

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[9:09 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're coming to order. I believe that the Stefaniuks' kind of nice party last night is now officially over, as of this moment. That was very nice, and our thanks to you and your wife, Bohdan.

Welcome to you all, in terms of a new year that's fast disappearing on us. With regard to the agenda, we have kept tomorrow on notice. We will make that decision later in the day as to whether we need to go the two days. It may well be that we have to come back in about 10 days' to two weeks' time to do some more finishing up on some of the matters. Also, lunch will be served at 11:30. My guess is that we would be adjourned for about an hour at that stage and then come back at 12:30.

The agenda is there. Any changes? All right.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if perhaps we could add under Other Business, one dealing with school pictures?

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Indeed, and any others we can pick up along the way. Okay.

What is your wish with regard to item 2 on the agenda, the minutes of November 24?

MS BARRETT: Do we have a Hansard yet?

MRS. EMPSON: Yes, they were sent out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They were distributed to the offices?

MRS. EMPSON: About a week after the meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is mail service bad over there? If you don't have a copy, give a call back to our secretary, please.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: I move we accept the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion by the member to

accept the minutes. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Business arising from the minutes. I'd advise you all to turn to the follow-up items.

MR. BOGLE: I believe that by the next meeting I'll have a report on this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(b) Presentation of Government Grants, Donations, and Awards, otherwise known as delivering cheques to happy constituents. In the course of this week I had an initial discussion with Dr. Mellon, and as I used the word "initial," we will wait to see what the response will be. But the matter has been raised on a personal, one-on-one basis.

3(c) Office Allocation. This type of office allocation is the one obviously that refers back to the space within the Legislature Building as well as the Annex. Again, I raised that in my meeting with Dr. Mellon as to what were the long-term plans or development about whether or not the office of the Speaker might be requested to look after the allocation of space. As you know, some of the other jurisdictions have the Speaker's office and the Legislative Assembly Office looking after larger portions of space allocation than what we have in practice here in this Legislature. So again, it's just been an initial discussion in that regard.

I understand, Mr. Taylor, that the contract has been awarded with regard to renovations in the Annex for the Liberal space, and you're on the move again.

MR. TAYLOR: Things are moving with lightning speed. We look like we might have offices for our MLAs in the Annex before the year has run out. I got my first word processor three weeks ago — very pleased — after eight months of waiting, so you seem to be shaking something loose there.

MRS. MIROSH: You're lucky. I don't have one.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd still like to have the opportunity to be able to house all our MLAs under the dome, if we choose to, like the other

parties can, so we're still keeping a little pressure on in that regard. But we anticipate that if the government is as successful in reducing staff as they say they are, there might be a lot of space in the building for us. So we're waiting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well. Okay. Space allocation: further pending.

3(d) Members' Expense Allowance. No action person. This is today's members' expense allowance. Is that correct?

MRS. EMPSON: No, this is the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ah, the discussion. Okay, (d) tab.

MR. TAYLOR: Is this speaking about . . .

MS BARRETT: Go to section 1(d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. November 24, the discussion of the matter: moved by Mr. Bogle that it be tabled. Back on November 14, Mr. Stevens, with regarding to the setting of the members' expense allowance. Do we wish to be dealing with this matter at this time or move it further down the agenda to Other Business?

MR. TAYLOR: I think I'd like to move that we leave that in the overall budget discussions.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Thank you.

3(e) Meetings with Other Legislatures.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whose responsibility it is to take initiative on this matter. I understand that we do have dollars budgeted in this year's budget for such a visit, and it was proposed initially that a subcommittee of the committee visit both the House of Commons in Ottawa and the Legislative Assemblies in Ontario and possibly Quebec City, where extensive renovations have recently taken place pertaining to their sound and visual systems. If in fact such a trip is to take place, plans should begin for it very soon, because it seems to me that our window is February. Once we go beyond that, I can't imagine members wanting to be away from the

House, because of caucus activity and preparation for the spring sitting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the blue sheet, section (e). What this committee is dealing with is the fact that the previous committee had put forward the proposition that it would indeed be good for the Members' Services Committee to visit other Legislatures to look at a whole range of services. So money was built into the current fiscal year for that purpose.

You will also remember that this committee, having a careful eye and ear upon fiscal restraints, then decided that the whole committee would not travel and instead requested that there be this smaller subcommittee of this committee to do the various visits that might be entailed. So at that stage of the game we have the minute that was struck for the Chairman and the vice-chairman of the committee, the Member for Cypress-Redcliff, the Member for Edmonton Strathcona, and the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. I don't know if initial discussion went along the line that there might be subvisits other than that the Ottawa visit would be very useful for all and that the committee might then break down into three parts to go visit other Legislatures. In that regard -- I don't know -- has discussion been held with the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon or the Member for Edmonton Strathcona? Do you know? I haven't; you haven't; you haven't. Then I guess this is a . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I think we still have to get over the initial jump to whether or not there would be benefit derived, before we even go. I think the Ottawa thing was thought to be of benefit, but I'm not so sure about the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would strike me that a motion to move this to later in our agenda might be very useful.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in looking at that particular minute, the fact that

. . . the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services be struck, composed of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Mr. Hyland, Mr. Wright and Mr. Taylor, to consider whether the Committee would benefit from visits to other legislatures and report its recommendations to the Special Standing Committee on Members'

Services.

If I read that correctly, this committee was supposed to consider whether it would. Is that correct?

MS BARRETT: That's correct.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the reasons it was suggested "other legislatures" is because once you go to Ottawa, the cost of going somewhere else is minimal in comparison. It's the overnight rather than the extra airfare. I think that was one point I tried to make last time when we talked about touring others. But with saying that, Mr. Chairman, I move that we table it to further on in the meeting.

MS BARRETT: Might I make a friendly amendment to that, Chairman? I'll move to table until we have a report, pending the meeting of the members of the subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Will we take it as a friendly amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment -- of the motion as amended? Opposed? Carried.

MR. HYLAND: I thought that with a friendly amendment it's usually considered that the motion is changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is true, but having immersed myself in Beauchesne for three days nonstop, I'm covering myself in all directions.

MS BARRETT: You were just getting ready for a party and you read Beauchesne for three days? Ooh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

With regard to item 3(f), I believe this was left in the hands of a subcommittee of Mr. Stevens, Mr. Wright, and Mr. Taylor. Mr. Wright is absent. Mr. Stevens, anything to report on this?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Wright hasn't called me. Has he called you?

MR. TAYLOR: I talked with Mr. Wright, and not knowing too much about computers, we appointed people from our staffs who are familiar with computers to meet and are supposed to get somebody from your staff too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we're looking for a friendly interface?

MR. TAYLOR: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think we should look very carefully at this. As far as purchase of computer equipment, probably we should look at an alternative of renting or leasing. The fact that these pieces of equipment are being changed so fast and outdated -- I think we'd be better served by leasing, in order that we could update and have the most modern equipment available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. There is input for the committee.

I notice that the way the motion of November 14 read, we don't seem to have established who the chairman of the committee is, although my recollection is that it was the Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Wright.

MR. HYLAND: Along with what Mr. Campbell has said, Mr. Chairman, as I remember, why we wanted this committee to do something fairly quickly was the fact that other years, if there were allotments left in certain constituency allowances, MLAs used that on several occasions to purchase computer equipment at the end of the year. I thought we were after a policy so that if equipment was purchased or whatever, there would be some compatibility so that if we did certain things in the future, that wouldn't necessarily become obsolete. Was that the wrong understanding, or have I...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That certainly has happened in times past.

MR. KOWALSKI: Really, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this whole motion is essentially the word Mr. Hyland just talked about: "compatibility." We've got the possibility of 83 constituency offices throughout the province and three caucus offices here, Legislative

Assembly. If everybody's going out and buying different kinds of equipment and the equipment can't talk to one another, then I think that perhaps we could do better. We've discussed this for some period of time now. Essentially it is to see how we make it all compatible. That's all. If I have a machine in Barrhead, why doesn't it just talk to the machine here in Edmonton? I don't want to talk to the one in Edmonton Highlands. There are systems and security systems to ensure that that happens. But that's the purpose of it all. Of course, the question of leasing or purchasing fits into that as a secondary issue.

MR. TAYLOR: We did have that amount of initial meeting, to get the information that we could possibly make things compatible with what the government has now, but the government doesn't know what the hell they're going to have a year from now. In other words, there are so many changes that trying to match a marriage up for the next number of years ahead looks like it's going to be very, very difficult because of continual changes, as Jack says, in the whole computer technology. So although you match everything today, three months from now you may -- because of the government's changes in the central computer, it could throw you out again. So it may not be that easy. But we've gone that far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Will members...

MR. TAYLOR: We're going to try to stop any unauthorized liaisons between computers. It's bad enough between MLAs.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I certainly hope so.

Mr. Chairman, it seems the committee hasn't really moved very quickly on some of these matters. They are a subcommittee of this committee, and one should expect some performance.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's like all affairs of the heart. You have to be careful as you move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That's sufficient for this discussion for today. We look forward to Mr. Stevens and Mr. Taylor being able to get hold of Edmonton Strathcona when he gets back next week -- I think it's something like that. If

you would, please, gentlemen. Perhaps, too, you could consult in the course of the day as to when might be convenient dates for you to be able to meet with Mr. Wright. Thank you.

Universal gasoline credit card, 3(g). Our understanding is that it should be resolved by March of this year. That's 1987, Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. We don't want it to drag out like some of the other issues. So that will continue as a pending.

Item 4 on the agenda: the approval of Members' Services Committee orders. It is the understanding of the Chair that this is basically pro forma, having had the action carried out as directed by this committee earlier.

4(a), Members' Expense Allowance. Here we are, back to the expense allowance. The advice to the Chair is that we can do all five in one motion, or you can do them one at a time. The motion, Member for Barrhead.

MR. KOWALSKI: I just want to raise a clarification point with respect to order MSC 3/86. I'm sure committee members will appreciate that I'm not trying to be pedantic, but in the past we have somehow spent a great deal of time dotting i's and crossing t's to ensure that everything is quite appropriate. I would just draw to your attention the wording in item 3(a) where it says:

in respect to the periods and the commencement of chapter 20, Statutes of Alberta 1986, to November 30, 1986, a maximum of 24 days in any year.

I certainly hope that the meaning of that is not the calendar year 1986, because we had a unique experience in 1986 where the 24 days covered the period April 1, 1985, through to March 31, 1986, and then we began on April 1, 1986, and had another mechanism that went to May 10 or 12, 1986. Then we had another mechanism that went from May 10 or 12 through to November 30, 1986, and then we have a new mechanism that starts on December 1, 1986.

In the past I have chastised some members for being rather pedantic, and perhaps I'm being pedantic, but I want to make sure that the clarification here is what we're talking about, is the way we wanted it before. If somebody comes along, they're liable to say, "Each member is only eligible for a maximum of 24 days from January 1, 1986, through to December 31, 1986," and that certainly is not

the intent of it. I know that isn't the intent.

I apologize, but the last five weeks I have spent a great deal of time on my back looking at the ceiling and looking at some of these things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's nothing to apologize about.

MR. TAYLOR: I think it has improved your outlook.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We're obviously going to do these one at a time, folks, so we're on 4(a). The Member for Taber-Warner. Any others?

Hon. member, I think indeed that's a point well made. The consensus of the committee is indeed that interpretation, but I'll raise the matter with legal counsel. This order is in effect even if we do not give the approval today, is it not? Or we can hold this until later in the day.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest that we could approve it. I was prepared to move the motion, noting in the motion the understanding that Mr. Kowalski just went through. It's the same understanding we all have, so if there is any question, at least it's in the minutes.

MR. CAMPBELL: A clarification on point 3(b): effective December 1, 1986, at any time when the Legislative Assembly is not sitting, a maximum of 10 days in any month.

I thought there was supposed to be a kind of rider in there that you could claim for some days if the Legislative Assembly was sitting in any particular month, whether it be prorated or however.

MR. STEVENS: That's not how that reads. That's not a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Banff-Cochrane, "At any time when the Legislature is not . . ."

MR. STEVENS: I think the way the Parliamentary Counsel has written it meets the intent of the motion that we discussed, Jack. It's a maximum of 10 days in any month which

stands alone. If the Legislature sits on March 16, then prior to that period of time, a maximum of 10 days, based on the claim, would be paid. If the Legislature sat on March 6, the maximum number of days that could be claimed would be five. That's my understanding. So I think this meets the thing we discussed, Jack. Any other way of doing it I think just complicates it. I don't think it's a problem, Jack.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. I just thought I'd bring it to the attention of the committee.

MS BARRETT: Could we take a moment please, Mr. Chairman, just to review the minutes? I believe this item was discussed thoroughly and for some reason it was concluded that it was redundant to prorate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The understanding is that you can claim 10 days in every month. I believe the Member for Banff-Cochrane is correct in the interpretation of it.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, this meets the requirements of the subcommittee that met that day. Mr. Wright and I met, and Mr. Wright agreed with the wording of this.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask, Mr. Chairman, if anybody has a copy of the Hansard of that meeting, not just the minutes, because I believe the explanation is not completely covered in the minutes. I believe it would be if we had Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, ladies and gentleman, this meeting is hoisted for five minutes so someone can go and find a copy of that.

[The committee recessed from 9:36 a.m. to 9:41 a.m.]

MS BARRETT: To answer the question put by the Member for Barrhead, it was his intention that the motion itself not be confused by the matter of months in which we are formally in session or not, given that the record shows he pointed out that members from out of town would want to be present several days before we commence a session in any event, and there is a natural maximum of 10 days. I think that

clarifies the problem, as shown in the Hansard reporting of the meeting of November 24, 1986, between pages 237 and 239.

Thank you, Wayne Kondro.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So Members' Services Order 3/86, section 3(b), is then clarified to everyone's satisfaction. Right? Thank you.

With regard to 3(a), we believe that covers the concerns as raised by the Member for Barrhead. The legal counsel is home sick today; we're calling him nevertheless to make certain what . . . I think the effective date to cover all that then . . . "Chapter 20, Statutes of Alberta, 1986" we assume means -- that doesn't cover it either. It's got to cover either the current fiscal year, April 1, or it's the commencement of this Legislature.

MR. STEFANIUK: Twenty-four days in any year, which refers to a fiscal year.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, would this be helpful? Prior to the election there would have been a Members' Services Committee or an Act or both that would have covered the period of time up until the dissolution. Would there not have been?

AN HON. MEMBER: That was covered in the Act.

MR. STEVENS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would cover a year.

MR. STEVENS: Exactly. Then from the period of the commencement of chapter 20, there was another order or whatever in effect. I think what the Parliamentary Counsel has done in that (a) is to take that into account. I read it as not being a problem.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I think the order as it stands is appropriate, given that item 3(b) very clearly would in almost any interpretation supersede any assumptions that might go under 3(a), just by having been stipulated. I'm certain that it stands legal as it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's absolutely no doubt in anybody's mind what we

want and what the intent of all this is. That's clear. It's in Hansard; this is all recorded. We have a few little words here that we have to get resolved with some lawyer. I'm sure that can all take place and we can go on merrily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. We should really have a motion, so we can go along. Cypress-Redcliff, you're making the motion for approval?

MR. HYLAND: Well, I was going to ask . . . Okay, I'll make a motion for approval. Whether I agree or disagree with it doesn't matter. Can I speak to my motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed. But if you're going to disagree with your own motion, I think I'll . . . No.

MR. HYLAND: I want to get it on the table, and I may not disagree with it, depending on the answer I get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you certainly have our attention. What's the wording of your motion?

MR. HYLAND: That we approve Members' Services Order MSC 3/86. My question on the motion -- I'm just looking at Bill 54. If I read it right, we did take out the \$75 a day amount when the Legislature is sitting. I just hope that's covered in the first part of the Members' Services order, because in the last part, where it says "when the Legislative Assembly is not sitting" . . . The only concern I have is that we make sure we don't end up and find out that because we had it pulled out of the Act so we could set it according to what we feel is right -- that we don't end up with somebody coming along and finding out, once we get into the Legislature, that we don't have any amount set in there for living allowance when the Legislature is sitting, yet we've covered it when the Legislature isn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a difference of opinion on this. Mr. Stevens believes that was covered and is now checking the transcript. That would not inhibit our giving approval to this. If indeed your concern is accurate and the

hole exists, we'll cure that before session. Mr. Stevens, any luck?

MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry; the Hansard I looked at is for the last meeting. I gave the report in the meeting before, and I don't have access to that here.

MRS. MIROSH: I have it.

MR. HYLAND: Can I change my motion to say that we accept the Members' Services order with the two understandings? It would be too loosey-goosey?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The motion we have -- let us deal with item 4(a), which is giving approval to the order in front of us. That does not preclude our then going on to deal with the issue now raised by Mr. Hyland. It will help clear up some of our deadwood. All those in favour of the motion for approval, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you. Mr. Stevens, I leave you with looking through that record, and we'll come back to it.

4(b), Members' Services Committee Order 4/86, the Transportation and Administration Services Amendment Order No. 4, where the administrative services order is amended to add the

reimbursement for the cost of taxi travel in the City of Edmonton and surrounding areas, subject to the submission of supporting receipts.

That order is effective November 24. What is your pleasure with regard to this order?

MR. KOWALSKI: If you just want a formal motion, we've already approved this. I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

4(c), Members' Group Plans Amendment Order No. 1. The document is three pages plus the schedule with regard to the extended health insurance provisions; benefits after termination of members' insurance; extended health, drug benefit; supplementary hospital benefit; and supplementary health care benefit, if members choose to enroll themselves in certain aspects of the plan. What is your pleasure with regard to this?

MR. HYLAND: I move we accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion for approval by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

The Chair has noticed the communication between the Member for Banff-Cochrane and others on that \$75 a day.

MS BARRETT: I was just going to point it out.

MR. STEVENS: Would you like me to go back to that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry I didn't have this at my fingertips. It's our meeting of November 14. At that time I gave a report on the various matters that, by Bill 54 and the Legislative Assembly Act as amended, were given to this committee for determination. With respect to expenses, only three matters were referred to the committee. One was the actual amount. That's now covered in item 1, which is \$7,508 a year. We agreed earlier that we would come back to that later in this meeting or when we discuss budget. That is one matter that has been provided to the committee by the Bill.

The other matters are two sections, and I'll be brief. One is temporary residence costs or allowances of \$75 per day for non-Edmonton MLAs to do official business here. We agreed, though, to maintain that at \$75. The other matters are to do with living expenses prescribed by this committee for days of legislative committee work. Lastly -- and we've dealt with that already -- was the 24-day matter.

So we were never given the authority to review the matter Mr. Hyland raised earlier. That has been retained in the . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: And that was made clear at that meeting, Mr. Chairman. If Mr. Stevens would go further into the minutes, he'd note that that was really clarified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: That we don't set the \$75?

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I think the matter is actually fully clarified under



subsection (e), in which the order MSC 7/86 states that "the living expenses in connection with service on a committee" — it doesn't specify what committees — "shall be \$75 per day." Given that all MLAs are members of the Public Affairs Committee, doesn't that just cover the whole thing? No? Why not?

MR. STEVENS: Only if that committee met.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that's only that committee.

MS BARRETT: I see. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the understanding here is that the members are indeed covered for \$75 a day, as in time past, and it's covered in the Act. We will double-check after the meeting.

MR. HYLAND: In my reading of the Act, it pulls that \$75 right out of the Act. It says: if prescribed by Members' Services.

MS BARRETT: I think you're right, Alan.

