

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[10:15 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It's good to see your smiling faces again. Here we are at -- what? -- day four of budget estimates and so forth. You've got the binders. You've had them, I gather, since Thursday. It's a fairly lengthy agenda. As you know, we've set aside two days. Perhaps we might perform a miracle and get through it in one day. In God we trust. If we do go to day two, we could meet at 9 o'clock in the morning. Space is now available if that's what we have to do, but we'll make that decision at the end of the day. Lunch arrives today at 12 o'clock, so instead of having a working lunch, maybe we could take one hour and then come back at 1 o'clock. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The agenda: first off, anything you want to give notice of adding to the agenda at this time? Or we could just go along and add as we go. I don't see any arms waving up and down.

Do we have regrets that we're aware of? Mr. Wright is not able to be with us, Pam?

MS BARRETT: It's just an incredible coincidence, but again he has his almost major court event of the year today and couldn't get out of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Stevens or Pengelly?

MR. CAMPBELL: Stevens is at some hearings in Peace River and tomorrow at St. Paul.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Nigel?

MR. CAMPBELL: Pengelly is on his way; he's en route.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. I always find it a bit cold in the minutes when we just say people are not here. We know that there are regrets and everybody has different circumstances.

What is your pleasure with regard to item 2(a), approval of the minutes of January 8? Moved by Mr. Hyland, approval of the minutes

as circulated. Call for the question? All those in favour of adoption? Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

On 2(b), the minutes of January 9. Mr. Campbell moves approval of the minutes. Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the approval of the minutes of January 9? Opposed? Thank you. Carried unanimously.

And 2(c), January 12.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, minute 87.129, 3(a), Furnishings, says "Constituency Offices" and should read "Legislature and Legislature Annex Offices." The constituency offices already have a policy in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Offices in the Legislature and Legislature Annex. These would be members' offices.

Any other corrections? Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the approval of the minutes of January 12 with the one correction, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried.

A few items under 3. Item 3(a), Presentation of Grants, Donations, and Awards, has been present before. As I mentioned in previous minutes, I've had initial conversations with Dr. Mellon, and a follow-up memo has been sent with that along the same line, so we'll just have to wait and see what the response is.

The same thing applies to item 3(b), Office Allocation. An initial discussion has been had about long-term space requirements in the whole complex, and the possibility has been raised there as to sometime in the future the Legislative Assembly Office, the Speaker, having more input with regard to space allocation. Again, that has been followed up with a memo and will no doubt take some time.

Item 3(c), Members' Expense Allowance. My understanding is that the members were going to discuss with their respective caucuses -- this would be the tax-free component, I assume. Is there any action to report at this time from the

various caucuses? Not yet, Pam? So we'll carry this on as a pending item. Thank you.

Item 3(d), Members' Purchase of Computer Equipment. Mr. Wright was chairing that. We also had Mr. Taylor and Mr. Stevens on that, and we were inviting them to discuss with our own administrative staff the ramifications. Has there been a chance to meet on this one yet?

MR. TAYLOR: I met with Mr. Wright, and we both concluded we didn't know a helluva lot about it. So what we did was second staff assistance from each caucus to try to work it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's fair to say that it's still pending and we're going to have more consultations. Given the fact of some space allocation changes, it's just as well that we wait a touch longer. We'll have the negotiations continue, and that's good. Thank you.

Item 3(e), the matter with regard to other Legislatures. Is there some development on that, Mr. Bogle?

MR. BOGLE: The subcommittee has met, and while there were certainly merits raised in visiting in particular the House of Commons and the Legislative Assemblies in Ontario and Quebec, looking at our fiscal year and the rhythm of the year, it was deemed that it's just not possible to have such a visit arranged and concluded by the end of March.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the decision of the committee that this item would then drop?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Item 3(f) deals with business arising from the minutes with regard to the Chair being directed to meet to see if we could get a discount with regard to some of the air travel within the province. We have in place a meeting with one of the carriers Wednesday at noon. So hopefully we'll be able to report some progress at the next meeting. I'm sorry; I've gone to 3(g). That's what happens with bifocals.

MS BARRETT: I wondered what the carrier was; now I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two agendas. I

take it back about my bifocals. I have two agendas. That's neat.

Anyway, back to Universal Gasoline Credit Card. Our information back from Treasury is that we're expecting a report by the end of March. So we'll just hold on to that until we hear from them.

Item 3(g), Reduction in Airfare Billing from Alberta Carriers. You already know that one. That's in progress; meeting on Wednesday.

Reduction in Gasoline Credit Card Billing. That's going to major companies to see if they will give us a reduction. I have no progress to report on that one at this minute since we've been busy doing other items. So that will be pending.

Item 3(i), Constituency Staff Travel Guidelines. In this regard, because of the reorganization within our department, we haven't been able to get to deal with this item.

Also, you will recall -- I think it was at our last meeting -- with item (j), Telephone Options Available to Members, that Mr. Hyland raised the matter of the fact that you could have a second line installed in your house to help reduce long-distance charges. We will be following up with another memo from the administrative side to apprise all members of what their options are. That's part of the necessary refreshing course. We hope it will be a refreshing course, better a refresher course to members as to what all their benefits are and what the support services are.

MR. HYLAND: In the meantime, too, didn't we agree that we'd let the rest of our caucuses know about it?

MS BARRETT: I did. I put a memo out to our members in fact encouraging them to do that in order to save on the long-distance bills. I presumed I was following instructions that we'd agree to here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On 3(k), you will recall that we also looked through in our budget process and thought it might be an interesting concept to invite Treasury to pay for their own documents. The memo has gone forward. As of this morning there was no reply. What was the total figure? One hundred and some odd thousand?

MR. SCARLETT: It won't take effect in this

budget year, but maybe for the next. It's too late now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. HYLAND: Does that mean then that this year, depending on when we start, depending on when the budgets are out, we could have two budget costs in the same fiscal year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the overriding problem is that all the other departments have got their budgets in, I assume, whereas we're the last group to be getting our budgets firmly into place. That's my guess.

MR. HYLAND: You mean it wouldn't take place for two years?

MS BARRETT: The '88-89 fiscal year.

MR. SCARLETT: No, for '87-88. If we could get them to take it over, we'll [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, stand by for the interesting reaction to that letter.

Item 3(1), Review of the Intern Program. That's pending. I hope to be able to get an interim internship program report back for the next meeting, because depending on when the next meeting is, we're about to get into the interview process for the selection of interns who then come on staff September 1. That's happening within the next three weeks. So that's another pending item.

All right. Item 3(m), Communication of Members' Services Committee Policy to Public Works, Supply and Services Regarding Legislature Building and Legislature Annex Office Furniture. Goodness, that picked up the correction to the minutes in a hurry. That memo did indeed go to the minister over a week ago.

Mr. Scarlett, you have some information with regard to item 3(n), related to the Legislative Assembly Act and long-term disability coverage for members.

MR. SCARLETT: You sent the memo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The memo was sent.

On the next item, Members' Benefit Package, age 65 and over. Mr. Scarlett.

MR. SCARLETT: I did some checking. With regard to extended health care benefits, once a person reaches the age of 65, they are automatically covered by Blue Cross extended health care benefits, which is in fact pretty much equivalent to what the members are presently being covered by Mutual Life. This includes dental care under the Blue Cross extended health care, eye vision, plus all the medical provisions. We also got agreement in principle from Mutual Life to raise the age for the extended health care benefits to age 70, if you so wish. Part of the question here is: because a member automatically at 65 receives the extended Blue Cross, is there much point in extending his benefits to age 70 with Mutual? This is just for the extended health care.

With regard to life insurance, Mr. McPherson is getting back to me. Presently public servants who reach the age of 65 and who are still employed by the government lose their life insurance capabilities but have the option to purchase for 31 days. They also receive an automatic \$3,000 benefit which is not paid for by the individual; the government covers for \$3,000 with no fees. Other than that, tentatively Mr. McPherson has said that it's very difficult for life insurance companies to extend the age limit past 65, but we're still looking at it, and possibly working out an agreement similar to — and I guess we should hand out that package — Prince Edward Island, which in fact offers a \$25,000 lump sum for members over the age of 65 on a life insurance policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Insurance coverage?

MR. SCARLETT: Insurance coverage. Rather than the full payout, they just go to a lump sum, a set figure of \$25,000, and Mr. McPherson thought that was a feasible alternative to look at.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest that to save time today, the Chair appoint a three-member subcommittee representing all three parties at this table to review in more detail this matter and then report back to the full committee.

MS BARRETT: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion? We can discuss it, but if you want to

discuss a [inaudible]. All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried. The Chair recognizes three volunteers: Barrett, Taylor, and Bogle.

MS BARRETT: Remarkable.

MR. TAYLOR: One from each party sort of fixes us, doesn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you for doing the follow-up on that, Rod.

At this stage I'd also like to say thank you to the committee secretary as well as our staff people, Mr. Scarlett and Mr. McDougall, for pitching in and, first of all, trying to determine the road map through our three sets of minutes and then all the follow-up items that have already been achieved in the space of a busy period of time.

All right. Item 4 is the Approval of Members' Services Committee Order 1/87, Severance Payments Order, which was passed at a previous meeting. You have that back in your binders, so you know what the wording is. Again, this is basically pro forma approval. A motion for approval? Cypress-Redcliff. Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion giving approval to Members' Services Committee Order 1? Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Item 5, 1987-88 Budget Estimates. What is the pleasure of the committee? Do you wish to deal with the caucus budget portion, or do you wish to go to the department and work our way through all of that?

MR. TAYLOR: I don't think we have reached a sort of preagreement on the caucus one yet, so I think it would be better to move on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, so you'd like to go to the department, the Legislative Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll go to another binder.

With regard to the Assembly stuff, I think we really should have a quick glance at it page by

page once more, because other information has become available from time to time about simple addition and things like that. It might be better to start with section 2, Administrative Support, and then if you will collectively remind me at the end to come back to 1, because then we have the totals.

Page 3, approval of a new total here. Is that correct with regard to salaries and so forth? The new total, if I read your figures correctly here under this left column, is \$6,483,802. That's of this whole section. So we'll go from page 4 on.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. Have I misunderstood something in here? There's a figure at the bottom of page 3. Has this been changed, revised, or what?

MS BARRETT: Yes, I'm confused too.

MR. SCARLETT: The original figure was \$6,468,818. That's the one we worked with before. The committee gave us a bunch of recommendations for revision. This total you now see is a revised total.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So taking into account a number of factors but basically changes that the committee itself made at the last two or three meetings, this will now be reflected in this total when we come back to page 3 after we've gone through the balance of this section. There were also found to be some errors in arithmetic.

My understanding is that page 4 is the same. Section 2, Administrative Support: page 4 is the same. Page 5 is the same and has been approved. On page 6, I request that you change a figure on the security staff thing, because somewhere in the operation someone did a calculation for the security staff based on the year previous. I don't want the security staff to have to take a decrease in salary, thank you. So the new figure, Mr. Scarlett, would be?

MR. SCARLETT: Nine staff at \$10,815, which adds a total of \$2,835 to the bottom-line total, making the bottom-line total \$139,000 exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the security staff for the Chamber.

MR. SCARLETT: The total security staff would

then be \$97,335, for a 14.9 percent increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That's the top line.

MR. SCARLETT: The bottom-line total change is negative 36.2 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minus 36.2 percent.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's an overall reduction in that area of 36.2 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MS BARRETT: That still means that under security force we do have two additional staff. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The two additional security staff reflects the two extras that I hired when I became the Speaker to look after the galleries, because I felt that the galleries were undermanned; underpeopled, not undermanned.

