

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[9:10 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We can come to order. The first item is the minutes of the last meeting. Are there any comments, or is there a motion?

MRS. EMBURY: I'll make the motion that we approve the minutes as circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion that we approve the minutes of the last meeting. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Business arising from the minutes of the last meeting. The material for the first one is under 3(a) of your support material, and the report is coming from the Clerk.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, two questions. With reference to the colour photographs, it appears that the Public Affairs Bureau is declining to provide the colour photographs. The reasons are indicated in their memorandum, which is in the support material. The second question deals with the provision of a folder in which the photographs might be inserted. The Public Affairs Bureau has agreed to foot the bill for a folder and has provided some artwork which they suggest might appear on the cover of the folder. I'll hold it up for your inspection, and you may pass it around if you wish. It's basically a sketch of the Assembly in session.

MR. HYLAND: It's missing Oscar.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not an exact depiction of reality, but it certainly gives an impression of our Assembly in session. It has considerable addition to the seats on the opposition side. I don't know whether or not that's wishful thinking on the part of the artist.

MR. HYLAND: That looks all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we could pass it around and carry on with the meeting. It seems that the minister is reluctant to change from black and white to colour, because colour costs a little less. There are two factors there. One is that the contractor undoubtedly has a supply of black and white paper laid in, sufficient for some time ahead, and that would have to be used up. He was asked to bid on the basis of black and white, and put the paper in for that purpose.

The second reason is that the cost of colour is a little less, and his profit margin would go up slightly. No one is suggesting that profit is sinful, but that could be grounds for objection by the unsuccessful tenderers, who might have bid lower had they known there was going to be colour, because their costs would have been down. The minister, having regard to being strictly ethical about it, is of the opinion — as I understand it — that the black and white should continue for the remainder of the present contract period, and we could switch to colour when everybody could tender on an equal basis for the provision of colour prints.

Is that good enough for that item?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next two items are somewhat related. We've been trying to get some standardization of the terms under which people who are paid out of Legislative Assembly funds are employed. The first one, item 3(b), has been on the agenda a number of times, because I wanted to review the contract. I have done that. I think it should cover most of the problems, or possible problems, that we've encountered in this regard in the past. It is my suggestion that members of the committee look at that contract or get some of their respective caucus staff to look at it. Unless there's some objection, I propose we adopt that form of contract. That would be the form of contract that would apply to someone like Michael Clegg, for example. It has a provision which will prevent postdated claims for overtime where the overtime was not previously approved. That's one. I won't take your time to go through it or summarize it further, but I suggest you look at it. I propose to put it to use quite soon, on the next occasion.

MR. HYLAND: If we have any questions on it, should they be directed to you? Then you could report at the meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. As a matter of fact, anything that is not routine that relates to the service of the members out of the Legislative Assembly should come to me. It's happened too often in the past that these things have gone on, and I haven't known about them. If I'm going to be responsible for them, I want to know about them.

MR. HYLAND: I'm talking about items relating to this contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I realize that, but I'm extending what you said to the general situation. I intended to say that anyway, and I thought this was a good time to say it — by your leave.

Item 3(c) is somewhat related. That's the one we discussed when we had the word from someone in National Revenue. We took advice on that, and as a result of that advice we were given a form of agreement to be entered into with constituency secretaries. The intent of that is to make it clear that constituency secretaries may be treated as we have been treating them thus far, as independent contractors. I think the text, as did the alternate text that was given to us by the lawyer we consulted, goes a long way in that direction. It gives us a reinforcement of the position we have heretofore taken, that these people are independent contractors.

The form of contract is, I think, included in your support material. I suggest you look at it. I would say that as a minimum that form of agreement should be used for any new constituency staff who are engaged. It would also be a good thing if we gradually changed existing constituency staff to this new contract. It won't affect their pockets or working conditions in any way, but it comes closer to the reality of independent contractors.

That brings up another item. According to the advice I have from Michael Clegg, each engagement of a constituency office staff person requires submission to and approval by the personnel department. That is going to be a damn nuisance. I

therefore suggest that the committee use the authority given to it under the new Legislative Assembly Act and exempt contract staff from that requirement, because the regulation applies to all contract staff, and put the responsibility right here. If there's a consensus in favour of that . . .

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, part of the question isn't here, and that's the question of what level Mr. Ullman is at in the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the answer: he's middle management. He's at neither the top nor the bottom.

MR. HYLAND: Does he have a title?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's in your support material, isn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: I gave it to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not? Well, that's where he is. If you want the exact name, I'll send it to you.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, may I go back to 3(a) for one moment? I believe the Speaker is in the Chair, but the Mace is not in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a good thing we passed it around. Let's point that out to Public Affairs. Thanks very much.

Can we then go back to this question of contract employees? I suggest that if the principle is agreed to, we get Mr. Clegg to provide the proper text for an order, as he has done before.

MR. STEFANIUK: There is an order. It's under 3(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I've read the text of the order. It's in the support material; I forgot it was there. It's under 3(b), but it would also apply to 3(c). If you look under 3(b) of your support material, those two pink sheets constitute the required text for the order.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I guess I'm a little confused because we're combining these issues. I thought 3(b) was the item with regard to the standard form of employment contract. I thought I heard you say that you would like to use that form in the future and that if we had any questions, you gave us the opportunity to raise them with you, and they would be looked at. Now you're talking about item 3(c), and you're asking us to refer to item 3(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned when I started on those two items, they are related, particularly because this order applies to both. So the support material could have appeared under either (b) or (c).

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry. I would like to take one piece of the pink paper under item 3(c) and go back and show it to . . . Maybe my constituency office is unique; I sublet. Other people look at the contract too. It doesn't appear that different, but I'd like to go back and check with them to see if it's as simple for them as the other one was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It wouldn't apply to any

subletting. That would apply to the leases on the constituency offices. The order applies to your own constituency secretary and also to contract staff, such as Michael Clegg.

MR. HYLAND: Do you sublet her, too?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes. I guess I'll just table the issue, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion to table, but I'm concerned that Treasury could cut off the pay for these people.

MR. HYLAND: Why?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because they have not been approved by the personnel department. We have about 60 constituency secretaries working out there, and none of them have gone through the personnel department.