MR. HYLAND: Just in the one section is all it pulls it out. If it pulls it out — and that section in the Legislative Assembly Act covered all sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, that's the end of discussion on this topic. We're turning ourselves into barroom lawyers, and I will get a legal opinion given to us. If it is defective, we will have a meeting before session to make sure it is in place. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4(d): MSC Order 6/86, Members' Group Life Insurance Amendment Order No. 1. A motion in this regard?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rocky Mountain House moves approval. It's basically a two-page document. Group life insurance: the order is effective December 12. Again, this is the one which was circulated in a package to all members for them to indicate there what their choice of option was. Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion for approval please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried.

MR. STEVENS: May I make a request, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. STEVENS: The material that has been circulated to all members is excellent. I'm sure each member who has had an opportunity to study it — some may not — will be looking into their own situations. May I suggest a follow-up administrative memo or call? The reason I raise that, there are members who are out of the country or province, and I know it has happened in the past that a member will be away. And the date is very clear.

MR. TAYLOR: Is there a percentage of signup that has to be done to carry the day?

MR. STEVENS: It's on the optional plans.

MR. TAYLOR: There doesn't seem to be a contract...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our understanding is that 20 members have signed up thus far, and we had put it in place for follow-up from the department; that is, a phone call to the secretaries of all members. It's up to the secretaries to go and hunt down their member no matter what part of the globe they are in. That's set up to commence on Monday. Thank you.

In addition to that, since we have at least one of them present, a letter went from my office to all of the whips to remind them that it was up to them to do a little whipping, encouragement of the troops. Okay?

Item 4(e), MSC Order 7/86 with respect to "living expenses in connection with service on a committee shall be \$75 per day." That was one that we did have to clarify. Effective date of that was November 24.

MR. STEVENS: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is for legal clarification. Moved by the Member for Banff-



Cochrane.

MR. HYLAND: You work with committees, sometimes the committee travels, and I think of the trust fund. Certain hotels at certain rates would exceed the \$75. The normal practice is then that the Legislative Assembly has picked it up. It is billed directly to the Legislative Assembly, and most often the food bill in with it. It may exceed \$75 a day, but they are picked up because that's what it costs. Does this prevent that from happening now, or should there be the phrase "or other expenses unless otherwise accepted"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pretty good barroom lawyer down there near Foremost.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, this really is intended for members who are in the Edmonton area on committee business. When the committee travels throughout Nepal or China or even goes to Cypress, then that's a different matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member, you're correct. You're both correct. It is indeed the understanding of being in Edmonton, but it doesn't say that. It's also related back to the other \$75 day issue.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, we've been here an hour, and so far we've done absolutely nothing other than go through things that have always been in place before. Order MSC 7/86 doesn't change anything that's happened in the last seven years that I've been a Member of the Legislative Assembly. It simply says that at that time you got \$75 a day if you served on the committee till 1987. We're just saying that it's still \$75 per day. I served as the chairman of a committee for four years and approved living expenses in connection with service on a committee when committee members of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund had to undertake a two-day tour that came about as a result of a motion of the committee to visit irrigation headworks in southern Alberta and they submitted expense accounts to me. All of them were approved; all of them were accepted. That was part of living expenses in connection with service on a committee at \$75 per day.

If this committee were to choose to meet in Calgary and we all had to go to Calgary because

the committee agreed to go to have this Members' Services Committee meeting in Calgary, all hon. members would submit a claim for \$75. There would not be a debate as to whether or not we had to change Members' Services Committee Order 7/86. If we choose to go to Cypress, that's where the meeting would be held. We're being very, very pedantic here in a bunch of things which just — it's 10 o'clock in the morning.

MR. STEFANIUK: If I may offer for clarification. The amounts had previously been specified in the legislation. Bill 54 removed the amounts from the legislation and placed the decision as to amounts in the hands of the committee. The committee very simply, at its meetings in November, stated that it wanted the same amounts to be retained. Therefore, an order is required in order to put that into place, but nothing has changed in effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay? The motion for approval as moved by the Member for Banff-Cochrane. Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you very much.

Item 5 on the agenda, '87-88 budget estimates.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, during the last meeting we had on Monday, November 24, I proposed a motion which would result in the budget allocations for the nonexecutive Members of the Legislative Assembly to remain as they were in 1986-87 as approved by this committee. After some discussion it was suggested that we would be very well advised, in fact, to come back with reports so that we would be informed when we went into detail on that motion. I would like to revive that motion at this point so we can open discussion on the debate with respect to the caucus allocations, otherwise known as nonexecutive council budgets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you be good enough to quote the paragraph number of that so we can all look at what the motion indeed is?

MS BARRETT: Item 86.190, coming under item 4 on November 24, 1986:

Moved by Ms Barrett that the 1987-88 budget estimates for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be approved as presented.

Discussion followed, et cetera.

MR. TAYLOR: What number is that again?

MS BARRETT: In your minutes it is minute 86.190.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That also means your estimate book . . . All right. That's the motion that is before us.

MS BARRETT: Now if I could, I'd like to speak to that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That one was withdrawn.

MS BARRETT: Yes, it was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this now becomes a new motion as moved by yourself with the same wording:

That the 1987-88 budget estimates for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be approved as presented.

MS BARRETT: Correct. Thank you.

In speaking to the motion, it won't surprise members of this committee that my primary concern, of course, would be with respect to opposition caucuses and the support that we receive, if I may speak in the "we." Particularly, given that the overall amount of expenditure compared to the overall budget as approved last year in the Assembly for the operation of the government constituted some .0025 percent; that is, the overall caucus budgets including government members.

With respect to the Official Opposition, that figure declines dramatically; it becomes .0085 percent of the budget passed in 1986-1987 for the operation of the government. I think with respect to the cornerstone foundation, so to speak, of our democracy, that this is a very reasonable percentage of expenditure given the responsibility of all MLAs and given the work that we do. The support that has gone with those figures, I think, has been exemplary from

all caucuses, and at this point I can see no reason that we would want to adjust that, as I say, given the fundamental nature of our parliamentary democracy, which does allow for a number of different perspectives presented by a number of different MLAs who form caucuses, as we know.

I think it's appropriate in that tradition that we uphold that particular budget at a zero percent; in other words, that the presentation constitutes no increase, which we may call zero percent increase or zero percent cut. We are, in fact, facing what would amount to approximately a 3.5 to 4 percent cut, based on projections of the CPI for 1987-88. So if we take inflation into account, it would constitute an effective cut of some 3.5 to 4 percent, which I think is reasonable, given the current economic climate in this province and in this country.

I have spoken to my motion.

MR. HYLAND: Just a question to Ms Barrett. The motion you presented isn't quite the same as the previous motion, is it? You're now just talking about the caucus budgets, not the total Legislative Assembly budget.

MS BARRETT: No. Actually, my particular reference, my particular concern, is with respect to the caucus budgets, and that was why I wanted to speak to the motion. But the intent of the motion is that the Leg. Assembly budgets be approved as presented in our estimates book for 1987-88, overall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's the interpretation of the motion by the Chair.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have to speak against the motion presented by the hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Excuse me, hon. member, for a moment. I'm sorry I interject, but we have a number of subsidiary conversations.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry for mumbling away in the corner here, but I'm trying to find the total budget. This is . . .

MS BARRETT: It's in the estimates book.

MR. TAYLOR: In the estimates book?

MR. CAMPBELL: He can work off this one.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whoa, folks. Just a minute here. The Chair has already recognized the Member for Barrhead. A question has been interposed by the Member for Banff-Cochrane. I have another conversation going between Glenmore and Little Bow. If I may just sort of ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. My apologies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you obviously have input, too. That's later. A quick question, Cochrane?

MR. STEVENS: A quick question, Mr. Chairman. Did you have a proposal as Chairman for how we would plan to deal with this, or are we right into it now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're right into it. The motion is the global budget. I've got the officers of the various personnel of the Assembly standing by to come in if you want to ask questions of the department side of it. The initial discussion obviously is with regard to caucuses. That's why I said we might be here for two days. The Member for Barrhead, please.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As I understand Ms Barrett, she has made a motion that basically says that the 1987-88 budget estimates presented for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta should be approved as presented. The documentation provided to us shows that as of December 18, 1986, the request being made by the Official Opposition is for a 6.9 percent increase, to change dollar figures from \$879,491 to \$940,000, shows — I don't know where you can get a correction.

MS BARRETT: That's based on forecasts on the prorated year, Ken. There's no change. These are exactly as approved at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, folks. Perhaps the answers will come to the questions after all the questions have been raised.

MR. KOWALSKI: The second point, Mr. Chairman, shows that the requests being made by the Liberal opposition are for an 11.5 percent increase, \$340,860 to \$380,000. It shows that the percentage increase being requested by the Representative opposition is .3 percent, from \$219,437 to \$220,000. The request being made from government members is a 3.5 percent increase, from \$1,353,094 to \$1,400,000. That's the information provided December 18, 1986, via the office of the Legislative Assembly.

If my hon. colleague indicates that in her perception that signifies no increase, I have to suggest that it appears to me there is a request for an increase. I can't support it, because I think the important purpose of this Members' Services Committee is to go through each one of the requests in terms of the elements advanced to us and prepared for us and given to this particular committee, and we have a responsibility to look at each of these items. I, for one, want people to know that I don't support the request being put forward by the government members for a 3.5 percent increase as outlined in here, and I think we have a responsibility to take a good, hard look at all of the funding proposals.

The government certainly has to go through it. As a minister of the Crown, I have more blood on my back as a result of my trip before Treasury Board than anybody else in this room will have, and I think that's a responsibility we all have now, to take a look at that in terms of what we have to do for the 1987-88 budget estimates. The Legislative Assembly should not be exempt from that kind of an [inaudible].

We are in a difficult economic environment. I just can't really see people coming forward and asking for increases of 11.5 percent, 6.9 percent, or the like, and I have to oppose the motion put forward by the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edmonton Highlands, in response.

MS BARRETT: I'd like to refresh the memories of the members of this committee with respect to the basis upon which the budget allocations

for government members, Official Opposition, Liberal opposition, and Representative opposition were struck in the summer of 1986 and approved.

After some debate, there was agreement that a formula ought to be used. That formula, as presented, came to a support package on the basis of all MLAs who are not in Executive Council, of \$40,000 per MLA. That came to \$1.4 million for government members. It came to \$640,000, for example, for the Official Opposition, having 16 members. Sixteen times \$40,000; that's what that comes to. And similarly, it would have come to \$160,000 for the Liberal opposition and \$80,000 for the Representative opposition.

Under a separate motion considered and approved, we then determined that on top of those basic allowances, the leaders' offices of the individual caucuses ought to be entitled to specific funding to go along with the roles that the leaders and their offices must perform. That figure came to \$300,000 in the instance of the Official Opposition, and from that point it was worked out that it would be a different figure for the Liberal opposition leader and a different figure yet for the Representative opposition.

If you do the calculations exactly as we had done in that meeting -- and I believe I have the minutes -- you will find that the exact budgets are as presented. The exact budgets came to \$1.4 million for government members; \$940,000 for the Official Opposition, which is \$640,000 plus \$300,000; \$380,000 for the Liberal opposition; and \$220,000 for the Representative opposition.

I propose that what we're seeing here is a difference in the prorating of the budgets in terms of the estimates and the forecasts, because some time had already gone by when we approved these budgets, and that that is what's shown in these so-called increases. In fact, I can present to this committee the exact formulation and the motion which did pass, which called for exactly those figures for the 1986-87 fiscal year, which in my resolution I am asking for continued support for. There is not, in fact, any increase proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First, the Clerk has input on the pro rata issue, and then the permission of the committee if the Member for Little Bow wishes to speak.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then Taber-Warner. Thank you.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, when the committee made its decision to establish caucus budgets by virtue of formula, those budgets were prorated to reflect the portion of the year which remained at the time when the decision was made. Consequently...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I'm sorry, gentlemen, but I know some of us are more soft-spoken than others. Perhaps I could invite the Clerk to speak a bit more loudly so that we might listen to this pro rata issue, because it does affect all of us. Thank you. I'm sorry.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, when the decision was made to establish caucus budgets via a certain formula, the establishment of those budgets was prorated for the period of the fiscal year which remained at the time those formulas were established. Now that same formula has been applied to a full year's operation for the 1987-88 fiscal year, and the comparison is made with a year in which the new formula applied to only a portion of the year and a previously established budget applied to the other portion. That's why changes are in fact being shown. I believe Ms Barrett very accurately defined the situation as it stands relative to the decision that had been taken by this committee earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we're caught in the matter that when you supply percentages -- it's the same business that instead of doing a raw-figure increase on somebody's salary and you deal in terms of percentages, then you get a bit of a distortion appearing.

MR. TAYLOR: This is on a point of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Within a committee I can't truly recognize that. Sorry. But the Chair is willing to have Westlock-Sturgeon follow Little Bow if Taber-Warner is willing to yield position. I get a nod, so it'll be Little Bow and then Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I just agree

with that analysis that was done. That's accurate.

The second comment I'd have is that what I felt we established during that initial debate was a base from which we could work as members. I felt we had gone through the gymnastics in 1986 as to what the base was and that that would hold for this term of the Legislature. If the government has given other directives to us, then we have to consider that, but my understanding was that that was the base from which we'd work, that we were through with that argument and could get down to business and get to work as legislators. So I hope we follow through with that and not go back and try to readjust and go through a number of gymnastics with those figures again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the base figures.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The base per-member figures.

MR. TAYLOR: My comment, and maybe almost a question to the Clerk, is that because some of the media are present and because our hon. minister with one leg used figures of 6.9 and 11.5, I think it's wise to point out that it was prorated and done on a straight factor as if the Liberals and NDP had been here in the same numbers from the beginning of the year; the increase would be the same as the Representative opposition, whose numbers were the same before and after. In other words, the increase is 0.3 percent if you put it on the actual basis of the same number of MLAs. So the number that is apparently a high percentage increase is due to the fact that we were existent in much fewer numbers before May 8 than we were after. Is that right?

MS BARRETT: No, that ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Can I make a comment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner, then Edmonton Highlands.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I'm asking a question of the Clerk. There's something screwy. I don't know how the hell we can be 11.5 percent higher than we were when we weren't here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about 100 percent?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the Liberal opposition's budget was established on the basis of the new formula, but it was prorated for that period of time which then remained in the fiscal year. So what we have as the proposed 1987-88 budget here for the Liberal caucus is being compared to a budget for a partial year and not a full year, because the caucus did not exist during that entire previous fiscal year.

MR. TAYLOR: No matter what the desire of the minister is for our disappearance before the end of the year, the fact is that we're likely to be around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; I didn't hear any of those comments today from the minister.

MR. TAYLOR: He's implying it by his mathematics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think you can construe that. If you want to pull out the Hansard record after this, we'll worry about it. Taber-Warner.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, on a point of ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I can't recognize that.

MR. KOWALSKI: ... personal privilege here. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; no such thing exists within committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Come on, you guys. Tony and Wayne understand it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would be only too happy to recognize the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, who has both legs functioning. Taber-Warner, followed by Barrhead.

MS BARRETT: No, Highlands. I had my hand up first, a long time ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; you can't argue with the Chair. I see him and then I see you.

MS BARRETT: You nodded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not having this challenge of the Chair. Thank you very much.

MS BARRETT: Whatever happened to the take-a-number system? Whatever happened to fairness? I had my hand up a long time ago; before Nick did, in fact. Please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Member for Edmonton Highlands. I've seen you a number of other times earlier, and I do recognize you. Taber-Warner has been deflected at least twice previously, so I don't want Edmonton Highlands to feel too out of sorts at having been deflected.

MS BARRETT: I think division care package would be appropriate.

MR. BOGLE: On the other hand, Chairman, Taber-Warner is so delighted that the Chair recognizes the correct name of the constituency that we don't mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Give my regards to Milk River.

MR. BOGLE: I'd like to come back to the motion, but before commenting on it, I want to ensure that I clearly understand the intent of the mover's remarks. Is the intent that we accept all the elements in the Legislative Assembly budget and freeze those numbers, based on the current fiscal year's numbers, or are you merely addressing the four caucuses?

MS BARRETT: No. If you would like me to make a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. The Chair does recognize Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Hallelujah!

In response to the question from the member from Milk River . . .

MRS. MIROSH: Taber-Warner.

MS BARRETT: I know.

Let me suggest that although my motion is revived in wording identical to that which I proposed at our last meeting, as I've said before in so moving, my particular concern is with the caucus budgetary supply. If you'd like, I'm

perfectly prepared to make a friendly amendment to my own motion, which would be that we'd just consider the four caucus budgets at first. If that suits you, I'll do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From the point of view of the Chair, perhaps we should then be going through this after general discussion. What's the will of the committee, to do it either caucus by caucus, on a one-at-a-time basis, or globally, which would just be the caucus budgets?

MS BARRETT: I'm willing to amend my motion to caucus budgets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we're just seeking advice. You would do the Liberals, the Representatives, the NDP, and the government members together.

MR. TAYLOR: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, but to me "global" means the whole \$15.6 million budget; it doesn't mean just the members' budget. I think we should debate the whole \$15.6 million, then move down to specifics. We're talking about a caucus budget of \$1.5 million, which is only 10 percent of the whole budget.

MR. R. SPEAKER: It's \$16.3 million, Nick.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry; \$16.3 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other input on the point as to how you want to go about your procedures?

MR. TAYLOR: If I may speak, then, I think the way to look at any budget — and this is no different. You look at the global budget and decide first of all what point you're working to. What's our omega point? Is it a 5 percent cut or a 10 percent cut? Then go back through the different items to see where we can make our cuts or whether we take the whole global budget.

MR. BOGLE: Are we now dealing with the friendly amendment as proposed by the mover of the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with that, because I'm asking the direction of the committee. So we don't have you distorted,

Edmonton Highlands, we take the friendly amendment to read . . . You really can't make an amendment to your own motion. You have to withdraw the original motion with the unanimous consent . . .

MR. TAYLOR: No, her original was all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MS BARRETT: I'm not prepared to withdraw my motion, Mr. Chairman. I'm prepared to vote for a friendly amendment in a certain direction, but I will not withdraw my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Then as the motion stands, the member is recommending that there be no change in the budget for all the elements of the Legislative Assembly.

MS BARRETT: Correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: The \$16.3 million?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: I must speak against that motion. I cannot understand how the member could, in light of the financial circumstances within which we find ourselves . . . Concerns have been expressed not only by all members of this committee but by most of the Assembly. Proposals were put forward by the Speaker that his budget be reduced by 5.3 percent. We have the legislative interns' budget proposed reduction of 2.7 percent; Alberta Hansard, 5.1 percent; and the Legislature Library by 5.5 percent. How can we ignore that and just blindly go ahead and give everyone exactly the same budget they had in the last fiscal year? I think that would be irresponsible. Therefore, I am speaking against the motion as proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then one assumes that later on there may or may not be amendments, or else there would be additional motions. Other discussion with regard to the main motion?

All right. Just to note that we are allowing a fair amount of discussion, and I would rather that others come in prior to Edmonton Highlands because then we might technically

get -- the Chair doesn't want to be challenged that technically that's the summation on the motion.

MS BARRETT: I'm actually trying to raise my hand to provide a point of information. Does that help matters a bit? I have the minutes of July 29 right in front of me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. But the Chair will see it as a point of order -- all right, a point of information, as long as the other members are willing to allow this not to be seen as being the summation on the motion. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Items 86.102 and 86.103, July 29, 1986:

Moved by Mr. Bogle that the 1986-87 revised Legislative Assembly estimates be amended to provide a per-Member allotment for non-Executive Member of \$40,000, recognizing two members from the Representative Opposition for a total of \$80,000, four Members from the Liberal Opposition for a total of \$160,000, 16 members from the New Democrat Opposition for a total of \$640,000, and 35 Government Members for a total of \$1,400,000, retroactive to May 9, 1986, for all Members.

The difference, as Bohdan explained, will of course be the time lapse between the commencement of the fiscal year and May 9. The first one was carried unanimously.

