

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen] [8:08 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: First is the minutes of the meeting of November 20, as circulated; if there could be a motion.

MR. PENGELLY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? Are you content, Bill?

MR. PURDY: Yes. I'm always content.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan? Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: Do you have to have approval of the previous minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought we would have to have, but actually we don't because the amendment is included in the November 20 minutes. That automatically approves it.

MR. STEFANIUK: But there are other minutes. You're just talking about the amendment. The minutes themselves were not approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. We didn't approve the October 23 minutes. Thank you. Is there a motion on those? Those are the ones where we actually started on the estimates and ended up at code 350.

MR. HYLAND: Was it that one where we had to change the text of the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel moved a motion that the text be amended, but there was no text given to it. In the transcript I was asked to come up with a text, and I did that at the November 20 meeting. What happened was that the original motion by Dr. Reid was passed on September 18. On October 23, Nigel moved a motion — it's on the first page of those minutes — that that minute of September 18 be amended because we wanted more clarity in regard to what was being provided to members' constituency offices. I was asked to come up with a text, and I brought it to the next meeting, November 20. It was adopted. It has now been incorporated into an amended version of the September 18 minutes.

MR. HYLAND: I guess the one I was wondering about is the one Mrs. Embury made. I can't find it right now. We changed it back.

MR. PENGELLY: That was on the wording.

MR. HYLAND: We decided to go back to the original wording.

MR. STEFANIUK: That was at the November 20 meeting, I think, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: I haven't got last meeting's minutes, I guess, or the minutes before.

MR. PURDY: I haven't got mine.

MR. HYLAND: Does anybody know what I'm talking about, or am I just talking in the wind?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan, if the net result was to leave the previous motion unchanged, then we wouldn't have to deal with it further.

MR. HYLAND: So those minutes had to be — we had to take that part out and insert the original text. Right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, is that right?

MISS CONROY: Are you referring to the September 18 minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Alan is referring to a motion by Mrs. Embury on November 20, whereby a certain change was to be taken out and we were to revert to the original text.

MR. HYLAND: It would have been the meeting before November 20, but it appeared in the minutes we were dealing with then. The text had to be changed back to the original motion.

MISS CONROY: Do you remember what it was dealing with?

MR. HYLAND: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan, would you like to take a quick look at the October 23 minutes? Have you got them there?

MR. HYLAND: No.

MISS CONROY: I've got a copy.

MR. HYLAND: Oh yes, I do. Sorry.

MISS CONROY: Mr. Hyland, are you wondering about — Mrs. Embury questioned the wording of one of her motions. She wasn't sure whether she had used those words. Is that what you're referring to?

MR. HYLAND: No, it's not that, and it might not be Sheila. All I remember is that we talked about changing a text. At the end I mentioned that the minutes had been changed, that the minutes we were dealing with that day were different from the minutes the meeting before. I just wonder if that correction, taking out the proposed draft text that shouldn't have been there, had been made to the minutes.

MISS CONROY: I think what you're referring to is the September 18 minutes. They've been changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Aha, great. You haven't missed a thing. We're just approving minutes

MRS. CRIPPS: Good.

MISS CONROY: It was the motion by Dr. Reid on September 18.

MR. HYLAND: Is that what it was?

MISS CONROY: Now we've changed it to make it clear on September 18. If you take a look at the September 18 minutes that I handed you this morning, attached to the agenda, the original motion is in and the rewording.

MR. HYLAND: September 18?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's the one I was talking about, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: That's what I was wondering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the change was made. That other one was the place where Sheila questioned — she said she wanted it in grade 6 language. Remember? But we left it the way it was. What happened at that meeting was that I was asked to word the motion, and I did. I guess maybe it was grade 7.

MISS CONROY: Is that okay?

MR. HYLAND: I guess so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did approve the November 20 minutes, Shirley; I misled you there. We're now talking about the October 23 minutes, because we hadn't approved them at the last meeting. We had only discussed them. We're now open to a motion to approve the October 23 minutes, as circulated.

MR. PURDY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we're in business then. I don't know whether you want to discuss any business arising out of the minutes or get right into the estimates, in which case I would suggest that any business arising out of the minutes be carried over to the next meeting.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to give notice to the committee that I have a meeting in Calgary at 2 o'clock, so I'll have to try to catch the 12:15, if it's on time. I put that caveat out there because it may not be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the one — Pray While Aloft? PWA? That's not for the record.

MR. PURDY: The cargo door didn't come open last time, so I was all right there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shirley, before you came in we were discussing where we had left off on the estimates. We started to deal with them, you may remember, at our second-last meeting, on October 23. Under Administrative Support we completed approval of code 350. It's under your second tab, Administrative Support.

MR. PURDY: We're on 400 now, aren't we?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, page 17.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just putting Shirley in the picture.

We're now at code 400. Are there any questions on that one? Is there a motion?

MR. PURDY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By Mr. Purdy, that code 400 be approved. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 410, Repairs and Maintenance of Equipment. Any questions? We have Chuck here.

MR. PURDY: Are we on 410 now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: What's the 59 percent increase? I see where the increases are, but what do you attribute it to, Chuck?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's that photocopying equipment, where we transferred a code. That's the biggest one.

MR. HYLAND: What page are you on, Shirl?

MRS. CRIPPS: Eighteen.

MR. ELIUK: This is all office and photocopying equipment maintenance contracts that we have in the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got one item that's increased 2,200 percent because there's a transfer.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I was thinking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been broken out to get more fine-tuned accounting. Then you have another one, the last one, with a 41.9 percent increase. Again, there's part broken out from another estimate. When you get to those other estimates, you'll see corresponding decreases.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think what might be pointed out is that this item now covers all the equipment, including the equipment in constituency offices, on which we have maintenance contracts. We've broken it out and identified it. I don't think the figure itself has changed drastically from the previous year. It was hidden somewhere. What we've said now is: this is where it ought to be, and this is what it really is. So it covers all the

equipment you have in constituency offices: photocopiers, telephone-answering equipment — everything we carry a maintenance contract on.

MRS. CRIPPS: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MRS. CRIPPS: Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By Mrs. Cripps. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 430, Professional, Technical, and Labour Services. There we have some transfers as well. You see where some of the transfers came from.

MR. PURDY: One question, Mr. Chairman. The MLA printing for brochures and pamphlets: can somebody refresh my memory?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chuck.

MR. ELIUK: It's any special kind of printing that MLAs may wish to have: the brochures they issue to constituents and special news information letters; that type of thing. All the costs and breakdowns here have been derived from monitoring the actual expenditures in each of those codes over the course of the '84-85 fiscal year.

