report.

MR. HYLAND: If I could say something about the offices. I think it's in here somewhere that they decided a little while ago that every member should have an office with an outside window or an office on the outside of the building. So they had to move some staff out, and every member now has an office on the outer perimeter of the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the parliament building itself?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. Every member, with the exception of cabinet ministers and some parliamentary secretaries, has offices [inaudible].

MRS. CRIPPS: What do they look at?

MR. HYLAND: There's nothing in front of their windows, Shirley. Two or three of them that I was in, in opposition and government, had two rooms, one for the secretary and one for themselves. I outlined the furniture. I guess it's a peeve of mine. There have been MLAs who have back problems who go to Public Works to get a chair and are told that they don't qualify for a chair; only ministers and executive assistants, et cetera, qualify. So there they have some sort of standard they use and you fit within whatever it is, deputy minister or whatever.

Basically each office has a desk, a credenza, bookshelves, a good office chair, and a chesterfield and coffee table type of thing. The ones I saw are pretty good. I went in the office of one member of the NDP caucus — I forget the gentleman's name. They accused him of being a pack rat. He had shelves built up the sides of his office on three walls. The only wall that didn't have it was the window wall. He'd been there for 20-some years and had that place chock-full of stuff. I don't know what his secretary did. She must not have had much filing to do, because he had it right up to the ceiling.

I think we should get a committee of some of the members to look at establishing a level that an MLA would fit into for furniture like that, so that every time — if somebody has a problem with their back, they have to go into a big hassle about getting a chair so it doesn't bother them as much, instead of those \$80 specials that we seem to buy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think our members spend as much time in their chairs as the Ontario members?

MR. HYLAND: It doesn't matter how much time you spend in it if you have a problem.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to introduce this subject until after we were finished with this year's budgeting because it can't be done as quickly as that. One thing that I think this committee does need to meet for on a fairly regular basis is to make a decision about the use of the Legislature Annex for members' offices. Perhaps it's in relation to that

move and the potential of that building and adequate services for the private members on both sides of the House that we should look at the office furniture. Certainly a lot of the offices in this building are not adequate for the 1984 function of a private member. It cannot be done in this building; there is not the space. Therefore I think we need to seriously address the question of upgrading the Legislature Annex so that all members of the Assembly will have an adequate office and adequate space for the backup services we are going to be developing. Perhaps it's in that context that we should address the office space and the furniture.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to that. First of all, when we moved our research offices over to the annex I thought how that was going to be a miserable setup. But it is very, very practical. It gives you more working room. It gives you the kind of room where you can get some people in and bounce some ideas off. It's working very, very well. At first I was very hesitant about it, but I think that's really what you're saying, Ian.

DR. REID: That's what our members who moved over there ...

DR. BUCK: Yes.

DR. REID: We had difficulty getting members to move over there, and now you couldn't get them to move back. I think that's the point. It cannot be done in this building, so let's look at what's available. There are empty floors sitting across there. That's nonsense.

DR. BUCK: Exactly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course the alternative that was adopted at Queen's Park was that the ministers moved out and the members took over the building. But then their House sits longer than we do.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, on that very point. I think a little bit of history would help. I think that would be a wrong move, because the ministers sort of become almost independent of the legislative process. I know we had that experience with Gordon Taylor. Gordon would come into caucus, throw down whatever legislation they had put together over there, and say this is what we are doing. He would tell you why, and then he'd scurry back to his office in the Highways Building. I think those ministers have to be right here under our thumbs, as MLAs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But if we're not here, our thumbs are going to be in the Annex.

DR. BUCK: That's okay. When we come to session and when people from the province come to visit the cabinet ministers, we don't want them over there in their little empire. We want them right here in our building.

MR. PENGELLY: That's where they expect to find them.

DR. BUCK: Exactly. So I think that we as private members can move into the Annex, but we want the

cabinet ministers here.

DR. REID: I would back up Walt on this. I think the poor individual private member, government or opposition, who finds the Attorney General in the Atrium Building over in southeast Edmonton or the Minister of Agriculture over in the Agriculture Building south of the university, and goodness knows where the rest would be — it won't work to the benefit of our constituents.

MR. HYLAND: I think the difference in Queen's Park, although they have that one building just across the street — I stand to be corrected, but I believe there are some parliamentary secretaries in that one. But other than that one, there aren't buildings as close to Queen's Park and tied by tunnel, as we have here. I know I was one of the first to go over, and it's been what — two years, three years?