MS BARRETT: Inclusive language. Does that mean we have one per gallery now during session or two per gallery?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Inside the gallery we have one at either end. It really requires one at either end. It also helps in terms of having extra people if somebody takes sick.

MR. HYLAND: There were two, weren't there, when we appointed the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms? There was never another appointment made to replace him in the gallery when he was on the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We also have security outside the doors as well, and then you have to have relief. Then you have security down on the ground floor by the members' lounge.

Is any member prepared to give approval to page 6 as revised?

MR. CAMPBELL: I so approve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Member for Rocky Mountain House. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just one

second here with respect to the security staff. We're talking about the people who function as guides and everything else around the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not the guides.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay. These people are on a contract basis? Fee for service? To use as an example the figure we've got written in there, if the spring session only lasts a month, we wouldn't be talking about that figure that's identified? They get paid so much an hour kind of thing?

MR. SCARLETT: They're paid by the year.

MR. KOWALSKI: By the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because remember that we have some of them come back also when Heritage Savings Trust Fund and other committees are meeting.

MR. KOWALSKI: Oh, yes. So that's the arrangement. If they were to come back for six months it would be the same price as if they came back for two months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's my understanding, but I'll double check.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: At the trust fund this year we didn't have any, seeing that it was in a different room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But when we're back in the main room we have somebody out front. All right.

Page 7: we require some changes here. Rod.

MR. SCARLETT: As a result of changing the contracts, UIC, CPP, and group life insurance now changes to \$35,205, long-term disability insurance changes to \$4,252, and workers' compensation changes to \$4,929, for an additional \$181 in total, the new total being \$92,213.

MR. TAYLOR: Would you do the long-term disability and workers' compensation for the employees again?

MR. SCARLETT: The long-term disability insurance is \$4,252, and the workers' comp is \$4,929, for a new total of \$92,213.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minor revisions. Motion to approve? Calgary Glenmore, thank you. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you.

Page 8 is the same, and page 8 has been approved. Page 9 stays the same. It has been approved.

Page 10, Travel Expenses: a reduction of 10 percent in attendance at conferences, starting with the National Conference of State Legislators on page 10 and ending with the Sergeant-at-Arms Conference on page 11.

MR. SCARLETT: If you want, I can go through each of the conferences, but the reduction is about \$3,300 in total.

MR. BOGLE: The intent of the motion was to lump all of these together, if you will, and leave to the discretion of the Speaker who attends, if anyone. I want to make sure we're not in any way impeding the ability of the Speaker to carry out the intent of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So on page 12 we would reduce by 10 percent the figure that . . .

MR. SCARLETT: No. The figure that originally was there was \$988,053. The motion reduced it by about \$3,300.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So the figure you now have on page 12 reflects the decrease.

MR. SCARLETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Approval to pages 10, 11, and 12, since they are . . .

MR. TAYLOR: We're reducing pages 10, 11, and 12? Is that what we're trying to do?

MR. SCARLETT: Basically, it's reducing the bottom two conferences on 10 and all of page 11.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, just the bottom two.

MR. SCARLETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The direction of the committee has been followed. All in favour of the motion by the Member for Barrhead? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Page 13 was approved. Page 14 was approved. Page 15: this is where we got to the land of postage.

MR. SCARLETT: I believe it was Mr. Bogle who asked what the increase is for unaddressed third-class printed matter sent out for rural areas. There has been a 3.1 percent increase, from 6.4 cents to 6.8 cents, effective April 1. For urban members it's gone up 7 percent, from 7.1 cents to 7.6 cents.

MRS. MIROSH: Why are we discriminated against?

MS BARRETT: Yes, really. We should send a memo to Ottawa. That's not fair.

MR. TAYLOR: People in the city are so slow reading, you have to send twice the bulk.

MR. SCARLETT: That's the urban letter carrier rate that's dropped off at the station.

MS BARRETT: That's why.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that pick up the point, Taber-Warner, about the stuffing of boxes in rural areas?

What's the recommendation with page 15? Approval of the figures shown there at the moment?

MS BARRETT: I don't have it written out, but I move that we allow for an increase of an average between the two, a 5 percent increase in the communication allowance, to compensate. Would that be an accurate way to do it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just the postage?

MS BARRETT: I don't know how to do it; I'm sorry. But I think we have to increase it to reflect the increased costs. You know, our constituents don't go away; they don't vanish as the prices go up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the Leg. Assembly Office this is where a 5 percent increase just for the postage item would plug in. Then we come back to postage again on another page, do we not?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could let this go and, where it appears on our allowances, increase the allowance by that in the motion to say that that 5 percent would be shown where it is applicable.

MS BARRETT: No problem.

MR. HYLAND: Then we don't have to calculate each individual change. I think there are about three different spots where it appears, aren't there?

MS BARRETT: I withdraw my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unanimous consent?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SCARLETT: If we change the communication allowances for the members by a percentage, we change the members' services order in some way. We have to change the order, because the total for the allowance is going to change.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask a question? Has anybody actually done precise work on this in order to develop a motion? If not, I'll take it on and try to do it at lunch time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. It can reflect where applicable along the lines that -- perhaps Alan and you could meet on that, please. That will reflect this back to page 15. In the meantime we can have a look through to see the other items that bring up postage, Blake. Perhaps you could have a look through.

Page 16 was approved. Page 17, approved; 18 was approved.

MR. SCARLETT: Page 18 wasn't approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have 18 showing approved.

MR. SCARLETT: Actually, the maintenance of the MLA OA system -- an additional \$1,900 was

added to the original figure. This is your new total of \$41,783. That was the Speaker's office: its system transferred to general administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the new total is \$115,401, which is up by about \$1,500?

MR. SCARLETT: One point seven percent. The original figure was \$113,501.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is someone prepared to move approval of page 18?

MR. TAYLOR: Just a question. It may be a little too technical. It says: telephone and answering services, 51 at \$65 a year. I just got one for the constituency. It's a very cheap one. Does this mean that rent is \$65 a year? Are we buying it or what? In normal appliance rental \$65 a year means something that's worth about \$300. We're either taking an awful shafting on it or we're buying the damned thing. I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand this is repair and maintenance, not a purchase.

MR. TAYLOR: It's not a lease. I see. That's an awful price though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have every reason to believe that in the course of the next year when we come back to the next budget, we're going to find that a number of economies have been effected in the department.

MR. TAYLOR: I just bring it out as an attention, because being familiar with appliance rentals, if you rent an appliance for four or five years, you should get your money back in four years. If you're paying \$60 a year for a \$100 appliance, somebody is doing pretty well.

MR. HYLAND: I think they're more money than that, but they're not the best.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did we get that approved? Yes, we did.

MR. BOGLE: There were some questions when we last discussed the number of copies of the Budget Address, the Budget Highlights, and the Speech from the Throne, as I recall, and

whether or not that was an appropriate expenditure for the Assembly or for Treasury and the other appropriate departments. Have there been discussions on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're picking up new business. The letter has gone to the Treasurer and there has been a conversation between the two EAs, but we haven't had any feedback yet on this. It also does raise the other issue as to the number of copies that are indeed being printed, let alone who's going to pay for them. So that needs to be addressed as well.

MR. BOGLE: So how are we going to deal with the matter, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the time being, I think we're leaving it in our budget, again because of the timing. I don't know where Treasury's own budget is at, but I...

MR. HYLAND: We could go on the same aspect, the one we got on the pictures. That was budgeted for a year ago, and it was just cut.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would take it as being the general consensus of the committee that if I can arrange with the Provincial Treasurer for him to take the costs right away, then we'll take that amount out of our budget as fast as we can. Or we might leave it in for some other purpose. But I would work on the theory that if we can take it out of here, we'll just take it straight out of the budget.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MS BARRETT: A question, Mr. Chairman. In your memo to the Treasurer, did you also refer to the Speech from the Throne copies, or basically just the Budget Address and Highlights?

MR. SCARLETT: I had some initial discussions. The Speech from the Throne is handled by the Government House Leader, I think; it's not under Treasury, so it's a different department. I had some initial discussions with them as to those requirements. But part of the Speech from the Throne numbers here would go back... Each member is provided 200 or something like that; I don't know for sure. It's

so initial right now that I can't really comment on the amount of money there or what it is.

MS BARRETT: Can I make a motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you make a motion... Okay, let's hear it.

MS BARRETT: It's pretty simple. It's just that we agree that Speech from the Throne costs come under Leg. Assembly, because I can't see any other reasonable avenue for payment. Whatever we tinker with it is not affected by this, just that we don't fool around trying to push it onto another department. I can't see any merit in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that line, I don't think we need a motion.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the operation of the Legislative Assembly in total, you need a throne speech and you need a budget. As to who pays it, I think there's a certain poetic justice in inviting Treasury to think about paying.

Page 19 seems to be the same, but 20 has some changes. At the top of the page it reflects the decision of the committee with regard to school pictures. Along that line, I'm informed that pictures are now actually cheaper to shoot in colour than in black and white. So the arrangements are in place with visitors' services to have that continued. I would hope that the caucuses would invite their members to use the official photographer rather than have your own staff run around with a camera. The lighting will be a pain in the neck, and they probably won't turn out. And you can't really get the school class back again to shoot them for the second time. So is that the one change reflected on page 20?

MR. SCARLETT: Right. The old total was \$2,401,397. It's just the one increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Is there a motion to approve pages 19 and 20? Thank you, Edmonton Highlands. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you.

Twenty-one was previously approved.

Twenty-two reflects the change in the

Olympics of \$20,000, which is a one-time figure. The CPA annual dinner will be changed to reflect the fact that it is the 75th anniversary of the opening of the building.

MR. BOGLE: That was my point, Mr. Chairman. That should not read CPA dinner; it should be the 75th anniversary dinner. So really the CPA dinner would disappear, and we would have the new . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a 75th anniversary event; there's not enough money there to do a dinner. All right. A motion to approve the revised page 22, please? Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried. Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: I suppose that with the 75th you're going to have the same reason for variance as the other: one time only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In all likelihood. Unless the Speaker dreams up something else for next year.

MR. HYLAND: The 76th anniversary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Like my wake. I want you to have a great time. You'll all be so relieved to see me go.

Page 23 was approved.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, a question on this. Why do we have this item in here, \$9,120? It was only Friday last that I renegotiated my contract for the constituency office, and I noticed that in the master draft agreement that we have provided to us as Members of the Legislative Assembly from your facility, the overall encompassing agreement basically says: list the number of things that might be included or should be included in the lease that you would have -- included in that are light and power -- which member would get, in addition to the \$26,000 per year for the constituency office, the right then to come back here and have their light and power paid for under this particular provision. If so, we're not being fair to all 83 members.

MS BARRETT: I think the lease contract you're referring to says that you have to have access to. I went through this with Parliamentary

Counsel in negotiating the Highlands one. I think that's the intent of that reference in the broad contract.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, that's not my understanding. In the case of the constituency of Barrhead, that item is covered under the per month that we've got. As I read this, it seems to me that some other hon. colleagues, after signing the contract, are basically then also getting their light and power agreed to from some other way.

MR. HYLAND: No.

MR. KOWALSKI: No, it isn't?

MR. BOGLE: My understanding of the situation is that in order to comply with the variety of complex rules given to us by our chartered accountants and others, we have to break out the \$26,000 constituency office budget into various components. This is contained within the \$26,000 per MLA budget. It is not in addition to.

MR. SCARLETT: That's the explanation. It's just for Treasury purposes.