The second motion:

Moved by Ms. Barrett that the 1986-87 revised Legislative Assembly estimates be amended to provide Opposition caucuses allowances of \$140,000 for the Representative Opposition office, \$220,000 for the Liberal Opposition office, and \$300,000 for the Official Opposition office, retroactive to May 9, 1986, with the totals for each caucus (including the per-Member allotment) to be spent at the discretion of each caucus.

If you add those figures, there is absolutely no difference between those figures and what is being presented for those caucuses on the first



page under Leg. Assembly estimates summary in the estimates book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That was with regard to . . .

MRS. MIROSH: That's no different from what . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Member for Calgary Glenmore. I'll recognize you in a moment.

That indeed is accurate with regard to the revised budget for '86-87. That keeps it in context with regard to the '87-88 discussion, right? Calgary Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: I'm confused as to what new information has been presented here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was just a point of information and a reminder, I guess.

MRS. MIROSH: You already had said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: It was still a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Chair has exercised a fair amount of latitude with regard to speaking to the motion before us. Any other comments with regard to the motion?

MR. TAYLOR: Speaking on the motion, I can sense where the Member for Edmonton Highlands is coming from, and I'm inclined to support it. What I'm bothered about, Mr. Chairman, is the way you've set up this budget, the way the changes are put in. The Clerk has already pointed out the fact that the Liberal opposition appears to be high because there were no Liberals before May. But the other side of that same coin means that the government members' increase of only 3.5 is grossly understated in view of the fact that there are a lot less government members than there were before May. In other words, I think we're playing with not a "stacked" deck but a deck that doesn't have all the cards in here when we start to compare percentages.

We're showing the government members as a 3.5 percent increase. Now, I'm not an ace in math without my \$10 Woolworth computer, but I really think that on a per MLA basis the

government members have had an increase of around 14 percent, not 3.5 percent, if you take what they had before May. In other words, I think the information we're operating from is wrong, period. Consequently, that's one of the things . . .

MRS. MIROSH: You just had it explained to you.

MR. TAYLOR: I know it was explained to me, but the fact that these percentages are sitting here and we're debating them is wrong.

MRS. MIROSH: No, they're not.

MR. TAYLOR: It's much easier to debate a budget if your numbers are right. I agree that it was explained, but the numbers haven't been changed.

MRS. MIROSH: We're looking at the global . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may follow in a moment, Calgary Glenmore, but you can't interrupt. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm almost to the point where I don't know whether it's tabling or whether we should take some time, but whoever is handy with a computer should run through that percentage change on the per member basis when it comes to the caucuses and pro rate in May rather than the present system, firstly.

Secondly, let's go to another area when we're speaking on the topic of cutting budgets. I think that to cut the budget in the research staff of either the backbench MLAs or the Official or Liberal or Representative opposition is a retrograde step. In other words, it's a little like cutting the expense of driving your car by taking a wheel off. That's the very control we have on the ministers, the very control we have on the executive arm of this government. I might remind that if the expenses have gone wild, it has been in that area and not in the area of opposition.

To cripple the criticism, the research that is so necessary to bring into line what's been going on in government seems absolutely counterproductive. I just don't understand the procedure at all. To group the opposition budgets of the Liberal, Representative, and Official and even the back bench — now, I'll

agree the back bench has as a research facility the staffs, diminished somewhat, admittedly, of the government. We don't. If you take away our staff, I'm sure the Minister of the Environment, kind as he is, would not loan me his researchers.

The point is that you are talking about cutting a budget in the very essence of what makes democracy go, and to lump it — first of all, to compound the issue by having a set of numbers in here that is not representative and, secondly, to come out and suggest that a \$15 million budget can be brought in line by criticizing the measly \$1.5 million that has been allotted the Official, Liberal, and Representative doesn't make sense. Therefore, I find myself hating to support the motion, because I like to think that some cuts should be made, but I don't think they should be in the watchdogs of the Legislature. But I would support the motion in lack of all else.

MS BARRETT: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're on the last go-around. I have a call of the question, but I also have recognized Barrhead, Calgary Glenmore, and Banff-Cochrane on my list and summation by Edmonton Highlands.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think what's important is to recognize that the motion presented by Ms. Barrett basically asks for complete confirmation of the summary of the budget estimates. I'm looking at page 1 of the budget document, which basically talks about \$16,368,246, without any debate. I said at the beginning that I would speak against that, and I want to make it very clear that I want to speak against that.

Hearing part of the debate that's gone on in the last few minutes, I am troubled by one inconsistency in the information we're talking about. My colleague from Westlock-Sturgeon just talked a few minutes ago about information and the difficulty to debate information when it doesn't seem to be as clear to you as possible. I was told — I heard a little earlier anyway — that the document we have in front of us looks at a 1986-87 forecast from May 9 to March 31, 1987, as read into the Hansard by the Member for Edmonton Highlands a few minutes ago, and then prorated for 12 months on the basis of the next year, so it would be just a bit different. If

that is true — and it was confirmed by the Clerk a few minutes ago in this meeting that that was true; he has now gone — then how does it work out when you look at the Representative opposition budget of \$219,437 to cover the period May 9, 1986, to March 31, 1987, to see an increase by \$563 for the 1987-88 fiscal year? If the information confirmed here a few minutes ago by the Clerk to be true is so, why don't those figures then judge accordingly in terms of the changes? It shows an 11.5 percent increase, from \$340,860 to \$380,000, for the Liberal opposition and an Official Opposition increase of 6.9 percent, from \$879,491 to \$940,000. If that is true — and Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to have that confirmed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll have to have you speak again when the Clerk returns to the room. He's at the moment checking with the Parliamentary Counsel about the previous Members' Services order as to dates. Thank you. We'll come back to that.

MRS. MIROSH: Can I ask for the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MRS. MIROSH: I'll pass and ask for the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I see. Thank you.

Member for Banff-Cochrane, you were the last one.

MR. STEVENS: If I pass and ask for the question, what are you going to do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to go to Edmonton Highlands to sum up her motion.

MR. STEVENS: Then I would like to make some comments. I'm quite disappointed in the way in which we've begun today's meeting. I fully support the views that have been given by my colleagues from Barrhead and Taber-Warner because of the way in which this has been opened by the Member for Edmonton Highlands. I'm going to vote against the motion, and I'm disappointed in the process. Because she has the opportunity to sum up, I'd like to say this. I hope after the question is called, after the summing up, that we as a committee can take a few moments to discuss

how we should deal with the very important document that has come to us today, and it's been before us before. We need to establish a process so we use our time effectively to review this document in all its detail.

I'm disappointed in the Member for Edmonton Highlands in the way in which this motion was brought to us. It does not provide us the opportunity to discuss a very important document in detail. Because we're going this way, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to raise my concern. This is a most inefficient process we find ourselves in because of the way in which the motion was presented in the first place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prior to summation by Edmonton Highlands, Member for Barrhead, would you like to make your points again now that the Clerk has returned to the room about this prorating . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: If it's on tape, why don't we just replay the tape?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because that's an unusual procedure for the committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm sure it is, but the statements were made, and I wouldn't want to say something so that somebody would say, "That's different from what you said five minutes ago."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, hon. member; I can't entertain that. It would be an unfortunate precedent.

MR. KOWALSKI: A few minutes ago then, Mr. Chairman, statements were basically made that the estimates we have in front of us on page 1 of this estimates document prepared December 18, 1986, were made on the basis of a prorating from May 9, 1986, to March 31, 1987, as confirmed by my colleague from Edmonton Highlands. And then the statement was made, "Yes, that's the way the '86-87 forecast was, and what we've then basically done for '87-88 is just prorate it over 12 months."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. Could I have all conversations in the room cease, at the table and behind the table.

MR. KOWALSKI: After that was made, there

was a bit of discussion, and the Clerk said, "Yes, that's correct." He said he would confirm what the Member for Edmonton Highlands said. My question is, if that is so, would somebody please describe for me this sophisticated form of mathematics which would then see the Representative opposition go from \$219,437 from May 9, 1986, to March 31, 1987, and then go to a 12-month period and show \$220,000 and a 0.3 percent increase and how that same mathematical formula would then apply to the Liberal opposition, which would go from \$340,860 to \$380,000 for a 12-month period and show an 11.5 percent increase, and then do the same bit of mathematics to show how all this prorating in this same confirmed-to-be-correct way, from \$879,491 to \$940,000 to show a 6.9 percent increase and, for the government one, from \$1,353,094 to \$1,400,000 and to show 3.5 percent. I raise it in the context of my colleague from Westlock-Sturgeon, who basically said, "How can we discuss something when we're not sure what the figures are?"

MR. TAYLOR: It's not making sense.

MR. KOWALSKI: I never said that somebody wasn't making sense.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't say "somebody."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, hon. member. The other thing is that the officials of the department have to deal with the figures as supplied to us by your caucuses.

Clerk, if you'd like to respond to the hon. minister.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, prior to the decision which was made in July of 1986, there had been a budget approved for each of the caucuses, and that budget came into force on April 1, 1986. At that time, however, there was no budget in place for the Liberal opposition, which subsequently came into being following the general election.

MR. TAYLOR: Hallelujah!

MR. STEFANIUK: When the new formula was devised in July of 1986, it was prorated for all caucuses for the period from May 8, 1986, to March 31, 1987, but for the period from April 1

to May 8 there had been in place previously approved budgets. And so a portion of those previously approved budgets applied to that period from April 1, 1986, to May 8, 1986, and consequently there is not uniformity in the percentage increases which result from application of the July '86 formula to an entire fiscal year to commence April 1, 1987, and to conclude March 31, 1988.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton Highlands with a summation with regard to the motion, please.

MS BARRETT: Yes. Does that clarify it?

MR. KOWALSKI: No, it doesn't. If you take a look at the clarification figures then from a mathematical point of view for May 8, 1986, to March 31, 1987, if you look at an NDP Official Opposition base of \$879,491 moving to \$940,000, that has thence moved \$61,000 on a base of \$879,000. We're talking about a proration over the same exact calendar period. You take a look at the government members' one, which starts at a higher base of \$1,353,094 -- same calendar period -- but to show an increase of \$47,000. Now, if we're prorating it over the same number of months and we start off with a smaller base and see a greater increase and then we go with the bigger base and see a smaller increase, once again I'm with my colleague from Westlock-Sturgeon wondering: what's the mathematical basis for all this?

MR. BOGLE: Question.

MS BARRETT: I'm prepared to do the summary, Mr. Speaker, and try to incorporate a final answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Summation and then the motion.

MS BARRETT: In summarizing some perspectives exhibited around this table, I'd like to first of all reiterate what I think needs to be said again and again and again; that is, if you look at the minutes of July 29, 1986, of the Members' Services Committee, as I already enunciated, you will find that we agreed by unanimous decision to allow for the 1986-87

budget year total global figures for each of the four caucuses as they are represented now in front of you under the 1987-88 estimate. If it is too confusing for some members to go about comparing '86-87 estimates, which really became forecasts, as they are reflected under the '86-87 forecast and calculate the basis upon which the percentage change has occurred, then I would simply refer those members to the Hansard of our meeting on July 29 in which those figures now shown under the '87-88 estimates for the four caucus offices are identical to those enunciated and enumerated in those minutes. That's the only way we're going to solve this part of the problem.

MR. BOGLE: Question.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I also note that the Member for Banff-Cochrane expressed his usual amount of distress at anything I do.

MR. STEVENS: Not everything.

MS BARRETT: He's worried, he says, because the process of my motion is just not sufficient to allow for detailed examination of the estimates which are in front of us. I think I would have to dispute that notion, inasmuch as the broadest possible framework for discussion is in front of us at this very moment, and anybody using any logic at all can certainly figure that out. It was the biggest motion that was humanly possible. Agreeing to let members indicate whether or not they would like to make a friendly amendment to reduce the substance of the motion would in fact have narrowed the debate. So I'm sorry the Member for Banff-Cochrane feels that way, but I don't buy it.

Finally, my point in making this motion is that we are talking about the very heart of a government. The Legislative Assembly is the lifeblood of a government. I don't think there's any way around that. We all function, I think, in a very important way. I disagree with the way a lot of people function, but I would still fight to defend their right to function as they have done and their right to continue to function in this way.

We are here as a matter of public service. We were duly elected by the public on May 8 to do a certain job. I do not think that what would come to about .016 of the entire annual budget to supply the lifeblood of the entire operation is

in any sense exorbitant. I think we would be remiss if we did not support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a call for the question. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Motion defeated.

I don't know about the rest of you, but if the rest of you are perhaps superhuman, I know the Chair needs to take a three-minute walk.

[The committee recessed from 10:47 a.m. to 10:55 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're back in session. Taber-Warner, a motion, I trust.

MR. BOGLE: Yes, it is. In the brief preamble preceding the actual motion, I would like to say that I see it as an objective that we should be aiming for — and I stress the words "aiming for" — an approximate 10 percent reduction in the Leg. Assembly budget estimates for 1987-88 over the '86-87 budget. Recognizing that there are certain elements where that cannot be achieved, I think it's incumbent upon us to do our utmost to find areas where greater reductions can be achieved and still provide the services that are necessary.

I would therefore like to move that for the budget of the government members, the Official Opposition, the Liberal opposition, and the Representative opposition, the following would apply: firstly, that the \$40,000 per-member allocation be reduced by \$8,000 per member, or 20 percent; and secondly, that the budget for the Leader of the Official Opposition be set at the average budget for all the ministers' offices — I'll pause for a moment and say that while I expect there to be reductions in most, if not all, of the ministers' offices, for the purposes of this motion I believe we have to use the existing figures; we cannot use figures that are not yet known — and that the leader of the Liberal Party's office budget be set at a portion of the Leader of the Official Opposition's budget and, further, that the leader of the Representative Party's budget be set at a portion of the leader of the Liberal Party's budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion has four parts: \$40,000 per member being reduced by \$8,000

per year per member, which would take it down to the raw figure of \$32,000, so we would be voting for a figure of \$32,000; the second part, the Leader of the Opposition on a percentage reduction, average of ministers' . . . Do I hear from Edmonton Highlands that there is a figure or percentage of that?

MS BARRETT: Yes, you do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which is what, please? Do we know?

MS BARRETT: Following discussion yesterday with the member who has now moved the motion, I went to the estimates book with a calculator and concluded that the average ministerial office budget — that is, that vote in each department called the minister's office, usually vote 1.1 — in 1986-87 comes to \$273,411.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Say that figure again, please. [interjection] I know; wait a minute. I want the figure.

MS BARRETT: The figure again is \$273,411.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion as I listened to it was a percentage reduction. Is there an agreement or formula on that figure?

MR. BOGLE: No, but I would suggest that we can take a moment to caucus later and try to determine what the average office cost is, because the figure we have is somewhat lower than that mentioned by the hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. We'll come back to that.

And then, that the leader of the Liberal Party would be a portion of whatever has been determined as an appropriate formula figure for the Leader of the Opposition, and the Representative Party leader accordingly kicking in on another . . . All right. Thank you.

Does the committee want to take a few minutes to have a little negotiation process, so we can arrive at reasonably mutual figures?

[The committee recessed from 11 a.m. to 11:06 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were at a point of

clarification. The mover of the motion, further comments?

MR. BOGLE: In my preamble, Mr. Chairman, I gave the rationale for the motion, and I very deliberately made the latter three parts of the four-part motion general, so that there could be further input by the various members of the committee and by our officials on the exact numbers. So I think it would be in order to proceed on the motion, based on the principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Based on the principle. All right. Thank you.

Speaking to the motion of four parts.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Member for Taber-Warner for coming to see me yesterday to alert me to intentions which might result in the current motion's being placed in front of us today. I think that was very kind of him. I made my view known at that time, not that I thought I might necessarily simply reintroduce the previous motion but that I certainly wouldn't speak in favour of the motion that the member presents. It was fairly easy with a calculator and the estimates books afterwards to analyze the effect of this motion.

First of all, in one respect the very principle that was finally hammered out on July 29 will be affected. In other words, as Mr. Ray Speaker said a little while ago, we went through an awful lot of gymnastics and an awful lot of what I called honest negotiations in the weeks leading up to the unanimous decision in 1986 to support the opposition caucuses and the government members' caucus to the extent that we did agree. I believe that what has happened since then is not necessarily an actual change in the economic climate of this province but perhaps a change in some parties recognizing the economic climate of this province. In other words, for example, the price of oil had begun to drop exactly one year ago as I speak, Mr. Chairman, and that didn't change throughout the summer. The ability for us to forecast our overall revenues was as accurate then as it was two months before and two months after. In other words, I think we made the decision originally on information that we all had, knowing about the economy.

We also made the decision knowing that the electorate had chosen to elect a grand total of 22 members of the Assembly who would not be

sitting on the government side. Very much of the discussion that took place in the campaign prior to the election, during the election, and very much after the election had to do with the electorate having chosen to basically hire watchdogs. And I think we agreed implicitly that all members do their jobs. Some members are here to do a job in working in pursuit of supporting government goals and aims; some of us are here to be critical of those goals and aims and offer alternatives. Nonetheless, all of the work we do is considered valid. I believe we actually came to a fairly harmonious conclusion on those matters when the tapes weren't rolling, and in fact when the tapes were rolling, after the initial debates took place on those three occasions in July, we ended up with a very brief discussion which resulted in the unanimous decisions.

It was by recommendation from the government members on this committee that, in fact, we should not be arbitrary in supporting what we originally proposed for budgets for the Official Opposition, the Liberal opposition, and Representative opposition but that we had to determine a principle to make sense out of it. Through the negotiations we did agree finally that to meet the figures that we had approximately in mind and to meet the goal of the government members who believed that a formula itself was essential for carrying on the business of not just this committee but all members of the Assembly — we did come up with a formula, that being the \$40,000 per non-Executive Council MLA, and then the staggered amounts with respect to the opposition leaders' offices.

I think that by even examining the motion that's in front of us we're actually overturning a very principal decision. There was no discussion, no hint at that time, that this would be subject to change. Rather, it was suggested that we are talking about a basis upon which we operate for the life of this Assembly. There are a million political points that could be made, and I'm going to do my absolute best to try to avoid doing that, because I don't want to play unfair at this point. I think that we need to deal just with the facts.

The facts are that if we, as the Official Opposition, were to be able to function on the budget as agreed to on July 29, 1986, our budget would constitute .0085 percent of the entire annual budget as passed for 1986-87. That's

considerably smaller than, say, the Office of the Premier, which is a very distinct office and which has a budget that I think is appropriate to the work that special office does. If we look at the 20 percent cutback -- and we would be looking at a 20 percent cutback when we look at the figures overall -- I think we're talking about something that would impose serious damage to the ability of the opposition caucuses in particular to function. I don't feel that it's appropriate for me to speak on behalf of the government caucus, but I suspect it would affect your ability to operate as well.

I had calculated that if we were to pass the motion as presented to us, we would be cutting from our budget alone, the New Democrat budget, \$128,000 on the formula itself. And I do not agree that the formula is truly up for consideration; I am, in principle, dismayed that it's even presented. We would further sustain a loss if we take the Official Opposition Leader's special allocation for his office of \$300,000 and bring it down to the average ministerial office as approved for '86-87 of \$273,411: a grand total cut of \$154,589. The remaining budget would be \$789,411, which constitutes slightly more than 20 percent less than the current budget of \$940,000. I think that that is more than going to the bone. I would argue that that is actually at the point of severing limbs.

I have not heard in any instance any reason that such dramatic axing is in any sense warranted. When we are talking about an extremely tiny part of an overall budget, the part of the budget that actually supports the cornerstone of our parliamentary democracy and our parliamentary traditions, I think that we can only look forward to hurting ourselves in every sense in terms of functioning in our capacity.

I might point out that even where submissions have been made for reducing very tiny budgets, as shown in letters of intent in our Members' Services binder, we're talking about very small amounts; in some instances, less than 5 percent. I certainly can't understand why the caucus budgets would be singled out for 20 percent reductions.