MRS. CRIPPS: Two years.

MR. HYLAND: And it's worked surprisingly well. In the summertime it gives you a little walk outside, and in the wintertime, with that tunnel done, it gives you — well, in my case, I spent about eight years, or whatever it was, in an office that didn't have a window, and now to one that maybe has too many windows. Nevertheless, it's a vast change and it gives more room to move around.

The part about this furniture: I often think that wouldn't cost much money to implement, because there has to be — whatever level you pick, there are offices renovated every year. If you're within that level, some of that furniture is moved from one to the other or into surplus, and everybody clamours for it. I don't think it will cost us much money to do some of these things.

DR. BUCK: Alan, read Hansard and follow Ray Speaker's progress over two and a half years to get a little chesterfield. He finally got one they were going to throw out in the garbage. He says: is it okay if I take that? I think it's in Hansard. Gerry, maybe you remember the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I don't remember that.

DR. BUCK: It's really pretty funny, but it tells a story.

MR. HYLAND: How do you think I got mine?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have two topics suspended. One is furniture and the other is space. Is there any kind of motion?

MR. KOWALSKI: I move that we table further discussion of this item, that we put these items on a pending agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that mean they stay tabled until a member moves that they come back in again? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next item under 3, Business Arising, is a policy with regard to word

processing equipment. I think I reported to the last meeting that we had a study of that subject under way and that the report was expected shortly. It has since been received. I'm not sure how widely it's been circulated. Maybe Mr. Stefaniuk can tell us.

MR. STEFANIUK: The committee now has it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In final form or its original form?

MR. HYLAND: Final form.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think I got one.

MR. HYLAND: It's in your book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under what item?

MR. HYLAND: 3(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, good. I take it all back.

Perhaps I can assume that members have looked at the report.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think all members have a copy of the consultant's report. It's been circulated with this document, and you all had a chance to read it in the last day or two. The whole question — and we've had a number of meetings here in the Members' Services Committee with respect to the need to include machines and machinery and infrastructure. I know that it may be a bit different in terms of the participation and availability of such equipment for the three caucuses we have, the government caucus, the NDP caucus, and the caucus for the Independents. In the analysis that was undertaken with respect to the availability of this particular type of machinery, I think it became very apparent, to me anyway, that it's about time all members of the Legislative Assembly went uptown in terms of the types of equipment and word processing equipment that is available to them.

So I have drafted for you a motion that I would now like to put before the table. I hadn't realized we were going to be so inundated with people here this morning, so I only have eight copies. They should be for the members of this committee. Mr. Chairman, I had one sent down to you, so there should be one for the members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who has not got a copy? Did you send out for more copies of this, Bohdan?

DR. BUCK: We're okay, Gerry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we? All right.

MRS. CRIPPS: All the members have one.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd like to move that the Standing Committee on Members' Services authorize the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly to, number one, invite a proposal or proposals from the vendor community to supply appropriate word and data processing systems; two, prepare an estimate of the cost of acquiring such systems to serve the needs of MLAs; three, obtain approval from the Members' Services Committee for acquisition of systems; and four,

ensure the timely acquisition, installation, and integration of the above-mentioned systems with existing systems in the Legislative Assembly as well as appropriate staff training to be completed prior to the 1985 spring sittings of the Legislative Assembly.

As further explanation of the motion I have, it would be my intent to ask members to approve this motion this morning, and when we come down to a further business item dealing with the estimates, I'm going to make an additional comment on how we might then deal with it. Subject of course to the approval of the committee, I would see the Clerk advance work without delay, to see the early implementation of the equipment in January or February 1985 so in essence it is functioning by the beginning of the spring sittings.

There's more I could say, but perhaps I should stop and, number one, see if there's any support for the motion and, number two, see if there are any questions forthcoming with respect to this motion.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have one comment. I'd like to thank Mr. Kowalski for taking the bull by the horns and presenting this to the committee. I approve completely of what he's suggesting here. It gets us on the road to start doing things instead of talking about them, and we've had a fair amount of discussion already in this committee on this very subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just going to raise a little inquiry about the first item of the motion. It says, "to supply appropriate word and data processing systems". Does that imply that we follow along the lines of the report we got? What is meant by "appropriate"?

