

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[10:08 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to day three of members' services for this month. When we left the other day, we flagged the day's agenda to be that we would meet until 11 o'clock so that Mr. Taylor could go off for an hour.

MR. TAYLOR: I'll be leaving at about 10 to 11.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll carry on. We have arranged for lunch to be served at 11. We'll be back to work at 12 o'clock, and we'll be working through until late in the afternoon, possibly as late as 6:30, unless we get other things done ahead of time.

When we left we had a motion on the table. There are some amendments. We had passed the motion. Some clarification was required with regard to sections 2, 3, and 4. The main motion had been carried.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we table the motion on caucus budget until a later time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to table. Would those in favour please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

That being the case, I would assume that . . . If you turn back to the budget estimates -- again I underline the fact that these are estimates; these are not final documents. Readers of the record and other observers should be very much aware of the fact that this is a process in a state of flux. When we were working through the estimates binder -- correct me if I'm wrong -- we had completed section 2, Administrative Support.

MR. BOGLE: Under Administrative Support, section 2, there were a couple of matters we had asked for clarification on. If it's the pleasure of the Chair, we might go back and tidy up those few areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One matter related to rural postal rates. That was one.

MR. BOGLE: One related to postal rates; one related to bulk requests, on page 24. May we deal with that matter now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.

MR. BOGLE: Upon doing some further checking on this matter and with the assistance of the Clerk, we were able to determine that over the past two years only two MLAs have accessed any pins through this section and that it's really not being utilized by members as a whole. I would like to move that for the 1987-88 fiscal year, the \$25,000 under bulk requests be eliminated. I think a portion of those funds could best be used by the Speaker under hosting for the '88 Olympics, but that might be a separate motion. I'll leave my motion to delete the \$25,000 as now stated for the next fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Let the record show that the committee agreed to something unanimously, to start the day off. Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that on page 24 the bulk request item read . . .

MR. BOGLE: You want it under Hospitality, page 22.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I guess it would have to move under Hospitality, wouldn't it? A figure of \$25,000 would be put in there for the purposes of the Speaker and the Olympic games.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We need the direction of the Clerk. Do we leave this on page 24, or does that get moved to Speaker's Office under section 4?

MR. STEFANIUK: Not if it's proposed that it's being moved to page 22, Mr. Chairman, which is hospitality in general. I gather what's being said is that it would be under the Speaker's direction.

MR. TAYLOR: You mean the \$8,600 would be increased?

MR. HYLAND: No, the \$8,600 is for 75th

celebrations. This would be a separate item for purposes of the Olympics.

MR. TAYLOR: Would you consider a friendly amendment, just to be consistent, of \$25,000 less 10 percent?

MR. BOGLE: The motion is for \$20,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So he's going better.

MR. TAYLOR: I should have known that the Member for Cypress-Redcliff would be like that.

MR. HYLAND: I think it's more appropriate under Hospitality generally than Speaker's Office because it would be a specific thing that will be gone next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion reads: ... an amount to be added on page 22, which would be \$20,000. That's down from the previous \$25,000 that was just removed. Discussion?

MR. BOGLE: I believe all members other than the Member for Barrhead were here when we last discussed this issue. I notice the puzzlement on Mr. Kowalski's face, so to briefly repeat the rationale for this, it's the belief of a number of us that there will be a number of parliamentarians from other countries coming to Alberta for the Winter Olympics next year. We cited as an example the visit by the vice-president and parliamentarians from West Germany who were in Calgary in September. Mr. Hawkesworth and I were there along with the Speaker and the Clerk and Mrs. Koper. We noticed that gifts were exchanged, so there is going to be some expectation that the Speaker, on behalf of all 83 legislators, host some functions for visiting legislators. That's the rationale for giving this one-time budget allocation to the Speaker's office. When we go through our budget next year, I assume that figure can be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? Call for the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The Chair thanks you all very much for that last motion.

Other items? Mr. Bogle, with regard to the follow-through on administrative support.

MR. BOGLE: The reason this item is held over is that in the news report there was a reference to bulk advertising rates going up by 22 percent on I believe it was March 1 or April 1 and a further 12 or 14 percent on July 1. All I want clarification on is whether or not that would affect any of the bulk mailings we do where pieces of mail are not addressed but are merely delivered to every householder, every box in the rural constituencies.

The Clerk has just handed me a memo dated January 9. I haven't had a chance to read it yet. What's the essence of it?

MR. STEFANIUK: On the front page, Mr. Chairman, what we have confirmed from the post office is that householder mail is due for an increase of 6.9 percent on April 1.

MR. BOGLE: With no reference to the advertising rate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll do a further bit of checking as to how it relates to the rural situation.

MR. HYLAND: In the papers I was reading over the weekend there was some comment about the increase. I forget the numbers, but the numbers on that third-class bulk mail seemed like they were higher than a 6 percent increase. Maybe it was the same story that you had; I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll be checking further directly with the post office. May we leave section 2?

Section 3 pretty well says it all. That's everything that has just kicked in.

Sorry; section 2, photographs of school groups. We still have page 19 in section 2. Members will recall that the matter of covering the costs of photographs for schoolchildren visiting the Legislature and posing on the inside staircase had come up in the main meeting and then we brought it back into the estimates section of our meeting, the practice in time past being to have five-by-seven photographs, generally in black and white, to be sent to those students. We've had a certain amount of discussion, and the information we have back is that a global amount of \$42,000 would cover black-and-white photos, five by seven, for visiting school groups.

Then we had this motion by Mr. Stevens: that the amount of \$42,000 be budgeted under section 2, Administrative Support — Professional, Technical, and Labour Services of the '87-88 estimates to cover the costs of black-and-white school photographs. That motion was tabled.

That was followed by a motion by the Member for Edmonton Highlands that an attempt be made to try to find funds in the '86-87 Legislative Assembly budget estimates to cover the costs of black-and-white school photographs for the period January '87 to the end of this current fiscal year. That item also was tabled.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to bring either one or both of these motions back off the table at this time? The first one in order would be the \$42,000 motion moved by the Member for Banff-Cochrane with regard to '87-88. Going once, going twice . . .

MR. STEVENS: I'd bring it back on the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The matter is now back on the table.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that in the past this matter has been handled by the Public Affairs Bureau and now there's a decision not to continue through with that. I'm not uptight that there should be a special appropriation under the Legislative Assembly estimates for that as much as I am about ensuring that we do have an opportunity for MLAs to access the photographer on the scene to undertake this. So really the choice is to have the school pictures funded under a special appropriation of the Legislative Assembly or to basically have each Member of the Legislative Assembly charged against his constituency communication allowance for this particular matter. I put it on the table on that basis. This \$42,000 is the total figure. If we're concerned about holding the line on some of these estimates or in fact reducing them, we've just added in an extra \$42,000. The alternative, of course, is to have a system set up with a mechanism to be there, and should each individual MLA access it, they just have it negated against their constituency communication allowance.

MS BARRETT: As I recall, when this subject

was raised at the last meeting, the Chair asked me if I had any particularly strong feelings about it. I'm willing to go with whatever the majority of the committee would like to see. In terms of overall moneys spent, I'm not sure that it makes any difference where it's spent, whether it comes from the left pocket or the right pocket. I think it's a theoretical debate. My personal inclination is to support the motion as presented by Mr. Stevens, though.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a point to consider. I don't know whether to move an amendment to the budget or not, but I can see that if it's all out of the constituency account, it's really unfair. It might be a very heavy load on those that have Edmonton constituencies, because if all of the schools show up, it's a pretty fair expense. On the other hand, I realize that having your smiling face looking back at you in amongst all the kids from every school in your constituency is worth a certain amount of publicity, so I can see the argument that the constituency should pay for it all. I can see arguments on both sides. I'm wondering if the Member for Banff-Cochrane would consider a friendly amendment to just put 50 percent of the charges of all pictures to the constituency and 50 percent to general.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I would rather that be moved as an amendment.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. I will move it as an amendment: to put 50 percent to each to compromise between the advertising goody that the MLA gets versus the fact that the local MLA gets hit harder than the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have an amendment. Speaking to the amendment, the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I actually speak against the amendment not for the intent as stated but because it seems to me — and the Clerk would be able to clarify this — that the more we add to the administrative work of the section which deals with making sure that the bills that we get for functioning as MLAs . . . We would probably just axe any savings that might otherwise be accomplished. I oppose adding to bureaucratic complications. It's not that I don't like the intent, but it's just more

complication, more work for the people here. I can't see that in the long run anybody benefits from that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion?

MR. TAYLOR: If I may close it off, just a clarification to the Member for Edmonton Highlands. It's not much of a bureaucracy involved here because it isn't a case of billing the constituency. They're not going to be chasing them to get the money. The account makes an entry anyhow, and it's just which accounts are debited. In other words, your constituency account is debited whether you like it or not. There is no billing, no chasing, so there's very little bureaucratic overhead at all. If they make an entry, it's got to be billed somewhere. It's got to be charged to this account or to your account or charged half and half. So I don't think there's any increase. That's all I'd say on it in closing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question with respect to the amendment. The amendment would reduce the figure from \$42,000 to \$21,000. Those in favour of the amendment, please signify. Opposed? The amendment is carried.

The motion as amended, which now reads "from \$42,000," now reads "\$21,000." All those in favour of the motion as amended? Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously. Thank you very much.

The next motion in this regard was moved by the Member for Edmonton Highlands. Will an attempt be made to try to find funds in the '86-87 Legislative Assembly budget to cover the costs of five by seven black-and-white school photographs for the period January '87 to the end of March? Does the meeting wish to have this motion lifted from the table?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before us.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. STEVENS: A question to the mover and perhaps then yourself. The amended motion we

just passed for '87-88, which is the 50 percent plan -- which I assume Mr. Taylor would see being administered in the way that was discussed before: the MLA would agree or not agree to cover half the costs of each of the sets of photographs that he or she might be obliged to pay for from his communication allowance -- is that what we intended for the remainder of this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Highlands, closing debate.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping someone would raise that so that I could bring up the fact that I can't amend my own motion. But I'd certainly be willing to let someone else do it.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'll amend the motion to say that the Legislative Assembly picks up 50 percent of the cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amended. Call for the question. Those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? Carried unanimously.

Call for the question with respect to the main motion as amended?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave page 19, I recall some discussion on the cost of both the Speech from the Throne and the Budget Address. We have 6,500 copies of the Budget Address printed. I suppose some could argue, but it's really semantics as to whether the Leg. Assembly or the Provincial Treasurer's department pays that cost. I am still a bit concerned that the Leg. Assembly budget is asked to pay for Budget Address copies other than those necessary for the Legislature itself. It seems to me that the costs for extra copies to be distributed by MLAs and the department more appropriately belong with the Provincial Treasurer's department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll take that as a direction to make inquiries with the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. STEVENS: For example, Mr. Chairman, we are charged by Hansard for additional copies of the Speech from the Throne. I agree with Mr. Bogle that we should look into that. If we want 100 copies or 10 copies or no copies, our communication allowance should cover that.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I added up the numbers. The total amount comes to about \$114,000. On second look, I guess one should take out the spring opening program and the Speech from the Throne, because that's really more Legislative Assembly. The figure we're looking at is about \$105,000 out of that budget. It's probably worth you as Chairman of this committee asking the Provincial Treasurer the questions that Mr. Bogle has just put.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It only seems fair.

MR. KOWALSKI: Just a question for clarification on those last four items on page 19. On one hand, we have the Budget Address, which is the speech from the Provincial Treasurer, 6,500 copies; the budget highlights, which is a small document of perhaps 10 pages that's about one-third the size of the regular Speech from the Throne; then the budget estimates, distributed by MLAs, at the number of 100 per MLA, at the figure of \$58,000?

MR. STEVENS: The bracketed 100 was deleted by the Clerk last week. It shouldn't have been there.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm sorry; I wasn't here last week. Who gets those? I don't ever recall getting 100 of these in the past at a figure of \$58,000.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of 100. That figure was erroneous, and the page was in fact replaced last Friday. But the account pays for those three or four or five large budget document books that are distributed to each member and, in some instances, additional copies which are requested by the member to provide to other interested parties.

MR. KOWALSKI: The system is that they're distributed via the Clerk's office in the Legislative Assembly and not directly from the Provincial Treasurer?

MR. STEFANIUK: They're produced by the Provincial Treasurer but distributed by the Clerk's office.

MR. KOWALSKI: And the Provincial Treasurer then charges the Legislative Assembly for the members to have a set?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's one way for helping him reduce his own budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: And this has been going on forever?

AN HON. MEMBER: Forever.

MR. KOWALSKI: I didn't know that. You've got to be kidding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is one of the reasons we probably need a little extra storage space. The Chair takes it as a direction to have a conversation with the Provincial Treasurer in this regard.

MR. HYLAND: It's only fair. If one department cuts the pictures, a service to the public, this should be questioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MS BARRETT: On this subject, Mr. Chairman, might I also request that we pursue some clarification of the actual numbers of those things printed? I find it pretty hard to believe that a three-volume set is actually produced to the tune of \$8,300. I'd like to know how many are produced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll take that for further clarification.

MS BARRETT: And further congratulations to the person who dreamed up the way we get to deal with our estimates books in the Assembly in this format.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. May we leave section 2? Section 3: is there agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we move to section 4, Speaker's Office?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, do you want to just go over the summary and then point out the reductions you've made, or would you like someone else to do that on your behalf or explain any variances you feel are significant and would like the committee to know about?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Basically, as you go through page by page, it's quite — looking at that percentage of change, you can see where we've been doing our best to effect a downward turn. It's the matter of the salary positions and the benefits that kick in automatically. For example, the Supplies and Services section on page 29, code 512A99. We had an estimate to do with that forecast of '86-87, and we have moved that down. That's a decrease of 19.5 percent.

I am hoping to go out and visit more schools and other centres in the province, speaking to various community interest groups as well as to schoolchildren. We've been able to get the program under way but not to the degree I had hoped for in this fall period. Next week we're going to central Alberta. So that's reflecting realistically the sheer demands on the time of the Speaker.

Rental of Equipment and Goods, 512G99. We've got the equipment we needed into position, partially through Public Works, Supplies and Services. That effects a reduction. You see that all along in that whole section we've been moving it down and keeping a close eye.

Page 30 picks up the office staff. As you know, we have two secretaries in the Speaker's office in addition to the executive assistant. That covers those positions. A market adjustment occurs on 31 and again on 32, a small increase to the executive assistant.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. HYLAND: At one time, between the government caucus and the Speaker's office, or maybe it was the Leg. Assembly office, half a secretary was paid for the Deputy Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's carried in our budget at the moment, although we haven't got the position. We have that built in for this coming year, to have that half-position with respect to the Deputy Speaker. Then the rest of the time I expect the Speaker's office will need some additional secretarial help, mainly because of additional projects that we have taken on in researching and finding all the previous members of the Assembly who are still alive and making the necessary arrangements with regard to the 75th anniversary of the opening of the building.

Just quickly for a moment, this is an opportune time to share something with you. My predecessor had made up those small Mace pins, and a sufficient supply was done that he started to send them out to members and formers members. We carried on with that because of the research we've been doing to locate all the previous members. Prior to Christmas when we sent out the Christmas cards, we sent along the pin.

Last Wednesday I discovered that a former member had died at the age of 94 and that the funeral was that day. I went to the funeral. When I know when the funerals are and can get to them, I want to do that on behalf of all members of the Assembly. At the end of the service a granddaughter came up. We saw each other, and I said who I was. She said, "I know who you are. You're the one who sent out the pin. I want you to know that my grandfather, for the last three weeks of his life, went around all the time saying: look, they remember me." I won't tell you how inexpensive the pin is, but how valuable the experience truly is.

That's part of the interesting thing about having additional staff people and PEP students. We've been able to do some of those kinds of — they're not necessary in one sense, but they're very necessary and very gracious, and they're being well received. Some letters I've had from former members would bring tears to your eyes. Sorry, I got distracted.

Page 33 is the page where necessary employer contributions kick in. On page 34 there's basically a small amount for staff training. I'm somewhat cognizant that within the department of the Legislative Assembly Office, we really need to have more of the staff taking advantage of various staff training opportunities. I have every reason to believe that many people within the whole department

are quite interested in that, so we want to move ahead on that.

Page 35. Supplies and Services, Travel Expenses shows you the figures that are built in for the rental of the Speaker's car and the Deputy Speaker's vehicle. The Travel by Presiding Officers and Staff is showing a 23.2 percent reduction.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, just a point of information. Has the Deputy Speaker's automobile been in place for very long? Was last year the first time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I believe it has been in place for at least three years or longer.

MR. HYLAND: Probably six or seven.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Cypress-Redcliff says that it's more like six or seven years.

MR. TAYLOR: Knowing that he lives in Lethbridge cautions me against voting against any removal, but I was just intrigued to think [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, he can save on his travel when he goes to visit your home country of Bow Island-Burdett because he can ride down on the winds of a chinook. It's coming back that doubles the cost.

MR. TAYLOR: If he comes back on the winds of that chinook, he will be back in 15 minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: He would have been Saturday night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 36.

MR. STEVENS: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that automobile insurance is provided for those officials or employees who are required to use their own automobiles to do public service work. My understanding is that that figure of \$150 — while it's a minor question, I hope it isn't different than it would have been had it been any other public service official or any other executive assistant. Generally, it's \$70 to \$90.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the whole year?

MR. STEVENS: Yes, and it's a maximum amount that's provided so that no insurance company has an advantage over another. The Legislative Assembly may be a little bit different. I hope it's not becoming a target for other concessions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll turn down the corner to check on that. Mr. Scarlett will be with us a bit later in the day.

Page 37. Freight and postage stays the same.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if [inaudible], as we may have to do all through the budget, relating to postage, dependent on what we find, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll keep that in mind. My answer at the moment is that the bulk of the extra mailing to previous members has taken place in this fiscal year. I'm hoping to have the second set of reminders about the September 3 anniversary date go out prior to the end of this fiscal year. I believe we have another section where we might be able to look after the postage, but your comment is appreciated. What's the figure we're using again?

AN HON. MEMBER: 5.9 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Page 38. Rental Property, Equipment and Goods is down considerably: 68.4 percent. I figured it would be nice to try to reduce it before government or opposition members of the committee got to us.

Long distance tolls are on 39; on page 40, service agreements.

MS BARRETT: On page 40 it says:

This figure includes office automation ... Should that be assumed by General Administration?

Is that question for us to discuss?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's certainly the question for us.

MRS. MIROSH: Page 40?

MS BARRETT: Yes. Under service agreements it says "note" — unless I've got a different book from everybody else.