MR. HYLAND: Why would they decide to cut them now, after they've been paying them for five years?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because they've discovered now that they weren't legally engaged.

MR. HYLAND: I thought we had one legal interpretation that they are and one that they're not. Which interpretation do you take?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. That applies to the deductions. This applies to the hiring of constituency office secretaries. They are contract staff, and there is an express provision that the engaging of contract staff must be approved by the personnel office. If Treasury takes notice of this, they will immediately know these people were not approved. We hadn't adverted to that. We didn't do it deliberately; we just went ahead. Under the old Legislative Assembly Act it was okay, but the Legislative Assembly Act was changed to require an exemption by this committee for that kind of situation. That was section 4(3) of the old Public Service Act, but it was amended by the new Legislative Assembly Act.

MRS. CRIPPS: So what we're asking for is an exemption.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All we're asking for is an exemption so that you can continue to engage your constituency office staff on such terms as you arrange with them and so that we will not have to go to Personnel to have each of those individual arrangements approved.

MR. KOWALSKI: As I understand this, Mr. Chairman, this morning you simply want approval from the Members' Services Committee to endorse your request for an exemption. Your request has nothing to do with the confirmation of these forms that Mrs. Embury has some questions about; we'll come back to that later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It only legalizes them, as it does the existing arrangements with secretaries.

MR. HYLAND: Except that approving the order would not necessarily affect the writing of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The terms? That's exactly right. The approval of the order has no effect on the terms of the two standard agreements.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's the clarification I wanted. If that's the case, from my perspective there's no problem doing that. We'll come back, as per Mrs. Embury's request, to defer the specifics of the forms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheila, this is by no means a backhanded way of getting you to approve these two contracts. That question is still left wide open.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. You misinterpreted my intention. I appreciate your clarifying it, but that was not my concern. I clarified that issue with you when I stated that I realized we had input. I still want to table this issue of changing the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're not changing the Act; you're exercising a power that was given to you under the Act to legalize something that is already being done. That's all it amounts to; nothing more, nothing less. I would feel a little concerned if we didn't deal with it. We have done similar things in the past. We have created exemptions before, but we did not extend it to contract staff.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to add that our concern for the approval of the Members' Services Order being exempted from PAO approval is particularly in relationship to constituency staff. At the moment the member determines the rate at which he will hire constituency staff, depending on local conditions. If we were to be obliged to go through the personnel office, we might well be confronted with a situation where that staff would be classified, and the member would no longer have the privilege of determining the rate at which that constituency office staff was paid. A full job description would be required, and the rate would be determined according to the various classification grids which prevail in the public service. This order, I suggest, would exempt the member from being subjected to that process and to continue to determine the rate at which the staff was paid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other clarification anybody would like to have?

MRS. CRIPPS: We're talking about two different things, aren't we? The pink at the back of (c) says contract employees. The order is referring to officers and staff. Is that right? Which order are we talking about?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's only one order prepared in your support material, and it's under 3(b). What we could do is make that order more specific and apply it directly to contract staff. If that will ease anybody's mind on it, I suggest we do that. I didn't draw this order.

Actually it is limited to that, because it refers to those two sections of the order in council.

MRS. CRIPPS: I see. I have a question, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure if this is the area for it. I understood that the Members' Services Committee extended workers' compensation benefits to contract staff. Did we not do that in the past?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We discussed it.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think we determined, through Mr. Clegg, that they were covered.

MRS. CRIPPS: What effect would what we're now contemplating have on that coverage?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The exemption won't have any effect on it. Whether our concerns about the Department of National Revenue may have any effect, I don't know.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think we're in an awkward position. We have a suggestion for tabling from one member, which I thought was nondebatable. We've been debating it for some few minutes. I don't know where we stand. Would it make the member feel better if the order were changed to specifically include those we're concerned about as exemptions and not deal with the contract as it's read or anything else?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Would that allay your concern, Sheila?

MRS. EMBURY: No, Mr. Chairman, actually it wouldn't. I think that a good point has been raised by Mrs. Cripps. I would also like to think that you would like that order left as it is, to include both categories. So I think the issue needs further study.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I knew what the puzzlement about it was, I'd certainly like to deal with it. Since I don't, I don't know what to say about that. I'll have to leave it up to the committee. I don't want to take the responsibility in case there's a question raised about paying these people.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, have we got a copy of the Act here? I'm not sure what 19(2)(b) of the Legislative Assembly Act is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have we?

DR. GARRISON: I can get one.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, surely if we speak to the Treasurer and tell him that we're dealing with the subject and hope to resolve it at the next meeting, he can get his people to lay off for a month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to even raise it. We had a situation some years ago when the Members' Services Committee approved categories for two of our staff. They were paid according to that approval for some months, and then it was discovered that it hadn't gone through Personnel. I got word about three days before payday that their cheques were being held. I don't want that to happen again for 60 secretaries.

MR. PURDY: I have another question that I'm not

clear on. The appendix on the next page is with reference to orders in council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because the orders in council are made under the Public Service Act, as I understand it, and there is a cross-relationship between the two pieces of legislation.

MR. PURDY: Haven't sections 3 and 4 of the Legislative Assembly Act changed since 1972?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which sections?

MR. PURDY: You said sections 3 and 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the Public Service Act.

MR. PURDY: It says at the top: Legislative Assembly Act, Employment Contract Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I realize that. This is what's happened. Before we passed the new Legislative Assembly Act, the Public Service Act had a provision which said: nothing in this Act affects the right of the Legislative Assembly to engage and dismiss staff. That was eliminated when we passed the new Legislative Assembly Act, making the Public Service Act applicable to Legislative Assembly staff. Under that Act certain orders in council were made, as I understand it, dealing with these staff questions. So by that sort of indirect route we come under the two orders in council that are referred to in the operative text of this order.

MR. HYLAND: You're telling me that there's one section — whatever section it is — in the Legislative Assembly Act that has removed sections 3 and 4 of the Public Service Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not quite.

MR. KOWALSKI: 4.2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The section in the Public Service Act was eliminated; it was repealed. The exemption given to the Legislative Assembly under the Public Service Act was repealed.

MR. HYLAND: When was that done?