MR. KOWALSKI: We have a report; we've also had discussions. I know that two other caucuses have the word processing system they have obtained, and I'm sure it is appropriate to their satisfaction. The type of system we would have in the other caucus would be one that basically would be the result of the feedback we would get from the Clerk when he has gone out and requested the vendors to supply a proposal to us. In the report that was circulated in the last couple of days, you'll note that a number of different systems have been identified, and all have their strengths and weaknesses. It's also apparent that within the Legislative Assembly itself, there is a system that exists. I forget the trade name of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NBI.

MR. KOWALSKI: But if it is appropriate, and the decision — I'm putting a lot of trust here in the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, as the chief administrative officer for the Legislative Assembly, to in fact come back to us with a definition of appropriateness. I'm not going to spend my time here going through a debate on the strengths and weaknesses of this system versus the other. I pay other people for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you envisage getting proposals from a number of suppliers?

MR. KOWALSKI: That is basically what number one says: "invite a proposal or proposals".

MR. CHAIRMAN: It doesn't say which, though.

DR. REID: That's an administrative function.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask Mr. Kowalski — number four says, "the integration of the above-mentioned systems". I believe that at one time — maybe it was in an informal discussion — we talked about making an integration of not only the systems within the Legislative Assembly but also the ones in the constituency offices. Do you see that as part of this, or do you see as a future step that we might want to see that our systems are compatible?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think that would be part of the recommendation in point number four. If you refer to the report done by Mr. Dean for the Clerk, you'll note that on the second last page, No. 1 under Addressing Concerns, there has been identification of the types of word processing equipment and computer systems that exist in various constituency offices. At least according to this report, there are some six units, four different types that currently exist in various constituency offices throughout the province. It's my understanding that the technology exists with respect to a linkup that can really transfer equipment from a machine that might be in a constituency office to the type of system we would get. Certainly just recently in Calgary, a new technological company by the name of Keyword, I believe, has invented a new process that provides for this compatibility.

So to be very specific in response to your question, Mrs. Embury, the answer is yes.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, with tongue in cheek, I think Mr. Kowalski was too quick to say we shouldn't worry about this. I think Mr. Kowalski and I should be appointed to visit Australia and Tokyo to check all these different systems out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He doesn't want to get into the nitty-gritty.

DR. BUCK: Then I'll get somebody else to volunteer.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that there is no great need for any public expenditure of money to have Dr. Buck or anyone else conduct a worldwide survey on the availability of systems. I think the entrepreneur in Alberta is very sophisticated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

The next item we have is Photographs of Visiting Students. I think you've just received a copy of a memo dated October 22 from Bill Payne to Alan Hyland.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have one question. Has the motion that was made last time to request colour photographs been transmitted to Public Affairs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: I wasn't asked to do it.

DR. GARRISON: We passed it on to them, but we've had no response yet. It was passed on to them orally. A written confirmation of...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who passed it on?

DR. GARRISON: I did, to the minister's office.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would request that we make a written confirmation.

DR. GARRISON: That's on the way. There was a problem with the actual wording of the motion. We had to wait for the transcript.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else on this?

MR. HYLAND: Who's writing the letter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who's writing what letter?

DR. GARRISON: I assume that the chairman would, on behalf of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. REID: There was a motion by the committee approving that Mr. Payne be asked to do it. I don't see what the problem was. That was two weeks ago.

MR. HYLAND: It hasn't been done; that's what the problem is.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would just request that we do something about ensuring that that decision by the committee is implemented. Is that fair enough?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS. CRIPPS: As soon as possible.

MR. ELIUK: We did an independent inquiry as to the costs of providing the borders for photographs, with respect to various sizes. The purchasing clerk phoned an independent supplier for us in Calgary, Calgary Photo. A five by three rectangle border would be \$8.60 for 25, a four by five would be \$12.80 for 25, a seven by five would be \$16.55 for 25, and an eight by ten would be \$25.40 for 25.

DR. REID: Is this for borders?

MR. ELIUK: Borders for photographs.

DR. REID: They are more expensive than folders.

MR. HYLAND: This is the folder price. I guess you've never seen that.

MR. ELIUK: No, I haven't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't seen this till just now.

MRS. CRIPPS: No. He meant the folder.

MR. HYLAND: I meant that Chuck had never seen the folder, because he wasn't at the meeting when I had that folder. This is the folder that you'd insert the picture in, and that's what? Less than 10 cents each?

DR. REID: Just about 9 cents each.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll follow through on that and report to the next meeting.