MR. HYLAND: No, that's what it says.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk, you've been here far longer than I. Is this just a matter of being able to rationalize the budget in various components?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the cost of renting all equipment which is supplied to offices in this building is taken out of the General Administration budget. It would appear reasonable, then, to follow that the maintenance costs for that equipment should also come out of General Administration rather than out of a specific office budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It makes sense to have a motion to direct that this be transferred to General Administration. Would someone be prepared to make that motion to transfer the equipment?

MS BARRETT: If it's the will of the committee, I certainly will make the motion that it be transferred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, signify. Opposed, if any? Carried.

Page 41. We were hoping to effect some reduced printing costs across the board in almost every part of the department because of purchasing the new print-ready machine. We are hoping that in the course of this coming year, that will be reflected. That we will no doubt come back to when we come to Hansard.

Page 42, Hospitality and Gifts. One of the aspects of being Speaker that I only slightly appreciated before I came to the office was the fact that -- and it's almost on an unpredictable basis as to how often it occurs -- the Speaker's suite is used as a place for protocol visits when we have persons from other political and parliamentary jurisdictions. For example, we've had the Japanese ambassador, the high commissioner from Trinidad-Tobago, the high commissioner from Great Britain, and a series of others. In the course of these people coming to visit, there's usually that half hour or so visit. If the House is sitting and if their schedule permits, they're introduced to the

Assembly. It's also an occasion when there is a presentation of small gifts. Whether it's a book on Alberta, cufflinks, or whatever, a presentation is made to the person at that time, photographs are taken, and we send those on at a later date. So there is that aspect of hosting that is included within the Speaker's budget on behalf of the whole Assembly.

It is also from here that we have some mobility and flexibility to be involved, say in that once-a-year hosting of a reception of all members of the Assembly so that they might meet with the legislative officers of the Assembly.

Other kinds of meetings occur. From time to time we hear that the wives and husbands of members feel in large degree sort of left out, so there are other hosting opportunities which are undertaken through the Speaker's office. The bulk of the work is really done by my wife.

Those are some of the things that come under this whole area. If you're traveling to other jurisdictions, then we have items for presentation as well.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, just a point of information. When we voted the \$20,000 -- remember we transferred it over -- wouldn't it normally show up in here in this code, or are we putting it in another code?

MS BARRETT: A special code.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We put in a special code because that was to relate to the Olympics for one time only, and then it would not show up in the following year.

MR. TAYLOR: Just for the one time only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. TAYLOR: Please excuse me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: See you later.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, not to be a fanatic about these things, but under vote 2 we also had an allocation in here for a CPA annual dinner.

MR. STEVENS: We've discussed that.

MR. KOWALSKI: We've discussed that? Okay,

I appreciate that, but I'm raising it in this context. That's a separately funded item other than this matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Did we agree to cancel the CPA annual dinner for 1987-88? What did the committee decide to do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. The committee decided that that amount would stay but that that would be used toward the 75th anniversary of the opening of the building.

MR. STEVENS: We done good.

MR. KOWALSKI: You did good.

MRS. MIROSH: It's for a birthday party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we hope.

Page 43 I think is quite self-explanatory. Forty-four is there for all the world to see, and you're quite welcome to it.

MR. STEVENS: Question on the Speaker's office estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question in regard to section 4. I assume the question . . . Do you have another question . . .

MR. STEVENS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . or are you moving that they be approved? Motion for approval. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MRS. MIROSH: No raises this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next section, 5, we bypass. Also 6 -- that's the government members, Official Opposition, Liberal opposition, and Representative opposition. That brings us to section 9, Legislative Committees. Any questions in this area? Perhaps we should bring up Mr. Bubba.

I propose that we go through this next section, and then we have lunch and hoist.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, a question with respect to page 50. Most committees of

the Legislative Assembly are either holding their own or being reduced. What's this thing of Public Accounts showing a 1,895 percent increase? I thought the tradition was that Public Accounts sat during a session of the Legislative Assembly. Under such an arrangement Members of the Legislative Assembly receive no stipend or extra for that. I may have missed something in here, but that's an 1,895 percent increase. When did all this occur?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should ask the question. The Clerk Assistant will be here in a moment for you to ask the question of again. When I saw it, I almost had a heart attack.

MR. KOWALSKI: The Clerk Assistant is not responsible. The Clerk Assistant is not the chairman or the vice-chairman of that committee. Why should the Clerk Assistant be answering questions that would come directly as a result of a committee of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As he is directly responsible for formulation of budget estimates with regard to all of those committees, perhaps he can give some other information. When I saw it, I nearly died on the spot.

MR. KOWALSKI: Who is the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee?

MS BARRETT: Barry Pashak.

MRS. MIROSH: That committee voted to have meetings outside of session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The chairman is the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, and the vice-chairman is the Member for Lacombe.

MR. STEVENS: It looks like they're going to try to meet outside the session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It certainly poses a bit of a distortion, to say the least.

MS BARRETT: One might say that, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This committee obviously has the right of override.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that question.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I think we understand it. We all know.

MRS. MIROSH: Should we make a motion, then, to . . .

MR. BOGLE: Let's wait for Mr. Bubba to give an explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can have an overview of all the committees and then come back to the specifics.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we can override the committee's decision, but we use control of the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we vote them a dollar, that sure sounds like an override.

Well, we have the chairman of another committee with us; that's good.

MR. STEVENS: Do you want me to talk about that one, Mr. Chairman?

MS BARRETT: Yes, why don't you, instead of sitting around?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, on page 50 you have the totals. First off, Mr. Bubba, we're into the whole section on legislative committees. Members have scanned page 50 with regard to the forecast estimates and the percentage of change. The Member for Barrhead has the lead-off comment.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Bubba, I'm on page 50. I'm looking at the budget estimates for various committees. It sort of jumps right out at you that all committees basically show a hold-their-own or a reduction — one as much as a 96.9 percent reduction — but one other committee shows a 1,895.4 percentage increase change. That's Public Accounts. I appreciate that you are not the chairman of this particular committee, but can you give me the makeup of what that entails? Do you have that, in terms of the estimates information you handle?

MR. BUBBA: As far as the detail is concerned, I don't have it right at hand. The basic reason

for the increase is that at one of its meetings in 1986 the committee voted to budget funding for a certain number of meetings of that committee out of sessional periods. That hasn't been the practice with that committee in the past. It has normally only met while the House is in session. As I said, a motion was moved and carried in that committee that it meet 10 times, I believe, out of normal session periods.

MR. KOWALSKI: At a matter of \$6,500 per day?

MR. BUBBA: That was the calculation, yes. It's a fairly large committee.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, when we get to that page, I'd like to make a motion to keep that budget the same as the previous year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we might work through this a section at a time.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question about this too, and I wonder if it's related to a general assumption that fall sittings will not necessarily be the case in the future. It was my understanding — and I'm not on Public Accounts; I've never discussed this with anybody. My recollection is that in the spring session we deal so much with budget estimates and so forth that that committee generally chose to do its work attached to the fall sitting. Is that correct?

MRS. MIROSH: No. I sit on it. I think there was a misunderstanding on when this money would be allotted. It pertained to this past year, and there was some confusion in that whole area.

MS BARRETT: Is it an assumption, then, that it would be one time only? I don't really understand the explanation that has been brought forward so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you have any direction from the committee that they intended to do this just in one fiscal year? Did they have a special purpose?

MR. BUBBA: No, there was no indication on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In times past, at least from my experience in the House in '79, the committee has always met during session on Wednesday mornings. It has indeed been an opportunity to get at the material that needed to be gotten at, but it was also a way of saving money for the taxpayers of the province.

MR. HYLAND: Should we do them one at a time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If lunch is arriving now, I think we should stop, have lunch, and come back at 12 o'clock. In terms of the process, because these other things are factors that kick in, I would suggest . . . We don't have the breakdown by committee, do we?

MR. BUBBA: Yes, it's on the subsequent pages 52 and 53.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll come back and start with pages 52 and 53. We're now adjourned until 12.

[The committee recessed from 11:03 a.m. to 12:12 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, folks. I think we'll come back to order. It's 12:12.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to propose that at some point this afternoon we leave the budget and go back to our normal agenda. There are a couple of matters that should be dealt with today. One relates to the question of furnishings in MLA offices. As members know, there is a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Campbell, Mr. Hyland, and myself. The three of us met with the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, and we do have a report and a subsequent motion to bring forward to the committee. I think there may be some other business arising out of the agenda. I would suggest that we wait until Mr. Taylor is back before deciding a time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the committee left off, we decided that we were going to move to page 52 and go one committee at a time for

whatever information or questions we might have. Having done that, we will then be able to return to the front of the section and go through the other various details there.

Before we proceed further, those of you who can take in a load of calories -- that includes not only committee members but anybody else in the whole room -- there is chocolate cake or whatever if you want to get up and grab that. It looks like there is even some other stuff left. Everybody in the room, please feel free to grab a cup of coffee and the goodies.

Page 52, Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Are there any points to be raised there? Mr. Bubba.

MR. BUBBA: The variation between the current year and next year, 13.6 percent, is explained primarily by the chairman's determination that some of the meetings of that committee previously held out of session will be held during sessional periods.

MR. BOGLE: A question on the travel. Based on the 1986-87 forecast of \$43,000, I note that we're projecting an increase of 16.1 percent, to \$50,000. What's the rationale for that?

MR. BUBBA: The recalculation of the new membership of the committee and basically how much it costs to move the committee to Edmonton for a meeting. As the membership changes, that cost would tend to change. That committee only has one local member, so all members have to travel in order to attend meetings.

MR. BOGLE: That's travel within Alberta?

MR. BUBBA: The total figure, which would include in-province travel, would also include any travel that the committee undertook to visit heritage sites. With one exception, those are of course in province.

MR. BOGLE: Prince Rupert terminal.

MR. BUBBA: Yes.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, what do they have to do to reduce the indemnities, allowances, and so on? Does that mean they'll be meeting fewer times? Is that the reason for this?

MR. BOGLE: During session, when the House is sitting. I don't want to belabour the point, but if the committee will be meeting more often in session, then there won't be a travel expense associated with that.

MR. BUBBA: Yes, that's true.

MR. BOGLE: Could we flag that and get a further explanation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? All right, that one question to come back. Thank you.

We'll go to the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations, page 53.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of giving approval to the estimates on page 53? Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, as chairman of Legislative Offices, should I respond to any questions and give an explanation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great idea.

MR. BOGLE: Do you have an amendment to move to this?

MR. STEVENS: I even have a proposal to make.

When you first received all the committee forecasts two or three meetings ago, Mr. Chairman, you remember that after some discussion, you wrote to each of us to ask us to review our submission. The committee will be meeting this week. On a poll I had of the committee, they reduced our submission, a total of \$55,962, to what you have before you, \$50,768. I will go back to the committee on Wednesday and recommend a further reduction in travel expenses and payments to MLAs by reducing the expectation for our number of meetings -- from 10, to nine now, to some other number such as seven. That will reduce our overall budget by another -- it will be a total of about another 10 percent. That will bring it down to about \$45,500. If you'll give me some flexibility, I will come back to you with the committee's final figures, probably within a few days.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly hear agreement to that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the Committee on Legislative Offices looks at the appointment of various people that are associated with the Legislative Assembly. It seems to me that 1985-86 brought about changes to senior positions, so I really wonder why, even as a result of the explanation given by my colleague from Banff-Cochrane, he couldn't in fact reduce this a further 10 percent. It seems to me that this has now been accomplished. I'd feel very much more comfortable if in fact that were dropped another \$5,000 to \$40,000. That would show a 20 percent reduction.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I'll certainly take that back to the committee as advice.

I should say that the committee does more than just appoint the Auditor General or the Ombudsman or the Chief Electoral Officer. The committee meets frequently with these officers, acts as a liaison with other members and the offices. We expect this year to visit the offices here in Edmonton; there is no additional cost for that of course. The committee is required to review the performance and fees paid to these three officers. But I'll certainly take that as advice and come back to you with a reduced figure.

MR. BOGLE: A question through you, Mr. Chairman. How many members sit on this committee?

MR. STEVENS: To the Member for Taber-Warner, Mr. Chairman. There are nine members, one of whom is local. That is one of the reasons for the adjustment in travel. Eight are from areas outside the Edmonton region.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have nods for a revised estimate in all likelihood coming back after their meeting this week. That's very commendable.

Page 55, Committee on Members' Services: I'd like to be able to say that we've reduced the meetings.

MR. CAMPBELL: Before anybody does

anything rash, I move . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We ought to be careful, or we'll run out of our own [inaudible].

MR. STEVENS: Other than for budget review and so on, Mr. Chairman, we generally meet in session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct.

MR. STEVENS: So at our present rate of progress, are we likely to see a problem with the proposed budget, given that we're three days on budget this year?

MR. HYLAND: When we budgeted -- and I could be wrong -- for Members' Services last year, I forget how many meetings we allowed for budget. It seems to me that we calculated one meeting a month and found that in the off-session one meeting every second month was probably sufficient. So there should be a saving there.

MRS. MIROSH: This month we've had three.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, but we had allowed some time for budget too, but I can't remember how much. Or maybe it was two years ago when we prepared the budget that we did that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As chairman I would hope that the bulk of our work could be done when we're in session, but there again, the timetables of the people involved is a challenge. I think that we've obviously been moving through some special circumstances after an election and trying to work out a far better working relationship with regard to all the political parties.

I take it then that the committee is willing to leave this one at the moment, which still represents minus 9.8 . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Member for Rocky Mountain House that it show a 9.8 percent decrease. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Page 56, Public Accounts: some accounting to be done, I understand. A comment, Calgary

Glenmore?

MRS. MIROSH: May I make a motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MRS. MIROSH: I'd like to make a motion that the budget remain the same in 1987-88 as it was in '86-87, that there be no change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The advice from Mr. Bubba is that because of the change in conference site location, it might well be in order to make it -- a \$3,500 figure should be sufficient to cover it?

MS BARRETT: My question is: is the '86-87 forecast as shown exactly the estimate that was passed in '85-86?

MRS. MIROSH: You want to know what it cost in '85-86?

MS BARRETT: I want to know if the forecast is the identical figure.

MR. STEVENS: For that year's estimates.

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's what I'm asking.

MR. STEVENS: Not the year before.

MS BARRETT: Right. If there's no answer, it's not a big problem.

MR. STEVENS: Bob, are you doing some checking?

MR. BUBBA: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure it's a problem for all departments. You don't know what your final figures are for some time.

MS BARRETT: That's fine. I'll just withdraw the request.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, were you looking for a friendly amendment to Calgary Glenmore's motion to suggest that it be as it was in the budget the previous year but that there be an additional amount of about \$3,500 for this possible travel of the committee? Is that what you were effectively . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what my initial information was.

MR. STEVENS: Would that be all right then?

MRS. MIROSH: Do you want me to make that amendment?

MR. BOGLE: No, you can't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's wait for the final calculation; I think we can do that. The advice, Mrs. Mirosch, is that a flat figure of \$5,650 might be realistic.

MR. STEVENS: Where would that be shown, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Instead of the total of \$65,050 at the bottom of the '87-88 estimate, it would now be \$5,650. Robert, if you'd like to go through your explanation for the benefit of all members, please.

MR. BUBBA: Under 512A99, the current total is \$27,150. That would be \$4,650. That would be for travel to the conference: airfare, hotel accommodation, that sort of thing. That's about \$2,250 more than for the current year. Then the figure under 515A99, Payments to MLAs, would be \$1,000 instead of \$37,900. That would cover, as now, indemnities, allowances, and MLA pension. I'm taking just a bit of a shot in the dark on that, but the variation from this year is \$800, and the reason I'm adding the extra \$200 is that because of the distance to the conference, a couple of members may require to travel a day longer. It just depends on where the delegates come from in the province and what arrangements they make for flying.

MR. BOGLE: A question for clarification. Have members of the committee attended the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees conference in the past?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The chairman and vice-chairman.

MRS. MIROSH: Did you want me to change my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The suggested new figure is

\$5,650. If that is agreeable to you, I'd be willing to listen to any motion.

MRS. MIROSH: I'll withdraw my motion and change it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there unanimous consent for withdrawal? Agreed unanimously. Thank you.

MRS. MIROSH: I'd like to change my motion to read that the 1987-88 estimate would be \$5,650.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Carried unanimously.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, can we go back to the heritage trust fund?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We go back to page 52.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the estimates on travel expenses remain at last year's forecast, \$43,050. The reason is that I've been sitting here thinking that 10 or 11 members went to Prince Rupert, and I assume that's not going to happen every year. My airfare was about \$650 or thereabouts, so the others would vary. Just using that for an example, 10 times that is \$6,500, or somewhere in there, for the airfare alone. That virtually puts us back to where we were, if we take that one off. If it's projected that we're not going to need as much, I think it would be funny to reduce the meetings and up the travel budget, seeing as we've probably made our major travel this year. I would think it's going to be at least two years before we go back there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair reads the motion as being that code 512A99 will now read \$43,050. The total under 10GF00, instead of being \$131,125 will become \$124,175. Any discussion? A call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please

signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you. We can turn up a corner on that page in this document to make the adjustments.

MRS. MIROSH: Are there going to be more adjustments then?

MR. STEVENS: I'm going to come back with \$45,500 or less.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where we have arrived at with this then is that I think the sane way to go at it is -- there may be some revisions for page 49. Certainly there are revisions for page 50, which is the summary. There are revisions with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Leg. Offices, and Public Accounts.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I presume page 51 is as required for the committees. Do you want agreement on that now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As required; I would think so.

MR. BUBBA: For general support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll take it as a motion from someone, please.

MR. STEVENS: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unanimous. Thank you.

Page 52 is taken as approval. The various adjustments haven't been made on that last motion.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fifty-three was approved, 54 is returning, and 55 and 56 are approved. A very substantial piece of work, members.

May we move to section 10, Legislative Interns?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, did we always have eight interns, or did it start out as six? Can somebody answer that?

MR. STEFANIUK: It started out at six.

MR. HYLAND: When did we decide to go to eight?

MR. STEFANIUK: I believe the last budget called for eight, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCARLETT: I think it was in 1981.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we get this process right? Since the EA is sort of looking after the program, would you direct the questions to Rod? Then we can go through all this.

First, are there any overview comments? No? All right.

MR. HYLAND: A couple of years ago or something we decided to go to eight instead of six. I wonder why.

MR. SCARLETT: I can find out. I think probably it was a result of the program being fairly successful within the caucuses.

MR. HYLAND: It's a matter of opinion on that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've been attempting to work with that.

