

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[8 a.m.]

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, it's 8 o'clock in the morning. You have the agenda as circulated, and we have a quorum. The first item of business is to deal with the approval of the minutes of March 3. Is there a motion to approve the minutes as circulated? Thank you, Mr. Pengelly. Questions.

MR. BOGLE: I think there's one amendment necessary, Mr. Chairman, under 87.291 on the fifth line down. Where we were speaking of "Legislative Assembly," we should have the insertion "pension plan" deleted. It should be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 87.291.

MR. BOGLE: It's the Legislative Assembly Act. There is no Legislative Assembly pension plan Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the deletion is to take out the words "pension plan." Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The question then is the approval of the minutes of March 3 as circulated, with that one small correction.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

There is a prior section 3(a) which relates to Members' Services Committee orders which have been previously approved and need to be approved in final form. So it'd be Members' Services Order 3, Transportation and Administration Services Amendment Order No. 5, and these three, one trusts, are for pro forma approval.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, is there a spare agenda around?

MR. STEVENS: Would you like these recommended one at a time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would think so please.

MR. STEVENS: I would move Order MSC 3/87 before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there a call for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

What's your wish with regard to Members' Services Committee Order 4, Constituency Services Amendment Order No. 8?

MR. KOWALSKI: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been moved for final approval. Questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of Members' Services Committee Order 4/87?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

And Members' Services Committee Order 5/87, Members' Group Life Insurance Amendment Order No. 2.

MR. KOWALSKI: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kowalski. A call for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no coffee. Carried.

Now, if we might return to the circulated agenda, 3(a), there was business arising from the minutes. I understand the agenda was developed by some consultative process. What is your wish with regard to item 3(a), the motion of March 3, '87?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we table this motion, seeing as the member who brought it forward isn't here at the time [inaudible] the regular meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to table to the next meeting.

MR. HYLAND: Next regular meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Regular meeting. No discussion on the motion to table. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried without dissent.

Three (b): Mr. Scarlett has some information to distribute to the members. Mr. Scarlett, would you like to speak to what we've just handed out please.

MR. SCARLETT: This Directional Plan report includes all the Existing Realities in the department and the Willed Futures. The initiatives that the department will take in the in between have been excluded because they're administrative more than anything. So this just shows the present and what the department is heading towards, and the process in between has been omitted from the report here that I've distributed to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in the document as you scan it, the covering letter lets you know who the members of the steering team were, who worked together with a consultative firm to do the analysis and development. Then we have the Overview as seen in Existing Realities and then going on to the Willed Future, and then within your own binders of the day the appropriate sections were pulled out which deal with the interrelationship and overlap with Members' Services Committee.

Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. This is part of the report then; I didn't quite follow why it's not all of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reason it's not all of it is because other sections of the report are strictly of the administrative nature dealing in terms of the office of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. WRIGHT: And not relating to services to members?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it's much more the organizational, the directional within house. The section in your binder, 3(b), shows a series -- if you don't have them there, the numbers are 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Those relate to members and their staffs; and then 51 and 52, members' allowance policies; and 66, communication from Members' Services Committee; and then on the other page, 72, 73, 74, administrative procedures relating to service to members; and 75 and 76 are also in that same section. The last one which directly relates to Members' Services Committee and in particular to a committee which you've been involved with, impact and utilization of technology, and that's 82.

MR. WRIGHT: These page numbers you refer to, are they in the report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those are initiative numbers, and they were in your binder as delivered.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, are we ready to go, then, to the initiatives as outlined in our book?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the committee's ready for that.

MR. BOGLE: I would like to move to initiative 19. I think that would be a very retrogressive step if we were to make orientation mandatory for members. Clearly, the intent should be to find ways to make information available, have orientation sessions. But to in some way insist that there be a mandatory process that members must follow in my view would be a grave mistake. And I think it does open the opportunity for greater consultation with the chiefs of staff of the various caucuses. I think that as we go through the various initiatives, we'll find that there are many, many places where we could add the consultation between the Legislative Assembly officers and the chiefs of the staff for the various caucuses, and we can find ways to overcome some of the breakdowns in communication that have occurred in the past, and we can find ways to ensure that, in particular, new members to the Assembly do receive the necessary material and information that's so pertinent in terms of carrying out the responsibilities of elected office.