There's another principle at issue here as well. I think this one will be slightly more contentious. I have always argued, and I believe firmly, that there is a difference between the way opposition caucuses and a government caucus function. In other words, in order to

maintain the critical perspective and role that we as opposition MLAs must, we need to exert a fair amount of energy in research departments in particular. I'm not going to claim that is not true for a government caucus. However, experience has shown me -- and remember, I speak not just from experience as an MLA for a brief period of time but also having served as a researcher in the opposition for several years -- that it is much easier for government members to call upon the services of all departments as a bureaucracy than it was for me as a researcher working for the Official Opposition.

Therefore, although I certainly wouldn't object if the motion were amended such that the government members might want to axe their budgets by 20 percent -- I don't think it's wise, but I wouldn't object -- I think it's extremely unfair, prejudicial, and presumptuous that members who do not work in our caucuses, nor have ever, would understand the extent to which we rely on the support package as determined on July 29, 1986.

I think, in principle, that supporting such a motion would be a severe blow to democracy. I think it would be analogous to a family, finding that it has more limited resources than originally anticipated, looking at the youngest child in the house and saying: "Well, you're the one that we can't afford; I guess you're out," or looking at deciding to keep the Cadillac and deciding instead to live on macaroni, which is not exactly nourishing, not healthy, and in the long run engenders damage to the whole physical system. A dangerous, dangerous precedent, I believe, is going to be set here if the majority of the members present pass this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Because of some comments in the previous couple of hours about the fact that the meeting wasn't moving along terribly well and all the rest of it, the Chair is now going to impose that we will speak once per member to this motion so we can indeed move along.

The Chair also wants to point out that after the disposition of this particular motion, when the time comes, I'm quite prepared to offer to go section by section through the budget with regard to the administrative side for which the Speaker is responsible.

MRS. MIROSH: Is there a 10-minute limit on



speaking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Standing Orders will give you 30 minutes apiece. Mover of the motion will get 90 minutes. Any other comments with regard to the motion before us?

MR. TAYLOR: If I may go on record, I don't know just where to start, but I will anyhow -- probably in the middle and work out both ends.

Looking at the amendment, I have to cast my mind back that as a fairly new member we went through quite a debate on what the parties were to get and what the back benches were to get here just a few months ago. One of the problems with not having everything in front of me, I do recall that the increase for government members I think was from around \$26,000 to \$40,000 per member. If we did it on a per member basis -- for instance, the REP Party went down and I think the NDP went down on a per member basis; the Conservative Party went up on a per member basis. Now to come along and suggest that after you've gone up a substantial amount, we should come down on a percentage basis all equal, to me is tantamount to getting speared in the corner, not losing an ankle along the boards. We went along for a formula on a per capita basis, and then we're going to be turned around and instead of playing ball, we're getting hit over the head with a bat because of the per capita increase for the backbenchers.

I'm not arguing whether the bankbenchers of the Tory party are worth it or not. As a matter of fact, I think we ended up thinking you were worth it by voting that. But to come around now and suggest a system of flat percentage cuts ... In other words, after the Tories, in effect, have been increased around 75 percent on a per capita basis and the NDP have been decreased on a per capita basis, the REPs have been decreased on a per capita basis, we just happened to be the foundling in the basket and got something in between. It doesn't make sense. In other words, we're playing with some mathematics that are not totally true. You raise yourselves on a huge per capita basis, cut the other caucuses on a per capita basis, and then come a year later and say, "Look, fellows, we're all going to take a percentage cut." That's a good way to disappear out the back door.

The other thing I might mention -- and this

may be a slight disagreement with other opposition members. I'm talking about leaders' allowance. I think the leaders' tasks, whether they be Representative, Liberal, NDP, or after the next election, Conservative, the point will be that they will have to watch all the cabinet ministers. The job of watching and policing the cabinet is the same whether you lead a one-person party or a 10-person party. I think one of the mistakes we made was to changed the leaders' allowance per party, because we already had put in a formula to reflect the size of the party by having a per MLA grant. On top of the per MLA grant we then said, "Well, the leader leading a small number of MLAs should get less than the leader who is leading more MLAs." I'm not sure that's true if all he or she is doing is leading MLAs, but if he or she has a staff to watchdog 25 cabinet ministers, it shouldn't matter how many MLAs are with that leader. In other words, the total budget variation should only be reflected by the per capita MLA grant, which I'm agreeing with. All I'm saying is that I think we should maybe look at that one again if we're putting everything on the table to look at.

The other thing that bothers me about going into looking at cutting the opposition and bankbenchers -- to the extent that they often examine the proposals put forward by the cabinet, you're in effect cutting the examination process. I think if you're going to improve the product, the last thing you do is cut money in the examination project. In other words, the examination of the product, you might say, as well pointed out by the Member for Edmonton Highlands, is around .005 percent. That's equivalent to the person who sits there at the end of the General Motors line and looks to see that all the wheels are on the car. It would make no sense whatsoever to fire him or her to cut their expenses because, in effect, the opposition is there to try to take one more look at the government legislation that's going through. So we say: "Oh boy, we're going to cut it. The first thing we're going to throw out is the examination process." The logic isn't there.

We go on from there, and there are a couple of other arguments. This whole stability of opposition staff -- I think that applies to a limited extent to the backbenchers. There again, I support the Member for Edmonton Highlands. I thought we had made a four-year

deal or at least a deal until the next election, or close to it. If we're going to get radical changes, maybe it's going to impinge on the opposition parties even worse than it will on government, because after all, you can slide people around a bit in government. In opposition, if we have to start canning or cutting back people we have under contract, it makes it very difficult indeed. I think having to go through this radical change each year gets difficult.

I might mention that the Conservative caucus I think has access to resources such as ministerial staffs and public servants that the opposition parties do not. If the government parties do get cut for any proportional cuts all across, this is going to impinge harder on us than the others, because we have no cousin or big brother in the administration who will take over the gap for us. So if we're without research, we're without research.

For 24 cabinet ministers we've done some research including the Premier's office, and there are 61 secretaries and 35 executives or special assistants. This translates into two and one-half secretaries per minister. I'm not even including the Premier's office, who has a much larger staff. For the Liberal opposition we have three secretaries, leader's office: three MLAs, for a ratio of one secretary per MLA. That's versus the two and one-half per minister.

When you look at this, and if there are to be some cuts — and here again I want to put it on the table. I've mentioned the fact that the per capita estimation and the leader's allowance throw us out of the black, because the per capita for the government back jumped as high as 80 percent but was actually cut by about 25 percent for the NDP and even more for the REP.

Maybe one of the areas we should be looking at and cutting is the actual MLAs' constituency allowance. If we want to reflect a cut and give leadership to the province, that might be more sensible than cutting the examination process. In other words, instead of firing the guy who's looking at the final product coming off the assembly line, maybe we should cut some of the expenses in the constituencies themselves. I'm just tossing it out if we want to give leadership.

Also, before we go into something like this, I'm not necessarily criticizing the numbers that are here, but it's one set of statistics. We all know statistics can be varied and changed quite

often. I would like to see us take some time to have the set of figures we have inside show us the percentage change on a per capita basis, show the percentage basis on a per caucus basis, show the percentage basis on a reconstructed full year, and show it not only for last year's budget to next year's estimate but the year before next to last year. In other words, when you sit down and pare and start looking at a budget as important as this, I just don't feel we have the proper statistical evidence in front of us in the quantities necessary to make an intelligent decision.

I've already thrown out one figure. As I mentioned, the per capita per MLA for the government backbenchers is a huge increase of 70 to 80 percent, whereas the per capita grant per MLA for the opposition is less. So these are the types of figures we should put in the mill.

I think it's too important now to just leave it. If I were to suggest anything, I think we should possibly be tabling this for another meeting until we have more statistics about a rundown. I am of the feeling that some of the members — Mr. Bogle, the member for Milk River, says we should be giving some leadership. On this set of statistics, we're not giving leadership. I submit, as the hon. minister of the constituency west of Westlock-Sturgeon said, that they could be confused. It could be confusing and confused. So we need more statistics. I suggest we give very serious consideration to going back one more year for the percentage change per caucus, the percentage change per capita, and then maybe we could sit down and take a good, hard look at them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the motion. If I understand the four-part motion, the first part is to reduce the 35 government members from \$40,000 to \$32,000 per member and all the loyal opposition members by the same amount. Then the Member for Taber-Warner made some general observations, so we could talk about principles based on some proportion of the ministers' allotments, whether that might be equivalent for the Leader of the Opposition, and then some proportion for the leaders of the Liberal Party and the Representative Party.

I've been doing some calculations based on

some assumptions. For example, if the leader of the New Democratic Party's office received about \$275,000, for the sake of this discussion — and that can be debated — which is roughly the amount of the ministers' offices per minister, and if the 16 members, not 15 but 16 including the leader, as we discussed before . . . I get a certain kind of figure here. I did the same thing assuming the leader of the Liberal Party, for example, received two-thirds of the average of the leader of the NDP. I assumed the leader of the Representative Party might receive, for example, 50 percent of that number. I know there are different numbers. But having worked all those numbers out quickly, the kind of result I came up with — and everybody can come up with their own results. What Mr. Bogle presented was a 20 percent reduction in the per member allotment.

If you assume that the Leader of the Opposition received the same as the minister, average, and the leader of the Liberal Party received two-thirds of that, and the leader of the Representative Party received one-half of that, this is the astounding kind of thing that happens: the government members would in effect receive an 11 percent reduction from the '86-87 estimate of \$1.35 million to \$1.2 million; the New Democratic Party would have a global budget not of \$879,000 but of around \$800,000; the Liberal Party would have not roughly \$340,000 but \$310,000; and the Representative opposition would have not \$219,000 but \$200,000.

The effect of all those, if you add them up, is that the government members would receive an 11 percent reduction for '87 and the New Democratic Party, the Liberal Party, and the Representative Party would receive a 9 percent reduction. Overall, the effect on our budget for the total, having a 20 percent reduction for members and having some kind of formula for the leaders of the opposition parties, would be an overall reduction of 9 percent.

Now I'm using the number 9 percent, based on the assumptions I made before, to say that I have just been to Treasury, wearing another hat as the chairman of AADAC. AADAC knows that there may well be more people under stress this coming year, and AADAC knows the problems and ravages of alcoholism and chemical dependency and so on, and AADAC knows that we don't have the money. I'm not uncomfortable at all with the kind of proposal

Mr. Bogle presented to us as members. If the formula he has proposed and the discussions that take place work out to that kind of adjustment, a 9 percent reduction is a welcome reduction in this Legislative Assembly budget. It would leave the government members bearing the greatest brunt. It would leave all of us having to do more with less. But it would leave the principles we established in July, but recognizing the new restraint we all have to face.

I repeat again: if that kind of discussion came out, there would be roughly \$1.2 million for the government members, about \$800,000 for the New Democratic Party, about \$310,000 for the Liberal Party, and about \$200,000 for the Representative Party. Mr. Chairman, that's an overall reduction in your part of this budget of 9 percent for all of us. I think that's something we should strive for.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think we have soup here, and I'd like to recommend we adjourn for lunch. But I'd like to come back for clarification of some of these figures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we chow up, put it back around the table, and we'll keep meeting. The appointment I had had to be delayed a little, so if we might do that, please.

[The committee recessed from 11:35 a.m. to 11:54 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before us has four parts, which more or less deal with a per member unit of \$32,000, the Leader of the Opposition with about \$273,411, and then appropriate discounting for the Liberal Party and the Representative Party. We've had four people speak to the motion. Does anyone wish to speak at this time? Is there a call for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Kowalski, I think, was going to start off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, once again, I think perhaps there's a need for some clarification on the subject matter of mathematics. Just prior to adjourning for lunch, I was listening to my colleague from

Banff-Cochrane, and he indicated that in his calculations, under the motion that we're now debating, the government caucus or government members -- and we don't refer to them as backbenchers in the government caucus; we refer to them as government members -- there would be a reduction of only 9 percent under this proposal put forward by the Member for Taber-Warner. I don't quite understand that, because the 1986-87 estimate forecast is \$1,363,094, and the formula that creates it is based on 35 members at \$40,000 per member.

If you calculate all this out, you come out to \$1.4 million. The motion that my colleague from Taber-Warner has presented basically says that that would go to \$32,000, which means a decrease of \$8,000 per member. If you calculate 35 times \$8,000, you come out to \$280,000. You take \$280,000 as a percentage of \$1,353,094 and that certainly is not 9 percent. I calculate that as a whopping 20 percent. So if we're talking here about leadership and recognition of leadership, the motion now before us shows government members showing the way with a 20 percent reduction.

The figures, of course, are proportionately less for the other parties in their percentage than the government percentage of 20 percent. Now we recognize that because of the positive traditions that have been established in this committee in the last year and the recognition of this factor and the recognition of that factor, the leadership probably would have to come from the government caucus, not because the other members would not necessarily not want to be equal, but we're not really pressing for it. It's my recognition and understanding, defined and put forward by my colleague from Taber-Warner, that it really doesn't demand that. The percentages would be less for other caucuses than for the government caucus.

I thought, Mr. Chairman, that you would feel much more comfortable having that bit of information with respect to the actual percentages before all of the committee, because I think some committee members were just a little -- not confused, but really not sure how my colleague had calculated 9 percent.

MS BARRETT: And that is remarkable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We all feel more comfortable.

MR. STEVENS: I don't, but I'll accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Most of us feel more comfortable.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, that follows a 65 percent increase that you had in here before ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. You've already spoken to the motion.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, just to speak a little on the motion and go back. Being a member of the previous Members' Services Committee, I recall discussion about three or four years ago when we first went to voting on global amounts for caucuses. I remember a lot of the same discussion at that time, and various people, maybe myself included, saying that it was important to establish the office or duties of opposition and fund them accordingly. That's when there were four in the opposition and the proportionate funding against government members was great. It seemed like a high per capita allotment. Even at that time, the extra thing that was put in there was that on the per member allotments, the leaders of those caucuses were included in their calculations.

I remember at that time -- I don't have it in front of me, but I could get it -- the then New Democratic Party member of the committee, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, saying something to the effect that when his party members became greater in the Assembly, the budget wouldn't necessarily need to be created on the same amount per person as existed, because members would be able to do some of their own research. Then we came up to the agreements or motions that were made last year.

I just want to make it known that previously we did recognize the existence of the smaller opposition and the importance that that opposition has to have a reasonable amount of money, or at least what we thought at that time was a reasonable amount of money, to carry out their work. It's tough to compare that on a per capita basis against what opposition receives now or indeed against what government receives now. I just want that on the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Other members? A call for the question?

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I move that the motion be tabled until tomorrow's meeting or until we next meet again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Till we next meet again. Which might well be . . .

MS BARRETT: Tomorrow, I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whichever should occur first.

MS BARRETT: Please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The amendment is basically to table. That's not discussable. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. The Chair interprets that as meaning with regard to the caucus funding levels.

Therefore, we are now in a position to be able to go on to the Legislative Assembly. That means there are certain elements of this we can't discuss because of the ramifications of the previous motion, so that allows us to get to Administrative Support. Can we start with Administrative Support, or do we have to jump over to 4 and start with the Speaker's office?

We're going to go to item 2 in your yellow tabs, Administrative Support. Any questions or comments that you have might be directed to the Clerk, please, as the deputy minister. As we move on through, we'll bring in the other individuals so that we might speak with them.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, you suggested we go to 2, and I don't disagree. Is it easier for us in doing that or — I notice we all have these tabbed sorts of things, which also have the same information but in much more detail. Is it easier to work? Maybe I have something you don't have or everybody else doesn't have. Have I got something different?

MS BARRETT: Do you have your estimates book, Greg?

MR. STEVENS: I have it. In each book, or at least the book I have, there are sections set aside with paper clips at the beginning. Maybe I've got an old book.

MS BARRETT: I think you do.

MR. STEVENS: I've just taken what I was handed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want it to be noted that you're getting favouritism. You have extra paper clips.

MR. STEVENS: Obviously. All right. So none of you have all this lead-in white stuff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have a white section in 2. Then if you go further back in the book, you have another yellow tab, Administrative Support, labeled 2, which is yellow sheets.

MR. STEVENS: It's a summary sheet.

MS BARRETT: He's got it.

MRS. MIROSH: That's the one. You've got everything we've got.

MR. STEVENS: What I'm asking you — you directed us to go to the yellow sheet, but we also have all of the backup documents in white, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I said, "to the yellow tab." Sorry. Are we agreed on white pages? Do you want to go yellow pages?

MR. STEVENS: That's what I'm asking you.

MS BARRETT: We're in the white pages; is that what you're saying?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, the white pages occurred because some members asked for additional information.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MR. STEVENS: So you are directing us to the yellow page, to start there. Is that what you're saying? I don't care, as long as I'm on the same page you're on.

MS BARRETT: Greg, you're being difficult to get along with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. Good clarification. Let's all be white today.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you. Will you take us through in the way you wish?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll ask the Clerk if he would like to lead us through, with brief comments on each section. Then if you have questions, we can come back. All right? Is that agreed at that end of the table?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, a section at a time, with page 3, white pages, Budget Estimates, Administrative Support the first section. It is with regard to salaries, wages and employee benefits. Bohdan, please. Any comments?

MR. STEFANIUK: Provision is made, Mr. Chairman, for one additional management position in this area. There is a transfer of an executive officer position from a contract employee to a permanent employee, which accounts for a fairly significant increase in management salaries. Any adjustments in the nonmanagement salaries reflect the merit and market adjustments which come about as a matter of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you tell them what the one position is that changed and what the new position is, please?

MR. STEFANIUK: The transfer of the executive position is the Parliamentary Counsel, who had been on contract for a period of two years, I believe, and who requested replacement in the permanent staff category. It was granted. The new position, that of a senior officer, is foreseen as that of a personnel officer, a personnel director, coming into the organization.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, maybe my question isn't in order, but we'll see. When the Law Clerk moved back under permanent employ, did that two-year hiatus cost us money for pension plans or anything like that?

MR. STEFANIUK: When he was on contract, he was ineligible for participation in the pension plan, but adjustments were made to his salary to compensate for that. In effect, when he moved to permanent status again, the amount of his salary was reduced and the benefit

package kicked in. The net result is that the same amount of money is being expended, simply transferred from one area to another.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Clerk. What are the market adjustments and merit adjustments for the coming year? Are those determined in advance?

MR. STEFANIUK: Those are adjustments which we have been made aware of already, which in fact have taken place recently, within the current fiscal year, but affect the salaries in the next fiscal year as well. The market adjustment, as the members may know, was recently announced for all categories of staff at a rate of \$62 per month. Those have been incorporated. There is a process whereby an employee's status or subcategory is adjusted on an annual basis. Support staff employees go through seven or eight steps in a given classification. Each year the performance of the employee is reviewed, and an adjustment is made to the next step.

MR. STEVENS: Then these in the nonmanagement area, Mr. Chairman, are not merit?

MR. STEFANIUK: Those are merit and market.

MR. STEVENS: The word "merit" is what I'm questioning.

MR. STEFANIUK: Merit is that adjustment from one step to another, the process of going through seven . . .

MR. STEVENS: Yes, but one could be asleep and show up for work and they would get it. That's not merit.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, not necessarily. That's market. If one is asleep and shows up for work and gets an adjustment, that's a market adjustment. Merit is something that is contingent on a performance appraisal.