MR. KOWALSKI: We've got some bureaucrat running around checking out all these pieces of paper to come out to \$9,120? That's ridiculous. Nobody's ever sent me a letter telling me to break down my monthly stipend into if it was going to be for garbage, light and power, or anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Well, I wouldn't want to have to employ someone to send you one to break it down.

MR. KOWALSKI: You know what will happen to the paper, should I get such a piece of paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. 21KA99.

MR. SCARLETT: If you look at that on page 19, Ken, it shows the constituency offices. Everybody's got the total, and that's transferred over again, just for Treasury purposes, to put it in the right code.

MS BARRETT: Just so they'll pay the darned bills.

MR. KOWALSKI: But they're not paying the bills.

MS BARRETT: It still comes out of our constituency payments.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, generally the way I understand it, they pay this but then they charge it to the relevant constituency allowance. That constituency allowance is debited, so nobody is getting away with anything extra, except maybe the secretarial costs of paying the utility bill, because the actual utility bill is going to be debited back to their constituency allowance anyhow. So I don't think they're getting anything extra, except maybe some secretarial work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure that not all the leases are uniform, to say the least.

MR. KOWALSKI: Granted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hate to plead mea culpa, but my power is over and above.

MR. TAYLOR: Think of the power that it gives you to cut off somebody's light and water.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. May we go from page 23 to page 24, and 24 is reflecting some changes. Mr. Scarlett.

MR. SCARLETT: The previous total was \$5,503,058. With all those other changes that we made, that's the new total.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The secretary mentions that the bulk items -- remember that purchase [inaudible].

MR. SCARLETT: So under the Promotional Allowance Program, the previous total was \$330,024. That accounts for the minus 7.6 percent.

MR. BOGLE: Just for clarity, Mr. Chairman, on the process. We've eliminated the bulk purchase program. Why would that not appear so that members can see that while it indeed was part of our 1986-87 forecast, it is not there in '87-88? Why just drop it completely from the page?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we'll show it as having been there, but it's been totally deleted, and then it's sticking a finger in their eye so they can see it. Right. Motion to improve the revised page 24.

MR. TAYLOR: What's the new total?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The new total showing there is that one, \$503,279.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, I see. You're approving that above the total amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That reflects the deletion of that previous amount under the bulk. Right? Motion to approve? Member for Rocky Mountain House. Page 24, all those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Page 25 was approved, 26 was approved, and 27. That takes us to the end of the section for the moment. Later on we will have a motion to deal with page 15. Following that, we'll also have to deal with page 1, the totals.

I understand there's another slight change on page 8.

MR. SCARLETT: The total manpower figure that presently reads \$800,400 should now read \$803,416, and that reflects those two changes that we made for the security staff contracts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that reflects a change of \$3,016. Your figure under Total Manpower on page 8 is \$803,016.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is that 016 or 416?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're right. It's 416. His writing is about as bad as mine -- not quite. \$803,416. A motion with regard to page 8 approval, please. The Member for Rocky Mountain House. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

That section we must come back to. We're now down to two pages. Well done, group. I think that's worth a five-minute break.

[The committee recessed from 11:12 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands, staying in the same section as we were -- section 2, Administrative Support -- that if we

turn to page 15, we will have a motion developed to give us the new figures, just to supply the new figures, and then we'll have a motion to approve the page as revised.

The Member for Edmonton Highlands, please.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, in the first part of page 15, under Legislative Assembly Office Postage, to use a round figure, first-class postage will increase April 1 by 6 percent, resulting in a change, so the figure which currently reads \$72,780 would read \$77,147.

The next part is going to have to be a motion. Under MLA Communication Allowance, in order to effect a change here through the proper channels, I move that we now define our communication allowance on the basis of .7850 times E over 1.5, which would result in a 3 percent increase in MLA postage costs, an amount of \$8,862. So the figure \$295,412 would now read \$304,274. I'm prepared to give the logic of the 3 percent when you're ready.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. First off, everyone is in agreement with the 6 percent on the Legislative Assembly Office so that that figure of \$77,147 is okay?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, let's deal with the 3 percent figure, and then after that we'll take the motion.

MS BARRETT: Okay. The reason it's 3 percent and not 6 or 7 percent is because the cost of mailing does not constitute a member's entire communications allowance. We thought that less than half of the increase in the costs that we will all incur starting April 1, 1987, would be appropriate, and 3 percent presented itself with appropriate rounding. The problem associated with this is that we do not know for sure that between rural and urban members the estimate really would be \$304,274 finally, because we don't have the breakdown of how much postage coming from our offices is first class or third class, but that we provide for the most that would possibly be needed, understanding that it could come in at fewer dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Discussion and a call for the question?

MR. HYLAND: Just one question. I think when the motion is formally made, we should include the members' services order number and that section. Then there won't be any question that it comes out right.

MS BARRETT: Yes. I'll amend my motion, if that's okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the House will take it that you — just give us the appropriate number.

MS BARRETT: Yes. I see it as section 2(1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 2(1). Members' Services Order...

MS BARRETT: Members' Services Order 4/85.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the appropriate Members' Services Committee order be amended to reflect. Okay?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

All righty. In theory, in the new figures on page 15 the top one is \$77,147. In due course the figure which presently reads \$295,000 and change will be \$304,274, for a new total of \$398,501.

On page 24 the revision then will reflect the appropriate increase of about \$14,000. Is there agreement to that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Revised approval for page 24. It just has to be reflected all the way through. Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Which in turn will redo page 3. Perhaps what we can do there is just hold on to that one, and the department can reflect that for tomorrow's meeting.

That, as far as I know, gives almost total approval to section 2.

Section 3, Members' Indemnities and Allowances. What changes to be shown here, Mr. Scarlett?

MR. SCARLETT: Under Life Insurance Maximum Coverage, the old figure read \$11,280. The new figure is as a result of the

new benefits package. Dental coverage: the old figure read \$22,908; as a result of the new benefits package, it's 25,896. Extended Health Care Premiums: the old figure read \$8,640. Therefore the old total figure was \$4,395,500. The total increase is 10.5, up from 10.3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's just putting in place appropriate approvals. Motion to approve page 28. The Member for Rocky Mountain House. Call for the question? All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Section 4, Speaker's Office, on page 29: a few changes here.

MR. SCARLETT: There are two changes. The insurance under Supplies and Services has been dropped completely. I found out from my insurance company that I don't need it. There was a code under Repair and Maintenance of Equipment; \$1,900 went over to General Administration. The old total under Supplies and Services was \$94,690. The old total before was \$309,571.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the figure they have in front on them now is the revised, and it's down further; it's a decrease.

MR. SCARLETT: Yes. A decrease of another .6 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to approve page 29? Member for Barrhead. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

We had approval on pages 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35.

MR. TAYLOR: Back to 29 for a minute, Mr. Chairman, for a point of information. There have been some rather drastic changes in the department. There is severance pay and stuff like that involved. Is that going to lead to a new page 29?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The arrangements made are covered out of this current fiscal year. With regard to the next fiscal year, with a number of the staff taking on extra duties, I intend to give them more money during that period. We hope to have the new director of administration in place within three weeks and a new Clerk and a new Clerk Assistant in place by July 1 at the

latest, so we'd then just be reflecting that period of time.

The other pages up to page 36 have been approved, which brings us to the land of postage. Perhaps we can leave that figure alone, from our point of view.

MS BARRETT: Is that your wish? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion from the Member for Edmonton Highlands to give approval to page 36.

MS BARRETT: What the heck.

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

MRS. MIROSH: You don't do much mailing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've been doing a lot with trying to locate former members and sending Mace pins to them, but we've got that pretty well accomplished.

Page 37 was approved, and 38 had been approved. Thirty-nine: pretty tough to approve that one — minus 100 percent. Motion to approve the page nevertheless? Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: I can see the headline in the Sun tomorrow: Taylor cuts costs by 100 percent.

MS BARRETT: Careful, Uncle Nicky.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It just proves that the Speaker cut costs by 100 percent.

MR. TAYLOR: Taylor forces Speaker to cut costs by 100 percent. [laughter]

MR. BOGLE: There's no one here to report it, Nick.

MR. CAMPBELL: Taylor takes the Speaker to the tailor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of 39 have laughed.

Forty was approved; 41, 42, and 43 were approved.

MR. HYLAND: Do we have to approve page 44?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

May we now approve all of section 4, Speaker's Office, according to the revisions you've made? All in favour? Opposed? Carried almost unanimously.

I understand that for the moment we will miss 5, 6, 7, and 8. We move to section 9, Summary of Budget Estimates, Legislative Committees. Do we have any new information in this section? Perhaps we could go to page 50 and come back to 49 after we go through 50. Fifty is another one giving us a summary. On 51 we had approved General Support. That leads us to 52, Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Do we have any new information on this one, Mr. Scarlett?

MR. SCARLETT: They came back and cut the travel expenses to \$43,050 from \$50,000, from the previous total of \$131,125. It used to be a 13.6 percent decrease; it's now 18.2.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, didn't I make a motion last time that the travel be the same as the year previous? So that falls in line with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This page now reflects a decrease in travel expenses.

Is there a motion to approve page 52 as revised? The Member for Barrhead. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously.

Page 53, no changes. That one had been approved.

Page 54, Legislative Offices Committee. This reflects some changes. Mr. Scarlett, if you'd like to take us through that slowly.

MR. SCARLETT: Through all the changes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so.

MR. SCARLETT: The figures for Leg. Offices. Originally under Travel Expenses they had \$3,810 budgeted: Airfare was \$11,088. Accommodation was \$1,788, and Meals was the same. The bottom-line total was \$18,511, so they went from a 2.8 percent increase to a 27 percent decrease in that area.

Originally they had \$11,000 budgeted under Professional, Technical, and Labour Services. Instead of zero percent, they've now gone to minus 4.5 percent.

Hosting: they originally budgeted for \$850 for Catering at Meetings and \$500 for Other Hosting, for a total of \$1,350. Originally they had gone for a 38.6 percent decrease. It's now 54.5.

Payments to MLAs: originally they had budgeted \$12,100 under Indemnities, \$6,300 for Allowances, and \$907, MLA Pension; a total of \$19,307, a 7.3 percent increase. It's now a 45.8 percent decrease.

The bottom line: they had originally asked for \$50,768, a 1.2 percent decrease; it's now 31.9.

MR. BOGLE: Could I ask for a clarification? I'd like to know the difference between the Legislative Auditors conference, which is to be held in Quebec City, and the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, which is in Montreal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation is a separate group. The practice of the committee over the last four years was to make certain that indeed at least one member from the committee went to that, in terms of bettering the relationship between the committee and the Auditor General in particular. That proved to be a very, very useful kind of relationship, because previously the committee was very distanced, in particular from the Auditor General. That was one of the areas to bridge. That's also where I went and gave a speech on the practice of the Legislative Offices Committee in this province, because it is a very unique one and it's a role which is very useful.

Then the Legislative Auditors one. Oftentimes they've been able to run them almost concurrently, and I wouldn't be surprised if the dates here aren't almost sequential between the one in Quebec and the one in Montreal. No. Not this year.

MR. BOGLE: As a former member of the committee, in the absence of Mr. Stevens — and I don't think anyone else here is on the committee — do you believe both should remain in the budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do. I believe that all of these are — I think it's one of the real reasons why the relationship with the three officers of the Assembly are very positive as compared to

some other jurisdictions.

MR. HYLAND: I move we accept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion to approve page 54. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Page 55 is approved.

Page 56. Public Accounts now reflects some changes. The motion last meeting reflects another situation as well. This has arisen since our last meeting. A memo from the chairman, Mr. Pashak, January 28.