MR. PURDY: It was in the budget last year, of course.

MR. ELIUK: Yes.

MR. PURDY: It's just a reflection of code 290. However, would there not be a duplication of services between the constituency communications allowance?

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I was thinking.

MR. PURDY: I know that in my 14 years I've never taken advantage of this particular vote.

MRS. CRIPPS: Neither have I.

MR. HYLAND: Unless it's office paper with your name printed on it.

MR. STEFANIUK: What this is out of, Mr. Chairman, is the members' communications allowance. You'll recall that we pointed out at the last meeting what we referred to as page 4, at the beginning of these estimates, and said that we had monitored the expenses under the various allowances and our best estimate is that of the total communications allowance available to all members, about \$272,000 goes for printing materials that members want to distribute to their constituents.

MR. PURDY: So this is not a new item; this is a carry-on through the communications allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's a break-off of what you previously had in the communications allowance.

MR. PURDY: I should have referred back to 290; I'd have seen that. That's fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it would have been simpler from our point of view to leave those things in the communications allowance, but you remember the discussion we had last time, where we send these things to Treasury under coding other than their own and they get bounced and there's delay in paying suppliers.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think you should continue the effort to have Treasury put in a code that suits those needs, because it certainly isn't indicative in code 430 what it actually is. You should really make a further request to Treasury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In a sense it is and in a sense it isn't. The guinea pig department right now that's going through the new, more flexible accounting procedure is the Solicitor General. Remember Ian talking about it? I think we're due to start next year.

MR. STEFANIUK: The summer of '86.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the summer.

MRS. CRIPPS: So it will be in next year's budget.

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, this is in fact next year's budget. Shirley, if the new accounting system works out in such a way that we can

establish our own codes for items like communications allowance, we would do that — pick out this money and throw it into those codes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Back to the way we were.

MR. ELIUK: Mr. Chairman, it might be an idea for next year to take all the allowances and have them separate from administration. In that way we wouldn't be jumping back and forth from what is communications and all of your allowances to what is actually being picked up by General Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion? Alan. That's on code 430. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 500. No change there. Looks like a [inaudible] figure.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510, Hospitality. No change there.

MR. PURDY: I so move.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 540, Other Purchased Services. That is one of those transfers.

MR. ELIUK: Yes. It's a transfer from code 430.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Isn't that included in the rent in most of them?

MR. STEFANIUK: Sometimes it is and sometimes we pay the utility company directly.

MR. ELIUK: Over and above.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion on 540? Nigel. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600.

MR. PURDY: I move that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By Bill Purdy. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 790. No change there.

MR. HYLAND: I'll move that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Alan Hyland. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Code 820.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm sorry; can I ask a question on the last one, code 600? It says "Promotional allowance program." There's no change in it, but it's not shown as being ... Oh, I see. It's called "Nil" on page 4.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. There's no transfer, Shirley. That's why it shows "Nil." The headings show transfer from and to, and we're showing no transfer, so it stayed in code 600.

MRS. CRIPPS: In code 600. Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we're buying there — promotional allowance is really your pins and flags and giveaway items, and 600 is an appropriate code to take it out of.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR. HYLAND: Are we on 790 now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 820.

MR. PURDY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Code 850.

MR. HYLAND: Purchase of office items. That's all the new office items we'd buy in a year — \$900 worth?

MR. ELIUK: We're buying another printer, one

of those Epson printers, for our office.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. It just didn't seem like a whole lot.

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Otherwise you've got to do a transfer, if you can find the money elsewhere, so you can make a capital purchase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 850 is moved by Shirley. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. We've come to the bottom line on this control group, 004.

MR. STEFANIUK: Page 5 under General Admin.

MR. PURDY: I move the Administrative Support appropriation of \$4,720,232 be approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would think that that's the only place we'd need motions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the end?

MR. PURDY: I would think so. I don't know why we ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Skip the motions on each item?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm not as used to this as Frank Appleby and Bill Purdy.

Next, do you want to have a look at pages 27 and 28 to start with?

MR. HYLAND: This time, without a fall session, unless we have one before the fiscal year end, we should have some extra money left over in temporary residence allowance.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we're dealing with here is the fall of '86, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I know, but I'm talking about this year's budget too.

MR. STEFANIUK: Oh, yes. It will revert to GRF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to have look at the highlights sheet now, page 29?

MR. HYLAND: You're going into Speaker's Office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I was going to go to the — oh, right; this stands on its own. Code 900.

MRS. CRIPPS: This is the allowances.

MR. HYLAND: It says salary too.

MR. PENGELLY: Indemnity and expense allowance?

MRS. CRIPPS: There wouldn't be an increase in salaries, would there?

MR. STEFANIUK: There would now, Shirley, because the combined inflation factor over the last three years will add up to more than 5 percent, so the MLAs will be due for a statutory increase.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh.

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, if it doesn't hit 5 percent in any given year, there is nothing provided in the way of an increase. But if, on the other hand, there is an accumulation over a period of years of a 5 percent inflationary increase, we're obliged by statute to give the increase. As you know, that provision was revoked by legislation on a one-time basis in 1984. But there is no legislation in place right now, so come January 1, 1986 — we don't anticipate any legislation, because the House is not sitting. Consequently, we would be forced to adjust MLAs' salaries by 5 percent.

MR. HYLAND: I think we signed a waiver one time.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MRS. CRIPPS: You said a change comes in January?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay. I just don't want something appearing on the budget that isn't there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion on code 900?

MR. PENGELLY: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nigel. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to look at the highlights, page 29?

MR. HYLAND: You have one place where there is a 107 percent increase in manpower, salaries of nonpermanent positions. Is that a move? Oh, I guess we'll get into that later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under 110?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. We'll get into that as we go through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What happened there is that Barbara — what's her last name?

MR. ELIUK: Jones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jones, yes. She was being charged to government caucus.

MR. ELIUK: Half and half.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Half to government caucus and half to the Speaker's office. The Speaker's office has assumed the other half, so it's all in one place now.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's nice to be whole again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: So is that one of those things where she was Frank's secretary before or something?

MR. CHAIRMAN: She's still Frank's secretary.

MR. HYLAND: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It makes a really official provision for a secretary for the Deputy Speaker. She's no longer a hybrid. Any other questions on page 30, L0300? Do you want to have a look at page 31?

AN HON. MEMBER: No problem there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to go over the individual codes? Code 110.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 130.

MR. PURDY: It's too overpaid, but what the heck.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the fact of the matter is that he isn't getting that. That's just the ceiling.