MR. STEVENS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As you all know, the next page also has a further breakdown with regard to salaries, wages, and employee benefits.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, my second question is on freight and postage. With the announcement yesterday or whatever . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't gotten there yet.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. We're just doing the top?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee prepared to go on to the next stage?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't want my statements to be sensed to be unfair, but I only know several of the people who fall under the nonmanagement group, and those people are employed in the Clerk's office. I want to say that I think those people do a super, outstanding job. I say that as a former chairman of the committee, one who's had to use their services. I want you, the new Speaker, to know that you should be very proud of them. The quality and the improvement of the documentation this committee has been getting — in recent months and years it seems that each time the quality is that much better, notwithstanding a few comments this morning about some numbers. But the organization of it is very, very clear, succinct, and precise. I want to have that statement on the record and say that those people I am familiar with — some I am not familiar with, not that I don't think they're competent. But the nonmanagement people I am familiar with, that basically function out of the Clerk's office, are very, very competent people and are doing a very good job for all of us in the Legislative Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I agree.

MS BARRETT: Ditto.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I think he's preparing a raid on your staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He'd better not be.

Further comments on the section Salaries, Wages and Employee Benefits?

MR. HYLAND: I notice the one new position, Senior Officer I(c).

MR. STEFANIUK: That's the new position that we foresee.

MR. HYLAND: It's not full yet.

MS BARRETT: I was going to say that after tomorrow's vote or the next vote we take on the budgets, we may be able to refer a couple of candidates to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Moving on to Supplies and Services. Comments? Clerk.

MR. STEFANIUK: We see some some increase, Mr. Chairman, in the cost of travel expenses and the area of gasoline credit cards. The estimate is based on current experience. Attendance at conferences is adjusted to reflect in most cases — in virtually all cases, I believe — the changes in venues which occur from year to year. Adjustments are made upwards or downwards to reflect the venue changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This then is page 9, relating back to page 3. That picks up the Parliamentary Association conferences in addition to all that travel by members.

MRS. MIROSH: We don't have a page 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't have that in yours?

MRS. EMPSON: The amendments were given to Irene two days ago to put in.

MR. STEVENS: That was probably why I was asking that question; I had a different package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, whoa. Then we stop and adjourn and go get the rest of the documents. Who else hasn't got the rest of the documents? Mr. Bogle? Okay, let's stop and go get them.

[The committee recessed from 12:15 p.m. to 1:36 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now reconvene as a committee. My understanding was that Pam Barrett was going to be back in a couple of minutes, but now I understand that she said to go ahead even though she was going to be a few minutes. All right, thank you.



MR. TAYLOR: Good. I want to move that we increase the Liberal opposition budget to double the NDP.

AN HON. MEMBER: Money or members?

MR. TAYLOR: I wanted to see how far she would go.

MRS. MIROSH: Agreed.

MR. STEVENS: Somebody was asking questions.

MR. BOGLE: I want our chief of staff to do the numbers for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bogle, can I ask you to take the Chair, please, as we work on through this? I'll come back as quickly as I can. Thank you.

[Mr. Bogle in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. Are there any other questions on page 3, which is the general review?

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, we're talking about cuts, and I'm looking under Supply and Services at Travel Expenses. I understand that most of that is airfare for members between the south and Edmonton and the north and Edmonton.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wonder if it would be appropriate to hold that portion of the discussion until we get to page 9, where there's a detailed breakdown of the airfare travel. You'll see it comprises \$228,570 of the total. In other words, page 3 is an overview. When we go on to pages 4 through 26, we have the detailed breakdown. May we move on then to page 4? I think the best way to deal with it, Bohdan, is that if there are questions, then we will get into the explanation. Otherwise, we'll just move on to page 5.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: I have one question. What would be the percentage increase if you take out the transfer from 511D99, which I understand is just going from contract? You show a 27.4 percent change, but if that were

taken out, it would reduce it to \$470,000 so the increase would be about 10 percent then.

MR. STEVENS: No, it would be \$60,000 over \$431,000, so it would be about 6 percent.

MR. TAYLOR: Six percent; that's more reasonable.

MR. STEVENS: Maybe 8.

MRS. MIROSH: Take out which one?

MR. TAYLOR: Take out \$66,706. Really, to make the budget look proper, that should be down at the bottom of the subtotal. The percentage increase should really show from \$431,000 to \$470,000.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nick, I'm going to ask Bohdan to supplement what I'm going to say if he feels it is necessary, but what Leg. Assembly is doing is following the general guidelines, the accounting guidelines, as set out by the Provincial Treasurer's office and approved by Executive Council. We have to go through a lot of bookwork. Even though it's not a new position — it's a transfer from another area — to comply with the bookkeeping requirements, this is necessary. Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, that's precisely right. What we had with this position was that Parliamentary Counsel was on permanent staff. He requested at one stage to be moved to the contract category, and subsequent to that he requested to be placed back on permanent staff. Those requests were acceded to, and this is the movement of dollars from one area of the budget to another but, in effect, not really changing the dollars at all.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, in light of trying to keep the public, probably through the media, as correctly informed as possible, the accounting does count what you do in the first two columns. I don't think accounting policy counts what you do in the next two columns: percent change and reasons for variance. In other words, I think in this particular case we cast a poor light upon the department by putting a 27.4 percent total increase there. It's not correct.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nick, it's an issue that we can't change at this table; it's a larger issue.

MR. TAYLOR: We can't change it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We can't change it in that we're complying with the general accounting procedures that . . .

MR. HYLAND: We'll show a reduction under contract employees.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll show a reduction under contracts.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, when we move to page 6, that same position is showing 100 percent reduction.

MR. TAYLOR: Which is just as deceptive. I'm talking about the interpretation. You showed the transfer in the statement. I'm just saying that when you make comments on the side, they're for the media and ourselves to pick up, and I think those are deceptive.

MR. STEFANIUK: But to get a true picture, Mr. Chairman, of what is happening in the area of salaries, wages, and employee benefits, one really needs to look at the bottom line of that particular group of expenses that appears on page 3, and it's calling for an increase of 8.3 percent.

MR. TAYLOR: Where is that?

MR. STEVENS: The summary page, page 3.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on page 4? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Page 5?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Page 6?

MR. STEVENS: Could I ask the Clerk, Mr. Chairman, if the security force, the nine staff, is the commissionaire force in this building?

MR. STEFANIUK: No, Mr. Chairman, that is the security personnel that are employed in the Chamber when the House is in session or when committees of the House are meeting.

MR. STEVENS: That's all I needed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Page 7?

MR. STEVENS: These are requirements, are they not?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That's right. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Page 8.

MR. HYLAND: A question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe what I heard was wrong. Memberships to the Bars — not the kind of bars Nick and I frequent but the Law Society Bars or whatever. I thought I heard somewhere that government was trying to negotiate with the Law Society on associate memberships, where it would be something like \$100 rather than \$700. I heard next that they weren't going to pay fees. If they wanted to remain full members of the Bar, the lawyers themselves would have to pay that fee.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, that is certainly true of those lawyers who are not required to act in the capacity of lawyers while they are in the public service. We have personnel with legal training employed in the research areas, and we do not pay Law Society or Bar Association fees for those people. In this case, the lawyer is required to act in a legal capacity, and we therefore pay the fee. I believe that is the practice in the Department of the Attorney General.

MR. PENGELLY: Bohdan, does that include those in the Attorney General's department?

MR. STEFANIUK: We pretty well follow the precedents the Attorney General's department establishes in respect of lawyers.

MR. STEVENS: Job requirement.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right. If it's not a job requirement that the employee render legal opinions, we would not pay the appropriate professional fees. But if he is required to render legal opinions, we will pay the professional fees. So this covers one employee, and that's the Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

MR. TAYLOR: Not a question. I'd like to make a motion. I would like to cut two items: staff training from four meetings at \$550 to three, and from four delegates and spouses to three delegates and spouses. I think it's more a question of leadership and style than actual money, but we should do it where we can.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There's a motion on the floor.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the staff training figure of four is for four management personnel. That enables us to upgrade the skills of certain management employees in the course of any given year, and it enables us to provide for some upgrading of skills as well for 11 support staff in the course of a year.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm not saying it has been misused in the past; I'm just thinking that in the overall operation of an organization that we're trying to cut here and there, there's a duty on us to cut where we think we can without appreciably affecting the service. I just mentioned those two areas. I think the service is bound to become thin -- I'm not taking that away and I'll have other moves as I go through -- but I'd like to move that we drop to three management and three delegates to the national conference.

[Dr. Carter in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's really two separate issues. The first one we're on is the staff training component.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I would vote against that motion. If there is ever a time for training and opportunities for training, it has to be when it's the most difficult time for this government and this Legislature. We're in a very difficult time. Seeing that there is no increase in the proposal, I'm fully in support of it. Tough times require different kinds of techniques. So I'm very much in support of the 15 training opportunities.

I might say, too, Mr. Chairman, that if these training opportunities involve the public service programs, there is a recovery to the government through the revolving fund.

MR. TAYLOR: That's not noted.

MR. STEVENS: Pardon?

MR. TAYLOR: Question.

MR. HYLAND: Just a question on the three versus four delegates. Have we ever sent the full four?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; are we finished with staff training?

MR. HYLAND: Oh, you split it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; I split it when I came back into the Chair. So your question was on . . .

MR. TAYLOR: No, I was just ready for the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The motion was that the staff training component become three. All those in favour of that motion? Three. Opposed? Three.

MR. BOGLE: It's up to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, all members have to vote. The same rules apply as in the Assembly. If all members are present in the room, every member must vote. You cannot abstain from voting. We have a division when we have a hung House. Nigel, I'm afraid that this time you'll have to vote.

The motion again is to reduce the staff training from four to three, as moved by . . . I thought you were going to leave the room. All

those in favour of the reduction to three management? Three. Opposed to the motion, which would leave it at four? Four. Thank you. The motion fails. It stays at four management staff training.

MR. TAYLOR: I move we knock the number of delegates and spouses attending the national conference at Indianapolis from four to three.

MR. BOGLE: Before we vote on this, and as a new member of the committee, can I have a brief explanation as to what the National Conference of State Legislatures is, what our practice has been in the past relative to representation, and the makeup of the delegation?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the National Conference of State Legislatures is a grouping of legislators from all the state Legislatures in the United States and does not include the U.S. federal Legislature at all. It is in many respects a lobby group on behalf of state Legislatures to that country's federal Legislature. It is an organization that provides a very sophisticated research facility having a very sophisticated bank of research materials pertaining to state Legislatures, of which we make use from time to time.

The practice of this Legislature has most recently been to in fact send four delegates. There were four delegates sent to Seattle. The delegation is appointed by the Speaker. The representation we had in Seattle was an all-party representation and included the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That last attendance was 1985. Last summer the conference was at New Orleans, and we declined to send anyone because we were in session.

MR. STEVENS: Could I just ask why it is in this particular section and, say, not with all the other conferences? I hope we're not going to go through the other ones with a question about each one as well. Why is it separate?

MR. STEFANIUK: Because it's a conference fee in this case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEVENS: This is a fee, not travel.

MR. STEFANIUK: This is not the travel. The travel appears grouped with other travel. This is the registration fee for attending the conference. The practice with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in most instances is not to charge a registration fee. That's why this one appears here along with the Association of Information Systems Professionals, the people who deal with computers.

MR. STEVENS: The only reason I raised it is that I cannot believe there are conferences other than CPA who don't have a registration fee. That surprises me.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering why we have to go line by line by line on little bits of money when we're looking at millions and millions of dollars. If the time is bad, I think we should leave it at the discretion of the Speaker and leave it in the budget. If the Speaker feels it's not justified, that would be the way I would vote. I don't think we need to chop it piece by piece.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore. I think everything in here is justifiable. I don't think the Speaker and the Clerk have put in anything that's frivolous. What I'm trying to say is that we have a task of not only trying to keep the budget in line or keep our deficit down but also showing some leadership, and I'm just picking these areas. I think it has to be done line by line. That's why we stuck it out for two days. I'm picking those areas where I think we can cut expenses. I assume they're good expenses; otherwise, they wouldn't be there. I don't think they're trying to pull any fast ones. I know they're not. Consequently, I'm just saying: sorry; instead of having four delegates, we're now going to have three. I know it's a token here, but I'll have some others I can assure you are not so token.

MR. STEVENS: I was waiting for them.

MR. BOGLE: Very briefly, I want to indicate that while there are a number of pages we've gone past where there has been no comment or question at all, it must remain the right of the committee to do what has been done relative to making some amendments. When these

estimates go before the Assembly, it is tradition that the Assembly does not debate them; therefore, this committee must have the authority and the responsibility to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has happened. Call for the question with respect to the motion on three delegates instead of four. All those in favour of reduction to three? Opposed? Thank you.

Other comments with regard to page 8 on the white sheets?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. TAYLOR: It pains me to give any lawyer money.

MRS. MIROSH: You don't like to pay the doctor either.

MR. TAYLOR: Not unless I need an abortion.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. STEVENS: On the next four pages -- it may only be three -- 9 to 12, could we just have a brief overview? For example, this is based on current experience and forecast -- and it's all there -- assuming attendance at the same types of conferences and the same levels of attendance. Is that what we're presented with? If we knew that, I'd feel better as a result. What is the rationale for this package? Then I'll feel better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first part of 9, of course, is the travel expenses.

MR. TAYLOR: I would like to comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll deal with that, and then we'll come to yours, which relates to this.

MR. TAYLOR: It's not necessarily in the move; I don't know. I'd like to have some information. We're putting a lot of money, \$228,000, into travel, and PWA and Air Canada get \$200,000 of it. Can't we negotiate, or can't

we empower someone to negotiate? I don't know what the alternative is. We can't threaten to walk all the time, but if we're that big a buyer -- we're buying \$200,000 worth of transportation. I know of hardly any corporation in the world that is paying for \$200,000 worth of transportation that wouldn't talk to one particular carrier and say, "How about a deal?"

MRS. MIROSH: Who else are we going to fly with?

MR. TAYLOR: I agree, but the only thing you can ...

MRS. MIROSH: Your alternatives are to drive or walk.

MR. TAYLOR: Actually, if the government of Alberta asked me to look at a deal, I would look at a deal, because -- who knows? -- they might have their own airline next week, or they might allow somebody else to be flying next week. In other words, I think we have a certain bargaining power that I'm not sure we're using. In the old days when we owned PWA, okay. Maybe there was no reason to get out there and shake them loose. I don't see any reason why we could not talk to them and ask them, for \$203,000, to reduce travel by 10 or 15 percent on our tickets. They do it on weekends, and they do it on all kinds of other things.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I don't know what percentage or dollars of that involves flights from Calgary or the north or the south daily when we're in session. I wonder if it's really necessary to fly home at night and back in the morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You and I have certainly seen it with members coming into the House in '79. Some were known on the airbus all the time. Nevertheless, the policy has been established that you have those numbers of trips and their availability on the credit card.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, on that last question, I believe the number of trips between the constituency or the place of residence and the capital in any given year is limited by policy previously set by this committee. While the travel may be used more frequently, at some

point the member becomes responsible for it unless it's used in connection with some other purpose.

In any event, on the question of reductions, we have from time to time been made aware by PWA of special packages. I recall one where they offered a book of vouchers which produced an extra trip as a result of advanced payment for a book of vouchers. We made that program known to the members.

I know that the Parliament of Canada uses an awful lot of travel. Members of Parliament can travel home to their constituencies every weekend, and the distances are great. But to the best of my knowledge that Parliament does not enjoy any reductions in the airfares that are given. What they in fact do is operate an internal travel agency in that they have a ticket-issuing facility within the precincts of the federal Parliament. They may receive in return for that the normal travel agent's commissions, but they in turn have to employ the personnel that will operate that facility. So I'm not sure that they realize any savings whatsoever. In fact, it may be more costly than the travel agent's commission which they ultimately collect.

MR. HYLAND: Do they fly first-class depending upon the distance away?

MR. STEFANIUK: I believe that at a certain distance they're entitled to first-class travel, whereas ours is limited to economy with an instruction that even lower fares be utilized where practical.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We all fly cattle class with Pacific Western Airlines.

MR. TAYLOR: I will move that our committee chairman approach the air carriers mentioned here to ask whether they will give us a 10 percent reduction for the Alberta Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Give us any reduction.

MR. TAYLOR: Not on the individual; on the ticket. I'm talking about the billing as you come through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can make the approach, certainly.

MR. TAYLOR: After all, your own travel agency would get you a 10 or 15 percent reduction.

MR. BOGLE: Question.

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

MLA Gasoline Credit Cards. That's the best estimate that we can give with regard to the members' travel.

MRS. MIROSH: Can we not do the same thing there, Mr. Chairman? I know that when I was on the hospital board, we got a substantial reduction through the hospitals from the various gasoline companies.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, the dilemma is that if we endeavour to do this, we're going to be competing with one or more. One may offer that, and I would resent, for example, if it happened to be Petro-Canada; I wouldn't use it. I would like to have the freedom to go to any gas station in my constituency at any time.

MRS. MIROSH: Yes, you're right. It's just one.

MR. STEVENS: So I don't mind if the committee wishes the Clerk to investigate whether someone would give us a reduction, but I hope we aren't limiting ourselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the spirit of the previous motion, I'm sure we could take it under advisement and try to make some contact. All we can do is find out what the response is and go from there.

MR. TAYLOR: I think you'd be surprised. I think they'd give it to you.

MRS. MIROSH: Maybe all of them will.

MR. STEVENS: They may all do it.

MR. TAYLOR: ICG approached me and said they'd give me 15 percent, and I figured out that I still had to push a car 15 miles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I take it, Calgary Glenmore, that your motion with regard to the credit cards is that we follow along apropos?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour?  
Opposed if any? Carried. Thank you.

Mileage return is best guesstimate.

MR. TAYLOR: Can I lump moving again and attending conferences here?

MR. STEVENS: We haven't got there yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know. It just arrived.

MR. BOGLE: There was some previous discussion about the 52 return trips between the capital and the constituency and also travel within the province. I want to make members aware that I'm currently doing some research on this matter, and it may be that we will need some clarification in a future meeting in our minutes that the 52 trips would mean maximum one trip per week.

But that's something that it's premature to discuss at this time.

On the question of travel within the province, there is another agenda item that we will deal with once we have concluded our discussions on the budget, and that's item 6, Automobile Allowance, under Mr. Wright's name. It was my intent to work into number 6 an amendment to our current limit of 25,000 kilometres for travel within the province to increase that to 35,000 kilometres. It would not affect the rate, but it would allow members who are using their own automobiles, provided they have receipts, to claim for miles that they are in fact incurring on government business. The only reason I raise it here is that that may have an impact on the budget. I don't know. I see that the current estimate is exactly the same as the forecast for the existing year, so it may be that there's still some additional scope for this without increasing the budget. I'm not aware of that.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, speaking of the 52 round trips a year -- and I could be wrong, because I think I'm holding the opposite view to the Clerk -- I thought the airfare and the ability to use an air credit card wasn't tagged to the 52 trips but that the mileage that you would get paid was tagged to the 52 trips.

MR. STEFANIUK: That in fact is true, Mr. Chairman. The way that order is written, it restricts it to the use of a car for 52 return trips but not to airfare. I suppose where the balance comes in with the airfares is that if a member is using the airfare on a regular basis -- for example, between here and Calgary -- then we have to reconcile that against his claim for the daily subsistence allowance in session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now conferences.

MR. STEVENS: Could you answer that general question before Nick gets into the detail? Is there a general approach that was followed on those three pages, so we would know what that approach has been?

MR. TAYLOR: You mean pages 9, 10, and 11?

MR. STEVENS: I just want to know, Nick, if the ...

MR. TAYLOR: One of the approaches I thought we'd take is that we'd just knock one delegate off each one.

MR. STEVENS: I didn't ask you that yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. STEVENS: I asked the Clerk for some advice, and it's been overlooked for a few minutes.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, that is, in fact, the case. The conferences are those at which this Assembly is usually represented, and the number of delegates is that which has been established by previous practice. The rates for the various conferences vary to reflect the changes in venues. In the case of the first one, the CPA Regional Conference, for example, that took place last year in Toronto. In 1987 I believe it is taking place in Regina, Saskatchewan, so the cost of attending that conference is reduced very substantially. Next year I believe it goes to the maritimes, and then you will see a sizable increase in it.