With respect to our conversation, this is to advise that Alberta will be hosting the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees in July, 1989. In order to budget for this conference, it might be useful for you to know that the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly spent \$14,000 to host the 1986 conference.

That's an item we would then reflect in our next year's budget, if the committee approves the hosting.

Now, for this present budget:

I think it might also be appropriate to provide a budgetary allocation that would permit an appropriate staff member to attend the 1988 conference in Halifax, in preparation for Alberta's hosting of the 1989 conference.

I also understand that Mr. Pashak, as chairman of our Public Accounts Committee, would indeed go to the conference which takes place next summer in July, unless he is no longer the chairman. Because Alberta, in theory, is to host the conference in '89, he then goes onto the executive across Canada, and that may reflect some additional travel costing in terms of this conference. To the best of my knowledge, we as a province have not hosted a national public accounts conference in the last seven or eight years, and as is the wont with all these conferences, it comes up for our turn to host them from time to time anyway. So that's the one memo. The committee can see how they wish to reflect that or not.

But first let us go through page 56 with the changes that had been made, partly in line with the motion of our last meeting.

MR. SCARLETT: Under Travel Expenses, originally Airfare was \$16,050; Mileage was \$9,240; Hotels, \$1,250; Meals, \$345; and Ground

Transportation was \$200, for a total of \$27,150. It now reads \$4,790, 99.6 percent down from 1,031.3 percent.

Payments to MLAs read: Indemnities, \$22,000; Allowances, \$14,250; and MLA Pension, \$1,650, for a total of \$37,900. It now reads \$860, which is a 7.5 percent increase, down from a 4,637.5 percent increase. The old total read \$65,050, a 1,895.4 percent increase. The net increase now is 73.3 percent, excluding Mr. Pashak's request for travel to Halifax.

MS BARRETT: I wonder if anybody knows when the conference in Halifax takes place. Does it not take place in the '87-'88 fiscal year, or would it be in the summer? Would you put it in the '88-'89, or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be in July of '87 in Halifax.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I thought you'd said '88. When is Quebec then?

MR. TAYLOR: Ours is '89, isn't it?

MR. SCARLETT: Part of this, I do believe, is in . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: He would be attending in '87 in order to get a grounding on what would happen in Alberta in '88.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hold on a minute. Sorry, I've got my dates mixed. Louise is also the secretary to that committee, so give us the information, please.

MRS. EMPSON: Actually, Ann is the executive secretary. Mr. Pashak will be attending an executive committee meeting in Halifax this month, in February. It's covered under the 1986-'87 budget estimates. The meeting in Quebec City is the overall across-Canada conference, and I understand that Mr. Pashak, being a member of the executive, will be hosting the executive meeting in February of next year here in Edmonton. I think what he is asking for is funds for a staff member to go to Halifax this summer to see how the conference is carried out so that when it's our turn to host the conference, we'll know what to do and how much to budget for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS BARRETT: What you're talking about then in February . . .

MRS. EMPSON: Is an executive meeting, of which Mr. Pashak is a member.

MS BARRETT: Right. But what Edmonton would be hosting in the current scheme of things would take place in 1989?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's okay. Got it.

MS BARRETT: Good. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't have to worry about this for a year.

MS BARRETT: That's what I was getting at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. I misread it. I read it correctly but it didn't sink in.

MR. HYLAND: Does he need to have — being on the executive, do you have to allow for more travel money next year in this budget, so that he can attend the executive meeting? Forgetting the conference.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, it should be in this budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The executive should be here.

MR. HYLAND: The executive will have to be here.

MRS. EMPSON: And it should be in the 1987-88 budget estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then we need to provide a figure for Hosting. Hold the phone. For 1989, that's about \$15,000. For 1988, one staff member, whoever is going to have to be the head honcho to look after the administrative details of hosting, is going to Halifax. We don't know what the figure is to fly to Halifax and to keep said person there.

MR. HYLAND: Twelve hundred bucks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Twelve hundred?

MRS. EMPSON: Easily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We don't know when. That's likely meeting July '88. So we do have to put that one into this budget we're working on, '87-88. No, because we'll be done in March. So we can hold that one for a year and hold the other one for the year after. But for 1987-88, when his national executive comes here, we need to have a figure built in to look after the hosting.

MR. BOGLE: I just wanted some further clarification on the travel expenses. We are seeing a doubling in the travel expenses from the current fiscal year to the next fiscal year. Where are all those dollars committed to? I presume that is getting to Halifax. How many members are going to Halifax from this committee?

MR. SCARLETT: Going to Quebec. I don't know for sure where the last committee was last year. It could be just a change of venue.

MRS. EMPSON: It is a change of venue.

MR. BOGLE: Do you know where it was last year?

MRS. EMPSON: I'm not . . .

MR. HYLAND: Regina.

MRS. EMPSON: Yes, it was in Regina, but nobody went because it was summer and we were sitting.

MR. BOGLE: Even so, it would have been budgeted for so that doesn't explain why the difference in . . .

MR. HYLAND: The chairman went. The venue was Regina. Right? Barry was away for two or three days; he went to Regina.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The tradition has been that when the House is not sitting, both the chairman from the opposition ranks and the vice-chairman from the government ranks go. That should be more than enough to cover the conference in Quebec for the chairman and vice-chairman of that committee and perhaps some money left over in this budget to be able

to handle the hosting of the national conference executive.

MRS. EMPSON: The actual total figure of that budget estimate was as a result of Mrs. Mirosh's motion to provide for extra funds because there was a change in the venue of the national conference from Regina to Quebec City, which would also take into consideration the increase in hotels and fares.

MR. HYLAND: So we should have it covered then?

MRS. EMPSON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This should cover it. All right. Thank you. But next year we need to look at them building in . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to support the request that's before us, but I would like it noted that it should not be inherent in the request that this committee will by necessity approve dollars to host this conference in Alberta in 1988. I think that's a separate issue. It seems to me that we have to find out what the merit is and what the importance is to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, to the people of Alberta. Why should we spend 15,000 bucks to host the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Having just been to a regional conference in Winnipeg, one of the issues that I raised in a workshop with the Speakers was that we undertake an analysis of the need for the conferences that are presently taking place across the country, whether it's for CPA, Clerks, sergeants-at-arms, librarians, Hansard, Public Accounts, or whatever. I've now got that well along in terms of the initial discussion, and it's on the agenda for the meeting in Ottawa that takes place in May. I can see where a number of conferences can be held concurrently and save the public purse across Canada quite a bit. I would be happy to add this as one of the items, because I don't think a rationalization has really taken place across the country as to duplication.

Is there a motion to approve page 56 as it has been presented? Cypress-Redcliff. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

All right. The magic hour of 12 has arrived.

Do you wish to adjourn for lunch? It has arrived.

MS BARRETT: Good idea.

MR. HYLAND: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

[The committee recessed from 11:59 a.m. to 1:05 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've all charged your coffee cups and all that stuff. Oh, we've got to wait for one more.

When we adjourned, we were at item 10, Legislative Interns. A number of changes had to be made because of the committee's motion to reduce the number of interns by two. In my opinion, we were finished with all of the section on legislative committees.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BOGLE: It's amazing what happens when he speaks ex cathedra.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, not much.

We have somewhat universal agreement for section 10, Legislative Interns. We have a number of changes to be made, Mr. Scarlett, starting with page 57. Basically, I assume this just reflects the downsizing.

MR. SCARLETT: All of it is just a reflection of the downsizing from eight to six.

MR. HYLAND: In this case, if we accept the one page, that should cover the whole thing.

MR. SCARLETT: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept page 57.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question?

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Page 57 being approved, that means that 58, 59, 60, and all subsequent pages under section 10 are now approved.

Section 11, Hansard.

MR. SCARLETT: I guess the first thing is that the Hansard budget you see in front of you is based on 80 sitting days. For your information, projections are that there will be 89 sitting days in this current fiscal year. So we're underbudgeted for 80; there are 89 this fiscal year. I do have some subsequent figures based on 90 sitting days for the next fiscal year, if the committee so wishes. That's for your information.

MR. BOGLE: I'm just curious if your executive assistant would show us what crystal ball he is looking at to come up with a figure on the number of days, because we've never been able to determine with any accuracy how long the House is going to sit.

MS BARRETT: I was going to ask the same thing. Is this Mr. Getty's scoop?

MR. SCARLETT: This is just if the House opens on March 5 and sits every working day until the end of March.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Till the end of June.

MR. SCARLETT: Till the end of March. We're working on -- last session plus those days in March makes 89.

MS BARRETT: No scoop at all.

MR. BOGLE: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So then you have to take into account whether you want to increase the budget accordingly, right?

MR. SCARLETT: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But certainly we need to flag it that if the session, whether it's two parts of the year or one very long part or whatever, goes beyond the magic figure that you determined, then let it be known that we're going to be back here probably for a special warrant. That's not inviting anyone to shorten the session at all; it's just so that you know for budget purposes that it still comes back to this table.

MRS. MIROSH: Could I make a motion to extend it to 90 days?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can make whatever motion...

MRS. MIROSH: I'd like to make a motion that we extend it to 90 sitting days. I anticipate that it will be that anyway, based on past experience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the motion is to 90. Now we have a motion.

MR. SCARLETT: For your information, based on a 90-day sitting period, the total expenditure would be \$651,552, which is still a 12.6 percent reduction. I have how it affects each of the codes, if members are interested in that.

MS BARRETT: I speak in favour of the motion. We're still able to show a reduction, and there is no sense in not anticipating 90 days, given the projections from Rod that we're looking at 89 in any event.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the total expenditure which is presently shown on page 67, \$607,843, would then read -- if one can remove the cream off the cake off this sheet -- \$651,552.

MR. CAMPBELL: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a call for the question. The motion would be to make allowance in the budget to move it to 90 days. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The necessary calculations could be just put in place if that's the will of the committee. We don't need to go through them line by line.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We might then go through the Hansard budget to respond to questions which were raised at the last series of meetings. Then we'll come back and take one motion for approval of the budget with the amendments. Someone will remind the Chair of that, please.

Working through on this, I understand the page where the questions show up would be with regard to page 76. The pages preceding are approved. We need to stop on page 73 to reflect the increased cost of postage.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask a question on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MS BARRETT: Is Hansard mailed first-class?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that was our information, wasn't it? The Editor is sick in bed today. Whether he will arise for tomorrow, I don't know. According to that, it shows a 10 percent increase. We did move that up, did we not, at our last meeting?

MR. HYLAND: Wasn't there something that we were mailing it third-class and they wouldn't accept it as third-class? It had to go first-class if you put a wrapper on it or some damn thing. Something about books and shiny paper or something, about magazines, wasn't it? I think we were forced by the post office to mail it first-class.

MS BARRETT: So, in fact, the 10 percent increase not only reflects the 6 percent increase in postage costs but also reflects a change in the numbers, that we have to mail it first-class as opposed to third.

MR. HYLAND: I think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's our understanding. We will make a phone call overnight.

MR. TAYLOR: Wouldn't it be practical, though, in view of the fact that we've raised the subscription to \$100 a year? Surely we'd be mailing them first-class.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, we have to.

MS BARRETT: I think we're being forced to in any event.

MR. HYLAND: We're forced to mail first-class, I'm sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will still check overnight.

MR. SCARLETT: Again, this will all change as a result. This was based on 80 sitting days. It will change again and increase for 90 days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We've turned down the corner of 73 to check, 74 and 75 are approved, and now we're at page 76. There is an item with regard to the \$5,000, the second

item down, left-hand side, Linotype typesetting equipment. Five thousand dollars was put in to cover the maintenance of the new equipment. That's the only change on page 76. We have approval of page 76, moved by Edmonton Highlands. All those in favour, signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: So we now know the actual figures there. Two weeks ago we didn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. SCARLETT: That was subject to the approval of the Linotype working.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. A committee request to Dr. Garrison to obtain the list of recipients of bound Hansard. Do you have that?