MR. PURDY: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to apologize, Bill?

MR. PURDY: When are you going to get him at the ceiling then?

MR. STEFANIUK: I like him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's better. Code 130.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 140.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 150.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 200. No change.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 270.

MR. PURDY: Why are we . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taking it out.

MR. PURDY: Oh, we're taking out. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a minus. You won't miss it?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 290.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 350.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 400.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 410.

MR. HYLAND: Did this 410, the reduction in service agreements, show up elsewhere, in that big increase? Is that part of where it comes from?

MR. STEFANIUK: No, it's just costing less.

MR. HYLAND: I didn't think servicing stuff ever went down. Nice change.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 430.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 510.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 600.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Code 900.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's statutory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the wrap-up.

MR. HYLAND: I move we accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The control group . . .

MR. HYLAND: The Speaker's Office at \$233,894.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Do you want to go to the next tab, Government Members, page 46? The overview is on page 47. Are you ready for the individual codes?

MR. HYLAND: I have a question. When we deal with the next three, I thought we made arrangements about three years ago that even though they have to lay it out for expenditure purposes, we deal with a bulk sum increase on the first page and that's as far as we go.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I thought too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's true. Do you want to do that again this year?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I would move that we deal with caucuses that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're going to approve total expenditure L0400 en bloc, as the French say? You're moving that, Alan?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: What are we moving? The last two years we've moved a percentage increase to each office, so what's your motion?

MR. HYLAND: That's what I'm saying. I'm saying we deal with one block funding. We make the motion of the increase, and that's it. We don't look at or try to change the pages beyond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, the total amount.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, we vote total amount — percentage increase on total amounts.

MRS. CRIPPS: But I notice that the percentage increase for the Government Members' Office is 1.7 percent, the Opposition is 4 percent, and . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: The total is 0.1 percent, Shirley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The bottom line.

MR. HYLAND: Supply and Services is 1.7 percent.

MR. STEFANIUK: So one-tenth of 1 percent is the block funding increase.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's for the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the government caucus.

MR. STEFANIUK: For government members' caucus.

MRS. CRIPPS: Government members. Okay, but when I'm looking at the Opposition, it's 4.2, and the Third Party is 5 percent. Now I thought we'd agreed . . .

MR. HYLAND: That's what they're requesting, and we'll make the appropriate motions when we get there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what they're requesting.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay, that's what I wanted cleared up.

MR. HYLAND: I'm not saying amount. All my motion is is a motion on the mechanics and how we're going to deal with the next three, isn't it?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there's a motion that the total expenditure under L0400, for the Government Members' Office, be approved at a 0.1 percent increase, which in this case results

in a total of \$919,769. Moved by Alan Hyland?

MR. HYLAND: How have you worded that now? My motion was meant to deal with...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The increase.

MR. HYLAND: No, my motion was meant to deal with the way we're going to vote the next three.

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. HYLAND: Not the amounts on the first one, because that will be next.

MRS. CRIPPS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So there's a motion by Alan Hyland that the budgets for the Government Members' Office and the estimates for the Official Opposition and for the Third Party be calculated at increases, in each case, of 0.1 percent...

MRS. CRIPPS: No.

MR. HYLAND: No, just that they'll be voted as a unit, and we'll deal with the percentage afterward — separate motions on each.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. CRIPPS: We dealt with all of them in the same motion last year.

MR. HYLAND: No, we didn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there's a motion that the approval of the estimates for the Government Members' Office, the Official Opposition, and the Third Party be dealt with in one motion.

MR. STEFANIUK: Not in one motion, I don't think.

MR. HYLAND: No, what I was saying is that they be dealt with with one vote. We don't go through it individually; we block vote it — so much percent increase on last year's budget (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: We treat it as one vote.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, that it be dealt with without reference to the detail contained in each submission.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MISS CONROY: By summary rather than individual code.

MR. HYLAND: That's all my motion was meant to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. What have you got?

MISS CONROY: I have a motion that all three caucus budgets be voted upon by summaries rather than by individual codes. Is that sufficient?

MR. HYLAND: Okay, that'll do it.

MR. STEFANIUK: Without reference to detail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Without reference to the details or the breakdown. Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: So in the case of Government Members, we're concerned only with page 47 as opposed to all the supporting data.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. It saves a lot of work.

MR. HYLAND: And really with the one figure on page 47.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right, the bottom line.

MRS. CRIPPS: If I can question — I thought that last year we voted for a percent increase straight across for all three offices.

MR. HYLAND: We might have, but what I thought we did was — individual conclusions. We used the same percentage each time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I thought too.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, we would have to have dealt with each expenditure code.

MR. HYLAND: We used the same percentage each time.

MR. STEFANIUK: We deal with L0400, and I think it was the wish of the committee last year that the same percentage increase be applied to each of the three offices, but they were dealt with as three separate votes for purposes of recording the decision of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the motion. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Can we go in camera for a few minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Off the record?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes.

[The recorder was turned off from 8:44 a.m. to 8:47 a.m.]

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I think we should deal with all of the offices the same way as we did last year; that is that we set a percentage increase for the three Legislative Assembly caucuses and that they're all dealt with exactly the same. I'd make that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Haven't we a motion by Alan to a similar effect?

MRS. CRIPPS: No.

MR. HYLAND: No, she's saying percentage increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. HYLAND: Oh, has Shirley a motion on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion by Shirley, and she has just repeated exactly what she said when we were off the record. Is there any discussion of Shirley's motion?

MR. PURDY: I have some concerns with the intent of the motion, because the intent of the motion is to decrease the other two parties' budgets to a 0.1 percent increase. I feel very strongly that they should be represented at this particular meeting to outline to the committee — there may be a unique situation that we're not aware of, in the NDP offices for one. The Representative Party looks like it's a straight 5 percent right across the board for everything. I don't question that one as strongly as I — have somebody from the NDP caucus here to question them on the 4.2 percent. Are they entering into a unique situation that they were under — they didn't have correct figures in from the '85-86 budget? That's my concern right now.

I still think the Representative Party should be represented, too, to answer any of the questions we may have.

MR. HYLAND: Well, with the previous motion we passed and with Shirley's suggestion there — as much as it would be helpful if the members from the other parties were here to answer questions, with the agreement that we just deal with bulk increases, I don't know if it makes too much difference what they ask for; it's what the committee sets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So as I understand it, what you're saying is that in view of your motion, if we now adopt this suggestion we're going contrary to what's in your motion? Is that what you're saying?