MR. STEVENS: The only change is that one has increased representation, and that's the Presiding Officers' Conference on page 10. Is that just an exception because of unusual ...



MR. STEFANIUK: I think what has been done there is that that conference has been attended by the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, and the Clerk, and it was deemed advisable that the Deputy Chairman of Committees of the whole House attend that conference as well, as it pertains very closely to his activity in the Chair.

MR. STEVENS: On that basis then, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly yield to Mr. Taylor, if he wishes to make a general motion. I would perhaps suggest, Mr. Taylor, that you might want to just take a moment to go through them one by one, because a general deletion of one delegate from each of these may have some impact that is not advisable. That's why I mentioned it. I wanted to get into that, Nick; maybe you need to go one by one.

MR. TAYLOR: The reason I would make the move is just trying to speed it up, and I don't see how one per one would hurt. Mind you, a cut where you're sending two is a 50 per cent cut; where you're sending three, it's 30 percent; where you're sending seven, it's . . . But overall I still feel that we should show some leadership to the public at large. The public at large doesn't in general get a chance to go on many free trips. One of the things that bugs them most about government or anybody related to government is the trips. From being in corporate work for years, I know that necessary conventions to go to just seem to keep increasing all the damned time. It's just one of those things. Everybody can make a single argument that that particular convention is absolutely invaluable and that you're going to get triple the value out of the employee that attends, but I think this is a year that we can afford to take a cut. I think we should give them some leadership. That's why I make the move that we cut one delegate from each of these conferences.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, rather than say one cut from each one, could we perhaps just look at the bottom line? I see it's increased from \$918,905 to \$988,053. To decrease that by a percentage — 10 percent, perhaps.

MR. TAYLOR: That holds air travel [inaudible].

MRS. MIROSH: Do you mean MLA expenses,

too? I thought that was just travel. Is that bottom line just travel?

MR. STEVENS: No, that's probably \$600,000, isn't it, of MLA? You've got \$228,000 and \$420,000, so you don't want to take 10 percent off the \$988,000, Dianne, if what you want to do is achieve what you've suggested.

MR. HYLAND: If you take 10 off that, you have to fly 10 percent less time from here to Calgary.

MR. BOGLE: There's a motion on the floor, and the discussion doesn't relate to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I don't know what the motion was.

MR. TAYLOR: One delegate from every conference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Great. I want to make quick comments with regard to a couple of these. It's a fact that the Regional Conference last year was in Toronto. We did not send a full delegation because we were in House. This last year the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association General Conference took place in London, England. We sent two delegates, the Clerk and myself, and spouses, and I asked that it be increased in terms of the conference to southeast Asia so it would reflect that we could send three. I have a certain difficulty whether that one is going to have any delegates sent, depending on what happens about the dates of the conference and the 75th anniversary of the opening of this building on September 3. So there may be a conflict with regard to that one. Maybe no one will go. But on the other hand, the contingency is there.

The others in there — we pointed out earlier with regard to page 10 that the Conference of State Legislatures last year was scheduled for and took place in New Orleans, and we sent no one. A lot of people want to go on conferences all right, but it isn't always convenient to time schedules and, therefore, it isn't like we always send a full complement, certainly not in the brief time that I've been Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I would go for a friendly amendment by the Member for Calgary

Glenmore that we lump all the conference delegate [inaudible] into one total, as it stands now, and cut that total by 10 percent, the cuts to be apportioned as the administrative staff works it out. If you don't attend one conference, okay; you've got more for another. Just reduce the global portion of this budget allowed for convention attending by 10 percent.

MRS. MIROSH: Instead of one delegate?

MR. TAYLOR: Instead of the one delegate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's \$18,000.

MR. TAYLOR: Or if that's complicating . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The chairman likes to see the friendliness between members, but I'll still treat it as two motions, if I may, please. So the first motion up for question is to reduce across the board by one delegate.

MR. TAYLOR: I'll withdraw that motion in favour of another one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there unanimous consent for the member to withdraw?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now the motion.

MR. TAYLOR: Do you want me to make one, or do you?

MRS. MIROSH: No, you're doing it.

MR. TAYLOR: I move that the global budget as allotted, starting with the NCSL conference and ending . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I assume page 9, CPA Regional, Regina.

MR. TAYLOR: . . . starting with the CPA Regional Conference and closing with the bottom of page 11, be reduced by 10 percent.

MS BARRETT: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wonder what's gotten into Nick. Why isn't it a 20 percent reduction?

MR. TAYLOR: I left the mean part to you.

MS BARRETT: Fair is fair when I cut back, right?

I am sorry I was not here, but I do wonder if any discussion occurred in my absence about why spousal travel is always included with the MLA or participants in the conferences. If we were serious about cutting and if the conferences themselves are important enough to warrant attendance, then what I see with all of them is that it could be cut in half. I wonder if anybody wants to answer that question.

MR. TAYLOR: As an old personnel administrator I can tell you that the reason you do that is to keep them away from other spouses. [laughter]

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, are we still on the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we're still on the motion, because this question raised by the Member for Edmonton Highlands is germane to the motion.

MR. STEVENS: Could I make this comment? If I am correct in my mathematics, as presented to us, there is the potential for 31 delegates and spouses for this total conference list — expenditure of about \$188,000. Mr. Kowalski is not here; he says that I'm not very good at math. But if I've done my calculations correctly, that's about what it amounts to.

I would rather leave the budget as presented here. I will vote against the motion, because I believe that the Speaker, in consultation with the members and, therefore, the various ways in which he does that with the members and the leaders of the various parties, has done an excellent job of working out which conferences are meaningful for our province, whether or not they should be attended if the session is on or not, and whether there is some relevancy in discussions we have with other Parliaments. I see no point at all in supporting this motion for 31 potential delegates and spouses to attend these conferences on that basis.

I believe spousal travel is very important. If there is knowledge of a conference and the Speaker determines that it is important to be there, with advance booking you will in fact always find that two can travel for the price of one. The hotel cost is the same. There is only the additional cost of some, and not all, meals.

I don't want to comment on what I know was a humorous comment, Nick. But many members have enough difficulty finding any time with their families. Asking a member with a spouse to again do government business without that spouse, we'll soon see that only single members will take advantage of an opportunity to represent this House.

So I am opposed to the idea of deleting spousal travel, and I am opposed to the idea of modifying this budget. I think the Speaker has shown an excellent way in which this has been handled in the past. I support its being handled that way in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there comments or discussions on the motion?

The motion reads . . . Please, Louise?

MRS. EMPSON: Moved by Mr. Taylor that the global budget for attendance at conferences, beginning on page 9 with the CPA conference and ending on page 11, be reduced by 10 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of that motion? Opposed? Could I have a show of hands again on the opposed, please? The motion fails.

I take it we're up to page 12 now. Any questions with regard to page 12?

MS BARRETT: I sure have a question.

MR. STEVENS: With the exception of spousal travel at the bottom, which I think I understand, my understanding of the remaining items is that these would be required trips for a member of the Legislative Assembly staff to visit a constituency office or to deal with a problem raised by a member or other ordinary things that are required to do the job in all of those areas. I understand the Clerk's vehicle; that's the standard charge by government services and so on. Is that correct, that the staff travel, that sort of thing, is all basically done on behalf of members or the administration of the Assembly?

MR. STEFANIUK: The budget item is placed here to enable either staff or, for that matter, the Speaker, if he were requested to look at a constituency office operation or a group of constituency offices, to visit a given area or a

particular constituency office. But this particular item is not assigned for the use of any one individual. Rather, the travel expenses for visiting constituency offices are something that we foresee being directed by the Speaker in response to requests which may be received from constituencies.

We have faced increased requests from constituencies, most recently a group of constituency offices in Calgary, for a meeting with them, and that occurred recently over a two-day period. The Speaker and myself, having satisfied ourselves that indeed such a meeting was necessary and having satisfied ourselves that the constituency secretaries in the Calgary area had indeed requested the meeting and that the meeting was sanctioned by the members for those constituencies, approval was given for one member of the staff to spend two days in Calgary for that purpose. It is on that basis that this money would be used.

MRS. MIROSH: And that was good.

MR. STEVENS: Oh, I agree.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I think we voted on the last motion, that would have seen a 10 percent reduction in all of the conferences, and then suddenly we jumped to page 12. I did have a couple of other comments I wanted to make on conferences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BOGLE: But now that we're into this subject, I wonder if we shouldn't finish it first and then go back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The last speaker I have on this at the moment is Pam.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I was surprised by this reference to Vehicle Rentals — Constituency Staff and Travel Expenses, Meals and Lodging — Constituency Staff as well. I believe that was what you just explained, Bohdan, was it?

MR. STEFANIUK: I explained the constituency travel, the first item.

MS BARRETT: The very first item?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's the one I dealt with in my explanation.

MS BARRETT: I would like to ask three separate questions. One is: are there going to be some kind of rules or bylaws about this? I'm not aware of constituency staff within our caucus from outside of town who might have known about this, so it might be advisable. I'm suggesting that some kind of guidelines about that come forward so that when our Edmonton constituency staff get together, which they do on occasion, they might be able to also see their counterparts from outside Edmonton.

On the Vehicle Rentals — Constituency Staff and Travel Expenses, Meals and Lodging — Constituency Staff, which come to \$3,805 and \$20,700, I wonder if you could explain the purpose of those and what happens with those.

MR. STEFANIUK: Those expenses are in fact charged against the constituency office allowances. All right? But they are placed in this category under this particular expense code to comply with Treasury directives so that when we submit the claims for payment to Treasury, they are coming out of an appropriate expense code. You can see there the notation "Transferred from 512K99," which is where the constituency allowances are provided for.

MS BARRETT: I get it.

MR. STEFANIUK: These vehicle rentals and travel expenses are incurred by constituency staff or constituency contractors on direction and request from the member for that particular constituency but certainly not at the discretion of the contract staff in the constituency offices. It is charged against the member's constituency office allowance, in effect.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One other quick thing on it in there. You see, the allowance is there for, say, Bob Hawkesworth's constituency office secretary in Calgary to come up here once or twice a year to see the Legislature, meet the staff, and all that kind of thing. That's what that larger figure is for.

MS BARRETT: But the larger one is deducted

from the constituency office allowance and transferred into another code so that it can then be paid to a different code. Right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, that's right.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right; that's the accounting system.

MR. HYLAND: That was the question I was on. I was wondering if this was new, and it's just a transfer from existing. The control on it is not only the two, but also you have to have money in your constituency office budget to do it. You can't [inaudible].

MR. STEFANIUK: Precisely.

MR. TAYLOR: The light is slowly dawning. I was going to try to move to do my standard 10 percent there, but you're in effect saying that the \$20,700 item and the \$3,800 item -- in other words, roughly \$24,500 -- doesn't come out of your budget anyhow; it's just a transfer back in fact. Since there was only \$40,000 all told, we're only chiseling away at \$16,000. I think I'll leave my guns for something else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. May we take approval for page 12 and move on?

MR. BOGLE: Pages 10 and 11.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Mr. Bogle, Taber-Warner, on conferences.

MR. BOGLE: If I could have just a one-liner from the Clerk on who normally goes to each of the conferences, other than the NCSL conference in Indianapolis that we've already talked about, starting with the CPA Seminar at the top.

MR. STEFANIUK: The CPA Seminar at the very top: four members designated by the Speaker, usually chosen to provide an all-party representation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a weekend trip, isn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. Presiding Officers' Conference: Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Deputy Chairman of Committees, and Clerk.

CPA Canadian Regional Council, the governing body of the Canadian Region of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association: Speaker and Clerk, usually in Ottawa, weekend. These are mainly weekend operations.

CPA Contingency Travel: that is to enable us to consider delegations for unforeseen trips. For example, there is a special conference that we just got notice of in Quebec City under the auspices of CPA. It is a procedural conference to mark the 75th anniversary of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The invitation has just come through; it hasn't even been considered. But that allowance enables us to at least consider the conference, to determine whether it's worth while or not.

Joint Canadian/U.S. Clerks: they meet once every two years. There was no conference last year. We provide for two of the three table Clerks to go to those conferences.

Annual Clerk's Conference: again, we provide for two out of the three Clerks to attend that once a year.

Other Travel by Clerk: that is to enable the Clerk to from time to time respond to requests for additional travel. Usually, if there are other Legislatures to be visited, we make every attempt to tie that visit in with another trip, attendance at a conference or something in another part of the country. Very rarely is this budget used by the Clerk in its entirety.

Uniform Law Conference is where the Parliamentary Counsel meets his counterparts. The Alberta Government Civil Lawyers' Association is for Parliamentary Counsel. The Canadian Bar Association Conference is for Parliamentary Counsel, one person.

Association of Information Systems Professionals is now a U.S./Canadian group meeting exclusively in the U.S. once a year, and that is the group of people who are in the business of computers and communication systems. We have used discretion there again and have sometimes sent one and sometimes two people to that particular conference.

The Sergeant-at-Arms Conference is a one-delegate representation once a year.

MR. BOGLE: I'm going to put forward a motion that starting with the NCSL Conference, the American conference in Indianapolis, and proceeding through all of the others to the bottom of page 11, the dollars be pooled and

reduced by 10 percent, and that it be at the discretion of the Speaker as to which conferences are attended and by whom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Isn't that the effect of the motion we passed previously reducing all conferences?

MR. BOGLE: No, because the other one dealt with all conferences, starting on page 9. There are a number relative to the explanations that have been given that are of significantly higher profile. I was starting with the NCSL Conference in Indianapolis and proceeding through to the Sergeant-at-Arms Conference in Toronto and suggesting that the dollars be pooled, that the dollars be reduced by 10 percent, and that this be discretionary for the Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: It's different. It could be considered an amendment, but it's so good that I will consider moving it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, then it becomes a direction that the bulk of the 10 percent downturn is going to come out of these areas.

MR. BOGLE: The 10 percent downturn comes out of these areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All the 10 percent comes out of this area?

MR. BOGLE: All of it. Your base is what is in the 1987-88 estimate now minus 10 percent.

MR. TAYLOR: If the Lord welcomes a convert, I'd be niggardly not to welcome one.

MS BARRETT: I apologize. For once today when I opened the door to the million door knocks, it was for me. Could I ask for that motion to be read again, please, just briefly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. From page 10 on your white document.

MR. BOGLE: From page 10 on the white document, from the NCSL Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana, proceeding through the Joint Canadian/U.S. Clerks' Conference, all of the conferences on page 11, ending with the Sergeant-at-Arms Conference in Toronto, that

the global amounts shown in the 1987-88 estimates be reduced by 10 percent. Rod, do we have an approximate figure?

MR. SCARLETT: Approximately \$3,000.

MR. BOGLE: Approximately \$3,000, and that it will now be discretionary at the call of the Speaker of the House as to which conferences Alberta is represented at and the makeup of the representative or representatives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I understand the gist. Edmonton Highlands?

MS BARRETT: Was I next on the speakers' list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: It's not a bad start, but I think it's pretty discriminatory. In essence, what we're saying with this motion is that MLAs can do all the traveling without restrictions applying to the overall expenditure as proposed, but when it comes to the table officers or Clerk's officers or whatever they're formally called, that's where the cutbacks would kick in. I don't understand why that would be fair. If we as MLAs are supposedly going to provide leadership and fiscal responsibility, is it fair for us to say, "Do as I say, not as I do"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Response to the question?

MR. BOGLE: First of all, in the explanation given — and that's why I asked for an explanation by the Clerk on a couple of occasions — the conferences that are not included in this motion are not exclusively for MLAs; they're mixtures of MLAs, the Clerk in some cases, and possibly others. I also point out that the first conference listed in the group, the NCSL Conference, which has a book value of \$14,720, represents almost half the total amount covered in this motion. That is a conference that would be attended primarily, if not entirely, by MLAs and their spouses. So I suggest to you, Pam, that it is indeed fair.

MRS. MIROSH: You have to stay in the room and listen.

MS BARRETT: I wrote them all down, and I

didn't catch that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are getting procedural advice from the Clerk that the motion is technically out of order because we've already decided that 10 percent overall be reduced.

MR. BOGLE: I beg your pardon. The motion included all conferences; this motion does not. If you want to deal with them line by line and conference by conference, prepare to do that, but clearly the intent of the two motions is different.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, maybe the misunderstanding — my motion is blanket, right across all the conferences. Although Mr. Bogle's isn't quite all the way, his motion is also a group. It's a different grouping from mine. Mine was the whole group; his was a portion of the group. I think it's quite in order.

MR. BOGLE: The Speaker may decide that Alberta does not need to be represented at the Alberta Government Civil Lawyers Association conference in Banff, as an example. That's at the discretion of the Chair. That is very different from your motion, which reduced our amount by 10 percent.

MR. TAYLOR: If you want to, we can run them one by one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not choosing to get into a procedural wrangle, I'll allow this motion to continue. If passed, I'll take it as very useful advice with regard to the decisions that lie ahead. We'll take it not only as advice but as direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a call for the question. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

Now, I think we're on page 13. Is that correct?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Advertising: Private Bills and MLA Communication Allowance. The

advertising of private Bills is obviously pretty well fixed. Perhaps there's discretion with regard to the communication allowance.

MR. STEVENS: It's a transfer.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, but later on in the budget that could be affected because of the postal rate, or we could wait until next year to trigger it: one or the other.

MR. STEFANIUK: This is the advertising portion, Mr. Chairman, that is taken from the communications allowance and, based on experience, is used by MLAs for advertising.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Advertising, not mailouts.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right. This is buying ad space in newspapers, radio, and television.

MR. BOGLE: Will this in any way affect an MLA's ability to transfer money around in those various components?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. The members' services order provides for an MLA's ability to transfer any and all allowances to the extent he wishes. This amount of money is merely placed in this particular section of the budget, based on experience with previous usage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is page 13 acceptable to everyone?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 14, Insurance: Four Vehicles.

MR. HYLAND: A question: the fourth vehicle.

MR. STEFANIUK: Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, and the Clerk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Fifteen.

MR. STEVENS: On 15, Mr. Chairman, while the announcements of the postal increases Mr. Hyland referred to may result in about a 6 percent increase in a first-class letter, not all of our expenditures on postage are first-class mail. Some of them are different kinds. Is this a formula? These are transfers anyway, not the

postage. Obviously, for the Legislative Assembly it may not be a 6 percent increase, but that's what a 2-cent change on 34 cents is.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to judge what effects the postal rates will have, because of the very usage of the various types of postage. I respectfully suggest to the committee that the amounts be left as they are. They call for no increase over the previous year's forecasts. If the situation arises in the course of the year where we see some significant increase that we cannot absorb, we would have to come back to the committee. But at the moment it would be virtually impossible to estimate what the cost of the increase would be to the Legislative Assembly or to members.

In applying the use of postage to communications allowance, members would rarely use first-class mail. I believe they would be using the bulk third and fourth classes in most instances. Some of the mail that goes out of these premises is certainly in the category of third and fourth class, but we didn't get to segregate it at the moment. If we were allowed the opportunity to come back in the event we saw difficulty with this item later in the year, that would be helpful.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, if memory serves me, one of our members' services orders says how the communications allowance is arrived at. Doesn't it have something in it, Bo, to the effect of the cost of two first-class letters delivered to each household in the constituency or something like that? That's all I'm wondering, if we're free to say we won't trigger it until the next budget year, because we don't know the effect of it. Our members' services order, unless we do something and say that this is what it's going to be, may trigger automatically and leave us with a shortfall.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the members' services order employs the definition "first-class mail"; it defines the amount in cents upon which the formula is calculated. The amount that was used initially represented the value of a first-class mailing, but the member has discretion as to whether or not he employs first class or any other form of mailing to use his communications allowance.