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we passed the new Legislative Assembly Act. Instead of that, they switched it so as to enable this committee to give those exemptions. That's the long and the short of it. That's exactly what happened. We had an automatic exemption under the Public Service Act as it stood before the new Legislative Assembly Act was passed. The two Acts were dealt with at the same time. Concurrent with the passing of the new Legislative Assembly Act, that exemption was taken away but the right to apply exemptions was transferred to this committee.

Under 19(2) of the present Legislative Assembly Act, which was passed last year, the Members' Services Committee may order that

(a) any regulation, order or directive made under the Financial Administration Act, or

(b) any regulation, order, directive, rule, procedure, direction, allocation, designation or other decision under the Public Service Act, be inapplicable to, or be varied in respect of, the Legislative Assembly Office or any particular officer or employee or class of employees in the Legislative Assembly Office.

Very simply, what was done is: we had a general, broad exception in favour of Legislative Assembly staff and the Legislative Assembly under the old Public Service Act; that exemption was removed and, instead of that, this committee was given jurisdiction to provide exemptions under the section I've just read.

What is proposed now is for the committee to exercise the power given to it under this Act and regularize what we were in fact doing long before this amendment was made. We've always hired constituency secretaries on the basis of arrangements made by the members. All we're trying to do is continue that.

MRS. CRIPPS: And that has nothing to do with Sheila's concern about the actual wording of the contract in (c). That's my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's exactly right. It has nothing to do with the wording of that contract. We could have any kind of wording at all. It simply says that when you agree on these contracts, including those you make with your constituency office staff, you don't have to go through the personnel office.

MRS. CRIPPS: For further clarification, Sheila, your motion to table was on the content of the contract. Was it on the standing order or not?

MRS. EMBURY: I made the motion to table on the whole issue. According to the agenda items, looking at the way they're listed here and looking at 3(c) and reading the reference material, I felt that we had expanded and changed the issue and received a lot of new information. While it's now becoming a little clearer to me, I would still like to have the copy of the Act and look at that whole issue separately.

MR. PURDY: I'd like to go one step further, Mr. Chairman, and have a copy of what the order in council of 1972 said — order 394 and the other one that rescinded 394 and replaced it with 980. As far as I'm concerned, it's redundant. If we have an amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act of 1983, why are we referring to orders of 1972? I wish somebody would explain it to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You see, the structure governing all government staff was in place. That was the Public Service Act and orders in council. They didn't apply to us. All of a sudden, by removing the exemption in the Public Service Act, those existing orders in council applied to us. It's like saying that Bill Purdy can catch fish in Lake Wabamun without a licence; we're going to give him an exemption. All of a sudden somebody removes the exemption. Lo and behold, Bill Purdy has to get a licence without any new order at all, because the existing law suddenly applies to him. So the existing

orders in council used to not apply to Legislative Assembly staff, but when the amendment was made, the thing snuck up on us. Otherwise we would have asked you for this exemption last year.

MR. HYLAND: I guess my concern is partly on Bill's. In the wording of the one order that relates to the Legislative Assembly, why don't we just say that the constituency office staff are exempt from the public service contract? My problem is: why we are referring to something that was passed in 1972 when our Act says that the Members' Services Committee may make an order to exempt these people? Why don't we just say that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have a point there.

MR. HYLAND: Why do we refer back to this thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I said, I didn't prepare the order. I think it will be effective the way it is. But if you want, you could alternately say that the Act doesn't apply. As I understand it, these orders in council are made under the Act. So if the Act doesn't apply, I would say the orders under the Act don't apply either.

MR. HYLAND: What you read out of there just said that the committee may make exemption. It doesn't say you have to relate to anything. Just being a simple farmer and not a lawyer, I would take that as saying that these people are exempt from the Public Service Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan, many a simple farmer has outfoxed a lawyer.

MR. HYLAND: It just seems that you have two orders instead of one, which is what your problem is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether I've explained the thing very well, but it's before you. What's the wish of the committee? Incidentally, Alan, I should also say that I think I once lost a bet with someone to whom I said that a motion to table was not debatable. What is the wish of the committee? We have the motion to table.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's debatable as to time only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That opens the whole can of worms. We have Sheila's motion to table, and, if there is no further discussion, I'll put that motion. All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried.

MR. HYLAND: Can I now ask a question relating to the information, not the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: When this comes back, will somebody be able to answer Bill's and my question about why we are referring to the order in council, why we can't just make the exception according to the Act? We could well have done this, and it might have been null and void.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, this?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, because these are precisely the orders in council that apply to contract staff. Orders in council can't be made out of the blue. Most orders in council have to be authorized by statute. There have been many court cases where orders in council have been overturned and found illegal because they didn't come within the terms of an authorizing statute. Parliament is supreme; the cabinet gets delegated authority from parliament.

MR. PURDY: It's being done here under either the Public Service Act or the Financial Administration Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Public Service.

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Let's get a correction and see if we can just make a simple order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll ask Michael why he worded it in this way, and I'll send you word.

MRS. CRIPPS: Would you also please have a copy of those orders Bill requested and the pertinent part from the Legislative Assembly Act put into our information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. I'll send it out to you, okay? But it's not a matter we should delay too long. If we know it's not right and we don't deal with it, we're asking for it.

MRS. CRIPPS: At the same time that you're checking, would you please check the item I raised on workers' compensation? What I'm particularly concerned about is that under 4(a) it says "and is not entitled to any benefits" other than those contained in paragraph 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about the short form of contract for constituency staff?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. That's the pink page you have in (c). I thought we as the Members' Services Committee dealt with workers' compensation and assured ourselves, if I remember correctly, that that was applicable to our secretarial staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. But a new situation has arisen, Shirley, because of this inquiry from Revenue Canada. As I understand it, if a person is an employee, compensation is paid by the employer, but if a person is an independent contractor, the compensation is paid for by the independent contractor.

MRS. CRIPPS: If we're going to live with section 4(a), though, and we as the Members' Services Committee have agreed that compensation should be part of the contract, then 2 could read as it does now, "plus workers' compensation benefits". We can get around it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to be clear what status we want to give these people and whether it's

possible for someone who engages an independent contractor to pay compensation.