MR. HYLAND: No, not really. It wouldn't be contrary. I'm just saying that I don't know if it makes a lot of difference. My motion says we vote one block: we don't ask questions about what's in the block; we don't get into the details. I think what Mr. Purdy is saying is that they can explain why they need it without getting into the details or without our getting into the details.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Are you ready for the question? It's Shirley's motion that we defer — do you want to read it back?

MR. PURDY: Please.

MISS CONROY: Mrs. Cripps moved that all three caucuses be granted a 0.1 percent

increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you got a text there?

MISS CONROY: That all three caucuses be granted a 0.1 percent increase.

MRS. CRIPPS: No.

MISS CONROY: The same as Government Members. Is that not what you wanted?

MRS. CRIPPS: No, I didn't think we would vote on the percent increase — just that all three caucuses be treated exactly the same on a percentage increase basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you want to amend the text? With that clarification, are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PURDY: No, I vote against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a point of order here, and I probably didn't go about this the right way. As I understand what Bill said, he was moving an amendment.

MR. PURDY: No, I was questioning it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I understood you to be in favour of deferring consideration of the motion until the other two caucuses were represented. In substance, that would have . . .

MR. PURDY: That was part of my speaking to the motion. The substance was there, but I did not move any amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You didn't intend that as a motion.

MR. PURDY: No, I did not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have a motion that — well, you heard it. I won't purport to paraphrase it anymore. Do you want to read it back?

MR. HYLAND: I thought we voted on it.

MR. PENGELLY: We haven't yet.

MRS. CRIPPS: Read it again. Yes, we did.

MR. HYLAND: It was three to one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did vote on it, but I thought I had called the question overlooking what purported to be an amendment. Since that was not the case, the vote on the motion stands and there is no point of order.

MR. PURDY: I'd like it to be recorded that I voted against it.

MRS. CRIPPS: If we would want to defer the vote on all of the caucuses, I don't have any problem with that. But I think they should still be treated equally.

MR. HYLAND: If we deal with any, we have to defer them all. It's all or nothing now.

MRS. CRIPPS: That was the intent of my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Does anybody remember what Jim said — if he could attend the next meeting?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, I think he is.

MR. PURDY: Yes, I think he said he was clear for that. I think it's the 12th, isn't it?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So we skip over to . . .

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I would then move that the three caucus votes be held until December 12 and, at that time, the administration staff be instructed to ask representatives from the NDP caucus and the Representative Party to be present to answer questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you consider saying "the next meeting" instead of "December 12" in case we have trouble with it?

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I feel that all of them should be treated the same — I notice that the opposition caucus has made provisions for substantial increases in staff. I know that some of our caucus members feel that they would like to have more staff, say a secretary between two instead of three or more members. If there is going to be a substantial increase in one caucus staff, then there should be a substantial increase in other caucus staffs. I'm here representing members of the government caucus, and I know that some of them want an increase. If the government has a hold-the-line budget for 1986-87, then I think we're all obliged to adhere to it. I won't be here on the 12th, and I want that on record.

MR. PENGELLY: So it's block funding, and they put it wherever they want. Is that what you're saying?

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't care where they put it but I know that . . .

MR. PENGELLY: As long as it isn't 5 percent or whatever.

MRS. CRIPPS: I know that some of our caucus members would like their own secretary or at least a secretary for every two people. We don't have it. I noticed that the opposition has substantial staff increases. If one caucus is going to get substantial staff increases, then I believe that the other one should too.

MR. HYLAND: That's really none of our affair. Our affair is the bulk amount.

MRS. CRIPPS: Precisely, and that's why I say it on a percentage basis.

MR. PENGELLY: They can spend it wherever they want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we skip over to Committees?

MR. PURDY: Did we not pass the motion that I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did we not . . . Oh, that's right.

MR. PURDY: The question wasn't asked on the

motion I put forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of Bill Purdy's motion that further consideration of these three sets of estimates be put over until the next meeting of the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that the administrative staff be asked to send special reminders to the two opposition caucuses that they endeavour to be represented. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're into Committees: page 77, the highlights.

MR. HYLAND: A question on Members' Services' budget. Maybe it wasn't last year; maybe it was before. I thought we had put travel in our budget. We've never done it, but I thought we had put it in the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Travel by the Members' Services Committee?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, for the committee to go to places — Ontario, Ottawa, Quebec, wherever — to talk about how their members' services work. I'm not sure it was necessarily the whole committee or parts of the committee. I forget what our discussion was at that time. I notice, unless I'm missing it, that we're looking at \$750 travel. That would get one person there and back.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, those travel expenses provided for here are relating to members' travel to come to committee meetings. There is no travel foreseen here by the committee as a group to other jurisdictions, because I don't believe that for the next year there was any indication that that, in fact, would take place. Obviously, the committee is in a position now to make any amendments to this proposal.

MR. PURDY: That's why, Mr. Chairman, you see the great increase in Legislative Offices. Pardon me; I guess we got a decrease again this year because of lack of travel. We had a bunch in last year, and it seemed we didn't use it, so

we decreased it by 40 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A big increase last year.

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think the Committee on Legislative Offices last year foresaw considerable requirements for travel budgets because they were interviewing candidates for two positions of officers of the Legislature. They foresaw having to bring candidates to Edmonton for final interviews or for the committee to travel elsewhere.

MR. PURDY: All three officers.

MR. STEFANIUK: So that accounts for the reduction, but there is still a provision for \$18,000 in travel. I think that committee foresaw its participation in certain conferences and travel to other jurisdictions during the year.

MR. PURDY: It's three different conferences that they participate in, and they're usually held this time of the year.

MR. HYLAND: Has the budget for Legislative Offices been passed by that committee yet?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. All of these submissions for committees have presumably been passed by those committees, except Members' Services of course, which is this committee's own budget.

MR. PURDY: As a member of Legislative Offices we passed our budget, which has a reduction, six weeks ago.

MR. HYLAND: So really the one we deal with is our own and accept the rest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We really have no authority to set budgets for other committees.

MR. HYLAND: When we get the final kick at the cat, it's probably questionable if we can change it. The only real one is our own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. PURDY: Another general question I have, Mr. Chairman, to the Clerk is Public

Accounts. I didn't realize that they actually met when the Legislature is not sitting.

MR. PENGELLY: They can't.

MR. PURDY: If they start doing that, that would be a very low realistic budget when you have to consider there are 28 members or something on Public Accounts.