MR. SCARLETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have copies for everybody? All righty. Let's have a look.

MRS. MIROSH: Are you putting some printer out of business? A \$100,000 difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've had a letter about that. We're not putting some printer out of business. I've had a letter of complaint that their business went down by 20 percent. My response is: if I'm here to help make this department more efficient, then I'm going to do that. It will cost us \$90,000. We can recover that within the first year. We have saved ourselves a considerable amount of money just in Hansard alone, and savings we won't know for a year as to what we've gained throughout the rest of the department. So you're caught on the one hand: what can you privatize, and what can't you, and what's an in-house saving? This one seemed to make immanent sense. So we proceeded.

MR. HYLAND: We're still printing out of house.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is getting copies print-ready.

MRS. MIROSH: Typesetting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes; the other advantage to this is that this allows us to go to printing

next-day Hansard, which is going to be an improvement of one to two days' service to the member. I'm sure my staff are getting tired of my saying so, but this group is here to serve the member, and this seemed to be one of the great ways to improve the service to the members.

MS BARRETT: You might not be able to measure that in money, but the other thing is that in terms of sheer efficiency, by the time Hansard delivers to the printers for typesetting the end product, that end product could have already been completed, and it really makes sense in terms of efficiency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We also discovered that in terms of the accuracy, this gave us more control over what was, say, one step.

MS BARRETT: Good point.

MR. HYLAND: You save in distributing the Blues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. What were known as the Blues will now be -- what do we call that stuff? Lorraine, what's that first printout called?

MS GIBEAULT: We call them the posted documents.

MS BARRETT: They used to be the grays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Posted documents is what you call them. All right. It's one step. I believe we're on page 77.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, the other thing on that too -- I forget the numbers, but when it went out to print, even taking away the setting part, available for people to bid on it, wasn't that quite a saving too? I remember Dr. Garrison saying that there was a considerable saving in -- were there more printers available or something that could bid on the product on the tail end?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's absolutely correct.

MR. HYLAND: So your recovery is gained even more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In terms of the tendering for

the printing side now, it's been reduced by 50 percent. That makes for -- is that going to show here? There are explanations on page 77, and then we'll go to who gets the Hansards. So that minus 48.2 percent really reflects the combination of the Linotype and a more competitive take-up on the bids for doing the printing.

As with what happened in the legislative committees, over there I intend to send a note to the committee chairmen, who reacted so well to the directive of this committee, because I agree that they did a good job of cutting back on expenses and following the direction of the committee. That same thing holds here with Hansard, and I think you'll also see it with regard to the library.

The summary as to where the copies go, please, Rod.

MR. SCARLETT: There are 230 three-volume sets printed. So when it says 690 books, it's three to a set of one session. One hundred and four of those are paid for. The other 126 are gratis, I guess: one set to each of the members; the Legislature Library gets two; the Lieutenant Governor gets one; the Clerk's office, three; Parliamentary Counsel, one; Hansard, three; the Premier's office, five; the New Democrats, five; the Leg. Assembly Office has 10; four complimentary copies; and nine for future requests. Of the ones that are purchased, there are 28 unmetered, 60 metered, and 16 are picked up. I have a list of where those go. It's mostly government departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Free or purchased?

MR. SCARLETT: Those are purchased.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From the departments.

MR. SCARLETT: Yes. One hundred and four are free.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the things that might be useful in here when we do this final copy, page 77, would be to identify that when you say it is 690 books, it really does represent three-volume sets, so that people are looking at them as being sets. We just need to add another piece of info there. It's been \$15 a set as the cost.

MR. TAYLOR: A question, Mr. Chairman. I notice there were five complimentary copies to the Premier, was it?

MR. SCARLETT: The Premier's office.

MR. TAYLOR: And five to the Official Opposition office. Since those rules were made, there have been a couple of other parties appear on the scene. I'm just wondering what — there's no need to have five. I would think that we could get . . .

MR. SCARLETT: There are four complimentary copies and nine extra for future requests, so I imagine that . . .

MR. BOGLE: I think what Mr. Taylor is saying is that there should be an acknowledgment now that the other two parties be allocated some copies.

MR. TAYLOR: Three would be plenty for us, and then maybe one or two for the REPs; I don't know. What do you think?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three and one.

MR. TAYLOR: All right. That would be four out of the nine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. That will be adjusted. If any of you want to see the list of where the other sets go, you're quite welcome to come on up and look at the list after the adjournment. So I guess the bound copies are not to be reduced. You're happy enough with the number of sets that are out there now?

MR. HYLAND: Now that you know it isn't 690 sets out there.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any adjustments of figures on this page 77 other than what we have? May we then have a motion to approve page 77? Cypress-Redcliff.

MRS. EMPSON: It's 80 issues of Hansard, not

90.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're right. We can't move approval of the page because of the fact that we have to make the adjustments to the material in terms in light of the number of days. That would show under (a). Copies of Hansard will go from 80 issues up to 90. So our approval motion at the end will be this whole section, taking into account the adjustment on days. Other than that, we're basically agreed on this page.

MR. HYLAND: I could always change my motion to say that we approve it with the amount being 90 days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; thank you. That's the motion.

Those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much.

Page 78. Is there any discussion there? This is a saving because of the decision not to print the Blues in their previous form.

Approval of page 78, representing a minus 30 percent reduction. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon carefully raises his right arm. A call for the question?

MR. HYLAND: One question first. Is this going to again be affected by the extra 10 that we put in?

MR. TAYLOR: There should be 10 more mailing covers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this would be the sheet plus the amendment that takes place because of the 90-day time frame. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

Page 79 was approved previously.

Page 80. I suppose we will now have to make some adjustments on this.

MR. SCARLETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Approval of page 80 with any minor modification that might need to be brought into play, which probably revolves around the bottom line there, developer and fixer for typesetter, to reflect the extra 10

days' use if indeed it does get used for the extra 10 days. Edmonton Highlands, a call for the question. All those in favour, please indicate. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

All right. May we then return to page 67. We have a motion to approve section 11, Alberta Hansard, taking into account the fact that certain figures will be changed slightly because of the day period moved by Rocky Mountain House. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Section 12, Legislature Library. Perhaps we will call upon the man who has to wear two hats if not two heads on his shoulders. Blake, do you want to take us through here, please?

MR. McDOUGALL: Mr. Speaker, this represents our second presentation of the '87-88 Legislature Library estimates. The two pages prior to the actual estimates, this brief memorandum, indicate first of all in section A that pages 82-1 to 96-1 — those are all the white sheets — are the original estimates presented to the Members' Services Committee on Monday, January 12, 1987, except that the errors noted have been corrected, the additional information that was requested has been provided, the accounts for pages which have already been approved have been marked "approved" with the appropriate date, and a breakdown of these estimates by individual section has been provided as requested.

Section B indicates that pages 82-2 to 96-2, the pink sheets, are the estimates as noted in section A of this memorandum showing the effect of Mrs. Mirosch's motion, which was tabled, to reduce the library's salary account — that's 511A99 — which was \$701,196, by 5 percent, considering Mr. Hyland's recommendation that this reduction be made to the library's legislative research services section, and finally the effect of a significant reduction, \$25,000, in the library's data processing services, 512L99, account. All of the pages noted in sections A and B of this memorandum have been interfiled for the convenience of the committee.

In section C of the memorandum I wanted to take a few moments to indicate the unique value of parliamentary library research services. A number of references were made to the section last meeting. I wanted to be sure that all members understood how it differs from caucus and personal research services.

On page 2 of the memorandum I indicate the three unique features. First of all, parliamentary library research units provide a pool of subject specialists which is shared by all members of the related Assembly and consequently negates the need to duplicate those resources several times within the same Assembly organization. This way considerable savings are realized. Secondly, I indicate that they provide a group of subject specialists which is available to the opposition parties and consequently has the effect of offsetting, partially at least, the extensive specialist resources which are available to the executive. This in turn helps improve the quality of the parliamentary process.

I should note as well that the Premier's office and several cabinet members have also used the services of our research section when they didn't have the related expertise within their own organizations or were seeking an independent source of information. Of course, a majority of our clients are backbenchers from all political parties represented in our Legislature.

Finally, the parliamentary library research unit provides a group of subject specialists to assist legislative committees and senior officers of the Assembly; that's the Speaker, Clerk, Parliamentary Counsel, et cetera. The former Speaker was a particularly heavy user of our research section.

As you probably noted this morning, you were given a comparative study related to cross-Canada insurance coverage for members of the various parliamentary Assemblies. That was prepared by our research unit, and it's an example of the Assembly requiring a research component of its own.

I just wanted to make those three major points, because those are the three major differences between a parliamentary library research unit and caucus and personal research services. I have found in my conversations with members in the past that they aren't always aware of that, and I wanted to make sure before we go into the actual estimates that I had made that clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Thank you.

The pleasure of the committee — as pointed out, we have two versions here. The white sheets represent the previous documents supplied to you but with the appropriate

corrections, which now have been straightened away thanks to the administration under the direction of Mr. McDougall. Then you have the second version, the pink sheets, which reflect what the result would be if this meeting takes off the table the motion of the Member for Calgary Glenmore to cause the effect of the minus 5 percent. What is the pleasure of the House?

MS BARRETT: With consent, I'd like to talk directly about the implications of that motion as presented on page 82-2-1 compared to the white page 82-1-1. But whether or not I can do that without the motion being back on the table is up to you, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll pull the motion back, if that's agreed. The motion before us is the motion of Calgary Glenmore. You have the substance of it here. It's basically the minus 5. You can find it in your minutes. Is it agreed to have the motion back on the table?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I think what we need to look at seriously here with respect to the pink page 82-2-1, which would draw the consequence of the member's motion, is a reduction of one staff person in leg. research services. But I think what's reflected here is deficient -- no offence to Blake -- inasmuch as I did a little work on this issue and have discovered that the convention with respect to severance pay for opted out and management employees under dismissals which eventually go to arbitration, and which has now become the norm even outside circumstances of arbitration, is salary compensation approximating one year.

It seems to me that if we don't know the fiscal position of the province a year from now -- which we don't; I don't have any projections, and I don't have the government's projections at any rate -- if we are looking at going for some kind of compensation like a severance pay package with respect to one person having been taken out of that department, we're no further ahead. In fact, what we need to look at then is the alternative to Dianne's motion, which is to keep that person, whoever that person is, on. I don't see that we'd be any further ahead. I

speak against the motion not just on the basis that I did before but also realizing that severance pay packages frequently add up to a year's worth of salary. Certainly in court arbitrations across Canada that's been the case.

If we're looking at a fiscal restraint policy for one year, we don't know what the second year is going to be like and we might be working against our own best interests if it's money that we're trying to save. Not only that, but Blake has showed savings virtually everywhere that he could in a really good way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for clarification: one month per year of service, not necessarily one year.

MS BARRETT: No, in court arbitrations frequently -- I have the study downstairs. I can get it for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the management level.

All righty. So we're on pink sheets if this motion carries. Other discussion?