MR. HYLAND: The master contractor can carry compensation, but the subcontractor is under him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but for the staff ... Well, I'd like to be sure.

MRS. CRIPPS: That should be included for next month's discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I'm not mistaken, I think that concludes the discussion of items 3(b) and 3(c).

Item 3(d) is an information item. One of the members of the committee asked what the arrangements were with one Brian Norwood, engaged by the Independent caucus. Attached to your material is a copy of the contract.

MR. HYLAND: Just out of curiosity — maybe I'm wrong, but my understanding is that the contracts signed by research staff, secretaries, et cetera, are recommended by Frank Appleby and have to be signed by the Clerk to be legal. Is this a legal agreement? The Clerk's signature appears nowhere on this plain letterhead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't studied it. It doesn't follow our usual practice. I didn't know it was being done, and I wouldn't have known if you hadn't raised the point or it had come to my attention as a result of a request for paying this man. So whether or not this is legally binding is a wide open question. It may well be that it's not. But I have a memo ready to go to the member who engaged this man, asking that he be placed on the ordinary form of contract. I haven't mailed it because I was waiting for the discussion on the topic before the committee. Is there any further discussion of that?

MR. HYLAND: I wonder if I could ask if my assumptions are true. Marg?

MRS. PRATT: Yes, that's correct as far as our usage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is that?

MR. HYLAND: I remember that discussion going on some time ago. It has to be signed by the Clerk to be legally binding and to receive a cheque drawn for that person and/or his representative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that they indirectly or directly become Legislative Assembly employees, even though they have caucus responsibilities. So the Clerk has been signing those, even with constituency ...

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I move that you forward the letter to the Independent member and ask him to sign the present contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the 1985-86

estimates. There was some indication that some of the members wished to give those further consideration. There are also two additional matters that have arisen since we had the estimates before us. One of them is the situation of the Law Clerk, the Parliamentary Counsel. With some reluctance, hesitation, I brought that matter before the committee, or agreed that the Law Clerk could raise the matter after the Clerk and I had dealt with it. It came to the committee, it got a fair amount of discussion, and then there appeared to be a consensus. I'm not sure if it was a motion by Dr. Reid, but there appeared to be a consensus which said, "Don't bother us with this; it's a management decision." As a result of that, the ball was back in my court, and I dealt with the matter further. I got some additional information, including the rates in the Attorney General's department.

After some further consideration, what occurred to me was that a lawyer working for the Legislative Assembly should not be under any disadvantage or less favourable terms than a lawyer in the same category working for the Attorney General's department. I think I said to this committee before, without wanting to butter you up or anything like that, that I consider the work done by a lawyer on behalf of the members to be just as important as any legal work done for any department of government. Following through on that, I agreed with the Parliamentary Counsel that we would change the 14 percent differential we had previously approved to the same one that applies in the Attorney General's department, which is 25 percent.

We can handle that for this year. For next year it should be approved in the estimates. To allow for that amount, which comes to about \$7,100 for the year, we have alternate text for the pages that are affected. That would be in effect until the end of the two-year contract, which was signed with the Parliamentary Counsel in September.

I have not provided the other point in relation to next year's estimates, but I think we can manage it. If necessary, I might have to ask for a special warrant. I have discussed it with the Provincial Treasurer. I don't pretend to have a commitment. It is with regard to a survey of the department, for which I want to engage a consultant. We have dealt with the personnel office on this. Incidentally, I should add that I hope nothing I have said about the personnel administration would give any indication to anybody that there's any hostility between them and me. As a matter of fact we're on very cordial terms, and we go to them frequently for their advice and assistance in regard to staff matters. I also went to them in regard to the terms of reference that might be given to a consultant to review the operations of the office of the Legislative Assembly. That information, proposed guidelines, came to us last week. We haven't reviewed them yet, but we'd like to go ahead with that.

They estimate the cost, without our having gone to tender on it at all, at between \$30,000 and \$35,000. That is an increase, or at least a new item, and I know we don't like increases in times of restraint. It seems to me that in a \$12 million operation where there hasn't been such a thing done for a long, long time, that would be a sound step to take. I could see it as possibly resulting in some economies. I could see it resulting in some improvement in staff morale,

which is a real factor. It could also result in some improvement in the services.

MR. PURDY: On that point, Mr. Chairman, something must have proliferated it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proliferated?

MR. PURDY: Something has happened for you to ask for a special warrant for a review of the department. As far as I'm concerned, that's very uncommon in government and in private enterprise, unless something is very, very wrong. I can't support that right now unless you can show me where the problems are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's difficult to answer, because if I do, I'm sort of arguing in a circle. It's my perception that partly because of workloads and perhaps partly because of structure — I don't know, and the purpose of it is to find out — staff morale isn't what it should be, for example. I know that doesn't directly show up in either the dollars and cents of a budget or the spending after the budget is authorized. I agree with you that it's something that is not common, but it certainly has been done in government departments. There are a number of precedents. In fact we were told in the Personnel Administration office that they have a number of those precedents.

MRS. CRIPPS: I took the information we've just received as information only and not a request from this committee for any decision. Am I wrong?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which information is that?

MRS. CRIPPS: The information you just gave us about your discussions with the Treasurer. That doesn't require a recommendation or decision by this committee, does it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. I gave that as background information, because at the moment the situation hasn't gone far enough. But it does affect services to members. I don't want to strengthen any impression there may be that we're bringing before this committee too many management questions that should be decided outside the committee. But it seems to me that this is of somewhat more extent and more importance, and that's why I have given this information.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it for information purposes. I guess I'm not opposed to ongoing reviews. I'd also like to consider one of the issues you've raised with regard to morale of all staff. I don't want to highlight it unnecessarily, either. I think we have to look very seriously at what has happened in this province. There's no doubt that it's not only within this building that there could possibly be morale problems. This has been quite a general trend throughout Alberta in the last couple of years. As a person who deals with a constituency, I'm sure you can appreciate the concerns down there — some very, very serious concerns. While many people are carrying on and doing quite nicely in my constituency, there are also a lot that have totally gone under — people on salaries who have maintained

their jobs but because of investments in the real estate market have lost absolutely everything. I'm sure everybody could go on and on. So I surely wouldn't like to isolate that there's something unique about morale that I don't know about. Maybe there is.