But I'd welcome other discussion on point 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, certainly the chiefs of staff development has taken place within the last nine months or so, and so that is a component that has seemed to be quite a positive step and would help in interrelationship with the Legislative Assembly Office.

Banff-Cochrane, followed by Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Can I just ask where we are with point 19, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 3(b). Three (b) gives you a blue page,

and it starts out with Initiatives, number 18.

MR. WRIGHT: And it says, "Negotiate to make orientation of members mandatory."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That was the last.

MR. TAYLOR: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I took that tip of Fitness Week and went all the way up to the bloody Carillon Room, and I don't think I'm going to be able to work.

MR. STEVENS: I wondered why you were breathing fast when you sat beside me.

MR. TAYLOR: Did you pass my resolution already?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask if you would perhaps remind us what it was that you were courteously bringing to our attention. I believe at our last meeting in March you had reviewed the background of the Fleming report, and it was agreed that when you received this report there would be a further discussion.

You are, as Speaker, Mr. Chairman, the department head of this Legislative Assembly Office, and I believe you are sharing with us this material out of courtesy to the committee. Are there specific areas of discussion you would like to have with us with respect to members' services or members' benefits which would assist you in the evaluation of the material that you have to date? Is there anything that you would like us to specifically direct our attention to to provide you with any observations that we might do as individual members or on behalf of our caucuses or as members of the Assembly generally?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Well, as you properly point out, the Speaker, aside from the House duties, has the challenge of heading up the department which is almost neither fish nor fowl, because too many people want to compare it to being another department of government, which it certainly isn't, because they don't have the other interesting interplay and dynamic of the various caucuses.

The thing that happened, of course, at our last meeting when some of the discussion occurred in the exchange was that then, not only as Chairman of the meeting but also as head of the Legislative Assembly Office, I was to draw members' attention -- and it's recorded in the minutes -- to what the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act provide with regard to the duties of the Members' Services Committee as well as the duties of the Legislative Assembly Office and the Speaker. And then also at that time I directed us as a committee to go back and have a look at Standing Orders to see the various parts of Standing Orders that relate to the operation of the Assembly. And again, that really runs from Standing Order 102 up to 115.

And it's in that regard under the Legislative Assembly Act where we have subsection 19(2), which lays out what Members' Services Committee may order variances of the Financial Administration Act or regulations and how that relates. Then we have, back in terms of the Standing Orders of the House, the various duties there. And as one goes through that material, which I did again, there is only one section there which really is directed from where the Members' Services Committee relates, and that's into the operation of *Hansard*, and basically that boils down to the establishing of rates at which *Hansard* will be charged.

So in all of this the Fleming report, which had been commissioned before I became Speaker, as I mentioned a time or two before in our meetings -- I felt it didn't go deeply enough into all parts of the department, and so it was that the other group of consultants were commissioned, working together with our own staff people to develop what we have here as this Directional Plan. And so the various -- and I realize this material has just been circulated to you about the Existing Realities, the Overview, and the Willed Future for the department, but in all of that we have extrapolated the material which does overlap with Members' Services Committee. These indeed are the sheets which we have here in 3(b), and those are the areas where hopefully we can as a department pick up the useful input from your various caucuses and from your staff people.

The other thing I would mention in closing is the fact that much of the material as developed was short-term stuff that could be brought into play in the department and be cured in a hurry, also a number of short-term items, and that the bulk of the material relating directly to the department could be and probably will be in place within about the next six months. And there are one or two long-range things which have to be negotiated in terms of various services which are now under the government.

Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the time to bring this up or if it should be under item 4(a), Other Business. My interest in this is primarily with respect to staffing requirements for the Assembly. As in one way referred to in the observations about systems, the work overload case, I suppose the implication of that is that more personnel would be needed, and I wonder about the budget implications of that, whether or not that affects the 1986-87 estimates as dealt with by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it '86-87 or '87-88?