MR. HYLAND: I'll make a motion. I move that the interns go back to the original six positions we started with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we have a motion for discussion.

MS BARRETT: I hate to do this, but I'm going to speak against the motion. I understand the good intention behind it, but having been at this university and having done graduate work at a university in which no such program existed, the difference in the, shall we say, level of competition in looking toward attaining a certain goal in, for example, Canadian studies, political science, economics, history, and that sort of thing, which tend to be the dominant disciplines amongst those who apply for the internships, was marked. I believe the academic qualifications of those we choose to come here are really outstanding. What follows as a consequence of the program is that we end up having trained on the job eight outstanding candidates to begin with, I think most of whom further pursue work in the political field. That

seems to be the follow-up from our offices with the interns we've had.

I also think the balance of sharing between caucuses has worked out quite well both prior and subsequent to the '86 election. I also think that making a motion like this without consultation, I suppose, with the entire committee that determines the program -- and I believe there is an academic committee -- might cut us off from some important information which could be forthcoming. Not just in speaking against the motion, I think we would do well to reconsider the motion -- in other words, maybe even table it -- until we've had a chance to get an oral or written report from that committee on the effects of reducing the overall number of interns.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated all the comments of the Member for Edmonton Highlands. This year we had eight interns, five of whom were selected by reason of their excellent candidacy and the excellence of the University of Lethbridge. Five came from the University of Lethbridge, which I think is quite an achievement for that university and those individuals.

We know there are more reasons for returning to universities and secondary education of all kinds these days: employment opportunities being diminished and so on. But I'm not comfortable with leaving the program with eight, even though the argument might be presented that because there are now more students, we should provide more opportunities. I think this program needs to be reviewed as well. I know this program is dear to your heart, Mr. Speaker. I think you meet with the academic committee and discuss the applicants and make the choices. But just as other things have to be reduced, this might well be a time when we say that we have six opportunities in the coming year. When revenue pictures change, maybe we'll have an opportunity for seven or eight.

I support the motion by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, does anyone have any idea who the academic advisory committee is?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rod, do you want to [inaudible] for the universities?

MR. SCARLETT: From Lethbridge, it's Dr. Peter McCormick. From Calgary, there's a new fellow. It used to be Dr. Roger Gibbins, but he's on sabbatical this semester, so we have an interim fellow from the Department of English, I believe. I can't recall his name. From the University of Alberta, it's Garth Stevenson.

MRS. MIROSH: They're all professors?

MR. SCARLETT: Yes, they're all professors.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As Speaker I haven't yet had an opportunity to meet with that group. We have interviews scheduled for late February with respect to the applicants, because the material inviting applications has already gone out. I don't see it being a major problem. If the wisdom of the committee is to reduce it from eight to six, we'll just have to tell all the applicants that we're unfortunately having to go down to six because of the budget cutbacks.

I do want to point out a couple of things with regard to the program. When I met with the previous group of interns when I became Speaker, I very much leveled with them as to some of the concerns government members have had. I think that's been a two-way street in terms of the challenges there. When the new group of interns came in, we again had a very candid discussion, and I would hope they would be able to build up relationships on both sides of the House. I think we have a continuing dose of reality. As all members know, for part of their year the interns -- they're not with us for a full year -- are with opposition parties, and then they switch over to the government side and vice versa.

I firmly believe that more time needs to be spent with the interns. From the point of view of the Speaker's office, that's been my intention, and I'll carry through with that. The main point of contact has been through the executive assistant, Rod, and I really appreciate the work he's been doing there. I also want to say thank you to someone who went out and got the first batch of corporate money, and that's Bohdan. Through the relationship with the NCSL, National Conference of State

Legislators, he was able to work with the people from Benson & Hedges, which gave a donation of about \$10,000 a year to the program.

MS BARRETT: What brand does he smoke?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's got Benson & Hedges. How about the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands?

MS BARRETT: You'd have to send me to Quebec.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the \$10,000 donation has been reduced in the last year or so to \$5,000. Again, we have been able to get an additional \$5,000 for the program from Petro-Canada, and thanks to the efforts of Mr. Eliuk, Pacific Western Airlines have been able to come up with a donation of about another \$5,000 in terms of travel costs for next year. I realize that we have to go out and try to get some other funding from other sources when it's possible, but it's not the best climate for seeking corporate donations. I'd just make those comments. Rod, I think there were some other things you wanted to add here.

MR. SCARLETT: I just bring this proposal forward to the will of the committee. When I budgeted, I budgeted for a 12-month period. The contracts are for 10 months. Last year, for example, we had the money to allow the interns to work the two summer months, July and August, because the House was sitting. It is possible that we can take the two months, or one-sixth of the budget, right out of the first code, the contract employee code, knock it down by a sixth, and we will not have the opportunity then to keep the interns on after June 30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MS BARRETT: Before the question is called, Mr. Chairman, can I have a question answered?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS BARRETT: I understand that there's some problem that has been encountered with the interns. This is actually the first I've heard of

that. I wonder if someone would be prepared to describe what those might be.

MR. STEVENS: Isn't that a personnel matter?

MR. BOGLE: Unless I missed something at the table, I didn't hear anyone say there was a problem. I didn't hear that at all.

MRS. MIROSH: There's no problem.

MR. BOGLE: What I did hear was a question that preceded the motion, a question by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff: when did we move to eight interns and how long have we been at that number? In terms of the spirit of what we're trying to achieve overall, the feeling was to go back to the original number of six. When we get to Supplies and Services, I think we may have further questions on travel expenses and other such things. But if I for one was not happy with the program, I would have moved that we eliminate it completely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton Highlands, in my remarks I mentioned -- what I was alluding to was that sometimes interns working for government members in times past found they weren't being utilized as well as they could have, and the interns felt a certain frustration about that. But a lot of that is just individual members using various interns. When I've looked at the workload so far, it seems to me that that seems to have been cured very well in the last while.

MS BARRETT: Just one final comment then, and it certainly doesn't preclude raising the motion again. I would ask members to at least temporarily defeat the motion and make a request that some kind of report from the academic committee which supervises the program along with the Executive Assistant to the Speaker be made in terms of an analysis of the importance of the eight positions and what they would make of a reduction to six members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll take that as a motion to refer. A question on the main motion.

MR. STEVENS: If the motion is adopted, would the change from eight to six take place April 1 or would it be better to take place at the time the interns are selected?

MR. SCARLETT: It would pretty much have to take place commencing September 1.

MR. STEVENS: I just raised that because I'm not sure of what -- in other words, our present contracts or the arrangements we have cover the current interns until when?

MR. SCARLETT: Till June 30.

MR. STEVENS: Oh, so we have to think about that. I wonder if the mover would think about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it wouldn't kick in until the fall.

MR. STEVENS: Would a friendly amendment then be possible? With the appointment of the new program, or however you word it.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I guess the way to do that would be that instead of saying "fiscal year," we could name the date: from that day on. I agree with it. I don't have a problem with it. It's just how it would be worded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it might be that we negotiate around the effective date for six being September 1. If we said any earlier and if session were to go longer, then we'd have to try to renegotiate, and we'd get ourselves into another kind of scenario. I think the effective date would be September 1, so then we'd take it into effect for a partial fiscal year.

I wonder if members would mind if I excuse myself for a few moments to go wash my hands, and perhaps we might have a solution when I return.

MS BARRETT: Will you table the motion until the next meeting? That way we could ask for the information and Greg could get the details that he wants in terms of the contract obligations. Could we do that?

MR. STEVENS: I don't need that.

MR. HYLAND: To me it doesn't matter. If that's the will of the committee. The reason I made the motion is to bring it to a head so we had to do something, accept or reject the motion or go on our way, either way.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't know what the hell's going on.

MS BARRETT: I think it's assumed that we will meet one more time. The motion is that we reduce the numbers of interns from eight to six. I'm asking now if we could table it and request a report from the academic committee under Rod in terms of any kind of contract for their work.

MRS. MIROSH: I don't doubt their work. I think they're probably doing excellent work. Very few of our government MLAs use them.

MS BARRETT: Is that right?

MR. TAYLOR: Is that right? We use them, and they love it too.

MRS. MIROSH: I can't speak for everybody. I speak for myself. Maybe it's because we're new; I don't know.

MS BARRETT: Maybe just to have internal discussions and discussions with Rod. If we tabled it, Al, it wouldn't preclude your bringing it up again after everybody's had a chance to think about it and talk about it a bit.

MR. BOGLE: What if we just table the motion to allow for some further input?

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's what I'm asking.

MR. BOGLE: Don't alter Al's motion in any other way.

MS BARRETT: Exactly.

MR. BOGLE: We can bring it back at another time.

MS BARRETT: Yes, at our next meeting.

MR. HYLAND: I've got a problem, if you say the "next meeting." With what Rod said, normally the committee only meets once. If we say "for more information," that can probably be done by telephone or something.

MR. STEVENS: I'm going to vote against the tabling.

MRS. MIROSH: The other problem is, in fairness to them, to delay it and then reduce by two, there are two contracts that are just sort of left dangling.

MS BARRETT: They don't commence the interviewing process until the end of February, so I'm assuming that we will meet at least one more time prior to then. We've got some other business, not just caucuses but some other budgetary stuff to deal with. I'll assume that by that time a thorough review by individuals could have been conducted. Do you see what I'm getting at? It doesn't at all preclude his motion from occurring. It might occur in 30 seconds at the next meeting. I just would like some time.

MRS. MIROSH: I'd like to have 50 of them. I love students. I think they should have an opportunity, but we just can't afford it.

MR. TAYLOR: I think it's a worthwhile program.

MS BARRETT: Oh, it's very worth while.

MR. TAYLOR: I'll vote for it.

MS BARRETT: Not knowing what's going to happen with this, Mr. Chairman, I move that we table the motion and deal with it comprehensively when next we meet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to table. All those in favour, please signify. Two. Those opposed to the motion to table? Okay. We continue with our discussion.

MR. TAYLOR: If I may speak, the main motion was to delete two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From eight to six.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd like to speak against that for a couple of reasons. One is that although we have the task of trying to cut corners where we can, in this particular case we're actually giving employment. By cutting it, we're creating unemployment, which I don't think is that wise. Secondly, I think the fallout for somebody we train in our regime -- the type of people we're employing as interns are some of our brightest graduates from Alberta schools. If we don't employ them here, or at least give them a

start here, we're in fact educating them to ship off somewhere else. So I think the fallout we get from somebody who continues their education here in the internship program and the number of jobs they create later by staying in Alberta far outweigh any cost now.

The next reason I'd argue for retaining interns is that in my short experience here, they really seem to enjoy it. Any work I've given to interns has been done with the highest possible quality. If you're not utilizing the interns in your own area, it's probably your own fault, not the fault of the interns or the fault that the program exists. I think it's a heck of a good program. I think we're known far and wide. It's a quality thing that gives a good impression of Alberta, if you want to call it that, to those outside Alberta in parliamentary circles and in the whole circle of educating in political science. I think we're doing a very good thing in every way, shape, and form. I would be very sad indeed to see it cut.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments?

MS BARRETT: A question to Rod. Do you know how we compare with other provinces in terms of the number of interns we have? Are we about average, above, or below?

MR. SCARLETT: I think there are eight in Ontario.

MR. STEVENS: How many people there? About 8 million people.

MR. SCARLETT: There are seven or eight in Ottawa. B.C. has seven or eight. Nova Scotia has four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quebec just finished mothballing theirs, didn't they?

MR. SCARLETT: Yes, Quebec got rid of the program this year.

MRS. MIROSH: What about Saskatchewan?

MR. SCARLETT: No intern program. I think Manitoba started an intern program. I don't know if it's still going on.

I might add as a footnote that the interns here are paid substantially more than any other intern program. That's probably \$400 a month

more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Including Ottawa.

MR. STEVENS: Is that because of the length of the term?

MR. SCARLETT: It has nothing to do with the length of the term. The original stipend of \$1,500 a month was set, and each of the increases that have been given to the public service have been applied to the intern program. For example, they receive the \$62 a month increase. The committee could give direction on lowering next year's contracts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which we would see on page 58.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, after we discuss this further and come to a vote today, would you be prepared sometime during the coming year to review the program with representatives of each of the parties represented in the House and come back with some recommendations for '88, perhaps even including discussions with the academic advisory committee, if I made that suggestion subsequently?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As chairman with responsibility for the interns, the answer is yes. I'm only too willing to do so.

MR. CAMPBELL: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a call for the question. The mover of the motion is Mr. Hyland. Any additional comments on the main motion?

MR. STEVENS: Would you remind us of the main motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's to reduce it from eight to six.

MR. STEVENS: Effective . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no date.

MR. HYLAND: Which is preferable? June or September?

MR. SCARLETT: It depends if you want the opportunity to hire interns and, if the session goes into July and August, to extend the contracts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: September 1, I would think, from a practical point of view. If this motion carries, it would come into effect September 1 so that while we're going through the interviewing process, we would have full knowledge that we are dealing with this new number instead of eight. A friendly amendment to one's own motion. All those in favour of the motion to reduce the number of interns from eight to six, please signify. Opposed? The motion is carried. That will make for a number of computation changes. The effective date is September 1, '87.

In the estimation of the Chair, that basically looks after pages 58 and 59, because 59 is a function of 58. On page 60 numbers will indeed change to reflect. If it has the agreement of the committee, we will make those adjustments and bring it back to the next meeting for this whole section. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll have a brief pause while we invite the Editor of Hansard, Dr. Garrison, to come up and join us. He's on notice, so it's a short hop, skip, and jump.

[The committee recessed from 12:59 p.m. to 1:02 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand some people might be out having conferences with other folks, but we'll still proceed.

I think you all know Dr. Gary Garrison, Editor of Hansard. If we look at section 11, which is page 67, perhaps Gary could go through the section and we'll take questions as we come upon them. How about skidding around the corner here so they'll have a better chance of seeing you.

Perhaps you can comment with regard to page 67.

DR. GARRISON: Do you want me to go through and summarize the page?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. GARRISON: I guess the main thing to point out under Salaries, Wages & Employee Benefits is that we have two vacant full-time positions that we're not filling, and we're covering the work by redistributing it among the other full- and part-time staff. So that would explain why Salaries -- Permanent is down 21.3 and Wages is up 22.1. There's a net decrease there, of course, of 6.2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions in that section?

MR. STEVENS: Gary, assuming the arrangements are concluded in phase 1 for the beginning of this session -- and I understand that phase 2 is still subject to further budget planning matters -- have all the arrangements been taken into account in this submission as a result of the new physical layout and so on and the way in which we'll be employing Hansard reporters? There are some advantages, are there not, in the way in which the building will allow the record to be made of Hansard?

DR. GARRISON: When you refer to phase 1, are you referring to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Renovations to the Chamber.

MR. STEVENS: Yes. I'm sorry; it wasn't clear.

DR. GARRISON: I don't think the renovations to the Chamber themselves really affect our operations terribly.

MR. STEVENS: Not at all? My understanding was that you would not need the same number of people to be sitting in the room as there would be much better -- am I off a phase here, Mr. Chairman? Is it the second phase that brings in better audio equipment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the things that is occurring here is that in the last half of February there will be some movement of staff to the other building. One of our problems about time and all that is the time lag between moving people from one building to another, so that's very related to your questions about the renovations to the Chamber plus the relocation of staff.

MR. STEVENS: You're saying then that the

same number of staff is needed to produce the same amount of material this coming year as there was before the renovations.

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's what we anticipate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Except you're down two permanent positions.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the "down two permanent positions" is because of an analysis of the workload with or without the renovations.

DR. GARRISON: Yes. That's not at all related to the renovations.

MR. STEVENS: The renovations have nothing to do with them. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplies & Services: might we move along to that part for a moment?

MR. HYLAND: That's probably where my question fits, Mr. Chairman, although I notice that one of the things we have to talk about is subscription rates for Hansard and Votes and Proceedings. Maybe it's more appropriate there, but is there a figure on the net cost to Hansard that's nonrecoverable?

DR. GARRISON: The cost is nonrecoverable.

MR. STEVENS: Most of it.

DR. GARRISON: That's right. I can give you the number of subscriptions that we've got. We have 738 paid subscriptions, so that might be relevant when you consider the amount of money that's going to be netted if there's a subscription increase.

MR. HYLAND: When I say nonrecoverable costs, I guess I'm looking at those paid-up subscriptions. How much are we losing on having 738 paid-up subscriptions? I know it's tough. It's a service the Legislature works with internally, and you can't figure that one out for the loss on those subscriptions. It's just to help us make our decision later probably.

Mr. Chairman, it may be out of order here,

or it may not; I don't know. It's up to you.

MR. STEFANIUK: The subscription revenue does not affect the budget, because the revenues go directly into the General Revenue Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Other comments under Supplies & Services, Gary.

DR. GARRISON: I noticed a couple of hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, good.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, to Dr. Garrison. How many copies are issued per day when the House is sitting?

MR. STEVENS: Of everything.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of everything.

DR. GARRISON: Eighteen hundred and twenty.

MR. STEVENS: Of everything? Votes, Hansard.

DR. GARRISON: I don't know about the Votes and Orders. That's not under my responsibility.

MR. STEVENS: Oh, that's not Hansard.

DR. GARRISON: But 1,820 copies of Hansard are produced per day. I should mention that 230 of those are unstapled and unpunched and saved for the bound volumes. As you know, we bind the volumes about a year later. So if you want to figure the exact number that is in circulation, just subtract the 230 from 1,820 and that's how many we have by subscription or for over-the-counter sales.

MR. CAMPBELL: The reason I bring it up, Mr. Chairman, is that we have one delivered to the office and we have one put on the table, and I was just wondering if that was a factor in your estimation?

DR. GARRISON: Well, the number we print does of course affect the cost directly. As I recall, Standing Orders says that each member is supposed to get two copies every day, so there is that requirement in Standing Orders.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's tied in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could change Standing Orders.

MR. STEVENS: Maybe my question will tie in with Jack's then. Gary, if we were to reduce the number of obligatory copies, it probably would not result in a saving. If you're going to print 1,400 or 1,600 or 1,800, there probably isn't much difference at that point.

DR. GARRISON: Not a whole lot of difference, no.

MR. STEVENS: The only difference might be in the delivery of them and other things. I just wanted to raise that. So if we're already committed to so many, the additional 200 or 400 or even 83 times would not really save much money, would it?

DR. GARRISON: No. That's right. The main cost is for setting up the press, the typesetting, and that sort of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the concerns about it, though, is that it does affect our storage problems on the eighth floor and goodness knows where else, let alone your office. It has the problem of a public perception that we're wasting a whole bunch of stuff.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, could Jack's question be put the other way? If you were to reduce the number, what would you suggest? Do we have 200 or 600 that we're throwing out at the end of the year, or does it depend on the day, on whether or not Nick Taylor was incredible.