I've certainly had feedback from many of the major companies in Calgary. I'm thinking primarily of the oil industry. Their cutbacks have been severe, and I mean severe. They've had to cut back totally on their budgets, so that has affected their staff and what they do. There have been no increases whatsoever in salaries; it's zero right across the board. And that doesn't mean increments that are automatic, either. We've had to deal with a really difficult time, and it has affected all of us. I'd be willing to participate in any private discussion amongst members of our committee or whatever to see how we could best overcome that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm as reluctant as anyone in this room to spend money or increase the spending of money. In fact I think some people have thought that in some respects I've been just a little too much the other way. But it seems to me that if there is an indication that the effectiveness of present spending can be improved and possibly even savings achieved, then at a time when money is tight, it is particularly important to go into those things in an expert way. It might not be as important in other times, because things are easier, there's more money around, and people are less concerned about that kind of thing. It's precisely because of special concern under these special conditions that the question arises whether there shouldn't be some special attention given to effectiveness and all that sort of thing.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification. What you're doing this morning is advising us that you may want to come back to Members' Services with a request in this regard; you're not asking for a decision this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. I'm not asking for a decision at all.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's a notice of a possible future agenda item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly. But it could affect the budget this year or next year, and I raise it at this point because it deals with spending. We're under the budget, but what I've said about the consultation does not apply to the Parliamentary Counsel. That is a solid budget item which arises from his changing to contract status. The alternate pages with the changed figures to accommodate the \$7,100 are here and available for insertion in your books.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, are we on (e)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right; we're on (e).

MRS. CRIPPS: I'd like to make a motion to rescind my former motion on code 430.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any discussion of that motion? Let's just find the reference.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mrs. Cripps had moved that under code 430 the allowance for constituency offices be increased, so that deals with one of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any discussion of that motion by Mrs. Cripps? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. I've just seen another hand come up. All those in favour of Mrs. Cripps' motion? Opposed? Carried.

MR. KOWALSKI: On the same subject matter you identified underneath the agenda item, I would like to move that the motion that was carried under my name under code 600 and listed in minute 84.124 be rescinded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion of that motion to rescind? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

As far as I know, that leaves only one item in the estimates, and that's the one I mentioned a moment ago, the \$7,100.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. It's my fault; I didn't bring my estimate book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have mine here.

MRS. EMBURY: I thought we just got an update on it. The whole book was revised, and that was appreciated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, this is up to date. But that was not, because that point had not been dealt with when the book was brought up to date.

MR. STEFANIUK: With your permission, Mr. Chairman. The book was prepared prior to the Speaker having made a decision to amend the Parliamentary Counsel's contract. With the amendment of that contract, a change has been effected in code 130 on the new blue sheets you have just received, page 3 of the working papers. The item showing Parliamentary Counsel has now increased to \$80,050, which is \$7,158 higher than what it was in the material that was presented to you in the books. The consequence of that is that the working papers labelled as page 4 have had to be amended very slightly. The contract employee is entitled to UIC and Canada Pension coverage, and the increase affects that figure, so we have had to amend it. The result of the changes on those two sheets, working papers pages 3 and 4, have required us to recalculate the white sheets, which are the summaries. So you have a set of white sheets which wrap up the general Assembly, as well as a set of white sheets which wrap up the Legislative Assembly estimates overall. We have prepared these to reflect that decision of the Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: What is the total cost?

MR. STEFANIUK: The increased value of the contract is \$7,158 under code 130. Under code 140 it's very minimal; it's simply the percentage — \$260.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I just have to state that it's tragic that this was done yesterday and not last week, because I probably issued some false

information. It's my problem and nobody else's, but it's quite regretful that I went to Treasury Board on Friday and reported something different, making the assumption that this was already in the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reason it wasn't done sooner is that there was some delay in getting the information. As I said, the final basis for the decision was that there should be equality and equity between this particular staff person and the corresponding ones in the Attorney General's department, who are ultimately paid out of the same purse.

MR. KOWALSKI: On this issue as well, I have to be assured that basically when you talk about all the benefits accorded the Parliamentary Counsel as an employee of the Legislative Assembly in the current fiscal year, whatever you include in the package up to your definition, as long as I know what the definition is ... With this now changing to a contractual arrangement, which I understand was initiated by the Parliamentary Counsel and was negotiated between the Parliamentary Counsel and you — now we are changing the conditions of the contract only three or four or five months after the contract was signed — is the package one and the same in value under a contractual arrangement compared to being a direct employee of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a difficult comparison to make, and that's one reason we adopted the comparison that has been worked out in the Attorney General's department. You may recall that I reported on this to the committee some meetings ago. I mentioned that the recognized differential was 25 percent. In other words, to change over from salary to contract, the contract amount was 25 percent higher than the salary. For the most part that reflects the removal of certain benefits. However, when the Clerk and I dealt with it, we didn't go as high as 25 percent. We went to 14 percent because we questioned spending the additional dollars. It was subsequently pointed out, on inquiry, that this is not the standard practice insofar as this particular type of professional employee is concerned. Also, he appealed to this committee, and the result of that was that the committee threw it back at me. I then made the decision to make this staff person equal to the corresponding staff persons engaged in the Attorney General's department. You may remember that we had a supporting memo from the Attorney General in which he said this would be a good thing to do. I realize that he's not responsible for our staff.

If we don't provide this, we are in fact downgrading him from what he was before.

MR. KOWALSKI: When the contract was signed between the Parliamentary Counsel and you, was it your view that the Parliamentary Counsel may have signed this contract under duress?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Depending on how you interpret that, I could say yes, financial duress.

MR. KOWALSKI: But the Parliamentary Counsel certainly afforded himself the time to investigate

what he would want in this contract and perhaps present it to you for negotiation, and it was mutually agreed as to terms and conditions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but with this idea that he appealed it to this committee, with the results that I mentioned to you.

I'm sorry; was there another hand up that I didn't recognize? Bill.

MR. PURDY: I have to excuse myself. I have a meeting uptown at a quarter to eleven.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks for coming. Alan.