MS BARRETT: Oh, sorry; '87-88, wrong year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would think that that occurs under 4(b), but I don't want to put that off. But if I don't see any other questions coming, then perhaps we could come to that.

MR. WRIGHT: On the existing 3(b), Mr. Chairman. This is a report that you commissioned, the Ernst & Whinney one, is it? Or part of it. Hard to refer to because the page numbers seem to have been obliterated. But how much did it cost, by the way?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You pay the bills.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: I think it was about 60.

MR. SCARLETT: That figure was between \$50,000 and \$60,000.

MR. WRIGHT: And it deals with the organization as a whole, I take it, including suggestions about staffing?

MR. SCARLETT: The focus wasn't so much on staffing as the function of the staff. The recommendations here may have one or two staff positions, but most of it is just restructuring the staff so that they are functioning more effectively. It's not increasing the number of staff to do the same job but restructuring that staff

to do the work.

MR. WRIGHT: And is that part in here?

MR. SCARLETT: Yeah. You can tell that from the Willed Futures. The Existing Reality to Willed Future will show how the reorganization takes place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the major concerns as we worked through the department since last June was to give added encouragement to the whole department in their understanding that they're here to serve the members first and to serve them efficiently and pleasantly and then to be serving the general public. But their primary function was their relationship with the members.

MR. WRIGHT: Yet when it comes to engaging new staff or dismissing old staff or rearranging them, your view of the matter is that Members' Services doesn't have any input into that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct. By the same token, just along but on a paralleled position, neither do I, as head of this department and having to eventually sign the cheques or whatever, neither do I come into the administration of any of the four caucuses.

MS BARRETT: An observation on that point if you will, Mr. Chairman, and that is that an individual caucus doesn't serve the entire Assembly. It serves the MLAs within that caucus; that is, the staff therein do.

MR. BOGLE: Well, if the discussion that we're having on the Directional Plan is going to veer off down the road we appear to be on now, then I want to state for the record my strongly held views. And they are based on the principle that the Speaker and the Speaker's staff do not become involved in the budgets of the individual caucuses. And that principle was respected very well by the Speaker when we were developing the budgets for the caucuses, because our budgets are based on a formula that looks at the number of members and a set amount; I believe it is now \$32,000 per member plus an additional amount recognizing the leaders of the three opposition caucuses. The Speaker does not become involved in how those dollars are used by various caucuses. We went one step further by passing the extraordinary motion put forward by the leader of the Liberal Party that allows a member to transfer up to 25 percent of his or her member's services allowance -- which is in essence the constituency allowance -- to the caucus allowance. I'm not aware of any other jurisdiction that has given that latitude to members; there may be some, but I'm personally not aware of any. Concurrently, there is the actual administration of the Legislative Assembly offices; it falls under the purview of the Speaker.

The role of this committee, as I see it, is in the approval of the budget. And we certainly have every right and indeed a responsibility to bring forward questions, in particular as they relate to services provided to all members. But the principle must be maintained that if the Speaker is going to respect the integrity and the confidentiality of the various caucuses in terms of how they deal with their own specific budgets, then the caucuses must respect the Speaker's role in terms of his administrative responsibilities. Unless we're prepared to change direction and if this committee wants to consider a change whereby a committee becomes far more actively involved in

what the Speaker is doing with his respective staff, then I believe that it follows through that the Speaker and his staff have to become more actively involved in the administrative matters of each of our caucuses, and that, in my view, would be regrettable, but it does follow through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It boggles my imagination.

MS BARRETT: Well, in response to the statement just made by the Member for Taber-Warner, as all members here are aware, I was the one who requested this meeting, and the purpose of the request was to review the budget implications of any change of staff to the Legislative Assembly under the authority of the Speaker. As far as I can see, the rules are silent or, more explicit, on the Speaker's authority within the Assembly overall, and I'm not questioning that. What I am questioning is, first of all, making any parallel comparison between the operations of staff which are assigned for the purposes of all members, including table officers, which is different from staff who are assigned to caucuses approved by the Speaker. That was not a subject I intended to bring up. That's a subject that was brought up by somebody else.