MR. HYLAND: Could I ask a question of Blake? The original estimate was minus 5.5?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: The pink sheets are another minus 5.5, or 11.3 more or less?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Going through it, Mr. Chairman, I think research is the basic lifeblood of the Legislature. There is proposing and opposing. Both sides presenting an idea or a Bill have to be well informed and have good research. Of course, that's covered with normal government. It's not our prerogative. The opposing side or the pro or the con or whatever you want to call it -- I don't like to think of it as opposition; I just like to think of it as proper debate when anything takes place. Maybe it's a counterbalance for the information on the executive side. As McDougall pointed out, it's also a common source that allows those of us in caucuses -- the government backbenchers' caucus as well as ours -- to devote our staff to other areas.

I think it's very counterproductive to cut the library costs, because all we're doing is sliding

some of the business that they were going to do over onto our own staffs and, in fact, making it worse. We're going to be doing it maybe two or three times, whereas his would have done it once and we would have freed our own staffs, whether they be back-bench or opposition, to do more original work.

I certainly would like to vote against it. It's not only the cost-cutting here; it's going to cost our other caucuses, be they back-bench or the other, some more money, too, to do their work, so we pay for it double.

MR. HYLAND: I've always had a concern -- and I would assume it's changed now because this is probably the second budget year since I have seen the figures -- with the amount that the research staff is used against the cost per usage; i.e., they gave us figures one time of how many calls they'd had and how many projects they did. At that time that included telephone calls and everything. The cost per project was fairly high. I'm assuming that now that they're getting used more, that cost is down. I just make that assumption; maybe Blake could correct it or reject it.

MR. McDOUGALL: The utilization of the unit has increased considerably since previous debates concerning this subject by this committee. In 1986 the amount of work completed by the section increased by 62 percent. The unit is very well utilized, in my opinion.

MR. HYLAND: If this pink is followed, that means somebody's services have to be ceased, because it's at full complement now. There are no empty spots?

MR. McDOUGALL: Yes. The pink sheets indicate the position abolishment of one of the research officers, which means a reduction in the level of service.

MR. BOGLE: I'd like to compliment the management of the Legislature Library for following the general instructions that the committee provided at its last meeting. I would only indicate to members that this is one of the most painful parts of trying to reduce expenditures -- trying to find an appropriate place. We can all find reasons why a service should not be eliminated. I wish to remind

members that this service is not in fact being eliminated. There are still two researchers, and there is the necessary support staff for those researchers. While we can argue the merits of the program, I think that the hard, cold reality of the situation is that we've got to find areas where we can make reductions. I compliment the administration again for having come back with an overall reduction of some 11.3 percent in keeping with the wishes of the committee at its last meeting.

MS BARRETT: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that as opposed to virtually any other section of our estimates, this was the one section that was singled out to look specifically at a decrease in the number of staff, and I think that's been a bit unfair. If it's the goal of this committee to look at further paring down of the Leg. Library and its associated bodies' budgets, then I think that the instructions to Blake should be that and not looking at axing individual positions.

I remind you, members, that at this moment all caucus budgets are looking at a 20 percent cut. That's a pretty substantial cut. It's well beyond the 3 percent cut that went to the four major granting agencies in the province. We are all looking at decreased ability to do the sort of work that we had been doing. My assumption is that the workload would then naturally go more into Leg. Library research services, which has already sustained, I believe, a 62 percent increase in utilization in the last year. Therefore, notwithstanding all the comments I made at the last meeting we had about this, I really urge members to defeat this motion.

We've got just about the most flexible person in the world sitting at this table; every year he has turned in a budget that has come in under the estimates. If anything, if you're really insistent that you want a total reduction of 11.5 percent, then I say: defeat the current motion and give Blake a different motion that doesn't require him having to cut staff, especially at a time when caucuses themselves are going to have to cut staff. If we're talking about members' services and our ability to do our jobs, we are happy to applaud a decision to go to in-house printing and a number of other things that we do in a very sensible, economic way. I think it's unfair to say that we have to axe a particular job in a particular section. I think it affects the discretion of the man who's in

charge of the whole division. I have every faith that if our instructions were to come back with an 11 percent targeted overall reduction, if there's one person who could do it, it's Blake McDougall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I need to point out that there are two positions gone in Hansard. So it's not just one section.

MR. McDOUGALL: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated prior to my presentation at the January meeting, it's not possible to cut the library's operating expenses any further without permanently damaging the main library operation. If we go beyond 5.5, which was the initial presentation, it has to be staff; otherwise, we'll permanently damage the library over the long term, and it's just something that I wouldn't recommend. We've gone as far as we can on that side of it, the discretionary side. The damage that would be done by trying to take more money out of that, the supplies and services for the library operation, would have the effect of permanently damaging the organization.

I appreciate your remarks, but it's just that that's what we're down to.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask a question, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, and hopefully any other comments that you have on this one.

MS BARRETT: Well, we're not in the Assembly, but I certainly am entitled to explore and debate and urge members in a particular direction, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that has happened.

MS BARRETT: Yes, it is. My question to Blake is: if you followed the directions here in the broad sense, is it possible to eliminate one or half a person in the secretarial component within the Leg. Library research as opposed to a researcher? Is that possible?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you respond, my previous introduction was this: if we had a whole series of points so that he can respond on a whole series of points, if that's what we've got -- so we're not ending up in a dialogue in this committee with a committee member and a

staff person -- if there are other points, it would be kind of helpful if we deal with them all at once.

MS BARRETT: That's the only one I know of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Obviously not. Fine, thank you. Please.

MR. McDOUGALL: If I understood the question correctly, referring to cutting secretarial support, there are only two secretaries in the area. So to try to recover the money, which is approximately \$35,000, you'd end up with something like, I suppose, two-thirds or a half of one secretary, which wouldn't be adequate to meet the work flow requirement.

MR. TAYLOR: What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, about this is that we're cutting -- I don't like to get into staff; I'd rather keep to a sort of envelope discussion, but I guess the motion did refer to staff. But I revert to envelope in that the department already has the library and research cut by 5.5 percent or so, which is more than we've cut in other educational fields, to our universities, our schools, and everything else, where it's in the 3 percent area. There's something awfully akin to a sort of Luddite philosophy, that when you're going to cut anything, you march over and burn a few books or shut down the libraries or cut the schools.

It's a message that we telegraph, too, out there to the public, that I don't like. We've cut our own travel, and we've cut in a few other areas. I'm not saying that we haven't cut. But I just think it's a very undesirable area. We already had the department come in and say they were cutting 5 percent. We leap on it and say: well, we want a particular person in research or whatever it is out of there to try to cut it down to 11 or 12 percent. It just doesn't seem fitting to be in that area.

I also mention in a practical sense that I see no saving in it whatsoever. It just means that the research caucuses that we're all funding, which apparently you want to cut 15 or 18 percent . . . It may only be cut 5 -- I don't know -- but obviously it's going to be cut. Certainly cutting this research as well as the other means that we're really kicking the dickens out of the whole idea and concept of research and study. Not only is it counterproductive and doesn't

seem to make sense, but I think it sends a message out there that's very akin to Luddite philosophy: if it's put on a piece of paper, if you can't eat it or hammer it, the damn thing doesn't exist; get rid of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For purposes of clarification, for example, on pink sheet 83-2, it shows that one position is vacant, to be abolished, and then one other -- the Research Officer II category, according to this sheet then, if it were to be followed through -- would be abolished. So of the two positions, one is vacant at the moment. I thought we would note that in terms of the conversation.

MR. BOGLE: I'm requesting a brief coffee break.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll come back around 2.

[The committee recessed from 1:55 p.m. to 2:01 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's good to have a stretch. The Chair recognizes . . . no one.

MR. TAYLOR: We were going to make a motion to table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The motion is?

MS BARRETT: I move that we table this motion for further consideration till tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Table the motion. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Carried. The library, section 12, is tabled. That was the last one we had in this section. That also automatically tables some other summary figures for the Legislative Assembly, so as far as the Chair is concerned at the moment, we'll hoist the budget books until tomorrow, with whatever other embroidery may take place with subsequent motions. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

Back to the original agenda: Automobile Allowance. Since Mr. Wright is not able to be with us, I assume that that carries over to the next meeting.

MS BARRETT: Which item are you on, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were actually on 6. We're back to our original binders on the agenda. I have an item 6, which reads "Automobile Allowance -- Mr. Wright." So we're going to hold that one.

Number 7, Members' Travel Allowance. Mr. Bogle.

MR. BOGLE: At our last meeting I gave notice that I intended to bring forward a motion relative to travel allowance for members. It was the original intent to include both the automobile and the air travel. However, there is still some checking to do on actual statistics coming out of the Leg. Assembly offices, and therefore there is further consultation to be carried out between members of this committee.

Therefore, the motion that I am proposing, which Louise is distributing now, is limited to automobile travel.

Be it resolved that the Transportation and Administration Order be amended, to come into force on the date of passage, in section 1(1)(c.1).

There are three subsections. Subsection (a) deals with striking 52 round trips per year and substituting 40 round trips per year. Subsection (b) strikes "25,000 kilometres" and in its place substitutes two categories, first for an urban member. We're using the definitions in the Election Act for an urban constituency and a rural constituency. An urban member will be entitled to 10,000 kilometres without receipts. If additional kilometres are driven or the member feels that he can claim for additional kilometres, then with receipts an additional 15,000 kilometres could be charged. For a rural member, the base rate without receipts would be 18,000 kilometres, and with receipts, an additional 27,000 kilometres. This would be on a fiscal year basis.

Finally, under (c) we'd be striking out the reference to

a single claim for all payments pursuant to this clause shall be made in respect of each calendar quarter in a form provided

by the Clerk of the Assembly and giving more flexibility to members by saying:

claims made in accordance with a form provided by the Clerk of the Assembly.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question about section (a). If we're not talking about air travel at this point, why are we referring to 52 versus 40 return trips?

MR. BOGLE: Because under the present order approved by Members' Services, under (c.1)(A) there is reference to 52 trips per year between a member's residence, place of employment, or business and the city of Edmonton. So there currently is a reference to 52 round trips or return trips, and we're reducing that to 40. This is for automobile purposes only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the two categories of trip by car: one from the constituency to Edmonton -- that's that first section -- and then this other area, where now we're going to make it two categories, an urban and a rural member, whereas before we had them combined as one.

MS BARRETT: Yes, I understand that. Can I ask one more question about the implication of this? If you're driving around, let's say you spend most of your time driving within your constituency. If that's most of your mileage claim -- and I don't contest that rural members drive a lot more than urban members -- on top of this amount can you also claim then for driving between your constituency and the Leg.? Is that it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Forty trips.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Gotcha.

MR. KOWALSKI: You can only come here 40 times.

MS BARRETT: So if you wanted to, if you were a rural member, you could claim up to 45,000 kilometres, 27,000 receipted, just for driving around your constituency, and then on top of that claim between your constituency and the Leg. centre, which is Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipted.

MS BARRETT: Yes. Those are receipted. Okay.

MR. TAYLOR: It bothers me...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Cypress-Redcliff, then Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. HYLAND: I was just going to get into it and explain that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: One thing that bothers me, and maybe it could be clarified, is that I get the distinct impression from reading these motions -- and I'm thinking now of Order MSC 4/83 that just came up awhile ago -- that if you go in a car, you're restricted now to 52 return trips, but if you go in an airplane, you're restricted to just as much as your body can stand. Is that intentional? MSC 4/83 says:

The following shall be provided to or for the use of Members on the condition that they are related to and reasonably necessary for the performance of their duties...

(a) regularly scheduled air travel service

(i) between points in Alberta.

In other words, I get the impression that a member can jump on a plane anywhere and go anywhere, and then we turn around, because he's crazy enough to get into his car and risk his life and limb, and he's restricted to 40. The logic doesn't follow to me.