MR. BOGLE: I want to raise a concern about postage. Based on the news story of the postal increases, it seems to me that there's going to be a substantial increase in the advertising category. I just went through the process of bulk mailing calendars in the constituency, and that comes under the advertising category. I guess you'd call it junk mail, Nick.

I think a 22 percent increase will occur on July 1 and a further 14 percent increase. My dates may be wrong and the numbers may be wrong, but I do recall realizing that it was going to be a substantial increase. Any MLAs, particularly in rural Alberta, who use the post office as a way to get a pamphlet or flyer or something out in a bulk mail sense could see a pretty substantial increase in their costs in that area. Before we finalize this figure, I wonder if we wouldn't be wiser to take a second look at that — we can skip over it today and come back to it in a further discussion — to see whether or not an increase is warranted.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the formula for establishing a communications allowance for each member is as follows: .7622 cents multiplied by the number of electors in the constituency, divided by 1.5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's useful information, but the question raised is for our administrative staff to go back and look at the ramifications in terms of the projected increases which have already been declared for the coming fiscal year. We can then come back to that to see whether or not we need to change the formula in this fiscal year. So we can bring that one back. We can get Chuck to check with the post office. It may well be that what you say is absolutely correct, that there's enough room in there to cover it. But given the supplementary information not only about the first-class postage increase but about the advertising increase, that may well kick it out of sight. So if we could take a note of that, please, we'll get back to it. It's obvious we're not going to get through all the budget today and tomorrow.

Any other questions with regard to page 15? Otherwise, turn down the corner of the page so we know we're going to come back to 15.

Anything on 16, Bohdan?

MS BARRETT: I have a question. What's an MLA OA system?

MR. STEFANIUK: Office automation.

MR. STEVENS: It tells you just above it. Right above, it says "office automation."

MS BARRETT: I see.

MR. PENGELLY: That's the Aurora in your car.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that's not the Aurora.

MS BARRETT: Is that the money we set aside so that the subcommittee could go ahead and function and all that?

MR. STEVENS: I just asked that.

MR. HYLAND: If that's the case, you want on it?

MS BARRETT: Is it really?

MR. STEFANIUK: They're put under rental costs, but what we have done with the equipment we have is that some portion of the equipment was acquired through the government's Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, which we leased back from the government over a three-year period and which we own at the end of three years. The cost of that lease for the equipment which was acquired on our behalf by government services in the current year is those figures which are reflected.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm still not understanding what it is. MLA (office automation) OA system: it's the size of the thing that makes me ask, otherwise I would hide my shame at having to ask what it is and let it go by. But what is the \$160,000?

MR. STEFANIUK: Those are all the NBI terminals and printers the members now have in their offices in the capital.

MR. TAYLOR: In the capital?

MR. STEFANIUK: Which all the caucuses have. It's the equipment which . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, all the caucuses.

MS BARRETT: They're talking about the word



processors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is your stuff.

MR. HYLAND: Why don't they say "word processors"? Then we'd know what the hell it means.

MS BARRETT: I have another question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we transfer it all back and stick it into the caucus budgets?

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, it's legislative handiwork.

MS BARRETT: Nick, you didn't catch that, did you?

MR. TAYLOR: I was going to give them back the typewriter.

MS BARRETT: I'll try to make my question coherent. Do we actually rent furniture for constituency offices? I thought this was owned by Public Works and loaned to us. Do we pay people interest on those things?

MR. STEFANIUK: Some leases have been written in such a fashion that they include rental of furniture. This allowance comes out of the member's constituency office allowance. We did run into a situation awhile back, and we are going to run into it again very soon, where there is not going to be any surplus furniture available.

MS BARRETT: Don't I know it.

MR. STEFANIUK: I recently received a memorandum from the deputy minister of public works requesting that we search our various offices to determine if there is any surplus furniture, because they would like to get their hands on it. There is a freeze on acquisition of new furniture, so they fully intend to recycle as much furniture as possible. If we're going to open any new constituency offices, I expect that we may well run into a situation where there is no surplus furniture available for them.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that if Pam wants to see some from

public services, she come on down; I've got all the old used stuff they don't want.

MS BARRETT: So do I; I live with that.

MR. STEVENS: I just assumed that rental of furniture would also be rental of office space including furnishings. It's the whole . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: That's likely to be the case in some instances.

MR. STEVENS: In some instances.

MR. STEFANIUK: I suggest that those are very, very minimal and most of the rentals are for equipment.

MR. STEVENS: Okay.

MR. PENGELLY: Bohdan, would these code-a-phones come under that? Are they expensive?

MR. HYLAND: And photocopiers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Photocopiers.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, to the Clerk. Are you saying then that this cost is charged back to the specific constituency offices and then rented?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, it is.

MRS. MIROSH: It's transferred. Typewriters, everything is transferred back. I don't have any say as to that cost. If I can get it cheaper somewhere else or free . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: If you get it free, then it's not charged. This equipment is placed in the office at the direction of the member. We don't presume to tell the member what the member wants.

MRS. MIROSH: But there's standard office furniture that Public Works has that you supply to the constituency.

MR. STEFANIUK: If it's available from surplus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kind of.

MR. STEVENS: If you don't have it now, you'd

better get it quick.

MRS. MIROSH: Yes, kind of, but the member is charged for that. I've never seen a bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because it comes out of your constituency office.

MR. STEFANIUK: If it comes out of surplus . . .

MS BARRETT: It's possible that she's just got all the stuff from Public Works, and there's no charge then.

MR. STEVENS: You may be the one who has to give some up.

MR. HYLAND: Possibly you got lucky.

MRS. MIROSH: Maybe I got lucky.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ask for the printout about your office.

MR. HYLAND: Are those photocopiers we decided to purchase three or four years ago for constituency offices included? They were purchased outright, weren't they?

MR. STEFANIUK: Those were, but some offices may have wanted upgraded equipment, in which case it would have been a charge-back to the constituency office allowance.

MR. HYLAND: The initial one wasn't.

MR. PENGELLY: So you can get one that they don't want for nothing.

MR. STEFANIUK: The initial one wasn't. There is a standard one that is available, but if an office decides that it wants more than the standard equipment, there would be a charge-back to that particular office.

MR. HYLAND: So we can get rid of that great, huge thing and get something smaller that works.

MR. STEVENS: I did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions with regard to page 16.

MS BARRETT: No. Question, question.

MR. TAYLOR: I have one question. I'm still not clear. I was under the impression -- maybe the Clerk could advise me -- that there was a standard package that came free, if you can say such a thing, to one office. In other words, two chairs, a set of legs, and whatever it is that . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: That's true.

MR. TAYLOR: There is a standard package that comes without being charged back?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. TAYLOR: I see. Okay. I haven't got anything from you people yet.

MR. STEFANIUK: If a member wants more, then it has to come out of his own allowance.

MRS. MIROSH: Oh, I've got all the free stuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Agreed with page 16?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. A five-minute break for coffee and whatever.

[The committee recessed from 2:50 p.m. to 3:07 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would perhaps meet tomorrow as well, or if you want to quit earlier.

MR. PENGELLY: Four o'clock I would say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four o'clock? Fine.

MS BARRETT: I wouldn't mind. I have another meeting actually.

MRS. MIROSH: It's an hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. On we go till 4 o'clock.

MS BARRETT: Quick, quick.

MR. STEVENS: Four o'clock?

MS BARRETT: Can someone tell me what page

we were on?

MR. PENGELLY: Seventeen.

MS BARRETT: We're not getting very far very fast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're on 17. Well, we love being together.

MR. HYLAND: Relating to AGT credit cards, Mr. Chairman, a few years ago when we went to the option of the member having an additional phone in his or her home so that you could dial direct from all constituency offices, legislative offices, and telephones in your home, we thought we could save quite a bit of money. Initially I think we did. Although it's only a 4.8 percent increase in AGT credit cards, I wonder what went awry, why that started to increase again. Are all the new members aware that they can have that extra phone put in their house to place their calls at home? If memory serves me right, at that time it was estimated that something like 48 percent of the long-distance calls occurred from the home after hours.

MRS. MIROSH: They're still long-distance calls, though.

MR. PENGELLY: I think the first year was . . .

MR. HYLAND: The rate of placing them over your phone at home is something like half or less than half when using the credit card.

MR. PENGELLY: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Credit card calls in rough terms are just about double, because in reality they're person-to-person calls.

MS BARRETT: This is very interesting. I understood that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everything here is very interesting.

MS BARRETT: No, I wouldn't go that far. Sometimes things are not that interesting, but this one is. I was under the impression that if you were a rural MLA and on a party line, you could have a separate phone put in. So you're

correcting that impression, I take it, and you'll have a chance to deny it if I'm wrong. If that's the case, though, and you make calls directly from this special MLA phone, the hot line at home so to speak, where do the bills go? Do the bills come directly to the Leg. Assembly as if you were dialing through your credit card? If they do, this is a real smart way to save money.

I have another question. Why is it that if people call in collect from around the province -- oh, I guess it doesn't matter if it goes on a credit card then because it's already collect; you've already gone through the operator system.

Can I have those answered, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, who wants to answer all of that? Clerk, please.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, every member, rural or urban, is entitled to have a special private-line phone installed in his or her residence at Legislative Assembly cost.

MS BARRETT: Hallelujah.

MR. STEFANIUK: That phone may certainly be used for all MLA business including long-distance dialing. In fact, use of that phone for toll charges incurred by long-distance dialing is encouraged rather than the use of a credit card, which indeed doubles the cost of the phone. What we have seen here is an increase in both credit card use and charges for tolls dialed directly from residential installations.

MS BARRETT: You've got 16 MLAs who didn't know that.

MR. STEFANIUK: But one of the difficulties that was mentioned is that collect calls come in at the double rate because they are operator handled, and there is not much that can be done about those, except to take messages.

MS BARRETT: I will do a memo to our group. None of us knew; not even Raymond had one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's fun to get together.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I might make a suggestion. I believe Ontario and certainly the House of Commons will not let their members accept collect calls because of that. If you

place a collect call to your Member of Parliament, you nearly always find he won't accept it but will call you back two minutes or so later on a direct line.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. TAYLOR: I would think that's one place we could save money, and we should. I'd be prepared to move, if you wish, that collect calls not be allowed any more on the Legislature's phone bill. I think it's a way of teaching us to cut costs, because a collect call is fantastically expensive. It's not double; it's nearly three times. It's double an operator-assisted call. An operator-assisted call is a flat rate, say, about a dollar and a half. If you're making a 65 cent or a dollar call, you double your cost, but if you make a collect call, it doubles again. So it's fantastically expensive if you accept collect calls.

MR. PENGELLY: Nick, will the operator give you the number that has . . .

MR. TAYLOR: If a collect call comes in, Joe Blow from Innisfail is calling, all you have to say is, "Sorry, I can't accept the call," and then of course you know it was Joe Blow. Or you ask who's calling. They've got to tell you who's calling; otherwise, you can't accept the charge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BOGLE: While I'm extremely supportive of any initiatives we can take encouraging members to have phones put in their homes so they can dial direct and save the use of the credit card, I'd like to remind the hon. colleague opposite that there are a good number of parts of the province that are not covered by the RITE system. I have over a third of the constituency I represent — as you know, that constituency borders on the U.S., so we're as far away from Edmonton as any in terms of a population centre. The greater the distance from Edmonton, the greater the cost of the call. A third of my constituents can't use the RITE line. Remember that the way the RITE line is set up, if any one of the steps is blocked, you can't get through. So the Edmonton-Calgary corridor may be open and it may be the Calgary-Lethbridge corridor that's plugged. I've had people get ahold of me who are so

frustrated when they've tried using the RITE system, so I've said to people, "If you live in Taber or Coaldale, where the RITE system is in place, and you can't get through to me and it's urgent, call collect. If you live in the part of the constituency that's not covered by the RITE system, call me collect."

I can't support your motion, because I think we'd be striking out and hurting the very people who are trying to get to us for some help on issues relating to government, where they need their MLA.

MR. TAYLOR: As a point of information. You might have misunderstood me. What you do is that a collect call comes in, but you don't accept it. They have to tell you who made the call and then you call back. They call it an operator 6 callback. They'll say, "Sophie Glutz from Warner wants to know if you'll accept the charges." "I can't accept them now, operator." Then they'll say, "Sophie Glutz at such-and-such a phone number," and you direct dial back. That's the way Members of Parliament do it. They have to cover from Newfoundland to Ottawa.

MR. BOGLE: Yes, and I hear criticism of them.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just saying that it's a very expensive system. You get the message from the collect caller free anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The discussion has been helpful in the case of Pam, and I assume in your case also, Nick, to get the message back to your own members about this other routing, which would save on some of the calls at any rate.

MR. TAYLOR: It might be nice to prepare just a single sheet explaining the different systems, which could go to all MLAs, in the interests of saving costs on phones. Whether AGT would be happy to hear you're counseling people to . . .

MS BARRETT: Having been an operator and knowing all about callbacks 6 and 5 and all of that, I can assure you they don't like it. But I would like to point out that I think it's not a bad idea. Instead of telling people you can call me collect if you need to, ask them, "When should I or my staff person be calling you?" and you can save money that way. It's false economy to have to have more people hanging around the

phones saying, "No, you're going to have to hang up and I'm going to have to call you back," and frustrating operators and all the rest of it. What I think is a smart directive, which can come out of a resolution of our intention, is to say: let's be a little more wise now that we understand the system here in terms of collect calls costing as much as person-to-person. We forget that. I'd forgotten it. But I really think you're pursuing false economy if you want to go for that full directive. Not only that, but as one or two other members said, and the chief of staff of government members nodded her head, and she knows darned well, having to go through that extra hoop when you're already kind of frustrated — you're usually already frustrated when you're calling an MLA — doesn't make you any happier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. TAYLOR: If they're really angry, I tell them that I'm with the NDP and would they please call us tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments with regard to page 17?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, Directory Advertising seems awfully high to me, for all they do. You just get a name in the phone book, but I don't suppose there's anything we can do about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this mobile telephone figure a transfer from another account that comes out of the member's communication allowance?

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm sorry; I can't answer that off the top of my head. I know that we cover certain mobile telephones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some of them, yes.

MR. HYLAND: I think — and I put that qualification on it — some of it's probably transferred, because out of your own communication allowances comes the air charge or standby charge. But the cost of a call comes out of the regular telephone budget of the Assembly, the same as your phone at home or

whatever; your standby charge, plus your rent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's both.

MR. HYLAND: It's both.

MR. TAYLOR: What comes out of the constituency?

MR. HYLAND: Your standby charge . . .

MR. PENGELLY: For a mobile phone.

MR. HYLAND: . . . and your rent, if you haven't bought it.

MR. TAYLOR: The toll for the call itself is out of . . .

MS BARRETT: And that makes absolute sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Page 17, agreed.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eighteen seems like a nice number on the way through to 27 in this section. Is 18 all right? I think we've covered a fair amount of that before.

Page 19.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know when we're going to come back to this, and unfortunately the member who raised this is away. This morning he raised some questions, and I don't know if it's in here. For example, we have a Visitors' Guide and other things related to the Legislative Assembly. I'm on page 19. Mr. Kowalski raised a concern about photographs for visiting classes.

MR. BOGLE: I think that's on page 20.

MR. STEVENS: Page 20? Oh, I'll wait till we get to 20.

MS BARRETT: I have a question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, that's another thing I'd like to bring up. With regard to Orders of the Day, how many copies of that particular handout do we get per day?

MR. PENGELLY: At least three.

MS BARRETT: Two. One on your desk at work and one at the Leg.

MR. PENGELLY: One at caucus, one at the Leg., and one on your desk.

MS BARRETT: Oh, you get a caucus copy. We don't.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maybe we could take a look at that and see if there is a better way of handling that. We have one when we get into the House. We are usually handed one going into caucus.

MR. TAYLOR: What about the idea of putting it on the word processor once, and then all the caucuses press their little printer button?

MS BARRETT: We aren't compatible. Wang can't talk to NBL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is about the number of Orders of the Day and Votes and Proceedings that are printed. We are directed to provide adequate copies. That's basically what it says.

We have also in the House asked the question about how many copies of Hansard are being printed every day. Gary Garrison is here. I believe you've taken some steps about rationalizing that as well. Is that right?

DR. GARRISON: We haven't really adjusted the numbers. The total is 1,820 at the moment, including all the subscribers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eighteen hundred and twenty copies of Hansard per day. It's all part of an overall thing that we're looking at in the department on cost effectiveness and the amounts being published.

MR. HYLAND: I notice that later on somewhere you propose to talk about the rates of receiving it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The matter of the Member for Barrhead that Banff-Cochrane was reminding us of was school photos. We had put it off until later in the agenda. Rod, do you want to briefly say how we think we have solved this thing? The directive came out from David Russell's department

saying that they would no longer cover it. My understanding is, Rod, that we've got a solution already.

MR. SCARLETT: Basically what the solution amounts to is that the Public Affairs Bureau, through Maryanne, will do all the arranging. Everything remains the same except that when the confirmation notice comes to the member, he will make a check mark and return it to Maryanne saying, "Yes, we want photos," or "No, we don't want photos." If you want photos, it will be charged against your communication allowance. For example, if you've got 60 children in the class, it might amount to something like \$20 to get 60 photos, or whatever their formula is; I don't know what it is for sure.

MR. STEVENS: I would like to ask: what is the total cost saved by the Public Affairs budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't know.

MR. STEVENS: I'd like to make a very unusual suggestion. Whatever it costs, if they have to cut it, can't we find it here in the Legislative Assembly? It should be a service. There are many times when an MLA will not be available for those school children. They may meet another colleague, maybe even an opposition member. It seems to me that's a reasonable thing for those school kids.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's what we're attempting to do, Greg. I agree with you. It's a very useful service. When I heard it -- and I only heard it by happenstance, because I didn't get the memo -- my reaction was a little severe.

MS BARRETT: We jumped past one I wanted to talk about. Can I talk about this for a second first?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this one, yes.

MS BARRETT: On the new costs to be absorbed by the members' constituency budget, it's \$20 for the photo session, very close to \$15 for one eight by 10 copy, or you can go for X number of five by seven copies at a charge of, I think, \$1.25 each. It isn't insubstantial; let's put it that way. Whoever is paying for it, it's not

cheap.

MR. STEVENS: May I make myself clear? I'm not saying that the member's constituency allowance should be charged this amount. What I am saying is that I might have one school a year, and you might have 47 because you're in Edmonton. I have no question with this.

MS BARRETT: I heard you.

MR. STEVENS: Did I say it right? We're being told it is going to be charged to the communication allowance, and I don't agree with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's going to be even more magnanimous. He's going to help pay for all of them, because he only has one school come a year. Same with mine. What you're asking is: if X amount is being saved by Public Affairs, make an additional global amount in our budget to cover it for everyone.

MS BARRETT: I understood; I was just clarifying the numbers, because I found out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We only found out late yesterday, so we don't have the exact numbers on this thing.

MR. TAYLOR: What is the range you're talking about?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't know; we're going to find out, Nick.

MR. TAYLOR: May I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're first after the Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Before we finalize this subject, we do need to know the numbers to see the magnitude. But on the principle of the issue, I'm very supportive of the position taken by the Speaker and by the Member for Banff-Cochrane. While I'm lucky if I get one class per year from the constituency, I know that schools in many constituencies, particularly here in Edmonton and immediately around Edmonton, send classes on a regular basis. To put this burden on the member's communication allowance would in my view be an unfair burden

for those members. Therefore, subject to the cost and the numbers, I'm supportive of finding a way to include it in the budget. I thought that someplace on page 20 under Professional, Technical & Labor Services might in fact be appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I need to ask a question at this stage and show my own ignorance. Bohdan, under Printing: Visitors' Guide, even though we don't have visitors' services under us, we're the ones who are supplying the stuff for them?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. STEVENS: Who has visitors' services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Public Affairs, now under David Russell. I think there's an awful lot of logic to having most of the operation of visitors' services under the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly rather than under Public Affairs, but that's another issue for another day.