MR. STEFANIUK: The travel expenses are not related to the committee's travel but rather to certain members of the committee and one member of the support staff, usually the Clerk of Committees, travelling with those people to an annual meeting of Public Accounts Committee chairmen. That is an annual event which is held somewhere in Canada. I believe it was in Yukon last year. I believe that the chairman, the vice-chairman, one other member, as well as one staff member attend that conference annually. I think that's what those funds are intended for.

MR. PURDY: Thank you. That clarifies that.

MR. HYLAND: If the budget for Members' Services is \$750 for travel and that's to travel — heck, in three meetings myself or Jim have got that \$750 used up.

MR. STEFANIUK: That could well be. What we base this on, Mr. Chairman, is the consideration of how the committee has met in the past. If the House were sitting this fall, there would be no additional travel expenses and no per diems paid. That is usually when this committee sits heavily, if you like, or frequently.

MR. HYLAND: What is the Time Air ticket now from Medicine Hat? Two hundred and thirty-seven dollars or something like that. I assume Jim's from Grande Prairie is not a lot different; maybe more.

MR. PURDY: Mine is \$151.50.

MR. HYLAND: One hundred and fifty dollars for Edmonton/Calgary. Nigel's is whatever. So I would suspect that \$750 would get us about a meeting and a half off-session. That's why I wonder if we should . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: If this budget were to apply

to this year — and it does — we obviously are incurring more expenses for Members' Services in the fall of 1985 than we had foreseen. What we have to offset that, though, is the fact that members are not here, the House is not meeting, and so there is funding available from that source to transfer in. One offsets the other to some extent. But this budget is based on what we would foresee happening in '86-87.

MR. HYLAND: I'm just wondering if that's enough without transferring it.

MR. PURDY: We're not worried about this year, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: No, I know.

MR. PURDY: Not until April 1.

MR. HYLAND: I'm looking in the future. That's assuming that out of session we don't have too many meetings.

MR. PENGELLY: Well, we sit during the spring and fall sessions.

MR. PURDY: Our greatest bulk of the time, as near as I can assess this committee, is during the budget process.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right.

MR. PURDY: The budget process takes place during the fall session. I think we're pretty close in our figures.

MR. HYLAND: Isn't there a motion on the books that says something to the effect that we'll meet monthly if necessary?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right, Mr. Chairman. There was a motion to the effect that we will meet monthly, and there was a date stipulated.

MR. PENGELLY: Every second Wednesday.

MRS. CRIPPS: It hasn't worked out.

MR. STEFANIUK: But what we have seen in practice is that the committee elected not to meet during the summer months. The spring and fall were covered by the members being in the capital, in any event, sitting in session. We

didn't see a January meeting last year, and I think we may not have seen a February meeting. So basing it on practice, this is what we've come up with, because in fact this is what the charge has been directly to the committee.

MR. PENGELLY: We don't even budget for one meeting out of session, do we?

MRS. CRIPPS: Do you claim for all the travel expense you are calculating anyway, Alan?

MR. PENGELLY: For these meetings?

MRS. CRIPPS: You claim for bus fare because you don't have a bus pass, but he's got a plane pass and so does Jim.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. That's how this is figured. You pull it out and try to balance it against general administration versus committee work and all that sort of thing for budgeting purposes.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: That's all I'm doing. The money is there. It's just a question of where you put it. Isn't that right?

MR. ELIUK: Overall I think the committee budgets have been a bit higher than actual expenditures have indicated. So the moneys have always been . . .

MR. HYLAND: It's a bit of blue sky to try to nail down a committee budget.

MR. ELIUK: Exactly.

MR. STEFANIUK: You recall there was the day, certainly within my time with this Assembly, when we used to budget a bulk figure for all committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Every year it was \$100,000.

MR. STEFANIUK: We never knew where a committee was going or what the plans were for committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We still don't.

MR. STEFANIUK: As committees have become

more active, we've tried to develop these budgets a little more precisely. I'm not sure that we're able to do it very precisely, but this is certainly closer to reality than it had been.

MR. HYLAND: In the old days if you had one committee in a year, you were out. You were done for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to get to the ...

MR. HYLAND: Okay, I'll leave that part of it alone and the part about — maybe we won't use it, and maybe it's there elsewhere — committee travel and visiting other jurisdictions. I think we spent a lot of time discussing that and accepting that theory. I know we didn't use it, and with zero-based budgeting you've got to start from zero even if you don't use it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're saying then, Alan, would of course apply to the time between April 1, 1986, and March 31, 1987. We would have to try to guess, I suppose, what might go on during that time and also perhaps consider what places we might want to go to. The places where you can go to get specific information about parliamentary budgeting and administration would be to other parliaments.

MRS. CRIPPS: Didn't we have that in the budget last year?

MR. PENGELLY: I thought it was Ontario, Ottawa, and perhaps B.C.

MR. HYLAND: We pulled a figure out of the air.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quebec, as well, was mentioned.

MR. STEFANIUK: Last year the committee talked about going to Ottawa, Toronto, and Quebec. Initially it was going to be the entire committee, and then I think there was some concern for, one, the ability of the entire committee to settle on a precise date and, two, the expense that would be incurred. The result of that was a decision, I believe, to have a subcommittee, a smaller group of the Members' Services Committee, travel. That appears to have withered down to Alan's having visited,

from some other conference ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: From a CPA conference.

MR. STEFANIUK: Having visited Queen's Park. That was the extent of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He made a very full report, and Bob Bubba is ...

MRS. CRIPPS: But Alan's point is that we had budgeted for it last year, if I remember correctly, and we haven't budgeted for it this year. I think your point is we should budget for it again as we did last year. Wasn't that in last year's budget?

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't think it was in the budget.

MR. PURDY: Two years ago.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, it's two years ago.

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't think it was in last year's budget at all, Shirley. I think we were simply going to find the funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was two years ago.

MR. ELIUK: No, \$750 was the forecast for last year, and the estimate was \$750. I can't recall its being in last year at all.

MRS. CRIPPS: I thought it was.

MR. HYLAND: Just a minute. It was two summers ago that I did that. That was in the budget the year before.

MR. STEFANIUK: I don't think it was an original budget proposal, though, because the consideration of the travel by the committee came within a budget year when there wouldn't have been a provision. I think it was generally felt that funding was available from within the overall Legislative Assembly budget to accomplish that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So where do we want to go on this item?

MR. HYLAND: If that's the understood agreement about travel and we decide to do

that, I don't have any problem with the way it's done now in the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, leave it the way it is in the estimates. Is that what you're saying, Alan?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, if we still accept the proposal that if we do decide and that's our understanding, we'll find the money elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll try.