MR. HYLAND: Can't we make a decision that we go with it or don't go with it? We've got a price; we know what it's going to cost us.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a service that we are providing to the public. These kids keep these things. You'll see them in homes and so on. I think it's a good expenditure of taxpayers' money, because we're doing it on their behalf. We're not doing it for the members. These things are much better than having a curled up old picture that you send out.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask for clarification. In light of the estimate provided by the Public Affairs Bureau, is it intended that we ask the Public Affairs Bureau to expend the additional funds, being \$1,500, or is the Assembly prepared to say that we will include that cost in our estimates?

MRS. CRIPPS: Who pays for the pictures?

DR. REID: Public Affairs Bureau.

MR. HYLAND: I move that we ask that the Clerk contact the Public Affairs Bureau to express our wish to provide that folder. We can see what their reaction is, and if necessary we should be prepared to pay for it out of our own budget.

DR. BUCK: I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Next is Employment Contract Forms, item 3(d).

MRS. EMBURY: It says: the chairman informed the committee that he would review it and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't done that.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move we table it till the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. HYLAND: Can I get just one question? No, I guess I can't.

DR. REID: It's gone by.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one?

MR. HYLAND: I'll talk to you privately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Constituency Secretaries — Revenue Canada: Bohdan, is there anything new on that?

MR. STEFANIUK: I have nothing other than the opinion that was provided by Parliamentary Counsel. I think members are aware of the discussion that took place on this item at the last meeting.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I was under the understanding that we wanted to find out what level Mr. Ullman was at. Because of the information received from him, we wanted to know where he was in the structure and if we should take it elsewhere. I wonder if Mr. Eliuk did that.

MR. ELIUK: Mr. Chairman, we have not contacted the Revenue Canada people since the last discussion with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was some suggestion — I understood from the last meeting that one of the members was going to get in touch with the minister in Ottawa.

MRS. EMBURY: No. We were waiting until we saw what level in the structure this person was at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess there was a misunderstanding there.

MRS. CRIPPS: I also understood that we had requested further information and clarification from Revenue Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we've got their word on it.

MR. HYLAND: That wasn't our concern. If this gentleman is a clerk there — if he's at the lower echelon, it's interesting that a lower rank clerk in the tax bracket can tell the Legislature what to do, by just a conversation, unless there's some written stuff.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, my impression was that we were going to try to find out what level this information was coming from, whether or not it was a level where decisions can be made, because there wasn't much to do about it if it was somebody far down in their ranks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But he speaks for the department. Suppose we find out what category this man has in the hierarchy, what do we do with that information?

MR. HYLAND: Then we get something in writing and, if we wish, appeal his decision to wherever we want to take it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we want to appeal, the procedure is already in place. It makes no difference from what level we get the word.

DR. BUCK: Only if that's his interpretation, Mr. Chairman. Then we're appealing his interpretation of the way he reads it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we're going to appeal it, then we need to engage counsel for sure.

DR. REID: Oh, no. I've appealed things to the income tax myself and won, without an accountant beside me.

MR. HYLAND: That's probably why you won.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we going to ask a staff person in the service of the Legislative Assembly to prepare an appeal?

MR. HYLAND: We'll do it ourselves.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we're at the level of an appeal. At the moment we have an indication, through Chuck, that this Mr. Ullman, whoever he is, is looking at the possibility that these people should be regarded as employees rather than contractors to the Assembly. But in the second paragraph of Chuck's memo, Mr. Ullman concedes that his department is not prepared, because of special recognition given to the provincial government, to pursue this issue other than on a one-on-one basis as the need arises. That sentence does not indicate that they're going to do anything. It's just that they've made us aware that they may in the future do something. I think the interesting thing to this committee would be: at what level is Mr. Ullman in the hierarchy of Revenue Canada?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. And after we find that out, what would you like us to do?

DR. REID: Probably nothing.

MR. HYLAND: If he doesn't put anything in writing, to hell with it. We'll sit on it.

MRS. EMBURY: That's right.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right. That was our decision last time, that we wouldn't do anything with it until it was put in writing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll find out and send a memo around to all the members of the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: But in the meantime, we do not make any change in the status of our secretarial staff in the constituency offices until we have a specific directive to do so, and then appeal it if we feel it's necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. EMBURY: Do we need a motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought that was a motion.