I would think that when we total up the amount of money we spend, air far exceeds the return trip category. So I don't quite understand, unless you've got a mad on about Detroit or something like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, hon. member, if you recall, the proposer of the motion mentioned that this was dealing just with the car side at this time because more work needed to be done on the air travel side. But points well made.

MR. BOGLE: They are very well made, and the original intent was to cover all together, because in discussing this matter with one member from Calgary, we determined that it's actually more advantageous for the budget of

the Leg. Assembly for a Calgary member to use his automobile to come to Edmonton and return than it is to use the airbus. It's actually a little cheaper on the rates we're prescribing. There's still some information to be obtained on air travel, and there were concerns expressed by some members that we not impede the availability members now have. Therefore, we're not able to deal with both the air and the automobile in the same motion. It is my recommendation, and that's why the motion is before us today, that we do indeed deal with the automobile portion at this time, and as soon as we're able to satisfy ourselves -- and I think as well in my preamble I indicated that there needed to be more input from other members of the committee -- then we would be able to move on the air travel.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I knew that if I hung around here long enough, I'd finally hear some wisdom coming from my colleague from Westlock-Sturgeon. What the man said just a few minutes ago really makes a lot of sense to this whole discussion. Then hearing what my colleague from Taber-Warner said about the fact that some people from Calgary find it cheaper to come by car than by air, which means that really the public of Alberta would benefit from their coming by car rather than by air, what we're doing in clause (a) is in fact just providing an incentive to up the costs of the operation of the Legislative Assembly by reducing their incentive to come by car and encouraging them to come by air. This motion has three parts to it, and I'm not at all comfortable with part (a). Part (a) talks about the 52 return trips and substituting 40 return trips. There are a number of Members of the Legislative Assembly who, by the very nature of the geography of the province of Alberta, have absolutely no access to air. It's true, what the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon said, that if you do have access to air, your body is the only thing that prohibits you from going. What we're doing in clause (a), as far as I can understand, is in fact putting in a biased approach to members who have no access to air.

I want to move an amendment to this motion. My amendment would read that the motion simply would have what is in clause (b) and what is in clause (c), with a comma after clause (c), where it would say:

substituting "with claims made in

accordance with a form provided by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, subject to the approval of the Members' Services Committee."

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in effect we would have a double-phased amendment. First is the deletion of clause (a); there would be a realphabetizing of (b) to become (a) and (c) to become (b); and the addition of a form approved by the Members' Services Committee. Discussion on the amendment?

MS BARRETT: I have a question about the amendment. What's the implication of ", subject to the approval of the Members' Services Committee"?

MR. KOWALSKI: I might have explained it. My whole tradition is that I'm really concerned about how bureaucrats tend to take things that the Members' Services Committee views as being very simple. Our whole purpose in what we've attempted to do in Members' Services Committee is make everything that we do very, very simple, clear, and easy. All I'm saying in here is that somebody else is going to come up with a form. All I'm saying is that that form has to be approved by the Members' Services Committee, because I don't want somebody to come back with a form and say: well, this is what you've got to do, because Members' Services Committee passed a motion on a certain day saying that this is the form. If I can understand the form, I presume that most other members of the Assembly can.

MS BARRETT: It should read then, "approved by the Members' Services Committee and provided by the Clerk."

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right; the form. I figure that if I can understand the form, everybody else can.

MR. TAYLOR: I know that as a member of the cloth you could be excused for thinking the millennium has arrived, but I want to support the Member for Barrhead too. We are now one flock and one shepherd.

I think his point about worrying about the bureaucracy having control of the form is a very valid one, and I want to say that he's on the right track. A few more moves like that

and he might get an honorary invitation system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want him to speak at your fund-raisers?

MS BARRETT: I'm going to ask if I can make a friendly amendment to the amendment under consideration just so that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a sub-subamendment.

MS BARRETT: That's right; so that people don't have to ponder what, in fact, we all intended. So instead of ", subject to the approval of the Members' Services Committee," the amendment would now read:

. . ."with claims made in accordance with a form approved by the Members' Services Committee and provided by the Clerk of the Assembly."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very friendly amendment. Things seem amicable at that end of the table. Unanimous agreement of the committee to the friendly amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MS BARRETT: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question on the amendment. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

Now on the main motion as amended, we have taken off the (a), so (b) is (a) and (c) is (b). One question from the Chair is the matter of coming into force. From an administrative point of view, a little lead time would be helpful. Whether or not you want to make it the end of this fiscal year, I don't know. But given the fact that many members are still away on holidays and all that, and trying to get it into gear so they know what they could claim for and all the rest of it, if there was pause for a moment, it would give us lead time so it doesn't take effect this afternoon if it passes.

MR. BOGLE: The normal procedure is for members to submit their claims at the end of each quarter. One of the reasons that that was changed is that some members prefer to claim a full year's allocation at the end of the fiscal year. We're now at — what? — February 2. We have almost two full months before we reach

the end of this fiscal year. I believe, although we're not at that point yet in our agenda, that it would be wise for us to set at least a tentative date for a meeting prior to the House beginning its sittings. If that's not possible, there's nothing stopping us from meeting once the House is in session and approving the order as amended by my colleagues. The intent, though, was that the order would come into effect now rather than at the end of the fiscal year.

MR. HYLAND: Come into effect now?

MR. BOGLE: On date of passage. If it passes, then it will come into effect today, but obviously there aren't the forms to be filled out. We'd be following the same practice, Mr. Chairman, that we did when we originally moved to increase the mileage allocation, and that came into force partway through a fiscal year.

MS BARRETT: I still have a question. This is not about when it comes into effect. Is that all right? Okay. Currently what do we call receipts, and are we required at this point to provide receipts? I've never had to write out my odometer reading. I wonder if I could get clarification of what this means, please.

MR. BOGLE: The intent of the motion was that members who use their gasoline credit cards, and I don't know of any member who does not . . .

MS BARRETT: I do.

MR. BOGLE: You do not use your . . .

MS BARRETT: No, I know of one who doesn't. Marie Laing doesn't; really weird.

MR. BOGLE: You said that; I didn't.

The member would be able to check with very little difficulty with the Clerk's office as to the submissions for gasoline receipts. The intent of the motion was certainly not to lay on members yet another workload in terms of compiling receipts. The material all should be in place.

MS BARRETT: So 10,000 kilometres would be automatic; 15,000 per urban member would be assumed correct on the basis of your gas

receipts? Fair enough.

MR. HYLAND: Just a minute. I don't know if we should say automatic. You have the choice to apply for it; you wouldn't get it automatically unless you applied for it.

MS BARRETT: Understood. But currently there is no delineation between receipted and unreceipted? This is a new thought, and really it's not a bureaucratic division; it's just so that you can support your claim if needed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a call for the question. We've had the amendment. We now have the motion as amended. All those in favour of the motion as amended, please signify. Carried unanimously.

On the last motion, just a friendly word to the caucuses as represented. I hope that you will have in place some sort of counseling service available to your members about their receipts and all that kind of thing so that there's some process for them to get some help, counseling about how they fill out the forms to make sure they are indeed accurate before they get shoved on or dumped onto the desk of the Legislative Assembly Office. It would be very helpful in terms of our staffing as well, because it's too easy for things just to sort of get inadvertently omitted or whatever.

MR. BOGLE: I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that as the amended motion as approved calls for the form to be brought back to this committee before it's finalized and distributed, a draft letter might also come back to the committee that would officially notify members of the change we've made so that the various caucus staffs could follow up. But the official notification would come from your office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The adjustments that are made for the current fiscal year, with the new formula in place, are only in place for two-twelfths of the year.

MR. BOGLE: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we need to remind members that they're not able to go up to these maximums for this last reporting year.

MR. BOGLE: We could deal with that in the memo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you as mover of the motion could help the staff in terms of that memo production, because we also don't need to have members who are going about their claims for the whole year working on the theory that they can now backdate it. It isn't backdated. That's why I want to lay additional onus of responsibility on the caucuses. Then it isn't just simply up to the Legislative Assembly staff accounting section to have to dot all the i's.

All righty. That was item 7. Item 8, Other Business for today.

MRS. MIROSH: I have a motion being circulated, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dianne, I gather a motion is being distributed.

MRS. MIROSH: A motion is being distributed.

Be it resolved that the unexpended funds for the current fiscal year in the bulk pin request program be transferred to the office of the Speaker, materials and supplies control group.

Therefore, no member would be able to get an additional number of pins other than what is presently in their constituency budget.

MR. CAMPBELL: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A call for the question. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

MRS. MIROSH: I have another motion, Mr. Chairman:

Be it resolved that the chairman request the Legislative Assembly to amend the Legislative Assembly Act to provide for a severance allowance to members in the event of resignation, loss in an election, or a decision not to contest an election, such severance allowance to be one month's indemnity allowance and expense allowance for every year of service as a member with a minimum of six months

and a maximum of 12 months.

This amendment would be proclaimed at a date set by order of the select Standing Committee on Members' Services.

This actually is in accordance with several other provinces throughout Canada and the House of Commons.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd like to speak on this a minute. Actually, I'm probably going to move to table it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can't give us notice. Please continue. I couldn't quite hear that, I don't think.

MR. TAYLOR: All right. I am just a little afraid of it. I like the idea that someone who has been serving the public for years has a sort of re-establishment credit or something to go back into society or to go into retirement, whatever the case may be. I just don't like the wording "loss in an election." I think the Tories may be more concerned than we would be, because we won't have that many with a long record. But I can imagine: vote Joe; otherwise, it will cost you a year's salary to throw him out. I think some work could be done on this. I move that it be tabled until tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion to table until tomorrow is before us. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose a motion. I don't know if Louise has passed it out or not; she's been getting lots of exercise in the last few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion's topic?

MR. HYLAND: The motion regarding pension.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll wait for everyone to get a copy.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, regarding my last motion, I won't be here tomorrow, so can it go in someone else's name?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, with the consent of the House. Who would you like to carry it?

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Bogle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to the previous motion as tabled, the mover has indicated that she is unable to be with us tomorrow. Is it agreed by the House that someone else can indeed sponsor the motion tomorrow when we bring it off the table?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let the record show. Thank you.

We now have a copy of this motion with regard to pension before us.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move:

Be it resolved that the chairman request that the Legislative Assembly amend the Members of the Legislative Assembly Pension Plan Act to provide that an ex-member will be entitled to receive a pension under section 17(2) if

(c) the sum of his pensionable service and his age equals or exceeds 55, becomes entitled to receive a pension in an annual amount equal to 4 percent of his pensionable salary for that office multiplied by the number of years of his pensionable service in or in respect of that office.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for that is that this would put our MLA pension plan in with -- I'm not sure exactly -- about half of the other provinces and more closely with the federal MPs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the change as compared to the present legislation is?

MR. HYLAND: Equal to 55. That's it. The rest is the same. For the service and age equaling 55. Now you get deducted back three-quarters of a percent or something per year for the years you're under or something like that.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a case of draftsmanship. With seven daughters being on my hands for so many years, "his" pensionable service, "his" age, and "his" this and that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's understandable, but that makes it conform to the Act.

MR. BOGLE: That's covered, Mr. Chairman, in the Interpretation Act.

MS BARRETT: I was just going to say -- because having designed a private Bill one time to change the Interpretation Act, I know all about this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it would cover your seven daughters when they all want to represent Westlock-Sturgeon at the same time.

MR. TAYLOR: No, they're taking over the federal House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see.

MR. TAYLOR: But you mean "his" is in the Act now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but there was another Act changed to reflect.

Further discussion on the motion? Is there a call for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Question.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, again, on draftsmanship. How do we slide from "if" to "becomes entitled"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; what line are you . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I'm still having trouble with grammar here.