MR. HYLAND: If the Clerk and administrator can live with that.

MRS. CRIPPS: It can be out of Committees.

MR. STEFANIUK: The only thing I would point out, Mr. Chairman, is that three or four years ago we had a little more leeway with budgeting. We're now following some pretty precise instructions about zero-based budgeting. I would suggest that what is presented to the committee for its consideration now is pretty much a bare-bones budget with no padding. While it may have been possible three years ago to find some extra funding elsewhere, unless we have some unique circumstances such as prevailed this fall, when there is no sitting of the House and certain savings are being realized, that funding is not generally available. So if this committee feels that it wants to travel to other jurisdictions during the course of the next fiscal year, I respectfully suggest that it would be appropriate to make some budgetary provision and revise this estimate.

MR. PENGELLY: Can we do that, Bohdan, and still remain within the guidelines in this budget?

MR. STEFANIUK: What the Assembly is finally concerned about when all the members take a look at this is: what is the bottom line for everything? Right now we are forecasting a 2.6 percent increase for Support to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. PENGELLY: That answers my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a total of . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Of \$12 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you can see that whatever might be added here for this purpose that Alan has discussed would have to be calculated as a percentage of \$12 million.

MR. STEFANIUK: If you add \$10,000 or \$20,000 to \$12 million, the percentage increase will not be significant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be less than 1 percent.

MR. PENGELLY: And Shirley mentioned that if we reduce the opposition's global budget percentagewise to what ours is, there would probably be money there to do it.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, because there you're talking about the dollars. This is where we get into some difficulty when we look at percentages alone. We look at individual items. If you look at an item that has previously been \$100 and you increase it to \$300, you have a 200 percent increase. So the dollars there reflect the percentage.

MR. PENGELLY: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Like this one we just went through. It's 2,000 percent, but it's not a whole lot of money.

MRS. CRIPPS: Are we on Committees in general or just the Members' Services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're just having a general discussion of Committees.

MRS. CRIPPS: For these committees, I know we've discussed the MLA pension at length. Are we now paying into that?

MR. ELIUK: You are not presently, but you will be able to pick it up.

MRS. CRIPPS: When will we pick it up?

MR. ELIUK: The end of December, as we always have in the past.

MR. PURDY: Have you got those figures together yet?

MR. ELIUK: They're being prepared. We should have them Monday.

MR. PURDY: And they will be distributed to the members at that time.

MR. ELIUK: Yes.

MR. PURDY: If you want to pick up your back pension, you can write a cheque for it.

MR. ELIUK: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: Shirley, you'll be able to pick up, as you have in past years, by making a bulk contribution. What we are working on and are still in negotiations with Treasury on is the ability to deduct at source. In other words, the \$100 which you are entitled to for today's meeting would have taken from it an amount toward pension, which would eliminate the need for you to do the catch-up at the end of the year.

MRS. CRIPPS: So next Monday you will have the calculations on 1985-86.

MR. ELIUK: Yes. The calculations are coming to us from Treasury. They've advised me that the printout should be in my office Monday. That's only for committees. We will be consolidating that printout with all the fees you have been paid. You'll be receiving a letter indicating the total amount of money that has been paid out to you and the 7.5 percent or what amount is owing.

MR. PURDY: That's averaged over the last three years, is it?

MR. ELIUK: The printout we're getting on Monday is what has been paid out to you over the last three years.

MRS. CRIPPS: I didn't realize it was retroactive beyond this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that was the effect of the motion. Right, Chuck?

MR. ELIUK: Yes.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to get into specifics on Committees, or do you want a motion of some kind in regard to Alan's concern

about contacts with other parliaments in regard to members' services and administrative matters?

MR. HYLAND: I would move that for want of a better figure, we use \$15,000 for Members' Services Committee. If we're going to travel, that would include it. Chances are that we probably won't use it, but the ability would be there if we did decide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would that be under code 200?

MR. STEFANIUK: Code 200 under Members' Services.

MR. HYLAND: I guess it would have to go under 200. I was just suggesting a global amount on the end of it.

MR. STEFANIUK: Is your motion then -- I guess it's not a motion, but is it to replace the \$750 with \$15,000?

MR. HYLAND: No. I was roughly doubling the total amount, \$7,520, to \$15,000.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have to put it somewhere, Alan. What you're suggesting is that we throw another \$7,500 into Travel Expenses. Is that right?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: Okay. That won't take the whole committee too far.

MR. PENGELLY: That would be one trip for a subcommittee.

MR. HYLAND: I know.

MR. STEFANIUK: It might not even pay for a single trip, Nigel. The reason I say that, Mr. Chairman, is that we have recently had some bad experience with attempting to use excursion fares. Just very recently we had to forfeit the value of an entire excursion fare because members decided rather late that they could not attend a given conference. So when we budget, I think we have to make provision for full economy fare.

Having in mind what was discussed previously

by this committee — that is, Ottawa-Toronto-Quebec — I think we're talking fares approximating, with the stopovers, \$900 to \$1,000 per person. Those are the fares alone. Nine members of the committee, and presumably some support, so perhaps 10 people travelling — that's \$10,000 just for transportation, plus the hotel and meals, plus per diems. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is low and that a more realistic figure, even for a single trip to three jurisdictions in central Canada, is probably \$15,000 to \$20,000.

MR. PENGELLY: We should budget for at least one trip.

MR. HYLAND: You're suggesting that the figure of \$15,000 I used shouldn't include the \$7,500; it should be \$15,000, period.

MR. STEFANIUK: I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if one trip is being contemplated to central Canada, with three jurisdictions on the list, the travel expenses should be increased by a minimum of \$15,000.

MR. PURDY: Where do you get the \$7,500 from, Alan?

MR. HYLAND: Here. I just doubled the final figure.

MR. PURDY: Oh, I see.

MR. PENGELLY: I see.

MR. PURDY: Because there's only \$750 in there now.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. I was using the \$7,500 and just doubled it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion hasn't been put. We're still working on it. Have you decided what form you want the motion to go to the meeting in, Alan?

MR. PURDY: I have some concerns. When you talk about per diem for the member, that's at \$6,300 now. Let's say we go for a trip to Toronto, Ottawa, and Quebec City; that's going to be four or five days' duration. You take the nine members, and you're looking at \$5,000

there in per diem alone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think \$20,000 is going to be right close to it.

MR. PURDY: You're probably looking at \$1,000 a day for hotel rooms and meals, so even the Clerk's estimation is low.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think \$20,000 is realistic, without any frills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would mean that the \$7,520 figure would be increased to \$27,520.