MR. HYLAND: Mine is related to the overall budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further inquiry about that? All those in favour? Opposed? No vote.

MR. HYLAND: I guess you cast the tying vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll vote in favour. I don't know what that situation comes to.

I put the question . . . Alan.

MR. HYLAND: My question is related to this first sheet on the budget. I have trouble with the percentages, because I made one of the motions. It shows that government members received a 3.8 percent increase in their budget, the opposition a deduction of 8.1, and Independent members minus 19. The motions in the minutes all read 2.8 or whatever; they all read the same. That's a little misleading, isn't it?

MRS. PRATT: That's just the manpower, Alan. Look over to the right, the second last column.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. That's better.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have a question relating to members' indemnity, which may not be necessary to come before this committee. Last year's budget estimates showed a 3.8 percent increase, and we passed a special Act which deleted that. I'm given to understand that in January that motion will probably not be necessary, because the inflation rate is under the 5 percent which would precipitate this increase. This year it shows 4 percent. So if somebody is looking at the budget estimates — which is what people look at, not the public accounts — it will show that in 1984 there was 3.8 and in 1985 there was 4.0 percent, which is 8 percent in two years, when in actual fact there is nothing. If it is going to be nothing this year, I want it to show in the estimates. I don't know how you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can't amend the law.

MRS. CRIPPS: But if at January 1 the inflation rate is under 5 percent, then this estimate should be amended.

MR. STEFANIUK: We would have to wait to receive the statistics from the Provincial Treasurer's department to show us what the rate of inflation has been in Calgary and Edmonton, because that is what the legislation is based on. In the meantime we have

included the figure, because obviously we have to make provision for an increase in the event that the inflation figures justify one. I think that in his wisdom the Provincial Treasurer would amend that figure prior to printing the books for presentation to the Assembly, if in fact that increase were not to be qualified for.

MRS. CRIPPS: All right. When you're making the presentation — if you do, and I assume you do — would you make the request that if there is any change, it be included?

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the approval of the committee we could make that request to the Treasurer. But the indemnities are statutory, and that's why the amendment you referred to was passed, making it clear that there would not be an increase last year.

MR. HYLAND: The budget shows an increase, so it's hard to argue with people. The Act is there, and when they see the budget they say, "Yes, but . . ."

MR. STEFANIUK: The thing is, Alan, that hopefully it would be caught before the books went for printing.

MR. HYLAND: I'm talking about last year, not this year.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's my whole point. I hope that Gerry would make the request that it be caught if in fact the inflation rate dictates that there's no increase.

MR. STEFANIUK: Last year there was qualification for an increase by virtue of the cost of living index. The disqualification came as a result of an amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act, which required passage by the Assembly. If there is no qualification, owing to a less than 5 percent increase in the cost of living, then the figure can be amended prior to the books going to press.

MR. HYLAND: I move that if the inflation factor doesn't trigger a raise in the wages of the MLAs, when you transfer these documents to the Treasurer for printing, you make the request that they be reduced by the appropriate budgetary amount. My reason for making the motion is that assuming we're going to approve the budget, in the event you transfer that and we know what the statistics are at the time, I don't think you could put that request in unless you had a motion of the committee, because you're changing the budget again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you're right.

MR. HYLAND: It's a little awkward worrying early.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's work it out clearly, so we don't have any misunderstanding. As I understand it, the committee wants to request that when I transmit the estimates to the Provincial Treasurer for printing, I say in the memorandum of transmittal that this committee has resolved that in the event the rate of inflation as contemplated in the Legislative Assembly Act is such that no increase is

to be made in member's salaries or indemnities, then a corresponding reduction is to be made and shown in the figure in the estimates for member's indemnities. Is that straight?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any discussion? I assume that's a motion. Do you want to accept the paternity of that motion, Alan? We don't want the chairman making motions.

MRS. CRIPPS: We'll take yours as clarification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. You can see that I'm struggling way back here with these new sheets. I can't seem to see any difference on page 2, the blue sheet, Code 120, from our last one.

MR. STEFANIUK: The differences are on pages 3 and 4. We gave you the whole set for that section to simplify the insertion. The changes are on pages 3 and 4, under codes 130 and 140.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you can just remove one section holus-bolus and put in the other, and you'd have it.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry; I don't believe that's true. I have a sheet in my book called Code 100. Do I just delete that?

MR. ELIUK: We had talked about change to the wording...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you give it a little louder, so Mrs. Embury can hear.

MR. STEFANIUK: The replacement sheet on Code 100 has changed one word in the explanation that's in the bottom left-hand corner, opposite the asterisk. We have said "one-half man-year each Government Members Offices and Clerk's Office" to clarify what was being done there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The previous text said they shared a half year, but in fact they are sharing a full year.

MR. STEFANIUK: We clarified the text.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The explanatory note was amended in order to clarify that; that's all. The figures weren't changed.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry. You said I could pull out my total package of blue sheets and replace them with what I got today.

MR. STEFANIUK: Not the total package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; I misled you. I hope that's the only time I've done that today.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the explanations are in the covering memo from the Director of Administration. They say:

Legislative Assembly
— first four white sheets
General Administration
— first three white sheets
— 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 15; blue sheets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry I misled you there. I hadn't read the memo either.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I think it's really regrettable that we couldn't have had this delivered to our offices last night. It would have been helpful for us to have spent the evening going over it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry about that. There was quite a large amount of support material. Ordinarily we try to get it out to you in advance and put it in the books as well.

MRS. EMBURY: It's very much appreciated when it is that way, and I'm very grateful for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the normal practice. In this case we didn't manage to do that.

Is there any other discussion of the estimates? If not, is anyone prepared to make a motion that the total estimates, with the total resulting from the decisions made at this meeting, should be approved?

MR. KOWALSKI: So move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

I don't know if we have any concerns of visitors at the meeting. Sorry. We're at (f). This is really an information item. We had discussed this topic, and as a result members wanted this comparative information. I don't think there's anything on it that we need to pass a resolution about today, but it does underline the concern of the administration that all members be urged to use the most economical means to make their phone calls.

MR. STEFANIUK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. That was a concern of members of this committee, not of the administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, but we have a concern as well.