MRS. EMBURY: Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we have no visitors to the meeting. The next item is the 1985-86 estimates.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the concern that was raised a little earlier when we were talking about future meeting dates, I'd like to make the suggestion that we defer discussion of the 1985-86 estimates today and agree that the business of the Legislature certainly has to take priority over our time, and that we perhaps might want to return to a discussion of the '85-86 estimates on a day following the conclusion of the fall session. If we were to agree to that kind of thing, that would give us ample opportunity to set aside as much time on that one day as we would deem necessary to very adequately go through the '85-86 estimates. I feel a bit pressured meeting in Members' Services during a session because of the time lines we all have to meet. On the other hand, I feel that the review of the estimates is very important and should demand all the time that I have to give to them.

My suggestion basically is that we defer discussion of the estimates today and agree to meet as the Members' Services Committee on the day following the conclusion of this fall session.

MR. PENGELLY: Providing it's not a Friday.

MR. KOWALSKI: Providing the conclusion does not come on a Friday, so we don't have to come back on a Saturday or a Sunday.

DR. BUCK: Did you say a regularly established date?

MR. KOWALSKI: No.

DR. BUCK: Or a date?

MR. KOWALSKI: The day following the conclusion of the session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next working day following the conclusion of the session.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think those are the words I was struggling to find.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. There's just one thing before we deal with that motion. There was a point arising from the estimates which we discussed at some length at the last meeting, and that was Mr. Clegg's remuneration on his contract. I wonder if you want that to go over to that date as well or whether you would like to deal with that today. There has been some additional material circulated in regard to it. I don't know whether you've had a chance to absorb it, but if you want to put the whole thing over, including that related point, fine. We should just understand what we're doing. If you want to deal with that point today, then we can deal with it. It has budget implications, of course.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I read through the material just handed round today, indicating that this is sort of the accepted thing, and obviously Mr. Crawford made that decision within his Department of the Attorney General. I think the words you used were "management decision" to allow Mr. Clegg to do this. Can't you make a similar management decision

that it be 25 percent rather than the 14-odd percent that you offered, and then we look at the budgetary implications for the next fiscal year, which we're addressing at the moment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly would have done that. As you say, that is ordinarily a management matter. The only thing is that it will result — we stayed within the current budget parameters, and it results in an increase in spending. We didn't feel that we could commit the committee to that increase in spending. Had we obligated ourselves to Mr. Clegg to pay 25 percent above instead of 14 percent, it would have affected our budget. So we stayed within the 14 percent because it kept us within the budget.

DR. REID: Did we not affect the budget with Chuck's salary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was a vacant position, surely.

DR. REID: But it was filled at a higher salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but it's within the range. We were outside of that situation.

MR. HYLAND: So was Michael's within the range of Crawford.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll just move that we leave it and do all of the budget together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. If it's the wish of the committee that we complete dealing with the thing on a management basis and that the budget implications will be incidental, then I'd like to hear that.

DR. BUCK: I support what Dr. Reid says. If this is basically a management decision, and this is how everyone else is being treated, I can accept that. I don't think it's going to affect our global budget. I think we can probably still stay within the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By about \$7,000. That's my rough estimate.

DR. BUCK: Out of a budget of how many dollars, Mr. Stefaniuk? What's the total?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Dr. Reid's proposal, agreed to or seconded by Dr. Buck. Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready to deal with it, Sheila?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's agreed.

MRS. EMBURY: No, I didn't agree to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those contrary? I guess ... I'm sorry. Those in favour? Those opposed? That's three and three, isn't it?

MRS. EMBURY: Four and three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four and three? How many were there over here?

MRS. EMBURY: Four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. BUCK: What is the purpose of the abstention? If this motion is defeated, what does that mean? Does it go back to the global?

MRS. EMBURY: The motion was carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other business, apart from the date of the next meeting, which we've already agreed upon?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just before you close the meeting, may I ask a question? I'm not sure if it relates to this committee, but it brings up the swearing-in ceremony of the Ombudsman. I drove out of the city, picked up my wife, drove back in, and spent half a day. That doesn't matter here or there. Then I sent my tab in and they said: no, we don't pay for social functions. I didn't consider that a social function. I thought I was requested to be there as a member of the Committee on Legislative Offices. Is that somebody's interpretation? It's not the hundred dollars; that's doesn't matter one way or the other. As I said, if they paid us MLAs the \$75,000 we should be getting, I would go to a lot of social functions. But I didn't think this was a social function. That's the point I'm trying to make. How do we have some clear definition of what we as members of a committee are expected to do and just purely a social function?