MR. TAYLOR: Maybe you should start selling a copy when I'm in.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, the only thing is that Nick Taylor's secretary can certainly run those off on the Xerox.

MR. STEVENS: Do we have a large supply that is wasted?

DR. GARRISON: That's all handled in the Annex, so I can't tell you exactly how many might be wasted. I know that about a year ago when we were dealing with the disposition of the 1985 issues, there was a fair number, but I

don't know how many per day. I do know that during this past session, there was an increase in the number of subscriptions, and we actually added 100 to the number of issues we were printing every day, as a result of demand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll take it under re-evaluation for the whole department in the course of this next year so we can really deal with this thing and have all of our exact numbers.

MR. TAYLOR: Has any analysis been made whether we make or lose money on paid subscriptions?

DR. GARRISON: Well, \$15 a year only pays for a small portion of the postage, it seems to me.

MR. TAYLOR: So we're losing quite a lot of money. So many of these subscriptions are made by corporations that deduct it from their income tax anyhow, so it's a small part. I'm just thinking out loud. Why couldn't we be thinking of a corporate rate or something like that, \$100 to \$150 a year?

DR. GARRISON: That's a possibility.

MR. TAYLOR: As a matter of fact, more of them would probably take it at that price because they could express some sort of prestige.

MR. HYLAND: At that price they'll pay it because they have to pay to get it to look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not deciding the cost of the subscription at the moment, but if you pull back into your main binder for today, not the estimates binder, I'm informed by my good right hands here that section 7 gives you the comparisons.

MR. TAYLOR: What page would that be, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 7, the yellow tab.

MR. HYLAND: How many subscriptions did you say there were, Gary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seven hundred and thirty-eight paid subscriptions.

MR. STEVENS: And any adjustment does not affect this budget. It simply goes to revenue, which is unfortunate.

MR. HYLAND: How many are printed?

DR. GARRISON: Eighteen hundred and twenty.

MR. STEVENS: Two hundred and thirty are saved.

DR. GARRISON: For the bound volumes.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a factor too. The fact is that mailing those copies out is going to be an additional cost.

MR. STEVENS: Do we get a flat rate for this?

DR. GARRISON: For mailing these out? Some of you may recall that about two years ago there was a discussion with Canada Post. They required us to mail it first class because it wasn't a daily publication year-round and because publication isn't the Assembly's main business.

MR. STEVENS: So it's 36 cents or whatever; maybe more because it's heavy.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. STEVENS: Is it enveloped or just stuck on?

DR. GARRISON: There is an outside page that is simply stapled on. It's an additional sheet that has the address printed right on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's us subsidizing those who are interested enough to want to read our golden pearls of wisdom.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, there are a lot of people in the Rocky Mountain House constituency that really don't have any idea who that Danish fellow, Hans Ard, is.

MR. TAYLOR: Tell them he's a partner of that Frenchman, De Tour, who builds the roads in your area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we come back to the issue?

MRS. MIROSH: To Dr. Garrison, Mr. Chairman, regarding 512K99, \$238,160. Can you give me a little more information on what professional, technical, and labour services are?

DR. GARRISON: That covers typesetting and printing.

MR. STEVENS: Go to page 77, and then you can break it down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has been a change with regard to the typesetting, so perhaps Gary could share that with you.

DR. GARRISON: Late in 1986 we made a commitment to purchase typesetting equipment, and we now have in place in rooms 109 and 110 of the Legislature Building some equipment from Linotype Canada to do our own typesetting in-house. That decision was made after these budget figures were drawn up.

I don't know how much detail you want me to get into, Mr. Chairman, as to the cost of the equipment and all that. We figured that the recovery of the purchase price, at the rate of expenditure of last year, would be in 1.3 years, that the equipment would pay for itself in 1.3 years. As a matter of fact, we opened tenders for printing publicly last Friday, and the printing rates we were given were considerably less than we anticipated they might be. We had estimated that doing our own typesetting would save us approximately one-third of the printing costs you see here, but the lowest tender is actually less than half the per-page rate we were dealing with all of last year — the last two years, as a matter of fact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other thing about this piece of equipment — this follows the trip of the Members' Services Committee to Regina and seeing how useful that machine was in terms of speeding up the process and cutting costs — is that this is as good a time as any to announce that we're now going to have next-day Hansard starting this session.

MR. HYLAND: No Blues. Next day would be official.

MR. STEVENS: On page 73 the postage cost of mailing Hansard is about \$29,000. If my mathematics are right, that makes it

approximately \$40 per issue per year just to mail it. So if we're wondering about the subsidy that's there, just the mailing costs alone . . .

MR. HYLAND: Twenty-five bucks.

DR. GARRISON: I hadn't figured that out that way, but if you divided it out, I'm sure that's what it amounts to.

MR. STEVENS: It's nearly \$50.

Mr. Chairman, we don't often have a chance to do this, and we can't do it for everybody that works for the Legislative Assembly. The opportunities don't occur that often. This government can be very proud, and I think all parties would agree, that one of the accomplishments of this government was to establish a Hansard. I think it was the first outside of the federal government in Canada. The staff of Alberta Hansard serves us all very well. Strange hours and strange words. I'm sure they have some arguments about what was said and what wasn't said, but they seem to handle it very well. I think all of us appreciate that. It should be said when Gary is here, to pass on to the staff working with you.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. MIROSH: Does this mean you're now going to have work all night to keep that printer working, to get it out in the morning?

DR. GARRISON: Not exactly. I should mention that when Dr. Carter said, "next day Hansard," it will mean something a little bit different from what we're used to. The afternoon sitting will be covered by an issue delivered by 9 o'clock the following morning. The night sitting will be a separate issue which will come out later that afternoon, around 4:30. We're specifying to the printer that it be delivered to the building by 4:30. So it will be next day, but it will be in two pieces.

We will have to work late into the night, but it won't be all night. I'm anticipating that it won't be a lot longer than people have already had to work to produce the Blues and the other things we do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The unofficial transcript in many ways supplants the Blues. Right?

DR. GARRISON: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then we can get on to the corrections and get with it.

DR. GARRISON: If I might just explain to the members, those unofficial transcripts are the items that have been posted in the members' lounge, heretofore only covering question period. Part of this change involves having these transcripts posted throughout the sitting, covering the entire sitting. So instead of the Blues coming out the next morning and some members having access to them, we will be posting copies of these unofficial transcripts in the members' lounge and in our office, and members will be able to suggest corrections on that basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Staying right on top of it, we're not intending to keep Hansard staff here any later than they have been. We're trying to see what other ways we can in fact try to shorten that process. One concern is about female staff in particular working around here until very late at night and early in the morning. It raises certain security problems.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, looking at . . . Oh, Bohdan; I'm sorry.

MR. STEFANIUK: I simply want to comment in respect of the wasted copies, Mr. Chairman, and to suggest that there is no uniform pattern in the number that are wasted from day to day. We do occasionally run into shortages on a given day. It really is all contingent on the popularity of the speeches made during any particular sitting.

MR. STEVENS: Or the subject.

MR. HYLAND: If I can just get helped through this. The number printed is 1,820; we have 738 subscriptions; that leaves us 1,082. If you take off what is saved -- which you said was 238, Gary?

DR. GARRISON: Two hundred and thirty.

MR. HYLAND: I had it 238. That leaves 844. If you take off two for MLAs and table officers, that's about 200. Somewhere there are 644 that aren't accounted for.

MR. STEFANIUK: The over-the-counter sales.

MR. HYLAND: Without subscriptions?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, there are a number of over-the-counter sales in the Annex. People come in and -- it actually says on the inside back cover of Hansard: 25 cents per copy. I can give you the exact breakdown of the whole 1,820 if you like: 738 subscriptions; 83 distributed in the House; an additional 166 for the members' offices, two each; and there are 356 which have been ordered by the various members and offices elsewhere in the building.

MR. HYLAND: A lot of that is probably for government departments. Do they pay extra for those copies or are they gratis?

DR. GARRISON: I was just going to comment that I believe these are all paid for as well. If there is a subscription increase, it would affect these 356 as well as the 738.

MR. HYLAND: So in reality, then, the subscriptions are about 1,000, not 700?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's right.

MR. HYLAND: The 700 are private subscriptions, and the 300 are off-site and inside government?

DR. GARRISON: That's right; 356 are within the Legislative Assembly complex.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. So that takes it down to 300. Over-the-counter sales are in the neighbourhood of 300?

DR. GARRISON: I believe that's right. I've got 247.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Stevens?

MR. STEVENS: Pass.

MR. HYLAND: How long do we save those things? Is that where the storage problem comes?

DR. GARRISON: I believe they're saved until prorogation or until just before the beginning of the next session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or the end of the world, whichever occurs first.

MR. HYLAND: So we're not storing that 247 for two or three sessions or whatever?

MR. STEFANIUK: No, we're not storing them on site, but I do believe we're vaulting for at least one extra session, at least until the bound volumes are published.

MR. HYLAND: By that stage, we can photocopy if people want copies.

MR. STEFANIUK: In the matter of a particular speech, there is a reprint service offered by Hansard now which is confined to a member's speech and is billed back to the member at cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We will move from page 67 to 68. This gives you the permanent positions.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, where and what heading will it be in order to make any move as to the change in subscription rates for Hansard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have put it onto the main portion of our meeting, not the estimates side, to examine the rates, so we will bring it back in there.

MR. TAYLOR: It comes back there, eh? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 68. This is the permanent positions.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's fine.

Page 69 is where you would pick up most of the part-time sessional folks.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I note that on page 69 we're going from 5.1 to 6.1 man-years. The explanation may have been given and I may have been out of the room when it was. If so, I apologize. Why are we going up one full man-year?

DR. GARRISON: We're dropping two man-years in permanent positions and we're picking up the work by using part-time people under wages.

MR. BOGLE: So we're saving one man-year.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 70, then, is a function of the others.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 71.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, again for clarity -- and I'm on page 70 -- are the employer contributions for a variety of health and related benefits all consistent with what's in the management pension package for government and the MLA plan that we just went through?

DR. GARRISON: I believe so. The same form was used for the staff of Hansard as was used for the staff of General Administration and the library.

MR. STEVENS: Basically, Mr. Chairman, if this helps, I believe these are factors provided by Treasury that each of us has to stick with in preparing the budget. Those are what you have used?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MRS. MIROSH: We don't have any choice there.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page number?

MR. TAYLOR: Page 70. I don't know just how to word this, but one of the modern conflicts that's developing in our society is the number of larger corporations and employers that are moving people from permanent to nonpermanent in order to dodge what some people feel is their responsibility to have them on pension plans and dental plans and other things. In other words, labour would argue that the benefits they have negotiated through the years in the last generation or two are now being abrogated by this appearance of going from a permanent plan to part-time, in effect throwing the part-time people on the back of

society as a whole when they lose those benefits. This is an accusation made of many of the big shopping companies and so on. That's the preface or background to my question.

You save one-man year, or one person-year, whatever way you want to look at it, by transferring people to part-time rather than permanent employment. Are we also putting more people out in society now without health care — well, health care you always have — without disability, Blue Cross, dental plan? In other words, is this part of the savings we're trying to make? If we are doing it, it's hardly the type of example government wants to set. I'm just asking. I can't do this quick an analysis just looking at it.

I notice you've come down .3 percent in what you have to put out for employer contributions. But is that covered just by the reduction of one person-year, or is some of that reduction due to the fact that our part-time people are not receiving the same types of benefits as full-time, on a pro rata basis, that is?

DR. GARRISON: I believe that is true, but my intention in doing this budget wasn't to save on benefits but to rationalize the amount of work that is available for Hansard staff during session as opposed to outside session. As Dr. Carter mentioned, the reduction of the number of full-time positions from eight to six and the increase in man-years under wages is a direct reflection of that. As you can appreciate, our workload is very seasonal. We have very high peak demands during session and not quite as high a peak at the present time, when we have committees meeting for long periods of time. But the workload is very seasonal. The demand goes up very high at the time of session, and outside session it is very much lower. So that is much more the rationale than to attempt to save on benefits.

MR. TAYLOR: I agree, but you had that problem before. The fact that Hansard is seasonal occurred in previous years the same as it does now, I would think. I'm a little concerned that the 21 percent drop in permanent salaries and the increase in nonpermanent is designed . . . Maybe I shouldn't be worrying about the government, but the government could be accused of trying to take the backdoor out of paying our rightful share of

social costs to employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not the government; this is the Legislative Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: The massive transfer of people to temporary employment, with the obvious view of getting around paying the benefits, is something I'd fight with Woodward's, Safeway, or the Bay.

MRS. MIROSH: As an employer of part-time people you still have to pay it.

MR. TAYLOR: But we're not doing it here, though. That's the trouble.

MRS. MIROSH: You have to, by law. You still have to pay Canada Pension Plan and unemployment insurance.

MR. TAYLOR: I agree. It's the dental plan, Blue Cross, and long-term disability that they will not participate in. For instance, our long-term disability has been cut by 50 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I believe the positions became vacant and have not been filled, so it hasn't been a matter of moving someone from a permanent position over to part-time. Is that correct?

DR. GARRISON: That's right. No one was moved. It's just a matter of redistributing the manpower.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Liberal leader's questions could well be directed during a sitting of the Assembly or outside the Assembly to the Minister of Labour, who I'm sure would be pleased to respond as to the government's intentions, to the agreements that are in place, to how downsizing is applied, and to how part-time or seasonal or wage employees or full-time employees and all the other categories do or do not receive benefits.

The questions he is posing today are not in order for this particular section of this debate. I'm not disagreeing that those questions should be asked, Nick, but I think the agreements we have with our employees, the policies we have with nonmanagement and management, provide for the payments of certain or all benefit costs based on discussions with those groups or based

on a government decision. Each case before us from this one area is based on those kinds of practices.

So I understand what Dr. Garrison presented. If there have been adjustments, you use the formulas to find out what those costs are going to be. I think those questions might very well be asked and would be answered very positively, Nick. I don't think any area has failed in any way to meet the requirements. But as the Member for Edmonton Glengarry said, every category of employee has or has not some or all of the benefits paid for by this employer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the reference is appropriate to Calgary Glenmore, not Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. STEVENS: Did I say Edmonton Glengarry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's all right. I know you haven't been feeling too well. You're tired.

MR. TAYLOR: I have complained before about something going by me in a hurry, but I didn't know about Glengarry, for fear that Glengarry had indeed joined me while I was out this morning.

MR. STEVENS: Sorry, Calgary Glenmore.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, what appears to have happened here is that a couple of people ceased employment with Hansard, and as a reasonable management step the Editor of Hansard has reviewed and found there is insufficient workload during the off times to employ these people and has chosen to take those positions up with part-time people during the heavy times. I would think that's wise management.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty.

MR. TAYLOR: I have one more question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is still on page 70?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. Through the Chair to Dr. Garrison. Are any of the part-time people who have been hired working full-time on a weekly or monthly basis? Does part-time mean part-

time each day, or does part-time mean full-time for one or two months or one week? In other words -- and maybe I could give you notice of a motion on this -- when is the longest period of time a part-time employee works full-time? Do you follow my question?

DR. GARRISON: I think so. They never really work full-time as such.

MR. STEVENS: The agreement for government employees covers that, Gary, doesn't it?

DR. GARRISON: Well, I'm not sure what you're referring to exactly. But what I was going to say is that during session these people work very close to full-time for the whole session. In fact, they may get some overtime if the House sits until 11 or 12 o'clock at night. A fair portion of them don't work a full day on Friday, when there's no night sitting, for example, or on a Wednesday when we don't have committee transcripts to do. So they could very well work very close to 37.25 hours a week on average for the whole session, but the actual number of hours varies from day to day and from week to week, depending on how long the House sits.

MR. TAYLOR: How many employees would we be talking about that would work approximately, on average, 37 hours a week over the whole session. A dozen?

DR. GARRISON: We can just add them up from page 69. The recordist would not work quite that many hours. The recordist runs the taping equipment, and he or she only needs to be here when the House is in session or when committees are meeting in the Chamber. The same is true of the console operator. But generally, for all the rest I think it's fair to say that it would be fairly close to full-time for session, especially if the House continues to develop the habit of sitting until 11 o'clock or so when there's a night sitting.

MR. TAYLOR: I think I will indeed bring it up later or at some other place. I'm just looking for the information. I don't feel happy about part-time people who are working almost full-time for a month or two and not participating in some way, shape, or form . . .

MR. STEVENS: They do get their benefits,

Nick, on a pro rata basis.

MR. TAYLOR: Not dental, for instance.

MR. STEVENS: Yes, they do, if they're on a permanent part-time basis or if they're work sharing. You might raise that with Ian. There are about eight categories of workers.

MR. TAYLOR: Is that right?

MR. STEVENS: Depending on where they are, they might get all the benefits for a period of time or half the benefits for double the time. Okay? So it is there.

MR. TAYLOR: I see. I feel better. Too bad; you're taking away a big issue from me.

MR. STEVENS: You can still ask the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 72, folks: 512A99, Travel Costs, Hansard Association.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 73, taking into account any subsequent motion. Page 73 will reflect any motion that may take place in our main meeting with regard to — oh, it really doesn't. Agreement on 73?

MS BARRETT: A question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, sorry.

MS BARRETT: I'm not sure where I saw this, Mr. Chairman, but I saw a note somewhere in our books about the increased costs of Hansard, and I wonder if there's...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, we had quite a lengthy discussion on this while you were out of the room, so in fairness I think perhaps you could check the record and we'll come back.

MS BARRETT: Okay. I'll catch up otherwise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The issue is coming back in our main meeting. It's one of the tabled issues. Okay?

MS BARRETT: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Page 74.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minus 95 ain't bad.
Page 75.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry; just a point of information. I notice these word processors have dropped off because the option was exercised. How long did you have to have them before the option was exercised? Is it a three- or four-year rental or what?

DR. GARRISON: It's a three-year lease.

MR. TAYLOR: Three-year. Then you paid a dollar to buy them.

DR. GARRISON: Actually, it didn't even cost us a dollar. We just had an option to purchase at the end of 33 months if we paid the additional three months' lease charges in a lump sum.

MR. TAYLOR: I was just curious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So if you've got any surplus equipment, you could speak to the leader of the Liberal Party.
Page 75.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 76.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Gary why we bind 690 books? Is that more than one book per session or sitting? Are there that many people who want these things in hard cover?

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the next page. That's 77.