MR. TAYLOR: My question goes back a bit. I didn't understand the Sergeant-at-Arm's honorarium. Is that for working late in the evenings?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the Sergeant-at-Arms is an employee of the Solicitor General, who is loaned to the Legislative Assembly while the House is in session. In recognition of the extra hours he works, which he would not normally work if he were employed by the Solicitor General, an honorarium is paid to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which is not a terribly huge amount.

MR. TAYLOR: No. It was just to explain it. After what the Sergeant-at-Arms in Quebec did a year or so ago, I'd put a lot of faith in him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're going to lay down your life for 4,000 bucks.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MS BARRETT: I see at the very bottom of page 19, Budget Estimates Distributed to MLAs, 100 per MLA. I've never seen MLAs carrying out 100 or even close to that, as far as I know. Is

that just the formula for deciding how many to print? Is that really what that is?

MR. STEVENS: Pick up the phone. You're entitled to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is our response that it is an entitlement?

MR. STEFANIUK: It is an entitlement, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then they get delivered to their offices after the budget, because it usually takes — what? — a week to 10 days to get the additional copies there.

MR. HYLAND: We're not talking about the full document; we're talking about the address.

MS BARRETT: No, budget estimates. Budget Highlights is above that, and Budget Address is above that yet. We're talking the real McCoy, the bound one.

MR. HYLAND: We don't make a hundred of those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are the blue-covered three-volume things. They're very expensive to produce.

MS BARRETT: I understand that. My question was: is it more the case that you ask for as many as you need? But they're really centrally distributed, aren't they? Treasury distributes a lot.

MR. STEFANIUK: We pay for the whole thing. This includes not only the amount distributed by each MLA, but the entire production of the estimates is charged to the Legislative Assembly.

MS BARRETT: That makes sense. I was just questioning whether...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does it? We could have a friendly amendment to send this over to Treasury and invite the Provincial Treasurer to pay for his own document.

MS BARRETT: Well, given what's coming up, you never know; I might support that motion. But the hundred per MLA is really a formula for

deciding how many to print, isn't it? That's all I wanted to know.

MR. STEVENS: Well, I got my hundred.

MS BARRETT: Are you serious?

MR. STEVENS: I'm serious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, I'm wrong. Wait a minute; I have inadvertently misled this House. It's not the blue, thick ones.

MR. STEVENS: It's the Dick Johnston presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it's the long...

MR. STEVENS: With the charts and stuff.

MS BARRETT: Then for heaven's sake, tell me what the Budget Address is. Isn't that it?

MR. STEVENS: That's it.

MR. HYLAND: That should be it.

MS BARRETT: That's two items above the one I was just questioning.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, but that is the initial production of the Budget Address for use by the government. These are the additional copies which are made available to MLAs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To send out to constituents. Then we need different terms here.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, at 100 per MLA, that's 8,300.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't realize we had more of those estimates out there than we had budget preliminary [inaudible].

MS BARRETT: Oh well, I'm sure it's theoretically correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a question we need to figure out. We have address, highlights, and estimates. To me "estimates" means an estimates book. Maybe we could just get



clarification on that, since we're not likely to get through this whole document before we adjourn at 4.

MR. HYLAND: Surely there aren't 100 of those binders sitting around, where we each have one.

MR. STEVENS: No.

MR. TAYLOR: That's what I'm wondering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll do a little checking, please. Turn down the corner of page 19, because we do need a question answered about those terms.

Page 20?

MR. HYLAND: You started on a subject that I want to — or did we just accept it and go on? It's who should pay for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pay for . . .

MR. HYLAND: The preparation of the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to figure out from the one who prepared this sheet for us what the three terms indeed mean. I assume that's Robert; is that correct?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, is it simply tradition that the Speech from the Throne and the presentation by the government of the day of its budget intention is borne by the Assembly, since it's a requirement of our legislation that these things be done? That must be why it's there. Whether it should be done somewhere else is another matter. Government has to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I assume that's the answer. Is that correct, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hold it for just a moment, folks. Rod went and checked the photograph thing.

MS BARRETT: Let's move on and come back when he's back to report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's right here. Is he back fast enough?

MR. SCARLETT: It would cost approximately \$40,000 -- that's a round figure Maryanne budgeted last year — to provide five by seven photographs to everybody that comes in and has their photograph taken, plus \$2,000 for the folders to go around the photos.

MR. STEVENS: That's \$42,000.

MR. SCARLETT: That \$42,000 is an approximate figure to cover everything.

MS BARRETT: That would eat up my communications allowance.

MR. TAYLOR: I think we should table that for another year. We'll be here for four years. We could go and get a picture three years from now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got that for information, and we'll come to it at the end of the budget process. You know it will cost another \$42,000. You've saved \$30,000 on conference travel — whatever the figures were. Bear it in mind as you go along.

MR. STEVENS: Wasn't it \$3,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I thought of all the savings that might or might not arise from the various caucuses.

MS BARRETT: I take it that continued negotiations will occur in an attempt to have Public Works resume those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, unless I get direction from the committee when we come back to the item.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: There's something wrong on Budget Highlights. It says \$4,594, and where it says \$43,000 in the '86-87 forecast, it shows a 0.0 percent change. Something's cockeyed.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, what we have is a separation of two figures, \$39,000 and \$4,594, which were lumped in the previous year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we have the corner turned down on 19.

How are we with page 20?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, maybe as I'm a freshman MLA in the crowd, you could explain what some of these things are. What do MLA & Officer Letterhead and MLA & Officer Envelopes mean?

MR. STEVENS: Chairman of such and such.

MR. PENGELLY: It should be "office," shouldn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the first part of that is the overprinting of personalized letterhead for MLAs. The other part may be the special letterheads that are used by various officers of the Assembly as well as special committees of the Assembly, who may wish their own letterhead produced.

MR. TAYLOR: I see, like "Liberal opposition leader" or something like that.

Overprinting Program: does that mean . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: The overprinting program is that where we employ the standard letterhead and overprint the MLA's name and constituency.

MR. TAYLOR: What is Cards & Wrapping Paper for Promo Allowance Program?

MR. STEVENS: That's when you give out a shoe polish tin, you have a Legislative Assembly blue card and a beautiful envelope, and you can say, "Dear shoe polish tin recipient, this is from Nick."

MR. TAYLOR: Nick and the boys.

MR. HYLAND: As long as it isn't black, you're okay.

MR. TAYLOR: Why would Quick Print Services be added, sir? What is Quick Print Services?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's the use of a government agency which produces offset printing at a comparatively low cost and to which we send certain materials for printing when the quantities exceed what might be a reasonable use of the photocopier and is more economical than the photocopier.

MR. TAYLOR: Don't you think that by a little timing of the orders or phoning some MLAs to wait, you might not need it?

MR. STEFANIUK: We may even have internal documents which require reproduction. If we get into a 50-page document and we need 100 copies, it's more economical to send it to the quick print services of the government than to try to pump it out on one of our own photocopiers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, in the operation of the House we're always happy, if you have an amendment, that you run it off on your machine at your cost instead of bringing it in for the Assembly to pick up that tab. We look forward to your co-operation in that regard.

MR. TAYLOR: If you've operated as many years as I have without a seat, you get to be a pretty good moocher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions with regard to page 20? Twenty is okay? Thank you. Twenty-one looks like a long page.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Twenty-two. In that regard, just a quick thing: Coffee Service in the MLA Lounge. I'm hoping to get a plug-in down at the other end of the lounge so we can at least put a coffee pot at the other end to try to ease some of the congestion at that one end.

MR. TAYLOR: Have we cut the costs at all? Have we forbidden the use of the lounge to anybody who uses cigarettes? I can take a shot of caffeine, but the nicotine lays me out cold.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the answer is no. Moving on to page 23 . . .

MS BARRETT: Can I ask about the CPA Annual Dinner?

MR. HYLAND: Me too.

MS BARRETT: I've never heard of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; what page are we on?

MS BARRETT: Page 22, the last item before total.

MR. TAYLOR: The annual dinner for nonsmokers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The annual dinner basically hasn't been held for a while. Bohdan, perhaps you'd like to comment on that for a moment.

MR. STEFANIUK: It was the custom for many years to hold a dinner for all the members and their spouses or escorts in the rotunda of the Legislature Building on the day of the opening of the fall sittings, under the sponsorship of the Alberta branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. It was discontinued some years ago. The provision is made in the event that it were to be reinstituted.

It has taken on some varied forms. I recall that when Bob Clark was retiring, instead of the MLA dinner, a reception was held under CPA auspices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time I remember, it was indeed down in the rotunda around the pool -- the pool; that's wishful thinking. I found it was -- as you know, a lot of us don't get many opportunities to interact with others outside the cut and thrust of the House and all that kind of thing. Also, a lot of the spouses really don't feel like they're that much a part of what the heck's going on, so it was one gracious way to be able to do that.

The other thing here about having the amount put into the estimate is that I could see that whatever we come up with as the means of celebrating the 75th anniversary of the opening of the building on September 3 might indeed be the use of this money. We're going to invite back all the living members, both Lieutenant-Governors as well as former members of the Assembly. With regard to that, I've got it arranged now that we will unveil the portraits of former Lieutenant-Governor Lynch-Staunton and former Speaker Amerongen on September 3. That will be part of this. So this might be a fitting way for this to happen. I don't see it as being any kind of sit-down, formal dinner but much more of a wine and cheese reception -- tea and coffee, small sandwiches -- so people can move around and interact and so forth.

MR. BOGLE: I think your explanation of the

significance of this year is very compelling. I'd like to suggest that we delete the CPA annual dinner under the 1987-88 estimate and insert the same amount of money for the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Assembly. I'll make that a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. TAYLOR: Excuse me for a second here. Is there already an estimate for the celebration? If this money hadn't been transferred over, how would that have been arrived at?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would have been like the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon: out there mooching.

MS BARRETT: You'd have to pay admission, Nick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was kind of hoping that what has just transpired might indeed transpire.

MR. HYLAND: As I remember those dinners, they were expensive to put on.

MR. STEVENS: You couldn't hear anything either.

MR. TAYLOR: We'd better vote for it, or it's liable to show up on our reconsideration of opposition [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion to have that changed from "CPA" to "75th anniversary"? Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you very much.

Page 23, Light and Power: candles all the way around?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Twenty-three is agreed.

Page 24 takes us to the matter of promotional allowances.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, two items. The first one: could I have an explanation of how Stationery Purchased for Use by MLAs and Leg. Assembly Offices compares with page 20, where we're talking about letterheads, envelopes, and

such.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, this is all those items other than the items which are printed. This is the writing paper, notepads, telephone message pads, pens, pencils, and carbon paper: the whole schmeer.

MR. BOGLE: All right.

MR. STEFANIUK: Computer paper, xerox paper.

MR. BOGLE: The second point: I understand the promotional allowance for MLAs. Could I have a brief explanation of CPA and House Officers? I guess that's also gifts and the bulk requests.

MR. STEFANIUK: CPA and House Officers was to enable the Speaker, primarily, to have access to certain presentation items for visiting dignitaries or to present when he visits other jurisdictions: gifts which might be of some substance. For example, recently one of the MLA Christmas cards which was printed from an original painting executed for the Assembly was reproduced in actual-size form for use as a presentation item by the Speaker.

Bulk Requests: that is really to enable us to carry some stock of presentation items. That's where we in fact [inaudible].

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we're now dealing with the requests for a fiscal year that will take us through the 1988 Olympics being held in Calgary and Canmore, and I can see much greater than usual demands being placed on the Speaker. There was a function in Calgary right at the end of the spring/summer/fall session of the House, which included representatives of at least one of the other parties and possibly two. I can't recall. In any event, there were visiting dignitaries from West Germany: the presiding officer of the Assembly and parliamentarians.

I raise the point for members' consideration. I think there's going to be great protocol demand placed on the Speaker of our Assembly on behalf of all of us. It may be covered someplace else in this budget. If it is not, I think there should be some consideration given here, even if it means a reduction in the bulk requests for a year, to ensure we have additional dollars added for the Speaker.

MR. STEVENS: Like protocol requirements or something like that?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, on the question of bulk requests, as I said, that is simply to enable us to carry an inventory which is unspoken for, so reduction of that particular item might result in our inability to carry a sufficient inventory of promotional materials to have available for members. In effect, it would result in depriving members of ready access to items...

MR. BOGLE: Bohdan, other than pins, if it means picking up the cookbooks and books on Alberta and things, while it's a bit of an inconvenience, we can all go down to Audreys bookstore or the like. I'm just trying to find a way to help our Speaker through one unique year. Knowing that even if we wound up adding to that sum -- well, I've said enough. I'll wait and hear what other members have to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I very much appreciate that concern, because it certainly came home with a vengeance, and not only with the reception at Heritage Park, where we entertained the vice-president of West Germany, and how much good came out of that. When we went back overseas, the response from the Canadian Embassy was, "What in the heck did you folks do in Alberta, because you've blown their minds?" Their own staff have never seen them so relaxed or coming back so high on how terrific a place was. The highlight of the whole Canadian tour was Alberta.

That also in itself generated a lot of reciprocal hospitality when we were in West Germany. To go to those places is a shock to the system as to what demands they place immediately in terms of protocol, the kinds of things we as Albertans never even think about. They always have a driver and a car there at your disposal, meeting you at the airport, picking you up -- the whole kind of thing -- as well as the hospitality. They don't assume that because they've given you lunch, that's the end of it. It's got to be lunch and supper and looking after you all the time you're within their jurisdiction. We tend to look at this and say, "We'll have you for supper, and that's nice," and that's about it. But you know that when they come from overseas, they have a whole different kind of approach to this thing, a far

broader understanding of hospitality than we have had.

Certainly, when you have the Olympic Games component come into all this discussion, we have to look at things that are really not terribly high on my agenda. But then I have to stop and realize that yes, together we, the Speaker, do indeed represent the people of the province of Alberta. So we are going to look at the fact that when we know that delegations are coming in, they're going to be using my vehicle and other vehicles to make sure we do go and pick people up at the airport and all that to the best of our ability.

In this regard, though, perhaps we could have additional conversation on this when we come to page 42, under the Speaker's Office, where we have talked about hospitality and gifts. We did have a higher figure in, but in terms of present economic reality we've taken a lower figure on this. I don't know if it is a fully realistic figure, taking into account the Olympics. But we might have that further discussion when we come to the Speaker's Office, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm having a little difficulty in understanding what the problem has imposed, but it says, "Transfers are being made to more appropriately reflect the account codes." Is that global \$330,000 figure supposed to be coming down the road from somewhere else? In other words, the member for Milk River-Warner says that \$3,800 may not be enough. Where are these transfers? I see a note below. I just want to understand . . .

MRS. MIROSH: Promotional allowance for MLAs.

MR. TAYLOR: The other MLA promotional had a number, though. All the other transfers were from such and such. But this doesn't. I don't understand. Are we transferring out or in?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's indeed fair comment, and overnight we'll have the Clerk catch up to his assistant, who did some of the preparation of this document, so we can find the appropriate code.

MR. TAYLOR: I see. While we're at it, what's that \$301,000 promotional allowance for the MLAs? Is that over and above our allowance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. HYLAND: That is our allowance, isn't it?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, that is the allowance.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, it should have had a bracket. Okay, you're going to straighten that all out then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to make the inquiry and trust that we will straighten it all out.

MR. STEVENS: Chairman, I appreciate Bob's proposal and your suggestion that we talk about it under 49, and we will. May I also suggest for your consideration that on page 22, which we've already covered and approved, you should have under Legislative Assembly something separate from under your future pages when we get to them, under Speaker.

I think Bob has made an excellent point. Besides the former CPA annual dinner and now the 75th anniversary of the Assembly, besides the Clerk's entertainment allowance, perhaps there should be something in there for the Speaker in carrying out those roles in the Legislative Assembly function. Am I wrong on that? I think what you said that we should do under 49 we will still do, but should you not have an area there? As Speaker you are required to do Legislative Assembly functions, and it might very well be in there as well. I leave that for you. But don't overlook 22 either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. A comment from the Clerk and from Rod, because you're both involved in this. Do you think that it's been covered in the other, or sufficient?

MR. STEFANIUK: Maybe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're having an overnight consultation?

MR. SCARLETT: I think it probably isn't. We went on the guidelines to try to bring our budget down.

MR. HYLAND: Does the consultation also include this bulk request?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the bulk request was explained. It's inventory. So we have to carry a figure so that we can put the stuff in the storage shelves for when you come in.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, but Geez, that's a lot of -- \$25,000 is a hell of a lot of pins and cups.

MR. STEFANIUK: Twenty-five thousand pins. And that is not by any means an unusual quantity for us to hold for 83 members.

MRS. MIROSH: I use half of them.

MR. STEVENS: That would be 300 per member ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's nothing.

MR. STEVENS: ... which is less than a bag, sitting on a shelf, for each member. I usually get them in that box of 500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure administratively at this time of year it causes a heck of a problem, because you know the sudden rush in the last two weeks to try to get everybody's promotional allowance expended or whatever. That makes for a very difficult inventory problem.

MR. HYLAND: How come that isn't in a revolving fund like Transportation has for a gravel stockpile or the other departments have for furniture?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, we've inquired about the advisability of setting up a revolving fund, and the advice to us is that this is not a sufficient amount, nor is there sufficient traffic to justify the establishment of a revolving fund such as Public Works has set up quite often.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. I believe we have turned down the corner of page 24 for additional information from the Assistant Clerk. Twenty-two has been changed. Page 25, the other grants column: Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, youth parliamentarian scholarships, Canada branch, and then the larger figure is to Commonwealth headquarters.

MR. HYLAND: Why has it grown so much? Did

they say why when they asked for more money?

MS BARRETT: Holy cow.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the increased fees come about as a result of a decision at the plenary conferences of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. It has been found that it is just taking more money to run the entire Commonwealth Association, so every branch has been assessed additional funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's an assessment worldwide.

MR. HYLAND: So do we have to pay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Concurrence on page 25?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 26, Purchase of Fixed Assets.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. MIROSH: It went way down. It's nice to see that drop.

MR. STEVENS: It might go up in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On 26, agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 27, Purchase of Office Equipment: photocopiers, typewriters, dictaphones, dictamites.

AN HON. MEMBER: What's a dictamite?

MR. STEVENS: They're mini.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's like a flea. Okay, are you in agreement?

MS BARRETT: My photocopier gets upgraded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand there is a meeting taking place tomorrow that hopefully might help along the line.

To double-check, we have a number of pages in this section with turned down corners for

additional information, hopefully to be gained overnight. I think, members, that we've come to the end of that section for today, and it is indeed one or two minutes to 4. Let's call it a day with regard to this meeting.

Tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, unless you wish to start earlier.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might express my apology to you and the committee. I have a constituency series of events beginning, which require my attendance -- I think I heard the secretary -- and I just cannot be here tomorrow. I feel badly about that.

If I might, I'd just like to reiterate that whatever the discussions leave, I think what the Taber-Warner representative recommended this morning, that overnight we give consideration to it very carefully -- I do feel the principles outlined this morning are the correct thing. We should try to strive for a reduction in our per-member expenditures and our leader expenditures this year. That's the way we should be going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MS BARRETT: Formal? On the record or off?

MR. STEVENS: I won't be here, you see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, we stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9. I would like to make the offer that if any of you wish to come and tour the changes, where we're at in the Chamber right now, please join me outside the Chamber door. It will only take about 10 minutes. Other than that, see you shortly.

[The committee adjourned at 4:01 p.m.]