MR. HYLAND: It seems like a huge increase there, but in the amount of the total budget it's not big.

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can add an explanatory note.

MR. HYLAND: There's a chance that we'd never use it, but we might.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our situation is different from what it is in private enterprise. In private enterprise, although you budget for the year, if you decide to change it, you change it. But once our estimates are approved, they're approved for the year and you're locked in. The only flexibility you have is the very unwelcome means of a special warrant.

MR. HYLAND: You have two choices: to go or not to go, to use it or not to use it. You have the two options.

MR. STEFANIUK: If you don't use it, it reverts to GRF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, there have been many cases of that. All we're really doing is buying ourselves some flexibility.

MR. PENGELLY: What percentage of \$12 million is that \$25,000? Why say \$20,000? Say \$25,000. There should be the possibility of one trip for each member plus support staff if you don't budget for a subcommittee.

MR. PURDY: To put it on the record, Mr.

Chairman, I would move that the Members' Services budget be increased by a figure of \$25,000, which will reflect a small increase in the total overall budget. Can you give us the arithmetic right now, Mr. Clerk?

MR. STEFANIUK: The Members' Services budget, as it appears on page 84, would be increased in total to \$32,520, and the bottom line on Committees would increase to \$281,055.

MR. HYLAND: We're still under last year's budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we've got some transfers in there.

MR. HYLAND: I know, but we're still under last year's budget because of the reduction in Legislative Offices. So we're not dealing with an increase.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, we're not.

MR. PURDY: You're dealing with an increase in the overall global budget of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only an increase in the estimates, not in what it was.

MR. PURDY: The estimates' budgetary percentage will change from 2.6 to something like 2.65. Right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shirley and Nigel, would you like Bill or Miss Conroy to repeat that motion?

MR. PENGELLY: Please.

MISS CONROY: Mr. Purdy moved that the Members' Services budget be increased by \$25,000, to a total of \$32,520.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it necessary to specify that that comes under travel, or can we just leave it in a lump?

MR. PURDY: No, just leave it in a lump.

MR. STEFANIUK: We'll have to break it out, Mr. Chairman, to show some increase in the payments to MLAs, because there would be an indemnity portion built into this as well as

travel.

MR. PURDY: That's right. You'll probably have to go fifty-fifty or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the motion?

MR. PURDY: We've got the motion. We're ready for the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I mean: the question on the motion. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Of course, it's implied that the necessary recalculations will be made to give effect.

Are we ready to go into the specifics under L0600?

MR. HYLAND: What page are we on?

MR. PENGELLY: Seventy-nine.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, if it's acceptable to the other members, I am ready to move a motion on page 78, the total amount. As I said earlier, the others have submitted their estimates to us, which have passed their committees. I think Members' Services is the only budget where we have something to deal with, and we did that. I'd be prepared to pass a motion that the legislative committees budget would be \$281,055.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the total on page 78, the bottom line L0600. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Can we go to the next tab, Legislative Interns? Incidentally, that budget would have gone down if it hadn't been that we have increases in Canada Pension, UIC, and Blue Cross. That's what has compelled the changes there.

MR. PURDY: A question, Mr. Chairman, on the global aspect of the Interns budget. Are you still receiving any outside support funds from industry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't guarantee anything for next year, but there are two contributors and they should be recognized. One is Benson & Hedges, Canada, which is a subsidiary of Philip Morris.

MR. PENGELLY: Molsons?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Molsons doesn't own that, does it?

MR. PENGELLY: Must be a shareholder.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the Clerk is doing his best to support that firm.

The other is Canadian Utilities, formerly Northwestern Utilities. We think we'll be getting the \$1,500 from them, and the amount from Benson & Hedges has been \$8,000. Last year they divided it into two amounts on either side of the fiscal year-end. We can't say for sure, but we're hoping.

Those funds, especially the Benson & Hedges ones, are not intended by the donors to replace any public funding already provided. They're intended for program enrichment. That has resulted in interns being available to members to a much larger extent to travel to their constituencies and to work for the members in those constituencies. That use of the interns, as a result of this encouragement from Benson & Hedges, has increased significantly during the current year and, I expect, will increase further.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, in view of the small percentage increase, 0.5 percent, I move that the Interns budget of \$170,251 be adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we go to Hansard? Incidentally, we're going to be saving money on Hansard this year because of there being no fall sitting. The increase over the forecast is 0.1 percent.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's in keeping with what we had for members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some unavoidable things that you're just compelled to . . .

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, what's the total complement of Hansard in permanent versus part-time positions when the Assembly is sitting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't tell you that from memory. Incidentally, there is a proposal under consideration by the Clerk and the Editor of Hansard which may result in some further economies. What we have right now is a very small core staff and a very substantial sessional staff. The result is that we have a terrific turnover in sessional staff, and we have to get them in early and pay them for the time they spend being oriented and instructed in what they're to do. The gist of the proposal that is being worked on is to switch some of those sessional staff people to annual contracts, where they will be available to us on a priority basis and will have a guaranteed minimum. We will have first call on their services and have a better hope of getting them back year to year so that once we get them trained, we get our money's worth out of the training and don't lose them for the next session. That has not yet been decided, but as I said, there is a real possibility that it may lead to an economy.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, in response to Mr. Purdy's specific question, I think that's defined on page 100, where we're showing eight permanent positions in Hansard.

MR. PURDY: That's right; I see that. I picked that up later on. Are there any part-timers, Bo?

MR. STEFANIUK: Not in this, because part-timers are paid out of wages on a sessional basis. We show eight full-time positions under Permanent Positions, and that in fact is what is in the core staff. We show 5.1 man-years under Wages, which is the part-time sessional staff who are hired. I can't tell you precisely what the total is. That's the total of man-years. It may be 10 or more people; probably a dozen, I would think. In any event, that's where it lies.

I'd like to add, Mr. Chairman, that we foresee the possibility of effecting even further economies in Hansard and in other sectors of the Legislative Assembly, which may ultimately have an effect on the proposed spending for the next fiscal year, through possible acquisition of typesetting equipment. Members perhaps have

not noticed the amount of print work that is put out by the Legislative Assembly. We pay typesetters to set Hansard, Votes and Proceedings, Orders of the Day, Bills -- the private members' Bills and private Bills, which we are responsible for printing. We have a co-operative program with Legislative Counsel, in the Attorney General's department, for printing all Bills, and type has to be set there.