MR. STEVENS: I'm on 77. Did you say 77?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that mean agreement on 76?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the long-range vision of

the Member for Banff-Cochrane, yes?

MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. Why do we need 690 bound at \$9 a book. It doesn't bother me; it's a small amount in the total overall budget. But is there that much demand for bound volumes?

DR. GARRISON: That anticipates a long session which would require us to break Hansard up into three books. So that anticipates a three-volume set of 230 copies. Three times 230 is 690.

MR. STEVENS: Okay. I see.

MR. BOGLE: That leads to the next question, which is: why 230 sets?

MR. STEVENS: One each for the 83 members and 150 more.

MR. BOGLE: Who do we provide them to?

DR. GARRISON: Those are provided -- I don't have a complete list, but I could get that.

MR. BOGLE: No. Just the . . .

DR. GARRISON: A number of those are to paid subscribers. As a matter of fact, as I recall, the cost of these bound volumes is the same as a one-year subscription to Hansard. In other words, they can have the bound volume.

MR. STEVENS: So for plus 15, they can have them both.

DR. GARRISON: As you can see, we're estimating \$9 a book, just for the binding.

MR. STEVENS: That's \$27 for the three volumes.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Edmonton Highlands might think of another motion about the bound copies to go with the other one, when we lift it off the table, please.

MR. STEVENS: Can we lift that one back then?

MS BARRETT: On further information, although I don't want to put words in your

mouth, Gary, I suspect that each of the government departments would actually have bound copies in their departmental libraries as well as the library downstairs. Also, would not a lot be going into the actual function of the government, not just to individual subscribers?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, I believe that's right. There are quite a few government departments who get the bound volume copies. I might add that there are some libraries, too, that don't subscribe to the bound volumes but get the daily issues and bind them themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. This would be another one of those things where if we did get any money or increase the rates, it doesn't come back to offset this anyway; it goes to general revenue.

MR. STEVENS: But what we are thinking of, Mr. Chairman, is that if you reduce the expenditures, that may be another option, and that's by reducing the numbers needed. I agree with you, though. The government should rethink this position -- most governments should -- because we don't provide the agency the option to make money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other point is that all the copies are in the library. The Legislature Library is here to serve the members, the general public. That also includes the departments, doesn't it?

MR. BOGLE: Further to that, I think each member receives two sets of bound Hansard . . .

DR. GARRISON: I think it's only one set.

MR. HYLAND: I think it's only one.

MR. BOGLE: Was it once two?

MR. HYLAND: No.

MR. STEVENS: Was it ever two before?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It used to be double sets.

DR. GARRISON: I'm not sure about that.

MR. BOGLE: I'm wondering if this isn't a more appropriate expense for an MLA out of his

expense allowance or some other such fund if he or she wants the set. I really think this is an area we've got to tackle in terms of trying to communicate more efficiency and streamlining. The same goes with the departments. If a department wants -- as the Speaker has said, the library is here to serve all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've got it down here for us to come back to, but we'll also get some supplementary information as to who gets all the bound copies.

DR. GARRISON: Okay. I'll get the lists.

MR. STEVENS: Why do we even do it? Let's put it in a little cardboard folder: 1985. I just really question . . .

MRS. MIROSH: They look nice.

MR. STEVENS: I know they look nice, but I just question the kind of money we all have to spend.

MS BARRETT: That way the paper eaters can't take them apart when they're photocopying them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: True. The other thing would be that in terms of overall numbers, an MLA needs only one copy. You don't need one over there and one here, but it's fine to have the bound set at the end. We'll get some more information as to where the bound copies are going. That will help us so we don't get into a bit of a bind on this page.

Page 78, Index. Is there any saving on this page with respect to what we're now proposing for next-day Hansard, Gary?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, there would be. I calculated the cost of printing the Blues for the last session and it came to between \$4,000 and \$5,000. So if we're not going to have Blues printed and we're going to have next-day Hansard instead, this figure would drop by between \$4,000 and \$5,000. Actually, it would be a little bit more because that only covers 63 sitting days and we budget for 80.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This then would reflect the purchase of that other equipment. Was this also taken into consideration as to how soon we'd

recover the cost of the purchase of the piece of equipment?

DR. GARRISON: No, because this doesn't relate to typeset material.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. STEVENS: Would you like to see us reduce that by minus 5 right now then?

DR. GARRISON: There are a number of things in here that are going to be different. As I mentioned, if we go by the tenders that were opened last week, the actual printing costs will be quite different from what is actually reflected on page 77. So I don't know how you want to handle that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point should be made that while one or two of you were out -- by virtue of the new tendering and the fact that we have this piece of equipment to have print ready, the tenders had come in at a reduction of 50 percent on the printing costs. As we go through the balance of this section, I think the other thing is that given a number of the comments here, there are going to be revisions that would reflect on this page rather than having a special motion now. Would that be agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we might go to 79, whatever Hosting means.

DR. GARRISON: This covers those occasions when our staff have to work very late. There were a couple of occasions last summer, as you know, when the House sat till approximately midnight and our staff needed to be here until about 2 in the morning. This simply covers the cost of a couple of pizzas to keep them going.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 80: We're holding the line here. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're all going to love the next one, on 81.

MR. STEVENS: I don't know what it is, but I'll agree to it.

MRS. MIROSH: Ziyad dual-bin sheet feeder.

MS BARRETT: What I want to know is: can constituency offices get those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next question is: do they want one?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 81. That's that section. Thank you. A little bit more information to come back and revised estimate sheets.

DR. GARRISON: Did I understand you to suggest that you want me to revise those sheets where the printing costs and those related things would be affected?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To reflect the tender stuff.

DR. GARRISON: Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: I was saying to the chairman and to the committee that I have asked Gary to actually visit the printing plants which tendered on the printing of Hansard, because we're into a whole new ball game now that we are going to be doing in-house typesetting. The printers who have tendered are unknown to us. We want to be very satisfied in our own minds that those people have the facilities and the capacity to handle our work on an overnight basis. We simply are not in a position to accept excuses for late or delayed deliveries. In spite of the fact that the tenders have come in very low, at least in one instance, we don't know that printer. We're not familiar with him, and that process is going to require Gary to visit the plant to satisfy himself that the equipment is in place to be able to handle our production needs and to satisfy himself from discussions with the principals that they fully intend and have contracted staff to be on-site during the night when, in fact, our production requirements take place.

What I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not have any assurance right at this moment that the lowest bid is in fact acceptable to the Legislative Assembly. That is speculative, I

suggest, at the moment. So until those investigations have been concluded, I think it might be imprudent to rely on the savings which are implied by the lowest tender which was opened last Friday.

I would further add that leaving the budget as it is proposed now would in all likelihood enable us to pay for the capital cost which will be incurred in acquiring the in-house typesetting equipment much sooner than we may have anticipated otherwise. In other words, we may be able to write it off, if indeed the lowest bid is acceptable, within one year.

MR. BOGLE: When will this committee be advised as to whether or not the lowest received bid is in fact acceptable?

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we next meet, within two or three weeks, I would assume.

DR. GARRISON: I don't think it will be too long. I was going to mention that the timing of the submission of revised budget sheets would come into play here too. I was going to ask what that was. If the printing contract is in fact awarded prior to the time you want revised budget sheets, then I don't think that's a major problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll bring it back to the next meeting, but all comments are useful.

MRS. MIROSH: Are these all local tenders?

MR. STEFANIUK: In light of the fact that our work has to be produced in a limited number of hours overnight, it's only logical that we can only entertain local tenders. Otherwise, we would be relying on long-distance deliveries, which could certainly impact on the regular and timely deliveries of the documents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, folks. Before we go on to the library, I think we should give ourselves a five-minute break and invite the librarian up. Before we break for the moment, we asked earlier, when Mr. Bubba was here, about how much of the Members' Services Committee budget has been expended thus far in this current fiscal year. The budget amount is \$32,520; as of the end of December we had spent \$6,807.

Okay, a five-minute adjournment and be back

here at 5 minutes past 2.

[The committee recessed from 1:57 p.m. to 2:09 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, folks, we go to section 12 of your estimates with regard to the Legislature Library. I'd like Blake McDougall to make a few comments before we go through page by page.

MR. McDOUGALL: I know you're very busy and on a tight schedule, so I'd like to take four or five minutes of your time to give you a general overview of the situation concerning our library. I've recorded it here in a brief memo so that you'll have the facts in front of you and won't have to remember the detail.

As you can see, in the first paragraph I've indicated the range of our library's responsibilities. In addition to providing the conventional information, reference, and research services that the other parliamentary libraries provide, we are also responsible for co-ordination of a number of co-operative projects among the administration's department libraries.

Then I indicate our relevant position as regards budgets, and you can see that we're fourth in the size of our budget and fourth in the size of our staff among the other Canadian provincial parliamentary libraries. We're fifth in the amount spent per legislator for parliamentary library services and third in the amount spent per capita. That's based on the population of Alberta. So despite the wide range of our responsibilities, our relevant position is not unreasonable in comparison to the other provinces. However, you may have your own views in that regard.

As well, last year the use of the library facilities rose significantly, and I've indicated some of the statistical figures or the volume indicators. We broke a number of previous records that were established since our library was first put in operation in 1906.

Finally, I indicate that because of the province's deteriorating fiscal situation, I was asked to produce a minus 5 percent budget. That represents a net decrease of \$63,299 and the loss of one permanent staff position. These decreases will have some adverse effects on the library service, but we hope to minimize the effects by becoming more efficient, improving

the way that we do things.

I'll stop there, and as we go along, if there are any further questions, I'd be pleased to answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have the budget sheets?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to go a page at a time as we have, or do you want to do overview comments?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to note that the library is a very labour-intensive service. Roughly 80 percent of the budget is labour, personnel, yet the reduction on an overall basis seems to be in the area of service — I'm saying "seems to be" till we go through it — rather than in the area of downsizing personnel. I just raise that as an issue, because I think every agency, every Crown corporation, every department of government — this is not; this is a service of the Legislature — has been required to look at its personnel and the size of its staff. Yet what we have in front of us, although it says one reduction, is virtually no change in Salaries, Wages & Employee Benefits and a reduction really in service based on Supplies & Services.

I just raise that as a concern about the approach taken. I think there are other ways that we need to look at in the future to reduce our costs in the Legislative Assembly including the Legislature Library. For example, we could look at the hours of operation, we could look at the days of the year that we're providing services, we could look at the range of services we provide, and we could look at whether the members only should be serviced or all these other things. I'm not concerned about being third, fourth, or fifth; I'm concerned whether we can afford it.

I just raise that as a general view, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any comments from committee members on that?

MR. TAYLOR: I'd comment just the opposite of my friend from Banff-Cochrane.

MR. STEVENS: That's normal.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't think it was normal, but ... I think he's cutting exactly where you should. When you cut people, you cut service. This is the type of cut I like to see; they're cutting the perks and privileges they had themselves. Would that we had the courage to do it ourselves. Consequently, I think he's cutting in the right place and not hurting the services. So they go to fewer conventions and belong to fewer things. I think it's a good way to cut. I don't think it affects them, but I just couldn't let it get by without making a statement. We're getting excellent service, not just because I'm around the corner from it and there's busloads going back and forth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And occupying their former space.

MS BARRETT: For which he is eternally grateful.

In terms of the overview, I think a very good job has been done here as well. I do note the severe cutting of travel expenses. Where we're talking about reduced services, in response to comments by Mr. Stevens, I think what you see — for example, Professional, Technical, & Labour Services is down 72.2 percent. That sort of thing that need not directly affect the ability of the employees to perform their jobs, which has obviously faced an overall increase in demand, shows that the cutting unfortunately appears not to have been able to avoid cutting at least one staff job but has taken place in areas that make sense. Obviously, Data Processing Services has seen some kind of improvement in efficiency capacities and that sort of thing. I think this is the most intelligent way to trim a budget as well.

MR. BOGLE: I want to support the remarks made by the Member for Banff-Cochrane. While I appreciate the work that's been done on achieving a 5 percent reduction, have some scenarios been developed as to where reductions will occur in the 10 percent scenario? Do those scenarios include the reduction of staff, and if so, where? In management, nonmanagement, or both?

MR. McDOUGALL: I've prepared the first status report, which is intended for anyone inquiring concerning our present budget and our present estimates. This gives a breakdown of

all the cuts that were made, as well as the few increases. I'll give you a copy of this. One of the closing paragraphs indicates that

as existing permanent and temporary staff vacate their positions, they will not be replaced as all hiring has been "frozen" and the money recovered from these changes will be needed to cover other library operating expenses. If the amounts realized through attrition are not adequate to meet our costs, then job-sharing, part-timing and layoffs will have to be considered.

So the next thing that happens is further staff reductions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you say you had a copy of that for everyone?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could share that, have a fast scan, and then I'll recognize Edmonton Highlands. Well, Taber-Warner is still on this point.

MR. BOGLE: Yes, before we leave the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's wait until we get the document, please.

MR. McDOUGALL: On the second page they indicate that it's not possible to realize any further economies without job sharing, part-timing, or layoffs. So that's where we are now.

MS BARRETT: I think there's a typo. It says one library tech resigned during December '87. That must have been '86.

MR. McDOUGALL: I'm sorry; that's correct.

MR. BOGLE: One further question. I'm trying to get at whether or not a position or positions have been identified if it is indeed the will of the committee that there must be a reduction in manpower.

MR. McDOUGALL: We've discussed among the management staff three approaches to this situation. Job sharing is the first alternative. We've had examples of that in the past two summers, but that's voluntary, and there has to be an agreement between two or more staff

members. Part-timing is the next alternative other than straight layoff. That means that the amount of time everyone will work is cut in proportion to the amount of money that's required to continue the operation of the library. Finally, of course, the most conventional approach is layoff, and it would appear that that would have to be done through seniority.

I've made a considerable number of inquiries about the other newer approaches of job sharing and part-timing. People tell me that it's a very commendable approach to this kind of situation, in that people don't lose their jobs completely. After all, like everyone else, these people have families, mortgages to pay, and so on. If they're part-time, they're at least able to realize part of their income, yet savings can also be realized. Indications to me have been that it's extremely difficult to implement. The reason is that persons in positions that have seniority are less inclined to go along with that type of arrangement. That's why organizations consistently have to fall back to straight layoffs rather than other more innovative arrangements.

At this time it's my view that we would have to do layoffs on the basis of seniority.

MR. BOGLE: Hopefully, the last supplementary. If that is the case, where would the reduction or reductions occur?

MR. McDOUGALL: I prepared a seniority list several weeks ago. It's confirmed from my records and those at the personnel office. However, the next step would be to have employees confirm that they agree that the dates they commenced with the government are correct. When you examine that list, to recover an additional 5 percent there would have to be three or four layoffs. Right off the top of my head, it would be one at the main library, one in the co-operative government library services section, and two in the research section. That would be the spread. There would be layoffs in each section, but in this case the research unit would bear the brunt of that particular scenario.

MS BARRETT: I might be wrong on this, but I understand from previous committees that the library has the reputation of being the most efficient component of the Assembly. I don't

know if I'm allowed to ask this, but I'm going to anyway, and you can decide whether or not you're going to let me have an answer. Is it the case that under your management, you are generally able to deliver a final tab that is marginally under the estimates for your department each year?

MR. McDOUGALL: We've never exceeded our estimates. In specific years we've come relatively close to our full allotment, but generally we have realized some savings. In terms of cost efficiency, we're generally regarded as one of the most cost-efficient parliamentary libraries in Canada, if not the most cost efficient. That's based on the range of services we're providing for the cost compared to the other provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments generally? Perhaps we can move page by page again. This takes us back to page 82, Salaries, Wages & Employee Benefits and Supplies & Services.

MR. HYLAND: That's where my question is. The result of the breakdown which they outline on page 82 starts on page 83, doesn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Within the [inaudible] Salaries (Permanent Positions), code 511A99.

MR. STEVENS: Are you accepting questions on that page?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.

MR. HYLAND: A couple of questions. The first one: is it in Standing Orders that the library has to be open when the Legislature is sitting? Included in that: are we paying overtime to the people in the library at that time, or have we ever thought of rotation, changing the time they work and having them work different hours, rather than having to pay the extra overtime?

MR. McDOUGALL: Library staff are not entitled to overtime payment; that's a condition of work of nearly all library organizations because of the fact that public and university libraries are open on Saturdays, Sundays, evenings, and so on. It's just a basic part of your working conditions that you are expected to work shift work, weekends, and so on without

any premium payments. So they aren't paid any overtime -- that is, unless they work past the amount stated in their working agreement and, of course, that isn't the case. Also, the staff are rotated through the evening shifts. So there is no overtime payment made to library staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The sound you hear is a saw. It's one of the MLAs from three Legislatures ago still trying to escape.

In Standing Orders, section 115: "There shall be a Legislature Library operated in accordance with the directions of Mr. Speaker." That gives some latitude to set hours and operate.

MR. HYLAND: So we could look at the hours of the library?

MR. STEVENS: Could I ask a question? Would the reduction of hours allow a savings? Is it because we have the hours so long that you have to have additional staff, whether they're part-time or full-time part-time or whatever they are?

MR. McDOUGALL: That's a consideration. It's not the only consideration, though. The staff that work on the public service desk in the evening are professional staff. The amount of time each individual works in an evening isn't a large percentage of the total time they work. I would be reluctant to cut back the evening service or that level of service on the basis of the savings it would realize. For the reduction in service, I don't think the amount of money saved would be significant.

MS BARRETT: My point actually is that when we're in session, the maximum number of evenings during the week which we can sit is three. I think the average length of time per evening would be like two and a half hours, so it couldn't come to very much.

Being one of the people who has been trained very thoroughly how to use this library, I actually do run down to it in the evening frequently, so I wouldn't want to see the evening hours cut back. If members know how to use it, you generally need very little time with the staff down there, but you can run down and get all kinds of information that's useful, particularly in estimates debates. Unless there's a plan to change our whole program to eliminate night sittings, I can't see that it would

really be any kind of real economy or saving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're still open over the supper hour?

MR. McDOUGALL: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't had time to find out. Who eats supper these days?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, page 83 says 24 and 24. The supplementary information by Mr. McDougall said that one position has been vacated. It says "vacant" for Library Technician I, but I add up 23. Is that a typographical error?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes, it is. It's 23 positions. Between ourselves and the administration office we had a number of problems with that correction, so that number didn't get changed.

MR. STEVENS: Is 24 man-years correct?

MR. McDOUGALL: In the '87-88 estimates, the permanent staff positions would be 23.

MR. STEVENS: And the man-years?