MR. HYLAND: It was our concern. We asked them for the information.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that I found the information very useful. It was exactly what I requested and required, and I appreciate the fact that I will no longer have to spend Christmas morning doing this work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. You were the one who volunteered to do it, weren't you?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, and I certainly recognize that it was provided within several days after we had our discussion and raised the point. I think we should accept this document for information, and hon. members of the Assembly should look at their own expenditure levels.

MR. STEFANIUK: On that question, Mr. Chairman, this document has been circulated only to members of this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It hasn't gone to all members.

MR. STEFANIUK: May it be left with the members of the committee to bring to the attention of their colleagues?

MR. KOWALSKI: Sure.

MR. HYLAND: I think it really shows what has been suggested before. The saving for residential lines is tremendous. You look at some of them: \$6,300 because the person didn't have a residential line. Long-distance calls would have been half that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is more or less what was anticipated in the information the administration provided previously.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, we only suggested that they put in a residential line. There was no compulsion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there can be in that regard.

MR. PENGELLY: Probably not.

MRS. CRIPPS: When I was first elected in 1979, I was notified that I should have a private line put in, because I was a Member of the Legislative Assembly and it was necessary for my constituents to be able to call me on a confidential basis if they wanted to. I believe all rural members probably have that. If there is any major cost attached to putting in another phone, it's only in the rural areas in any case.

MR. HYLAND: Except that in your case, even though you had the private line, the calls were still charged to credit card, not the private line.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right. They were still charged to the credit card. If you total the credit card calls, residential, constituency, and legislature office calls, you can see that when someone uses the credit card extensively, it's much more expensive than only using it when absolutely essential.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give notice that we should have another of these done six months from now, just to see if there's been any progress made.

MRS. CRIPPS: Good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. PENGELLY: We'll see that members of caucus get a copy of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Maybe you could give them a little sales pitch.

MRS. CRIPPS: Definitely.

MR. KOWALSKI: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that sufficient for that item?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next is item (h). There was a question about the application of promotional allowances . . . Sorry; I marked off the wrong item.

Item (g). I was going to suggest that we leave that until the end of the meeting. The screen is here. We can show the slide presentation at the end of the meeting for any members who want to see it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a very fine idea. I have a little problem. I have to leave by a quarter to eleven because of another commitment. I'm wondering if it would be okay with you and members of the committee to deal with one item that Mrs. Embury, Mr. Stefaniuk, and I were charged to deal with at the last Members' Services meeting. If there's time, we'll come back to some of these other items; I don't know which are priorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I dispose quickly of item (h) and say that those things have been dealt with?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, as Ken suggested, let's skip down to item 6.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move we deal with it as per the information included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That makes for a short discussion.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm just being facetious.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'm willing to start the process of reporting on item 6. At this time I'd like to say that the bids were sent out, have been received, and at the present time are being analyzed for questions and comments. Hopefully we'll be able to report very soon that we're on schedule and that the equipment will be available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions? Ken, did you want to add to that report?

MR. KOWALSKI: No. That's one clarification I wanted. Mrs. Embury has indicated that. Mr. Stefaniuk, in terms of the last time we discussed this in Members' Services, as I recall from the Hansard of it, the first or second week of December would almost be decision time. We're basically now talking about the third week of December. Is this correct?

MR. STEFANIUK: The 19th at the very latest.

MR. KOWALSKI: Is the thought, then, that the three of us would have to get together on the 19th?

MR. STEFANIUK: If not get together, if that weren't practical, we'd at least have to talk by telephone, perhaps in a conference call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion of that item? Any questions of those giving the report? Is it considered to have been dealt with sufficiently?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Christmas card item is pretty well passe, for this year anyway. To avoid what happened this year, my suggestion is that next year we get the Clerk to get this process under way possibly in the month of August. We had a number of compliments about what he produced last year, except that the paper didn't accept ink from certain pens as readily as it might have. That is my suggestion to dispose of this item.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Let's make sure we bring it forward in ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to say in August. Is that all right?

MRS. EMBURY: I'd be delighted to have that, Mr. Chairman. This has been a concern of mine since I've been here. One thing I would like to emphasize — I don't know if it needs following up. I spoke to the Hon. Bill Payne about taking pictures of the Legislature now. I'm assuming it will be Mr. Eliuk or the Clerk who will be communicating on this issue. Whoever it might be next August might also reinforce that communication now with the Hon. Bill Payne's office or who they communicate with.

I also had a further point brought to my attention. The Legislature looks so beautiful right now: the stairs, the poinsettias. I don't know if that's worthy of a picture, too.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the process of taking photographs of the building from the exterior has been under way for approximately the last month. We've been attempting to capture the right sort of thing and the right angle. We're not satisfied with anything we've received. We have already made arrangements for a photographer to photograph the interior of the building as it's decorated now. I'll pass this around quickly. It's a card I received this week from Manitoba, which shows the interior of that Legislature in its Christmas attire. Depending on what we get, we'll be prepared to make a choice and recommend that for printing.

I would add that in future we would prefer to do it within the Legislative Assembly office, as we have in some past years, because we found that members have encountered considerable difficulties dealing with the Public Affairs Bureau, through receipt of incomplete orders, short orders, over orders, and that sort of problem.

MR. HYLAND: You do have some pretty good private-sector people giving some pretty damn good rates on cards right now.

MR. STEFANIUK: We did a private-sector card last year, if you'll recall, with the doors of the Chamber, and handled the distribution ourselves. I don't think we had nearly the problems that ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: And there were a number of compliments on last year's effort. Is that okay, then? We'll put it over to August. In the meantime photographs are being taken, as you suggested, and

we'll be ready to deal with the thing more specifically in August.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, in view of what the Clerk has now reported, I want to emphasize that the process at the present time is still for the Legislative Assembly to work with Public Affairs. Surely there could be that co-operation. All the cards that are deemed worthy of consideration by the members could come from Public Affairs through the Clerk to the members. Is that not the process?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What did we do last year?