MRS. EMBURY: Good point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't aware of the situation.

DR. BUCK: I'm sure it's happened to other members. If Alan Hyland would have had to fly all the way up from his constituency to come to a social function — sure, he gets his airplane ticket and everything, but he would probably have had to pay for his wife's room that night, et cetera, et cetera. So he'd have been \$150 out of his own pocket. I don't think we should have to do that. I don't know who I'd go to, to make sure this doesn't happen to a member of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is certainly a good place to raise it. It also involves the question of whether your spouse goes on the trip, especially if there were an airfare incurred, and whether that would be included.

DR. REID: Whether it should be one of the four trips per year or whether it should be an additional special one.

DR. BUCK: This invitation specifically said that Dr. and Mrs. Buck are invited to the swearing-in ceremony of the new Ombudsman.

DR. REID: And you are on the committee.

DR. BUCK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure that when the invitation was sent out the budget implications weren't thought of.

DR. BUCK: It's the principle of being a member of a committee, when you're requested to be someplace.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

DR. REID: Because you don't appoint a new Ombudsman every day.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, on this point. Was the stipend form Dr. Buck filled in signed and approved by the chairman of your committee?

DR. BUCK: No. I sent it to Bob, and he's the one who said: no, this is a social function.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob Elliott, your chairman.

DR. BUCK: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: I just assumed that it had been approved by the chairman of that committee, and then on that point I was going to make the argument that under no circumstances should it be rejected by anyone. But in the case the chairman did not, so I'm not sure where I am.

DR. BUCK: Possibly the chairman of that committee doesn't have any guidelines. I guess that's really what I'm pursuing.

MR. PENGELLY: Start with him, Walter.

DR. BUCK: No, no. What I mean is that somebody has to say to the chairman: these are the things you do, and these are the things you don't do; this is what we pay, and this is what we don't pay. I just put it out for discussion, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know what you feel.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could just share a bit of information. I know that other members around this table have been chairmen of standing committees as well. Normally those things are agreed to by the committee members, as to how they should deal with it, rather than just by a chairman. I would encourage Dr. Buck to have that committee discuss it, and whatever the recommendation is is the one that we as the Members' Services Committee would uphold.

DR. BUCK: But I guess I am making an appeal to Members' Services, because it affects members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we can't really over-rule the chairman of the committee, although we can provide ...

DR. BUCK: No, we can't. But we can make a recommendation or find out what the definitions are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We provide pretty flexible budgeting for committees.

DR. REID: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this is the ideal situation for some unofficial discussions between

members of this committee with members of the Committee on Legislative Offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does somebody want to undertake that?

MR. HYLAND: And other committees, too.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think Dr. Buck raises a good point, which at this point in time I haven't been involved in. But I think that if a member of the Legislature is requested or is obliged to attend a certain function as part of his mandate, either as a committee member or as an MLA, and if in that function there is a stipend attached, then he should be paid it. In other cases, if we have budgeted it, as we have for the cost of covering the expenses and the expenses only, then there should be no question that that is an accepted bill and that the member be reimbursed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the spouse?

MR. PENGELLY: It doesn't always happen. You get special invitations to openings, and you drive 100 miles and whatnot.

DR. BUCK: Nigel, this is a legislative committee duty.

MR. PENGELLY: Oh, I see. It's not just an invitation to an MLA.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, if you like, I'll volunteer to take it up with the chairman of the committee on behalf of the Members' Services Committee. I'll report the resolution back to the next meeting.

DR. BUCK: At the same time can you — the other committees there are with the same kind of situation.

MRS. EMBURY: See if it arises; sort of do a check with all of them.

DR. BUCK: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that if the chairman approves it, that's an end of it as far as we're concerned? After that, it's up to the Auditor General. Right?

MR. PENGELLY: That would be interesting. Some of us here volunteered to be on a committee to select the Bighorn award. We're going to have to fly up here, drive here, spend the night here, and so on and so forth.

MR. HYLAND: That's a departmental committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's not a Legislative Assembly committee.

MR. PENGELLY: No.

DR. BUCK: You see, there's the difference. It's not a Legislature committee, which already has a statute saying that you are reimbursed so much. If this committee meets for an hour next Friday when the

House is not sitting, they get paid. That's the only principle I'm trying to have looked at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So Mrs. Embury has agreed to discuss it with the chairman of the committee and report back. Is there any other Other Business?