MR. McDOUGALL: No. That's under Wages, the next page. There are two man-years there, so that would be 25, if you include the full-time wage equivalents. The corrected figure then would be 23 on page 83 and two on 84.

MR. STEVENS: And 25 man-years on 83?

MR. McDOUGALL: That's 25 man-years as opposed to 26 in this fiscal year.

MR. BOGLE: So the 24 is wrong as well? It should be 26?

MR. McDOUGALL: No, it's the second, unless we're not looking at the same thing. On page 83, the first column at the bottom, the first figure, Positions, would be 23 positions and man-years, 23. The next page, page 84, two man-years -- that's unchanged.

MR. STEVENS: We've got that, then?

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go back to my original remarks. I'm disappointed, and I will

say it again. It is obvious from your own remarks, Mr. McDougall, that there has been no what I would consider to be serious -- and I say that with kindness -- consideration of the number of positions and their utilization beyond what we see here. Given what is happening all about us, with the reduction in our revenues as a government and therefore in moneys that may be available for the Legislature, I can't believe we have virtually what we had last year. Yet what is happening? Sooner or later the Legislature is going to have to face the same question again. Mr. Bogle has asked if there have been any plans for the future.

Number one for me: I think the service has to be examined very, very carefully. There must be areas of the service that are extensive or go beyond what we can have in times of restraint or there are operating hours that need adjustment or relations we have with other agencies that have to be curtailed -- in other words, doing more with less. What we have here is a reduction in ... I even find an error on page [82]: Travel Expenses, from \$1,300 for the year before to \$13,800.

I'm jumping ahead, Mr. Chairman, but still, in looking at the page we've gone over very quickly ... Another member said he was pleased to see these reductions in travel, but when I turned to that page, there appears to be an error on that page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which page number now?

MR. STEVENS: Travel Expenses, 87. It says '86-87 travel allowance, \$13,800. To me, it adds up to \$1,150. There's something missing.

So I'm not comfortable at all. I think this entire library budget should be reviewed from the point of view of how we can provide a service with reduced staff. We don't look at asking the employees whether they'd like to work-share. We don't ask the employees whether they would like a layoff or not. What has to be determined is what the service is, how we can best provide it, and what positions can be abolished and still give us the service in these times. I'm sorry; I feel very strongly about that.

MR. McDUGALL: We're speaking again at a general and I would say more philosophical level. Right now I'm looking at the overall summary of budget estimates for the

Legislative Assembly, and I see that of the 10 or 11 elements the library has made the greatest reduction in its estimates, minus 5.5 percent. The figure I had prior to the meeting was an overall increase in the Assembly's estimates of plus 3.9 percent. I guess my question with that is: where is the equity in that particular situation?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I have to respond to that. This is a draft document, subject to a review by this committee, line by line, page by page. What you have before you for other areas may not even be factual today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And indeed is not because of the changes made on Thursday, Friday and some very radical changes that have been made today.

MR. STEVENS: I want to know what the philosophy was. If it wasn't to make one change unless the employees themselves liked it, we'll never see any change. I just don't understand that. I think we have to look at the hours of work, what we're doing, why we're doing it, and where we can reduce that work. If it means there are reductions in positions, we follow the normal policies that we do. I'm just astonished. What we have here is no change of personnel except that somebody left. Otherwise, we wouldn't have that.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, while I agree that the travel expenses and perks for the staff have been reduced -- I appreciate that -- I would like to make a motion, if I may, to reduce the salaries and wages of employees by 5 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean by an additional ...

MR. BOGLE: You're talking about the global.

MRS. MIROSH: Right. To add up to 5 percent total -- the global total of \$701,196 to be reduced by 5 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Give me the page number and the figure you've just quoted.

MRS. MIROSH: Page 83, \$701,196 -- last year's -- to be reduced by 5 percent in total.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The motion before us is with regard to that item. Any discussion in that area?

MS BARRETT: Something tells me -- it must be experience -- that this motion is going to pass and that my perspective is going to be defeated, but here it is.

I take issue with the comments from the Member for Banff-Cochrane in particular and oppose the resolution, therefore, on the basis that this library has proved to be just about the most efficient component of this Assembly. I don't recall that a particular motion on the global salary budget was made for other components of the Assembly. I think the intellectual capacity of this Assembly is being singled out in such a way that it will diminish its ability to be both the finders and the conveyors of information to the members of the Assembly in particular, who are elected to be informed prior to and in the process of making deliberations and conclusions.

I suspect this motion is going to pass in any event, and therefore I would tag on a personal hope, which is that by whatever means, the head of the library, in the unfortunate event of such a motion passing, is able to find a way to maintain the staff and the services which I as a member of the public in the 1970s found to be so helpful and useful and as a member of a research staff in the 1980s continued to find so and as an MLA simply can't say enough good about, for the next several years and from my past experience. So I regret any decision which may come forward to make that a reality for you, Blake. You have my personal heartfelt congratulations on the best library I have ever been in. I've been in those incredibly comprehensively staffed British libraries too, and I've never seen a library as good as this one.

MR. McDOUGALL: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I have a bit of a problem with that motion. My concern is more with the research portion of the library than the library portion, if I may break it down that way. I agree with some of the comments about the library and the service it gives. I have a distinct problem and concern with the research portion of it. I would sooner see the reduction in the research portion of it than in any way that would stop access to the library portion.

I'd sooner see the reduction at the other end. It's a personal view and something I want to put on the record, and I think I've said that a couple of times before at various budget meetings through the years.

MR. TAYLOR: I have a bit of a problem with the motion too. I can understand where he's coming from, but I think we're -- the word isn't "meddling" -- going into the nuts and bolts a little too much rather than sticking with the overall plan for the library. It was asked to cut by 5 percent; they have come in with a plan of 5.5 percent. Admittedly it may not be in the little portions and areas all of us in the committee would have done, each in our own way. The point is that he did arrive at 5.5 percent. As far as I can see, he did it without impinging on the quality of the services or at least the times. I think that to make a specific motion, whether it is on repair and maintenance or wages -- as we have done with these wages -- gums up the whole process and balance. The very most we should do if we're going to start changing categories is to send it back with a suggestion that they redraft the whole thing.

In this particular area you must remember the fact that one person hasn't been rehired. They have one less individual. So if we assume that the same amount of work is going to be done in the future as has been done in the past, we're already loading onto those people who are left a little more work than they were doing before this person left. To go back to him and ask for a 5 percent cut on top of that -- this is where I think we're really wrong. My experience has always been that you might cut the number of people, but sometimes you have to give the people who are left more money.

The point is that as long as the whole budget is cut, that's what's important. Going out and cutting each individual 5 percent is not going to do it, especially after one has already left. Consequently, I'm having a lot of trouble with it. I think we're going at the whole thing backwards. He's done a good job as far as I'm concerned. It looks okay. You may think he should have kept in entertainment and traveling. That's his business. The point is that it has been cut 5.5 percent. The people who are presently there are committed to giving the same type of service they did in the past when they had one more employee.

In total, then, I would not support the

motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair must make the comment that with regard to the process we've been going through, nearly every member in this room has indeed tinkered with the specific items and has had motions carried, including the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MRS. MIROSH: Yes, that's right. Line by line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's just a comment with regard to process.

MR. TAYLOR: I agree we're tinkering in the process, but I think they should be more suggestions than going back and rolling through. What I am getting at: I thought we were going to tinker, but I get the impression, especially from the government [members] here, that God has spoken on this. When you pass your motions, the vote is six to two, whether He heard it or not, and the motions take on an edict from on high. It's not a suggestion; it's not an idea. I thought that when you do nuts and bolts you'd put back. But we seem to want these things carved in stone. I am sure that when the Member for Banff-Cochrane passes this, he expects, he wants it written in blood that 5 percent is cut off salary — no hanky-panky at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, if you check the record, you will discover that a lot of motions have neither passed nor been defeated simply on the basis of six to two. There have been a lot of variations throughout our whole process. Anyway, fair enough.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that we table the motion and bring it back for consideration at a future time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to table.

MR. TAYLOR: There's an eight to nothing one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Those opposed to the tabling motion? Okay, there's an example of a six to one.

MR. STEVENS: At least could the question on page 87 be answered? Was that just an error?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, we can keep on going through the process. Yes, 87 was bad addition.

MR. HYLAND: Does that mean it's still a reduction of 5.5 percent, or does that \$13,000 instead of \$1,300 really throw out the 5 percent?

MR. McDOUGALL: There were two earlier errors, and then there's this one. The reason we have this problem at the library is that we send our material to the administration office, and it's prepared manually. It's then put into this format using a word processor. Obviously, we're going to have to try to do something to improve the accuracy of the end result of that process. That's the problem.

The reduction is there. I don't have the initial figure here for you, but it is a real reduction from the figure shown, which is \$13,800, to \$1,300. That is accurate. What happened with the '86-87 figures? I'm sorry; I can't answer that.

MR. STEVENS: Can we have that when we come back?

MRS. MIROSH: That could be pretty important. It shows the same on page 82.

MS BARRETT: That's just the summary.

As a preliminary explanation, is it the case that in fact what's missing from the explanations and from the specifics of the estimates shown on page 87 is, for example, the axing of travel related to conferences and professional development and stuff like that? Is that what that really is, prior to getting your specific information?

MR. STEVENS: No, that's on page 86.

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's what I'm asking about. Is that what's missing?

MR. McDOUGALL: The reason for the difference, the drop from \$13,800 to \$1,300 which appear as totals on 87 and on the overall summary, is that all staff travel has been cut with the exception of that required within the city of Edmonton. So there's no conference travel or any business travel on my part. The only travel is staff traveling to pick up information from the university or other library

units located within the city of Edmonton. I apologize for the error on page 87.

MR. STEVENS: Will that be corrected, then, with some information? Because conference fees are shown on page 86. As long as we know what's missing . . . There must have been some expenditure that's not being planned for besides conference fees, because they are covered on page 86.

MS BARRETT: Those are eliminated.

MR. STEVENS: Oh, that's not travel?

MR. McDOUGALL: That's not travel. Those are separate accounts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We have some adjustments to be made in this whole section. My understanding is that that has impact, to say the least, on at least the first batch of pages, from 82 through 86. Any other comments with regard to 86? We certainly picked up a major one on page 87.

MR. HYLAND: I want to ask a question on positions. It's listed on 82. I want to talk specifically about the research component. Okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.

MR. HYLAND: My question is: are all the research officer positions presently occupied?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: They've been occupied for a while? There hasn't been much of a change?

MR. McDOUGALL: No. I believe the economist was replaced two years ago.

MR. HYLAND: Since that there's been . . .

MR. McDOUGALL: No. The amount of turnover in the library organization since the recession began in 1982 or whatever year you would pick has of course been reduced substantially, for obvious reasons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As we go through other sheets, bear in mind that we will be back with

revised sheets in about two to three weeks' time.

Page 88. The matter of increased postage I suppose comes into play again here. Does this take into effect the postal rate increases of April 1?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes, in part.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eighty-nine.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ninety.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ninety-one is a good number.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question, Member for Cypress-Redcliff?

MR. HYLAND: There are two places for replacement of terminals.

MR. STEVENS: Now we've got to service them.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. One's service and one's replacement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 92, Binding.

MR. BOGLE: On page 92 the explanation given is to reduce — actually, we're reducing the amount of binding we're doing. Are we postponing a problem that will occur next year? How are we able to do that?

MR. McDOUGALL: That account provides not just for binding but for the employment of personnel from private agencies to offset sickness or more extended periods of absence of the staff. So that particular amount of that account was reduced in the basic maintenance binding, and the library will continue as it is presently.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm troubled by the code then, the explanation below it, and the reason given, because they're completely at

odds with one another. How can we have binding show up when what we're really talking about is reducing outside help?

MR. McDOUGALL: My explanation is referring to the variance of the total account, and the item on the left is indicating where the money will be spent. It remains in the account. Sorry.

MR. BOGLE: Binding is left?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: I understand that. So the savings that are accruing are accruing because we're no longer going to have outside people coming in to replace those who are away on sick leave and so on?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes. The remainder of the funds in that account will be used primarily for hiring people in private or commercial agencies for office overload situations when the staff is absent for extended periods of time.

MR. BOGLE: So now if someone is sick, there's no one to replace that person for the day.

MR. McDOUGALL: We have a wage allowance on page 84, which gives us some flexibility there. The reason we had an allowance in professional services [inaudible] is that it's sometimes easier to get people on very short notice from a private agency.

MR. BOGLE: My overall concern is that a member of the Assembly will have no idea what we're doing by the explanations given. It's only with your assistance at this table that we understand.

MRS. MIROSH: It actually should be entitled "labour services."

MR. BOGLE: That's part of the code at the top.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So with a different explanation that should indeed -- when that is corrected, we'll come back to that with the new sheets, and hopefully that will meet the concerns.

Page 93.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, what would

happen if we didn't have an automated book catalogue? Would one of these people actually be able to sit down and do it, or would it mean that we would no longer have a catalogue?

MR. McDOUGALL: The Alberta Government Libraries Union Catalogue is a centralized record of the books, journals, and so on that are acquired by the major libraries within the government of Alberta. It was automated a number of years ago, and this reduction is the cost of the data processing that's required to maintain that particular record.

MR. STEVENS: That's the first item?

MR. BOGLE: Are you on the first or the third item?

MR. McDOUGALL: I'm sorry; I thought you were talking about the union book. You're talking about the automated book catalogue. That's the catalogue in the main library that's presently being converted from a manual catalogue to an automated one; that is, the files will appear on fiche and be available at any number of points within the province or in the building here rather than just in the main catalogue at the library proper.

MR. STEVENS: You said that was being done. Do you mean this is an ongoing -- is it going to end sometime?

MR. McDOUGALL: A lot of the technical work and planning was completed earlier. In terms of inputting, it began -- in January, 1986, we began to produce the new product, which is this data being processed in automated form and eventually coming out in a form of microfiche. Of course, the advantage of that is that the whole catalogue can be examined at any number of points. If anyone has the fiche, then they can see what's in the library's catalogue. I believe that program was approved two years ago by this committee.

MR. STEVENS: Is it a one-time-only, three-year, five-year -- is this a forever item?

MR. BOGLE: In other words, how far into the process are you?

MR. McDOUGALL: In 1986 we just got

started. Our last calculation was that it would be six years to get all of the inventory that's presently in the library. We started doing the new material that we're acquiring, and then last summer we hired one student to work on the existing inventory books in the library. We would hope to have the complete collection in the new format within six years.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I hope this item might come back with some kind of an explanation. Whatever this committee did two years ago, times are different. I'd like to know a little bit more. Are we committed to a \$200,000 program? What would the impact be of doing it at half or one-third the speed or some other kind of approach? Because that's one staff member.

MR. BOGLE: I'll just add to that. I'd like to know what happens if we just stop it, notwithstanding the fact that we've invested \$35,000 in it. I understand we have an ongoing commitment of another four and a half to five years to complete the process. I think this committee must look at the alternatives, and one of the painful alternatives is to cut our losses and stop at this point in time and continue with the card system.

When we do meet next to talk about other matters relating to this important budget, that should be one of them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The librarian is making notes. Other comments with regard to page 93?

MR. BOGLE: Are we correct? Is item 2 a kind of build-on on item 1, the automated system for indexing government publications?

MR. McDOUGALL: No. The CODOC system was approved and implemented in 1976, and all of the government's collection of government publications — it doesn't include standard books and journals, just government publications — is already in that. That's an ongoing program, and it's the only index to that collection that is available.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, are these more than the publications produced by the Queen's Printer?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes. You see, we're a deposit library for the federal government, and we acquire government publications from other jurisdictions on a selective basis. We're a full deposit for the government of Canada and the provinces of Alberta and Ontario.

MS BARRETT: A clarification here. My assumption, knowing something about libraries, is that dropping CODOC would in fact cost us more because you then need more people to do everything manually. Is that correct?

MR. McDOUGALL: When I arrived here in 1974, there was no systematic access to the library's collection of government publications. In a parliamentary library certainly one of the most important sources of information is its collection of government publications. You probably know, since a large number of you do reports, that the requests for service that we get from your offices are for those items. This system identifies uniquely each specific item in the collection and provides a related index to them so they can be found. Before it was very difficult and time consuming to find this type of material. For instance, at the time this program was implemented, there was no additional staff hired to put it in place. People simply changed from the manual jobs they were doing to the new system.

[Mr. Bogle in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Member for Edmonton Highlands?

MS BARRETT: No, thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: My question has been answered.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any other questions, recognizing that this matter will be brought back?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. Page 94, under Hospitality.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Page 95, Materials & Supplies: an overall 18.7 percent reduction.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On page 96 . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Sorry; just for a second on 95. The reduction in periodicals and newspapers: is that Alberta? Is there any cutback at all in the Alberta weeklies?

MR. McDOUGALL: No. All Alberta publications, including the weekly newspapers, are priority acquisitions in our library. They won't be affected.

MR. TAYLOR: These are things like the Miramichi Gleaner and stuff like that, are they?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Page 96, Purchase of Office Equipment.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. We have a number of items to come back to on the library vote. I'm going to suggest that we take a short break until the Chairman returns, because I believe then we're going to move away from the budget to other matters on our agenda, unless he has some other budgetary matters he wishes to deal with.

MR. TAYLOR: The Chairman is returning, is he?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe he is. Thank you. We'll just take a short break.

[The committee recessed at 3:08 p.m. and resumed at 3:15 p.m.]

[Dr. Carter in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, we're now back in committee, and the Member for Rocky Mountain House has a recommendation.

MR. CAMPBELL: I recommend that we go through the library budget by section so that we could cost out, say, research and all the

different components of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this would be seen as a separate document, because for budget purposes we have to go through it in this style, but we could also . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Take a look at it and just see where the larger share of the budget is being spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's the motion before us. Is there a call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: We're back in the meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's my understanding. Now that we've come to the end of those sections, we have to get into a number of revisions and so forth, but we can now return to the items of the main agenda, as long as that's everyone's understanding. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you. Now we take each other by the hand and lead ourselves through what the main agenda is.

On your original agenda for Thursday, January 8, Friday the 9th, and so forth, on the second page I believe we've now more or less dealt with 5. Item 6, the automobile allowance, is one which goes over until the return of the Member for Edmonton Strathcona. Then we basically come down to the Hansard subscription fee, followed by Other Business. Under Other Business, because of a report as a result of a meeting with the minister, I see that we have the matter of office furnishing, and under Hansard costs we have the daily cost and the bound volume cost. We also have some information with respect to long-term disability insurance. Any other items that come to mind at this stage or comments as to the order you want to take them in?

MR. BOGLE: I just want to add one more matter to consider under Other Business. It would be a notice of motion relative to the

travel allowance. If it's appropriate, I'll come to that when we get to section 8.