MR. STEFANIUK: Last year we arranged for the printing of the card, we distributed the card ourselves, and it appeared to be a very satisfactory situation. This year I have a page, a summary of problems that we've run into in dealing with Public Affairs.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I can appreciate the problem of communicating this year. But without going into too much detail, I think there possibly were reasons for that lack of communication. It was a very beautiful card last year; however, it was extremely difficult, due to a handicap, to sign your name. When you're signing 900 cards, that's not easy. All I'm saying is that surely that could be overcome another time by talking to people who do this all the time. I would still like to ask at this time that the process start early in the fall by the Legislative Assembly contacting Public Affairs, so the members may have the advantage of both experts on this topic.

MR. HYLAND: That doesn't say they have to print it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other discussion?

The next item is pretty much an information item. I don't see what we can do about it. This is the one where the communications allowance was calculated on the basis of an enumeration which the member found to be incomplete. You have the correspondence. I think it's unfortunate if some voters were not included, but I really don't see that there's anything this committee can do about any kind of erroneous enumeration, if there was one. Okay?

The next item can also be dealt with briefly. As you know, we have a situation in Spirit River-Fairview where we have a temporary vacancy which is different from the kinds of vacancies that occur when a general election is called. We worked out, I think in October 1982, guidelines for constituency offices during a general election. We did not, however, deal with them specifically nor specifically with the constituency office funding in relation to a by-election which could result from a death or resignation. I propose to work out guidelines of that kind and bring them to the next meeting of the committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any other business?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, thanks to the Clerk

of the Assembly, an item was brought to my attention that I think I should report on. It is in regard to an item that was raised at one of the last meetings of this committee. I believe it was in regard to expenses incurred by a member for a committee of the Legislature. I was asked to pursue this matter. I would like to report to this committee that I have done that with the chairman of the committee, and it's under consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Do you want my motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean to adjourn? What about the date of the next meeting? Do we follow the general consensus we had a while ago?

MR. PENGELLY: The second Wednesday.

MR. KOWALSKI: The date would be January 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that's what it works out to.

MRS. EMBURY: Unless it's not necessary. I'd like to give notice that if we stick to the same deadline, unfortunately I'll be absent. But if a meeting is necessary, I'm sure the committee will ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll do again as I did. I didn't succeed in reaching all of you, but I did succeed in reaching most of you, and I think I left messages for the others. I reviewed the agenda on the telephone, as you may recall, to ensure that you felt the meeting needed to be held and shouldn't be put over to the following month with a larger agenda. Okay?

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm sorry. You must have ignored me, because no message was left with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We tried to get you.

MR. KOWALSKI: No message was left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I left word to leave a message if you couldn't, and I was told you were going to call back on Monday morning.

MR. KOWALSKI: I received no such message.

MR. HYLAND: I never got anything either. Of course, we were together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll look into it. I definitely had messages back on the attempts that two members were going to phone me on Monday morning. I asked for all of them to be called. I'll check into that. I'm sorry it happened.

Alan, are you ready with a motion? Oh, sorry.

MRS. EMBURY: Excuse me. Is this to adjourn? In view of the fact that it's premature because we're going to see the slide presentation, I would like to ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you expect there will be a motion arising from the slide presentation?

MRS. EMBURY: No. I just want to make a motion to commend the Clerk of the Assembly for having this done so quickly and, I have to say in anticipation, to the satisfaction of all members. I just want to say that this will really be appreciated by the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, how many copies of these will be available?

MR. STEFANIUK: We're contemplating at the moment having three sets and simply playing it by ear, if you like, to determine whether that's enough to put in circulation. If it isn't, we'll obviously have to get more sets together. But at the moment we have purchased three carousels, and we propose to provide them to members already set up in carousels. Karen has come in now with the lists of the slides that are on the carousel at the moment. I hasten to mention that there are certain shots we would like to take but won't be able to till the spring. For example, the Provincial Treasurer presenting the budget has never been photographed and consequently Archives don't have that kind of slide. We'd like to be able to take that, because it will enable the member to discuss with the group he is making the presentation to the method of providing moneys for the government to spend. There are a couple of others, aren't there, Karen? We'd like to catch the Speaker's procession and Royal Assent being given to legislation.

The first part of this presentation today consists of a tour of the building. The second part, which we already have, begins with any session; that is, the Speech from the Throne and the ceremony surrounding that. By spring we hope to be able to complete the functional part of this. The first slide is an overall view of the building as you come in from the front, with the gardens in the foreground. The last slide Karen has placed in the presentation is a group photo of the pages, because we thought you might want to talk to youngsters about their potential role in the Legislative Assembly.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, would they be available in the first two weeks of January?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. We have one set now and, with your approval of those, it's a question of having two more sets made up. Certainly you can have them. Karen has lists of what we now have ready to distribute among you as well, so you can have a list to go with the presentation as it is at the moment.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just one other thought. Individual Members of the Legislative Assembly will be using this particular program of slides to show the kids. I think it would be appropriate if there were a slide of the member at the desk in the Legislature. This is not something that can be done within two weeks. This would have to be done over a year — because, heck, it would take that — whenever a photographer is in the building. Each member would be given a copy of that slide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the desk in the office or in the Chamber?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think the Chamber would be much more appropriate, because it deals with the Legislative Assembly. I know there are all kinds of details along the lines of photographers and everything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe the background could be sort of obscured. If we take it when the House is not sitting, which would be the easiest time of course, then it will show the other empty places, unless we can get the photographer to just close in on the member and blur out the focus.

MR. KOWALSKI: The best time would be for the photographer to be there during question period when just about all members are there — not a major point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd have to get the leave of the House to have a photographer go around during question period.

MR. KOWALSKI: I thought he'd just take it from the top.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see — by a telephoto.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. It's the simplest, easiest way. It doesn't have to be high quality. You couldn't get much high quality [inaudible].

MR. STEFANIUK: In other words you're saying you don't want to pose for it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Oh, no — just Kowalski yawning in his chair type of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: We can probably arrange that in the spring.

MR. KOWALSKI: All it is is a general picture. If there are two or three colleagues around, that's great.

MR. PENGELLY: Did you want the member standing?

MR. KOWALSKI: No, just sitting or doing whatever they're doing.

MR. HYLAND: Is my motion still on the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm just waiting to put it.

MRS. EMBURY: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Hyland's motion for adjournment to January 9. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Providing we have to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the usual condition.

[The committee adjourned at 10:52 a.m.]