Our consultations with industry specialists have indicated to us that we are at the stage where in-house typesetting becomes a feasible operation, and we think we should consider it to effect economies and to increase our control over the documents which are being typeset and printed. That could result in savings overall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the considerations there is that the typesetting is now being done by private enterprise. My own personal feeling is -- and I really have no basis to go on as yet -- that the bidding we're getting on it is a little high. I'm reluctant to transfer it to in-house typesetting, taking it away from private enterprise. But it may be that we need some kind of yardstick, because it appears that the cost to the taxpayer of doing it this way would be substantially higher than if we had our own in-house equipment.

Is there anything further?

MR. HYLAND: Maybe we need some more people bidding on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't restrict the numbers of people.

MR. STEFANIUK: It goes out for public tender every year, Alan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody who wants to can bid on it.

MRS. CRIPPS: What would you do with eight staff this year, when there is no fall sitting of the Legislature and virtually no government legislation being prepared?

MR. CHAIRMAN: They do committees, and they also do the index. What else do they do?

MRS. CRIPPS: It must be fairly slack, though.

MR. HYLAND: Prepare your red book.

MR. STEFANIUK: It isn't all that slack because there's a lot of catch-up being done. A lot of instruction manuals are being rewritten, which we have the opportunity to do this year. There are the committees which continue to function, as this one is and others have been. As a matter of fact, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee meets through the summer and into the early fall. We have also reached agreement with government where we are offering services to certain government agencies or departments that require the services Hansard is able to perform.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For example, we will go to Hansard for the final proofreading of the new order forms, which I expect will be available very shortly. That's just one of the small things they do for us.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's true that the pressures aren't there, Shirley, but we don't have the part-timers, who are usually in place to handle the pressures, and the overtime and what not. But those eight can be kept reasonably busy. They're here on a daily basis, and they've all got work to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you let them go or transfer those to temporary positions, you pretty well destroy your organization and you have difficulty maintaining a sufficient nucleus so that when a session is called, you're ready to go. When the majority in the House decide they want to go back into session -- when they're adjourned, as they are now -- perhaps they don't wonder whether Hansard is going to be able to cope and provide them with a daily record. We do have to have that ready stand-by. I don't know whether we can compare how busy we are with how busy firemen are when there are no fires, but we do have to be ready to cope.

I'm sorry, Alan; I delayed you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Hansard budget for the '86-87 year be \$733,767.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

We go over to the Legislature Library. Do you want to look at the highlights on page 115?

MR. HYLAND: How did the library's proposed increase of 3.8 percent -- it's 3.7 in wages; that took care of most of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three point eight is the bottom line after ...

MRS. CRIPPS: Why would the Employer Contributions and the Allowances be so high over and above last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have no choice. Those are Canada Pension, Unemployment Insurance, and Blue Cross. Am I right?

MRS. CRIPPS: They're not up the same in other budgets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have no real choice on those. We might have some on Blue Cross, if we wanted to reduce coverage.

MRS. CRIPPS: But in Hansard, for instance, they're up only 3.4 percent.

MR. STEFANIUK: It depends on what staff we're dealing with. If we go back to Legislative Assembly Administrative Support, you'll see where the allowances and supplementary benefits are up 15.2. Employer contributions are down, but that's because of a switch in personnel from permanent to contract.

What we're facing here in the salaries budget is, first of all, the management increase which was granted earlier this year by authority of the minister responsible for personnel to all managers and executive staff. The resulting increase in employer contributions is based, one, on those higher salaries and, two, the increases required relative to those contributions. What you may have as well, which is a variable, is the status of employees. For example, if an employee becomes married and requires family coverage as opposed to single coverage, the amount of the contribution increases quite substantially. Again, we're dealing with percentages which in dollar figures are not necessarily as significant as the percentages which appear opposite them.

MRS. CRIPPS: Are management staff increases and the permanent positions' salaries two different sets of payments? Or is that just pulled out?

MR. STEFANIUK: What you may have, Shirley, are two things. One, management staff was entitled to an increase this year for the first time, I think, in two or three years. The other thing you have is other employees on anniversary dates becoming eligible for an increase to the next category in their respective classifications, which also accounts for some percentage. So as people go on in the public service, each year they are entitled to a review and to a movement to the next category within their classification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions about the Library estimates?

MR. HYLAND: Maybe I should have asked this in General Administration. Now that the Law Clerk is on contract, do we still pay for his belonging to societies or does he pay that himself?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a job-related expense. If you were going to expect him to pay it, you'd have to increase his contract remuneration to cover it, because it is a job-related expense.

MR. HYLAND: I guess the way I look at it is that when somebody contracts something, they contract everything to go with the job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fair enough, but then the contract price would have to reflect it.

MR. HYLAND: When we contract the services of an engineer per se, we pay so much for that service. If he wants to belong to the professional association, he belongs to the professional association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's true, but when the engineering firm quotes fees to people, they're based on their overall costs. That includes attending professional seminars and that sort of thing. I think there isn't really a lot of difference in this respect between contracting with a firm and with an individual.

MR. HYLAND: Are we contracting with an individual or a professional corporation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, he's not. If he is incorporated, I don't know, but we're contracting with him personally.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Library budget of \$1,124,522 be accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MRS. CRIPPS: We've accepted it, but what's this increase from \$3,500 to \$5,000 for conferences? Is there some special conference this year?

MR. STEFANIUK: Where is that? Could you give me the page number?

MRS. CRIPPS: One hundred and twenty. It must be something special.

MR. STEFANIUK: We're showing an increase of \$1,500 in conference fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to pay the fees that the conferences charge and the costs.

MRS. CRIPPS: I was wondering if it was a special conference or if there is something unusual, maybe a location.

MR. STEFANIUK: Locations could change, and as you know, we have variations in the budgets for travel depending on where a conference is located. Those can vary very dramatically from one year to another. If a conference one year is in Saskatchewan and we only have to cover travel to the neighbouring province, it will vary significantly with a conference that the following year is held in Newfoundland. That's the sort of accounting that takes place here.

MRS. CRIPPS: I see. Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: We base the estimates on precise locations in a given year.

MR. PURDY: That's why, when we go back to Legislative Offices budget, you've seen a decrease. Some of our conferences were closer than '85.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion has been adopted. If there are no further questions on that item, can we go to the next tab?

MR. STEFANIUK: There is no more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. STEFANIUK: The three caucuses have been put on hold until the next meeting. Other than that, the budget is done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're through. Is there any other business anyone wants to raise?

MR. PURDY: The date of the next meeting, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had tentatively agreed the last time that it would be on the 12th. Do you want to leave it that way?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: I move we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 9:48 a.m.]