MR. HYLAND: I can move mine related to office furniture if you want to clear the deck a little, because it's all typed up and I think it's been circulated to everybody. I don't know if it's necessary to read it into the record, seeing as the secretary has a copy of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there's another copy around, I'd like to see it. Thank you.

Is it the general will of the committee that we will go in the following order? We'll do office furnishing, because it occurred earlier, then we'll come to the matter of Hansard, and then we'll go on to the matter of travel allowance. Okay?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. The motion before us is a draft; everyone has a copy.

MR. TAYLOR: Perhaps you could explain the change from the present. I thought we had two desks.

MS BARRETT: From ad hockery to systematic, my dear; that's about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It's moved by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff. Would you like to speak to your motion?

MR. HYLAND: In answer to the member's question, Mr. Chairman, at the present time there is no standard. The long and short of it is that it's whatever happens to be there. We're just trying to set a standard that'll fit everybody so that everybody's treated the same.

MRS. MIROSH: This is just furniture and nothing to do with the xerox machine? That's under a different category?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MRS. MIROSH: Okay.

MR. STEVENS: Chairman, does this mean, too -- maybe the mover of the motion will know -- that, for example, the double-pedestal desk would be assigned to the Member for Calgary

Glenmore with an inventory number and at the end of her term all that equipment goes to the next MLA? Or is it cannibalized by Public Works? I raise this because what happens at the end of any session, for those members who don't seek re-election or who are not back here because of the work of the other parties and so on, is that a great deal of cannibalizing goes on. Are these going to be assigned inventory and maintained that way?

MS BARRETT: Why don't you amend it that way?

MR. HYLAND: You can amend it if you like. I would think it would be easy to do then. There isn't a standard now, and there would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk, is there information with regard to the question?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, once furniture or equipment is made available to a department, including the Legislative Assembly, it is the responsibility of that department to carry the inventory record on that furniture and to make it available for audit purposes, as a matter of fact. So once furniture has been assigned to the Assembly by the department of public works, it would be entered on the Legislative Assembly's inventory records, and an inventory of that furniture would be taken yearly.

MR. STEVENS: Glad to hear that.

MR. BOGLE: In an earlier discussion this afternoon, Pam, I believe you mentioned that we should have a flowering plant included in that.

MS BARRETT: I think the correction is that someone mentioned it, and I laughed and said, "Yes, I guess we don't have rank."

MR. BOGLE: Oh, I'm giving you credit for mentioning it.

MS BARRETT: I don't know who mentioned it.

MR. BOGLE: I'll amend the motion to add "flowering plant."

MR. HYLAND: Do you want flowering or just a

plant?

MR. BOGLE: A flowering plant.

MR. STEVENS: It must be in full bloom when you receive it.

MR. BOGLE: I'm not kidding.

MS BARRETT: And he doesn't like that pinkish purple colour, please.

MR. TAYLOR: He doesn't think it's funny. He spells it f-l-o-u-r; it's a head of wheat he wants in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm taking this as it sounds, a friendly amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. STEVENS: Could I ask you a question, Chairman? I notice the mover has a "four-drawer, lockable bookcase." Would that be four shelves or three? It doesn't matter to me, but you know what Public Works will do when they get that. They'll say, "Let's see; here's a small bookcase," or "Here's a big bookcase." Were you thinking of a standard bookcase? They're probably nonstandard everywhere.

MR. HYLAND: Four-shelf.

MR. STEVENS: If you don't tie that down now, they'll fiddle with it.

MR. HYLAND: More or less . . .

MR. STEVENS: It holds books.

MR. HYLAND: That's right. Those kinds that have shelves on top and the bottom about two feet high, so you get storage as well.

MS BARRETT: With glass doors.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. You'd get storage underneath as well as just books.

MS BARRETT: You're talking about ones that measure somewhere around four feet high and three feet wide.

MR. HYLAND: No, I'm talking about three feet

wide and about six feet high.

MS BARRETT: Oh, those ones. Yes, that's reasonable.

MR. TAYLOR: Do you want a stepladder with yours?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. TAYLOR: I was wondering if we could make an even more friendly amendment. Can you say "the meeting table or another desk"?

MS BARRETT: It calls for a meeting table or a sofa.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just furnishing one now. I took two desks, and it worked out well.

MS BARRETT: Oh, you're not precluded from doing that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you could get more variations. This is the basic package that has been negotiated.

MR. TAYLOR: Except that knowing public works, it will soon get to be the norm. I ought to have the right to substitute a desk for the table.

MR. CAMPBELL: Just an observation, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure Helmut Entrup would have entertained this particular motion. When we got into cannibalism, I was thinking that he confiscated hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff's desk.

MR. HYLAND: It's a long story.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Banff-Cochrane. Final comment.

MR. STEVENS: Is there a correction on — Alan, it says, "a round meeting table with four side chairs or an upholstered couch." Is that a round meeting table with four side chairs or with an upholstered couch? I'm being silly, but some bureaucrat is going to read this and ask what we really meant. Is it a round meeting table with four chairs?

MR. HYLAND: I think the first paragraph outlines it: within space limitations of assigned offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the other thing would be that the mover of the motion could go and get photographs of examples to attach for the minister.

MR. STEVENS: I just don't trust Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree.

MS BARRETT: Glossy eight by 10s, marked on the back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question to achieve this basic package.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried, with two abstentions.

To give effect to this, the Chair trusts that there will be follow-up carried out by whom?

MR. STEVENS: Somebody see Ernie.

MR. BOGLE: No, correspondence should now go from yourself, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of this committee, to Ernie Isley, the minister responsible, advising him of the policy established by the committee. Then the ball is in Mr. Isley's court. By the wording of the motion, it's also permissible for caucuses to assist in the selection of furniture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Another one of those "Action: Chairman" things in the minutes. The black and white glossies which will be attached will come out of my general block budget for \$21,000 for school photographs; black and white five by sevens will come out of my communications allowance.

The next issue is costs with regard to Hansard. I think that occurred in E(7).

MR. BOGLE: Can we have a brief break, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

[The committee recessed from 3:30 p.m. to 3:33 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we return? Members, what's your pleasure with regard to this item, Hansard?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, it's clear from the orders that we've directed Alberta Hansard to do certain things, which they are doing, and that you have within your purview the opportunity to review rates, based on our advice. Am I correct on that?

When you look at the table that's attached there, Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering whether or not we should make an adjustment in the annual subscription rate, bearing in mind, of course, that this is revenue to the Crown, not offsetting the costs. Some people might argue, "No, it gives everybody an opportunity to buy it," but did we not calculate roughly \$40 per subscription just for postage alone? I see British Columbia is at \$37, and that probably reflected the old postage rate. I'm not sure we should continue with the \$15 charge.

I'm certainly concerned about the number of bound volumes. Unless I have some other reasons — I'm not going to make a motion; the other members may want to comment. I would like to see us do away with the bound volumes. I think that can be done by ourselves if we need them. I'd like to see us change the subscription rate to make it more reflective of the cost.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the subscription fee, on a rare occasion I'm in real agreement with the Member for Banff-Cochrane. He makes a good point.

MR. STEVENS: Can I write that down?

MS BARRETT: Yes, you may. It's recorded in the minutes having been uttered by none other than...

I think it's really appropriate to make a review. I don't think the Crown has to go about providing information about the elected officials to the electors. That's not a source of making money. On the other hand, it hasn't been increased since who knows when. Let's face it; the costs have really gone high, and virtually every department that orders its own, if they pay a fee, can afford it. Most of the subscriptions that go out to nongovernmental

agencies are actually going to other agencies, although I know a couple of people who personally subscribe. I don't think they'd go broke if we raised the price a little bit.

On the member's second suggestion: please don't do that. It's more cost-efficient for one binding agency to do a whole bunch. If the member would like to cut the numbers that are bound, I don't object, but please don't axe them. In every office — and it will happen in yours; I'll just bet you — someone will come along and say: "Hey, remember what you said on such and such a date? I'll just borrow that." It will disappear, and then you will have to go and use a photocopier to photocopy the library's or somebody else's copy, and it just ends up in a lot of paper chasing. For the few bucks to bind the copies going to the members and to government departments, I think it's way more efficient in the long run to just stick with that system. Cut if you want, but don't eliminate.

MRS. MIROSH: I would like to make a comment on the subscription fee. I notice that Manitoba has two separate fees. The hon. member sitting next to me mentioned that corporations could probably afford to pay a lot more. I wonder if we could come up with two separate fees.

For once — I don't often do this — I agree with the Member for Edmonton Highlands. All kinds of weird things are happening here today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's all presession. Remember: for, for, for.

MR. TAYLOR: I just want an opportunity to leap on the bandwagon. I indeed agree with an increased fee. I agree with keeping the bound copy, because it's awful trying to run around finding one copy when one's missing out of the middle.

Manitoba already has a precedent; I don't see anything wrong with charging a corporate fee of \$100 to \$150 a year, because they buy it anyhow. It goes through their accounting department, and whether they're paying \$17 or \$125, it's the same amount. We might as well have the advantage of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Cypress-Redcliff, then the Member for Edmonton Highlands, and hopefully we might start seeing some determination of action with two

recommendations.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that the rate of Hansard be changed to \$125 for the individual person and/or corporation having a subscription, \$175 to other government departments, and that bound copies are sold to people at the cost it costs us to put them together.

MRS. MIROSH: One hundred and seventy-five dollars for a corporation?

MR. HYLAND: No, \$125.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first motion we'll deal with is the matter of the subscription rate alone, which is that it be \$125 per year.

MR. TAYLOR: Per individual?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Per individual. For everybody.

MR. HYLAND: Individual and corporate.

MRS. MIROSH: Both the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the annual subscription rate be \$125 per year.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I think that is about twice the cost of Time magazine, and the latter is probably more valuable than the former. I think that is just too high a cost to expect anyone to read it. I like the way the member's heading, but I think he's going a little high. I do like, though, that he has put the corporate membership the same as the individual membership, because if there were differences and if I were a corporation, I'd simply have one of my officers take it as an individual. I don't like that idea of a separate fee for a corporation, as opposed to the other.

Could I ask the member: is he thinking of changing the orders so that the five copies going to the departments would be charged for, or are those free?

MR. HYLAND: The copies going to the . . .

MR. STEVENS: The deputy minister gets five copies anyway. Those, I presume, are gratis, because you're obliged to give those out.

MR. HYLAND: I would propose that government departments pay the subscription rate of \$175. That's what my motion proposes, so I suppose it needs to change or . . .

MR. STEVENS: So your thinking, Al, is \$125 for individuals and corporations and \$175 for government or who?

MR. HYLAND: Government.

MR. STEVENS: Any government?

MR. HYLAND: Government departments.

MR. STEVENS: I'm going to vote against it. I think it's just a little high.

MR. TAYLOR: Maybe we should dispose of this and start over again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

But that issue you raised would affect a change to Standing Orders, so I think we'd best deal with the subscription rate alone and then we could make a recommendation later to Standing Orders and so forth.

MS BARRETT: First of all, in carrying on what has almost become a mutual admiration society, I agree with the Member for Calgary Glenmore.

MR. STEVENS: And we haven't even got a date yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to have to frame the transcript.

MS BARRETT: With periodicals and occasional academic publications, you'll find that they have individual and corporate rates. Even though the Member for Banff-Cochrane says that a lot of corporations will just take them out as individuals, it's actually not true. A lot of companies just won't do that. They'll pay the corporate rate, so I don't mind the difference.

I like the intention of the motion, but I too figure it's gone too high for individuals. I'd look at seeing what the real cost is on the noncorporate subscription and charge that.

With respect to selling Hansard to the departments, I think that's so funny because it really is money going from one pocket to the other, and it actually costs more to

administer. I know the member's intentions are good, but I'd like to see some kind of thought-out revision to the formula as enunciated. I couldn't vote for it the way it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion the chair has before it is to move the annual subscription rate of Hansard to \$125.

MR. HYLAND: Can I close debate on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments with regard to the amount or the principle?

MS BARRETT: I have a question. Does anybody here have a reasonably precise figure of the individual cost when you break it down? You said it's about \$40 a year for the mailing.

MR. BOGLE: Only my mathematics, and I could be wrong.

MS BARRETT: I'll get my calculator.

Once you consider that it's an essential thing that we have for MLAs and departments, isn't it a matter of probably another 20 or 30 bucks per subscription that would reflect the real cost in an annual subscription?

I wonder if I could make an amendment, Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. TAYLOR: Any amendment that changes the thing is counter to it.

MS BARRETT: All right then. I move that we amend the motion to read that we change the cost of the Hansard subscription to individuals to \$60 annually. A little low?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So what we have here is \$60 to individuals. I'm waiting to see if there is a second half to this. The original motion was to everyone.

If you are all having some difficulty with what the negotiated rate is, we can stand adjourned for a moment. If the figure is \$125 or some other one, if you want to do that . . .

[The committee recessed from 3:44 p.m. to 3:47 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we're back to the first thing. As far as I'm concerned, we're dealing with the subscription rate.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, with the members' approval, I'll withdraw my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it unanimous?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The floor is ready for a motion.

MS BARRETT: The motion would now read that we authorize Hansard to charge \$60 for individual subscriptions — that is, nongovernment, non-MLA subscriptions to Hansard — and \$100 for the annual subscription for corporations or those agencies otherwise referred to as corporations.

MR. TAYLOR: Could you make corporations \$125? It sounded better.

MS BARRETT: I'll amend my motion then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question on the motion? The motion reads \$60 for individuals and \$100 for corporate.

MR. STEVENS: I have a question on the motion.

MR. TAYLOR: I would amend the motion to corporate, \$125.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we have an amendment to make it \$60 and \$125.

MR. STEVENS: I want to ask the mover or maybe the amended mover: I presume, then, that we leave the free copies alone so that departments would still receive five and the opposition would receive theirs. All of this would continue?

MS BARRETT: Correct.

MR. STEVENS: So any additional copies — it meets those requirements, whether it's \$60, \$100, or \$125 . . .

MR. HYLAND: For any additional ones over five that they take, they pay \$125 or the rate for individual copies.

MS BARRETT: Yes. Go ahead and amend it like that; I don't object.

MR. HYLAND: Your motion would cover that.

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's right; it would.

MR. HYLAND: The way you worded it it would.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, do you know what you do here? It says that you provide additional copies from time to time or something. Yes, here it is, in (d):

the Queen's Printer, the Provincial Archivist, and such officers of the Assembly, libraries and news media representatives as [Mr. Speaker] may determine . . .

I presume you have a mailing list of some sort.

MR. TAYLOR: But our motion doesn't touch the free ones.

MR. STEVENS: I know that; we're not doing that. I just want to be sure that we're . . . So the libraries would receive their free ones; the news media would get their free ones.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman could frustrate this whole committee by giving everybody in Alberta a free one, but I don't think he will.

MR. STEVENS: So you have a limited list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's what this discussion is, that there is indeed a free list. The information is that my predecessor reviewed the list and cut it down somewhat, so I'll review the list.

MR. STEVENS: Okay.

MS BARRETT: Then it's understood that that's still at your discretion, period, and is not affected by the motion. Good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment to the main motion changed the corporate charge for Hansard from \$100 to \$125, and it's with the amendment that we're now about to deal.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Carried unanimously.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't believe it. Somehow or

another I got into the wrong meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The main motion as amended, which would be \$60 individual and \$125 corporate.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Carried unanimously. Goodness, two in a row. Well done, group.

MR. STEFANIUK: There's still one part of this, where we're looking at the cost of the individual copies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the Clerk has rightly informed me that we also have to deal with the matter of individual copies. It has been 25 cents per copy.

MR. STEVENS: Depending on whatever page, it doesn't matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to leave it at 25 or whatever?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move we charge 45 cents a copy.

AN HON MEMBER: Make it easier; hike it up to 50.

MR. HYLAND: Okay, 50.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, could we just get a bit of advice as to the rough demand and the cost of this? Is it \$10 a copy to give out an extra copy? Is it \$1 a copy? Do many people phone and say, "Send me 15 copies?" Do we even charge for that extra copy? Do we have hundreds of thousands of these being asked for or six?

MR. STEFANIUK: Cumulatively we do, but they are mostly across-the-counter sales, Mr. Chairman. The individual comes to the eighth floor office in the Annex and says, "I want a copy of Hansard from a given date," and a staff member has to get that copy and has to receive 25 cents and write a receipt.

MR. STEVENS: It must cost \$3 to write the receipt.

MR. TAYLOR: Can we increase it to \$1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the mover of the motion wishes to change the 25 cents to a buck at this stage.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion that the individual charge will be raised to \$1. Call for the question.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously. Holy smokes.

There is one other issue, and that is the effective date. Effective immediately? Hansard subscriptions have gone out, and we'll need to send out a follow-up letter and inform them of the effective dates.

MR. STEVENS: Does the effective date for a subscription become the date of the first day of a sitting -- for example, this spring, whenever that might be -- or is it ...

MR. STEFANIUK: That is the practical effective date, because there is no Hansard being published otherwise.

MR. STEVENS: There is no Hansard now. So no matter what's gone out, the first would be day one, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. So the thing is, we would send out the notification saying that the new rates are in effect. If they do not wish to have a subscription at the new rate, then we will refund their money and get on from there. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. The next item I have on the agenda is with regard to ... Oh, thank you. Bound volumes: take this under advisement or are you all set to move?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that we sell the extra bound volumes at our cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, a floating figure: our cost plus shipping and handling.

MR. HYLAND: That's our cost.

MR. STEVENS: That would mean then, Mr. Chairman, that there would be one bound copy for the member of the Assembly and a bound volume for the Premier and the leaders of the opposition, and that's all. The rest would be at cost, unless you change that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would also extend it to the leaders of the other parties.

MR. STEVENS: Yes. I said "leaders."

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion? Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously.

The next issue is allowances.

MR. BOGLE: I want to advise the committee that at our next meeting I intend to bring forward a motion that would affect our travel allowance. At the present time we have unlimited travel by air within the province, unlimited travel by bus, and a maximum of 52 trips per year by car between a member's residence or place of business or employment and the capital, plus up to 25,000 kilometres per year of general travel within Alberta.

The three areas I intend to address would be, first, the number of trips made to and from one's residence or place of business or employment and the capital. In preliminary discussions I've had with the Clerk, it appears that that figure could be reduced from 52 to 40 per year without any undue hardship. In that same category, I'm also looking at some kind of restriction on the use of travel between one's residence or place of business or employment and the capital. Whether it's by air or car, it's my view that there should be a cap of one trip per week unless the member specifically obtains permission from the Speaker for additional travel. But that's something we're still doing some work on.