MR. HYLAND: Just one comment on that other business. There's also something we have never allowed members to charge for, and that's parliamentary visits. That's a committee thing. But I think that's something we can handle all together, if that hasn't been handled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What sort, for example?

MR. HYLAND: Well, you never charge when you're on a parliamentary exchange. Your expenses are paid, but you don't charge for the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. You mean a per diem committee fee.

MRS. CRIPPS: But that's an association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's never been provided.

DR. BUCK: That's not a legislative committee function.

DR. REID: That's a parliamentary thing.

MR. HYLAND: I have something else as well. Some time ago we talked in this committee about a slide presentation of the Legislature. I would like to move that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly contact Public Affairs and put together a slide presentation that can be used by the members to take into schools to illustrate what the Legislature Building is like, what goes on there, et cetera. I don't think there should be that great a cost to it, because they must have hundreds and hundreds of slides of this building and activities in this building that could be put together in a package. Maybe we need half a dozen reprints of the package so that members can pick them up, take them out, use them during their tours through the schools, and then return them.

MR. STEFANIUK: A question, Mr. Chairman. Does the intent of the motion entail the preparation of a text which could be used by the member in making the presentation as well?

DR. REID: Some basic facts about the House. The text would have to vary so much according to the age group of the students you're talking to.

MR. STEFANIUK: No. I had it in mind that normally when someone does a visual presentation, they have a text which follows with the individual slides. It occurs to me that something would have to be developed along those lines if the member were going to be equipped with a package to take to the schools.

MR. HYLAND: I think it could be. Others probably have different opinions.

MR. STEFANIUK: A series of 40 or 60 slides by themselves, unless the member took the time to view

them privately and develop his or her own text, would appear to me to be perhaps of limited use.

MR. HYLAND: I think it could be an outline text. Anybody who has made it this far in the political game surely can ad lib long enough to tell about the building they work in.

MR. STEFANIUK: Or would you just want a listing of the description of the slides?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I think that's all we need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the member can adapt it to the age level of his audience.

DR. BUCK: Exactly. It's the same thing, Mr. Clerk, when we got the printout for the Rutherford scholarship thing: three pages of something, and the kids are restless to get out of there. You say, thanks for coming, congratulations, and you tear up that garbage that they gave you.

MR. KOWALSKI: You don't congratulate the government for [inaudible]

DR. BUCK: Ken, if you read those three pages you'd lose 2,000 votes.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right.

MRS. EMBURY: Alan, could you read your motion again — how it's worded?

MISS CONROY: "I move that the Clerk of the Assembly contact Public Affairs concerning the getting together of a slide presentation about the Legislative Assembly."

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the motion, because I've had some private members come to me and they really want this. In fact they really want it yesterday. So to expedite it — the Clerk of the Assembly could certainly contract this out to the private sector, but the reason Public Affairs is in there is because they already have a little bit of a stockpile. But what I would like the intent of that motion to be — maybe it's obvious that Public Affairs would contract it out. The only reason we want Public Affairs to have some involvement is to see what they've got on hand so we're not duplicating and wasting stuff. But I think Public Affairs would then contract it out and get it done right away. Is that the intent of your motion?

MR. PENGELLY: That would also include Government House?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. It would have to be concentrated on this building.

MR. HYLAND: And activities in it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I support that wholeheartedly. I think that's an excellent suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there would be any problem getting the slides from Public Affairs. If

there were any particular shots that look significant, we could easily get Rolf to shoot us a few more inside the building.

You'd want to cover it more or less to take the place of a visit to the building? Okay.

Is there any other Other Business?

MR. HYLAND: Are you going to vote on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. EMBURY: I understand it can be done in three weeks from today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I get you. I read you. I should apologize that there were at least two items on today's agenda that I wasn't prepared for, and that's my fault. However, we'll have everything shipshape for the next one.

Is there any other Other Business? The only item is that we've agreed to meet on the first working day after the House rises. What are your preferences for a starting hour?

MR. KOWALSKI: Could I make the suggestion that we begin at 9 o'clock?

MR. PENGELLY: I could agree to that.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, another suggestion: that the agenda be the approval of the minutes of this meeting and the budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And nothing else?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You wouldn't mind if we reported on two or three items that we should have reported on today?

AN HON. MEMBER: Very short.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I understand there's a motion for adjournment.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

[The meeting adjourned at 9:22 a.m.]

This page intentionally left blank.