MS BARRETT: So am I.

MR. TAYLOR: If the sum of his pensionable service and his age equals or exceeds 55, he "then becomes entitled" or "becomes entitled" to receive a pension in annual amount?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, that's the reading of the Act. The Act reads that way:

(b) has accumulated at least 5 years' pensionable service in or in respect of that office,

becomes entitled to . . .

Before this, it reads:

An officer who

(a) ceases to be a member,

(b) has accumulated . . .

Then this would become:

(c) the sum of his service . . . becomes . . .

So there is a previous phrase which reads in the override, "An officer who."

MR. TAYLOR: I see. Thank you.

MS BARRETT: I have a question about what this means. If we use an example in which the sum of pensionable service and the age of the member upon retirement is less than 55, what's the implication of this?

MR. HYLAND: You would go back to the way it is now, only you wouldn't go back as much, because you put the two together. You wouldn't go back to the same extent.

MS BARRETT: I don't know our pension plan very well, I guess. What does the 4 percent refer to then?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's the contribution you make each year.

MS BARRETT: Oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was a significant "oh" down at the end of the table.

MS BARRETT: It's not a problem. I'm just obviously not well enough informed about how the plan actually works once it's implemented.

MR. BOGLE: I was going to suggest that from my understanding, for each year of service for pensionable purposes there is a 4 percent calculation on the pension. If a member served for 10 years, that's 40 percent, so 40 percent of your salary plus tax allowance. Under our present law, if you are not age 55, there is a deduction based on the actuarial, and that deduction reduces the pension benefit for each year you are younger. What this motion does is follow a process that's followed in the majority of provincial jurisdictions by recognizing the years of service plus your age equaling 55.

MS BARRETT: All right. I've got it now. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. A call for the question?

MS BARRETT: Question.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion. Louise will circulate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Procedurally it's been helpful to get the following comment: we need to have for the record, if the committee is willing, the unanimous agreement that tomorrow when we return to discussing the Legislature Library estimates -- and we did have a motion that was tabled for the second time, as proposed by the Member for Calgary Glenmore -- someone else may sponsor that motion when it's brought to the table again tomorrow.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Let's return to the Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. CAMPBELL: The motion reads:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly Office provide word processing/computer paper, ribbons, and other necessary services and supplies for the word processing/computer equipment which has been assigned to caucus offices and that is owned by the Legislative Assembly Office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Commencing when?

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess commencing on passage of this motion.

MS BARRETT: Let's do it for the next fiscal year, because it's going to change the estimates a bit.

MR. CAMPBELL: The next fiscal year?

MS BARRETT: For '87-88.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For '87-88. Do we have universal agreement to that effective date, April 1, 1987, comprising part of the motion?

MR. CAMPBELL: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The "necessary services": we're being absolutely crystal clear here; you're not asking the Assembly to be buying all the equipment. We can understand that "necessary services" -- does that mean what? Service agreements? Maintenance?

MR. CAMPBELL:

Other necessary services and supplies for the word processing/computer equipment which has been assigned to caucus offices and that is owned by the Legislative Assembly Office.

MS BARRETT: So that would mean service contracts then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we'll have to remember that we're going to have to readjust that figure for our budget.

MR. McDOUGALL: Mr. Chairman, by "provide," does that mean pay for or just have in stock so that when it's ordered -- I'm not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I look around this room, I suspect it would mean paid.

MS BARRETT: If it's a discussion at this table, it must mean money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Provide indeed.

MR. CAMPBELL: In God we trust, and everybody else pays cash.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm quite sure that my director of administration is wondering where the cash would be from. A computation will indeed have to be made somehow, hopefully by tomorrow, to reflect the revision to the estimates.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question for the addition of an effective date of April 1, 1987. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

MR. BOGLE: Before we leave Other Business, I wonder if we may have a very brief coffee break, because I believe the Member for

Westlock-Sturgeon is working on a possible amendment. If we could deal with the motion before the Member for Calgary Glenmore leaves, that would be appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's always good to have a chance to stretch.

[The committee recessed from 2:41 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I gather we have a motion, which we have already said is tabled till tomorrow. This is with regard to the pension? Okay. First off, do we have agreement to now return to that order of business?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

The original mover of the motion was Calgary Glenmore. Is that going to carry on or are we now going to have . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Should we do that or amend it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to amend it.

MR. TAYLOR: Amending it, I would take out the words "severance allowance," and substitute "re-establishment grant."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've got a different page.

MRS. EMPSON: No, it's the other one. It's the severance one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right Here it is. We now have the correct motion here. So lines 2 and 3, which say "a severance allowance," are now going to read "a re-establishment grant." Nice wording.

MR. TAYLOR: Then we continue on with that sentence. After "in the event of", delete "resignation, loss in an election" and the rest of the line, all the next line, and in the line after that, "allowance to be." That's all to be deleted and the words "equivalent to" substituted. We proceed down to the next line, where after the word "allowance" we take out the words "for every" and insert these words: "at the date of retirement times the number of full years or

fraction thereof of service."

MS BARRETT: I thought you were going to make this simpler.

MR. TAYLOR: Pardon?

MS BARRETT: Nothing. It's a wisecrack.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "With a minimum of 6 months and a maximum of 12 months" stays?

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry. Louise just informed me that I forgot another portion. After the words "grant to members in the event of," where I've then deleted everything, substitute "their termination of office."

MR. CHAIRMAN: This excludes death.

MR. TAYLOR: So the motion should read:

Be it resolved that the chairman request the Legislative Assembly amend the Legislative Assembly Act to provide for a re-establishment grant to members in the event of their termination of office, equivalent to one month's indemnity allowance and expense allowance at the date of retirement times the number of full years or fraction thereof of service as a member with a minimum of six months and a maximum of 12 months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. PENGELLY: A question, Mr. Chairman. I have some difficulty with the words "re-establishment grant." I think it is a severance allowance, and that's what you should call it. What are you dressing it up for, Nick?

MR. TAYLOR: I thought the re-establishment grant -- if I may answer, Mr. Chairman -- was just that. If you've been serving this time, I don't like the idea -- severance allowance only means that somehow or other you've been cut off and here's some money in lieu of being cut off. We've already got a pension and a number of other things. This, I think, is just an amount of money to help you get back into civvy life. I thought it was a better word than "severance allowance," which is nearly always tied today with letting people go.

MR. PENGELLY: But what I'm getting at is that it isn't a phrase that's commonly used in business.

MR. TAYLOR: No. But when you switch, when you modernize, as they call it, and technology puts somebody out, you re-establish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a big concern with the word "termination," but just so that we make sure that those that are drafting it understand it the same way we do, and that for example -- what was his name in Nova Scotia?

MS BARRETT: Billy Joe.

MR. HYLAND: Would you get severance pay or re-establishment pay in that case?

MR. PENGELLY: Yes, but he waits till he gets out of jail before he can get it.

MR. TAYLOR: You hit the hole in it.

MR. HYLAND: We understand what severance pay means, as long as it's drafted that way; that's all I'm saying. That's probably just a comment for the chairman in his letter of transmittal.

MR. TAYLOR: You're referring to -- if the person has retired for moral turpitude or something like that, thrown out of the House, he would still qualify for it. I thought of that, but then we're opening a new field. It was one reason I used "re-establishment" rather than "severance" too. If you want to open it up, you could add another sentence and say, "This shall not apply in a case where someone loses his seat by judicial process."

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I don't have trouble with it, because we know what we mean. As long as the drafters do it that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the drift at the moment, I would suggest that perhaps it might be wise to do a tabling until tomorrow and that the Parliamentary Counsel's advice might be sought in the framing of the appropriate motion. If that indeed becomes the case, I

would hope that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon and either the Member for Cypress-Redcliff or the Member for Taber-Warner, whoever wants to volunteer, meet with Parliamentary Counsel overnight. It would be useful.

MS BARRETT: I move to table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Until tomorrow?

MS BARRETT: Until tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. A motion for the amendment. All those in favour? Thank you. Volunteers, together with the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, about the correct wording? Taber-Warner and Westlock-Sturgeon. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: I was just going to ask if we could ask the lady in the Liberal jacket to type it up all pretty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure that having a generous nature, she would do that for you, no matter what the colours.

All right. Any other motions to come before the committee today?

MRS. MIROSH: Should I withdraw that motion then too? We're working on an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's all right. Thank you. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: I move we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Until what time tomorrow? Until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. TAYLOR: I had an item I wanted, not necessarily to discuss -- but you were kind enough to send us a brief around on the Fleming report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I am caught. We have a motion to adjourn. Perhaps it might be withdrawn or something like that for a moment or two.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I can withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Unanimous

consent to withdraw? Thank you. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: I thank the Member for Cypress-Redcliff. Gentlemen always come from that constituency.

We did receive a report a while ago from your office, which was good, outlining the Fleming commission's proposals. I was wondering if we could set some time on our agenda fairly soon to discuss them. I don't think it's necessary this afternoon. But there were some proposals in there. I note, Mr. Chairman, that people have quoted the Fleming recommendations from time to time, and I notice there are some recommendations that we are definitely not following. Maybe you don't want to follow them, but I think we should decide what parts of the Fleming report we're accepting and what parts we're rejecting if we're going to use it as a justification for some of the things that we're doing, and we seem to be doing that. So what part of the Fleming report is law and what part of it is — is it apocrypha?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apocryphal.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd like to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed. I'm only too willing to have the report brought to the table for discussion at a future meeting.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, having read it probably almost a year ago now — we may not get to it tomorrow; there may not be time for everybody to review it by tomorrow. Perhaps that's one thing we could put on the agenda for whatever Members' Services meeting follows that, so we all have time to sit down and look at it again. Indeed, some members may not have looked at it already.

MR. TAYLOR: There was a good review put out. Was it you that did it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We [inaudible]. That fits in with my plans for future meetings of the committee and the sharing of our mutual responsibilities with regard to the whole Legislative Assembly Office, so I would see that indeed as not being for tomorrow but for another meeting. Thank you for bringing that

up, Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. HYLAND: Can I make my motion again now?

MRS. MIROSH: Are we going to set a date for the next meeting? I mean not tomorrow's but the next month, so I can not plan other things. The first Monday in March?

MS BARRETT: That's Monday, March 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The morning of March 2 would be available, if that's useful. It would give us time to make sure we had all our tidy-up done.

MR. TAYLOR: March 2 I booked off, I'm afraid, for the same reason you mentioned. It looked like it would be a good time to tidy up. I'm blitzing your constituency, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. MIROSH: You're blitzing his constituency?

MR. TAYLOR: And yours.

MRS. MIROSH: Stay out of mine, Nick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's all right, hon. member, as long as at the next election you don't feel too hurt if I still blitz your candidate.

MRS. MIROSH: Me too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: An alternative proposal for a date then.

MS BARRETT: March 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday the 3rd?

MR. CAMPBELL: Tuesday the 3rd or Monday the 2nd?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday the 3rd, 9 a.m. No, I see a groan.

MS BARRETT: No, no. Are you reflecting my facial expression here? I just don't have my calendar with me.

MR. BOGLE: Can we finalize it tomorrow?

MS BARRETT: Yes, let's go with Tuesday the 3rd. I'll just change things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday the 3rd or Thursday, February 26? No? All right, Tuesday the 3rd. We will finalize it tomorrow at 10 a.m.

Now the Chair recognizes the Member for Cypress-Redcliff on a motion to adjourn.

MR. HYLAND: Till 10 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, take up thy books and walk.

[The committee adjourned at 2:59 p.m.]