MRS. MIROSH: What about emergencies?

MR. BOGLE: The third area would be to

increase to 35,000 kilometres the 25,000 kilometre general travel allowance that's now permissible within the province.

So the intent of the motion, briefly, is to reduce the total number of yearly trips but give the Speaker of the Assembly discretionary authority and to increase the number of kilometres one can charge for within the province. Those are the key elements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Basically, what we have here is a notice of intention to deal with those issues at the next meeting. I understand a number of those things fit in with some of the concerns you have, Mr. Taylor. Since one of our from time to time more vocal members is not present, I would hope that Mr. Bogle or Mr. Taylor might update her and advise her of this from the minutes.

MR. BOGLE: I did prior to the discussion.

MR. STEVENS: Because of the comment from Dianne, Bob, in the discussions you'll be having in developing the proposal — you said "permission from the Speaker." Could the permission not be limited to beforehand but be after the fact? There may be some cases . . . [interjection] Okay. So it's just permission, and it would likely be on the basis of more than one trip a week, or it could be more than the 40 due to some other requirement.

MR. BOGLE: For instance, I'm aware, as I'm sure you are, that when the House is sitting, some members of the Assembly travel back to their constituencies partway through the week for business or family reasons. To me, that is a matter the member would take up with the Speaker to ensure there is recognition of that fact, just as if we're attending the opening of a new school or hospital and it happens to be on a day when we're sitting in the Legislature, we now have the right to go to him and advise him we'll be away from the office. On the other hand, we're not playing hooky; we're attending government business within our constituencies.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation. I think it's something we've needed to move toward.

MRS. MIROSH: I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Are we specifying one trip per

week? Could we just say so many a year or so many a month rather than the Speaker having umpteen dozen phone calls . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: It would certainly help me.

MRS. MIROSH: . . . so that there's a little more flexibility than one per week.

MR. BOGLE: One of the advantages of discussing the matter this way is that members are now alert to the subject matter, and we can discuss that informally between now and when a motion is drafted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's a certain number of trips per year, it may help. But it would certainly help to address the difficulty in times past, when some people were known to be on the airbus every single day.

That, then, becomes basically a notice of motion for our next meeting. I gather, Member for Edmonton Highlands, you've had some consultation about the next meeting and the matter of travel challenges.

MS BARRETT: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This next item is correspondence with regard to long-term disability insurance, if you'd care to take a moment to read that.

MR. STEVENS: Could we have Mr. Clegg here, or is it unimportant whether or not we do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's home sick with the kind of stuff you've got.

MRS. MIROSH: What's with this building? We should have given them all flu shots.

MS BARRETT: She uses "we" in the royal fashion, I note.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Basically, what we have, in effect — you remember the package we presented and approved originally. In order to give full effect to the total comprehensive package of long-term disability, we need to change the Legislative Assembly Act. We have gone to an interim position at the moment, so there is coverage, but it is insufficient as compared with the other proposals. Could we

have a motion to the effect that we indeed proceed to attempt to make a change to the Legislative Assembly Act?

MR. TAYLOR: The second paragraph could be summed up quite easily: write on the side that they left old Nick out.

MR. STEVENS: Or any other recognized.

MR. HYLAND: No, you don't get paid for any other recognized.

MR. STEVENS: Oh, that's right.

MR. TAYLOR: That's what happens when you blast the insurance company.

MR. STEVENS: Chairman, I would be happy, as a member of a government party on this committee, to recommend this. Could I have an explanation of the third paragraph, though? I'm not quite sure I understand the meaning of it.

It is important to note that this insurance coverage does not give the improved terms in respect to a previous disability the committee had sought under the plan considered last month.

Is there a difference of opinion between our lawyer and the company?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. This is what I was attempting to explain. The package which was in place for cabinet members and the Leader of the Opposition and, we think, for the Speaker was X. The one we contemplated and examined and wanted to put in place, as received from our consultant, Jim McPherson, was Y package, which is really X, improved. Because of this wrinkle and the Legislative Assembly Act, we could not put that one totally in place without doing this change to the Legislative Assembly Act. What I then did by members' services order was to put everyone, all the MLAs other than cabinet ministers, into the same coverage, X, that the Executive Council had. That's the present position.

MR. STEVENS: So no member is not covered today, other than for this particular flaw?

MR. SCARLETT: Any member who already has a proven disability won't be covered. That's

part of the problem with the Executive Council's long-term disability package.

MR. HYLAND: So we're not on the new disability package yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You, Alan Hyland, are now onto what the same was as the others. But some of our members have medical disabilities and cannot qualify for that.

MR. HYLAND: Even that we can't qualify for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct. We need to make a change to the Legislative Assembly Act so we can move everybody into that.

MR. HYLAND: If we make the change to the Legislative Assembly Act, we can put forward the proposal Mr. McPherson gave us. It was quite an improvement over the one Executive Council got.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's it.

MR. BOGLE: I want to raise the question of the age limitation. I'm not sure this is where you'd like that to be discussed. Would you rather we completed this and came back to that matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should complete this first, please, and take that as a separate issue.

MS BARRETT: I'm glad everybody else got to speak first, because I now understand what's going on. I will therefore move that this committee recommend to the Government House Leader -- I assume it should be -- that a Bill amending the Legislative Assembly Act to accommodate for full provisions under the new long-term disability benefits package as approved by this committee and subsequently approved by Order in Council be commenced in the next sitting of the Assembly so that the full terms of that package be incorporated into the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the necessary changes be made in the Act.

MS BARRETT: That the necessary changes be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's the spirit of the motion. That is it: to allow the Members' Services Committee to deal with the long-term disability.

MR. HYLAND: Discussion on the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: I have one concern. I wonder: relating to the Order in Council, should we do that in the motion? We're after acceptance of the new package. If we relate it to the Order in Council, it may tie us to that old package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the understanding of the committee that it's to move to the new coverage. What we want to do is to give effect to the Legislative Assembly Act so that it in turn will show that this committee has the right to do the proper coverage. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

It will take us a little while, remember, to get through all these mechanisms. At the time this is introduced to the Assembly, I trust we'll have all parties support it. It really doesn't need to get drawn out. It basically should be: yes, let's get on with it.

There's another issue with regard to this.

MR. BOGLE: It's the issue of one's age for long-term disability. I think a brief explanation by your executive assistant as to the parameters we fall under and how that compares with the management division of government would be in order. I for one -- and I may be the only member of the committee -- thought that long-term disability could be available to all the 83 members of our Assembly. Apparently, that is not the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The threshold age, 65, is what we're . . .

MR. SCARLETT: I checked with Jim

McPherson on all the members' benefits, particularly the long-term disability, but it does include all benefits. Under this new package all benefits for MLAs including the dental supplemental health quit at age 65. That is the same as what happens in the public service; at 65 all benefits terminate. His explanation was that this is a typical plan set out for private corporations, et cetera, that at the age of 65 all benefits cease.

Part of the problem is that it costs too much, in his estimation, to add to that age limit, to either put on a ceiling of 100 . . . Because you don't know if an MLA -- for instance, we now have two MLAs, I believe, that are 65 or older. Once you put a cap at, let's say, 70, sooner or later we're going to come to that cap too. We'll have a member who is 69 sitting for four years. Where do you put the cap? That increase in age from, let's say, 65 to 75 -- if we moved it to 75 -- isn't very economical. In fact, what it may do is exclude the 83 members from the management and excluded class of the public service. Right now the members are grouped with the 3,000 members. If we opt out and try to increase the age level, it may in fact increase the rates to the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To underline this point, one other thing that needs to be borne in mind on the medical benefits side is that at age 65 the other benefits kick in, in terms of the payment of that within what's prevalent in the province anyway. It isn't as if they're totally cut off at the pass.

MR. BOGLE: I want to thank Rod very much for the work he did in checking with Jim McPherson. I was remiss at the time I spoke about this, first with the Speaker and then with you, Rod, in requesting that we also get a comparison with other legislators. This is one area where I think it's not appropriate to use the analogy of the private sector alone, because unless you are the owner or the chief executive officer, you're retiring at age 65, whereas when you serve in an elected position, there is no limitation. I should have thought of the question earlier and had not. I think that piece of information we need as well, Mr. Chairman. How have other legislatures dealt with the matter of age 65 on various plans for members?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll go for more

information.

MS BARRETT: My sentiments were reflected by the Member for Taber-Warner. We're in a completely different situation. The conventional retirement age simply does not apply to MLAs, period.

I recall the lengthy discussions we had with the insurance agents present at two of our meetings, in which they explained that in many instances in a very large pool of insurance changing some of the terms for 83 people was not going to make a difference to the overall contributions necessary by other participants or by ourselves. I'd like to see a motion very soon to correct this problem. I don't think it's fair, and being from the political party that has always believed that you create a pool of funds for the benefit of everybody equally, like in medicare, I believe the same thing needs to apply here.

would request of Rod, if it's okay with the Chairman, that he first of all explore how much extra we as individual MLAs would have to pay to make sure that we can include those members who are currently or are going to be over 65 so that we do not face an age limit on MLAs. The second thing is that if we can't do it through that agency -- sorry to give you more work, Rod -- we explore a way to get that done, because I don't think it's fair.

MR. TAYLOR: I certainly speak in support of what the member for Milk River said. This is a job held by people . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Taber-Warner.

MR. TAYLOR: Taber-Warner; sorry. I keep thinking of his airport rather than his [inaudible].

It baffles my imagination. When the insurance group men and we sat down, they had written a policy. Now he says that it doesn't apply over 65. That's like going to the artists' guild, sitting down with the various actors and listening for a month or two, and then writing a policy that doesn't apply if they step into a theatre. What the hell did they think they were writing a policy for? I have nothing but the utmost contempt anyhow for this particular insurance company. I won't get into it. I hate to say, "I told you so." They're quite retaliative words. I've had nothing but problems with

them.

Nevertheless, let's go on to the second stage of the thing. When they talk about 65, don't forget that 65 has been an age they've had in there since I was a tad. The whole life expectancy of people over 65 today is entirely different from what it was 30 years ago.

Thirdly, we're talking about disability insurance and a basic retirement income. Don't forget that the insurance company only kicks in what the government does not give. People over 65 have a right to and do receive a great deal of funds from the state just because they've lived that long, or they have other plans. So the idea that an insurance company is of necessity facing huge increases in costs because somebody is over 65 doesn't really stand up. Between the old-age pension and the other disability tapes that are already in there . . . Because they only come in and make up a basic amount. I don't think it follows.

Lastly, if they start paying benefits to somebody who's 70 or 75, surely they expect they're going to die before the person aged 45 they start paying benefits. This is not life insurance; this is a sustenance for the rest of your days. Surely the rest of your days after you've reached 65 is a lot less than for a 40 year old. It doesn't make sense at all. To me it's just a big boondoggle, and somebody should get kicked.

MR. STEVENS: I don't want to get too much into this, Mr. Chairman, but I think your executive assistant's explanations were — considering he's not an insurance agent or representing them, he did an excellent job.

I don't mind the questions raised by the Member for Edmonton Highlands following the suggestion by the Member for Taber-Warner. I would like to see some documentation from the agent or consultant which would show if a change of this nature could be developed and, if so, the impact on the plan. I can assure you that when long-term disability is considered as a shelter or a protection for part of the income for the normally considered working span — that working span up until recently has been 65. Even the federal government is changing that, and our pension adjustments now can be taken at 60, a lower pension for a possibly longer time or, if we wait till 70 or some combination between, a higher pension for a shorter time.

The basic purpose of long-term disability is not to do what you just said. It's there to help us through those working years when we can't work, and it presupposes that a decision is made by that person during his or her work career to make plans for the future, to have a retirement income, to have government support at age 65 or some other number. I really think we need those answers.

If we tinker with this at all, we take a terrible risk of having 83 MLAs drop right out of the plan and having a whole new plan, which can be written by anybody — but I'll tell you that the premiums will be incredible, because no one has done that anywhere. It's good to have that information from other provinces. You can't do it. We've only gotten into the era of new approaches in the last little while because of the Charter. It's going to take time. It may take a decade for this to work through the system, but I think we need to know what the costs would be to raise it to 70 or some other number. Do they have a recommendation on that based on our age? Our average age as MLAs is — we're not the oldest in the country, but we're sure not the youngest. If we do drop out of the plan, what would that cost?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So then the Chair takes it as a request for further information to bring back.

MR. SCARLETT: Do you want from all benefits or just long-term disability?

MR. STEVENS: I think that's the main one, because the government pays the other benefits. You pay for medical care; we pay for . . .

MS BARRETT: LTDI, I'm sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dental, long-term disability, supplemental health.

AN HON. MEMBER: It stops at 65.

MR. SCARLETT: The same with life insurance. Just as a footnote: at age 65 each member has 31 days to carry it over to a private plan, with no medical evidence. Do you want to look into the life insurance to continue until . . .

MS BARRETT: I think so. Any aspect of this whole issue that is going to discriminate against those members who might at any point in their serving be 65 or older I think needs to be explored in such a way that we can resolve that form of discrimination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll make the request for further information and bring it back. In the meantime, though, I don't think we should see this as prejudicing or in any way stalling the previous motion of trying to get the change to the Legislative Assembly [Act].

MS BARRETT: No, I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to get this out here loud and clear, that we're going to attempt to proceed in the spring.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll take that as consensus on that. Thank you.
Other business?

MR. TAYLOR: I have a question just before we get off that. Do you know if there is any kind of negotiating quirk so that they could lose the whole thing?

MR. STEVENS: No, it's only if you do that that you get kicked out of the plan. You wouldn't do that then.

MS BARRETT: That's right. He's asking for it to be explored.

MR. HYLAND: We would have to do it another way.

MR. TAYLOR: No, I'd like to negotiate the point with the insurers. If they are intractable and do not want to change it, we might lose the whole plan. Or do we go for a year anyhow? In effect, are we tying the Chairman's hands and saying that he has to accept the plan regardless of what kind of an answer he gets from the insurance company?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. HYLAND: We asked him to explore ways of achieving the other end.

MR. TAYLOR: Yet I detected from you that you wanted us to accept the plan regardless of the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a couple of things. We've agreed that we're going to review it within a year. We are now already two months into that year. It may be longer.

MR. TAYLOR: Don't get me wrong. I'm trying to clarify that. Much as I don't like this insurance company, I would go for it. I would say, "Okay, you run this one, but there is another turn at the end of the year when we might be listening to you much closer than we were listening now."

MS BARRETT: That is what Greg was saying. Don't throw out the baby with the bath water.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other thing that bothers me much more, though, is that we have some members at risk at the moment, so let us please make sure that we move them so they're at least partially covered.

MR. HYLAND: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: They could join the Liberal Party and ensure their re-election forever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we come to the date of the next meeting, there are a couple of items I want to give you just for information purposes, because hopefully a number of you are going to go away and enjoy some holidays before we get back to session.

With regard to the renovations to the Chamber and its precincts, I thought you might be interested to know that I have listened to you long and carefully and I think we're going to achieve the ability to supply three more telephones for members. We're going to do this because we're going to relocate the Sergeant-at-Arms. That small area outside room 312 hopefully is going to give you three extra telephones, which should help. There is indeed also going to be a coin telephone added, but that's going downstairs underneath the fountain. We have a number of people wanting to make long-distance phone calls, and it's up to them to go to that pay phone. These extra three telephones I'm talking about are for members only, because at the best of times

you've got enough problems trying to get through all those telephone messages you have.

You heard earlier that we're now moving toward attempting to supply a next-day Hansard, which hopefully should be construed as being helpful.

Another one is that we're trying to ease some of the congestion in the members' lounge. We have to put in another electrical outlet so that we can then run a coffee station, if you will -- just a very small one -- at the other end of the members' lounge to ease some of the congestion that's always over by the sinks and that. That's minor, but got to keep the caffeine flow going.

You're going to enjoy a larger 312. I've given up the Speaker's robing room. The two walls have been torn out, so that whole area is going to be much longer -- the same width.

MR. TAYLOR: An exhaust fan for smokers: is that on the list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'll have to deal with that one yourself.

Also, with regard to washrooms, behind the Assembly what was the women's washroom will now become the men's washroom. What was the men's washroom will become the ladies'. We will then be able to make the stall in that washroom accessible for the handicapped, because we don't have wheelchair access on that floor. An extra stall is being placed in the north end, which will be for the handicapped. That's the area where the Sergeant-at-Arms' space has been until now. Those changes will be in effect.

The new furniture has arrived for the member's lounge. In addition to that, right now they're working on the repaint and improving the lighting in there, so that's under way as well.

MR. STEVENS: How long is estimated for the painting job and the internal repair of the rotunda? Two weeks? Three weeks?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. The targeted date of completion for everything, both the rotunda and the Chamber, is no later than the third week of February, and some hope sooner. It's really coming along quite well.

Might we think in terms of the next meeting? Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: I'll just take a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I'm sorry. You don't do it in one minute. The press can wait for you.

MR. STEVENS: Just pick one, David, and we'll hold our hands up again, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In terms of getting documents back and so forth, I know some will be away on holidays.

MR. HYLAND: I think Nigel and I come back about the same time, around the end of January.

MR. TAYLOR: What are we looking for? Somewhere in February?

MR. BOGLE: How about Monday, the 2nd?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Monday, February 2. That's what it is.

MR. STEVENS: You lose two of us that are on the task force, but that's okay.

MR. BOGLE: Which task force?

MR. STEVENS: The grazing lease policy.

MR. BOGLE: What is your schedule like?

MR. STEVENS: That's the day we're in Peace River. That's the last day.

MR. HYLAND: So if we go to Tuesday, you're okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thursday, January 29, in the morning.

MR. HYLAND: That's the day I get back. I'm sure as hell not coming up here.

MR. BOGLE: Can I suggest the 2nd and that we hold the morning of the 3rd in the event we need more time? That inconveniences a number of us, but we just have to nail down some dates. The 2nd and the morning of the 3rd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: February 2 and 3. The February 2 meeting to commence at what time?

MR. BOGLE: Ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten o'clock, Monday, the 2nd.

MS MIROSH: What's wrong with 9?

MR. BOGLE: I think we might go earlier on the second day.

MS BARRETT: I've just blocked the whole morning, so if we need it, we'll start whenever we decide.

MR. BOGLE: Through the Chairman to the Clerk. Where we've made alterations on pages, they will be back in? Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, members, for your diligence and perseverance. Motion to adjourn by Cypress-Redcliff. All those in favour, please stand. Carried unanimously.

[The committee adjourned at 4:29 p.m.]