My concern is the financial implication. If the budget estimates approved by the majority of this committee some months ago are changed by any of the decisions hitherto with regard to staffing of the Assembly, I think a case can be made for reviewing the caucus budgets themselves, and I would remind the member that there was dissent, in fact a minority view strongly expressed with respect to the designation of caucus budgets on a formula basis. That was a position that we never endorsed, inasmuch as we always believed that demonstrated need is the most important factor in determining a budget. If demonstrated need in fact is the basis upon which changes to the Legislative Assembly budget for the current fiscal year have been made, then demonstrated need I think can once again be revived as a legitimate and objective factor in determining budgets. That's the whole purpose of my having asked for this meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edmonton Strathcona, Rocky Mountain House.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Do I translate what the Member for Taber-Warner has said as follows, and do you agree with it then that you, as Speaker, have the right to engage staff and dismiss staff, and however much they provide in the way of services to members, it's not our business to question that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I have a forest here. I have Rocky Mountain House on this point, Banff-Cochrane, Taber-Warner.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, in the two Acts at least, whether one reviews the Legislative Assembly Act or the Public Service Act, the department head, in this case meaning the Speaker with respect to the Legislative Assembly Office, is empowered to make appointments, to dismiss or suspend, and so on. There are some exceptions provided under the Legislative Assembly Act which would require an Assembly resolution, not the power of this committee.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I'm perfectly aware of the legalities of it. I'm talking about how we organize ourselves. I mean when the head of a department, any department, takes steps to engage staff or dismiss staff, doubtless under the Public

Service Act he and he alone has the right to do these things, but most of them have some sort of system of consultation, and I would have thought it would be reasonable to have the same sort of thing here in this segment of the Legislative Assembly service.

MR. STEVENS: Consultation?

MR. WRIGHT: That sort of thing. Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner on this point.

MR. BOGLE: On the point. I heard nothing stated by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway that I would disagree with.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's why you didn't hear from Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. BOGLE: That's why I didn't hear from Kingsway. In that I was addressing a broader issue, and I thought we were beginning to go down a different road. Unless I misunderstood the member for Edmonton Highlands, she was coming back to the question of the budget as approved by this committee and subsequently approved by the Legislative Assembly and any alterations to that budget. That's a very different matter, and I agree with the member completely that any requests by the Speaker for additional funds or if, in terms of implementing the Directional Plan, additional staff were sought by the Speaker, then it would be incumbent upon the Speaker to come back to this committee and discuss them. The Speaker would not just automatically go ahead and move in his own direction to do things there are not dollars within the framework of the budget to do. So I don't see any inconsistency at all in what has been said, if that helps clarify the matter for the Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

We do have a very special responsibility, Mr. Chairman. Traditionally, the estimates for the Legislative Assembly are not debated in the Assembly. It is incumbent upon members of the Members' Services Committee to review the budget in detail, and the record clearly shows that we've done that over the past number of months. That's the responsibility of the committee. In order to satisfy the members of our various caucuses that that process which sees the Leg. Assembly estimates go through without debate in the House, in order to see that system maintained, in my view it's incumbent upon us as members of this committee to take the place of the Legislative Assembly, if you will, and we do that.

Just in conclusion, if the Speaker wanted, as a result of the Directional Plan or any other proposal, to provide a service that has not been budgeted for or is not within the umbrella of the budget, then the Speaker would be back to this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Having reviewed the Legislative Assembly Act and Standing Orders, it comes down to the direction that has taken place for a number of years as well, which has been that it is indeed up to whoever occupies the office of Speaker to be responsible for the appointments of the Clerk, the Clerk Assistant, the Parliamentary Counsel: the staffing of the whole department. As I have mentioned to the committee previously with regard to the hiring process for the Clerk, out of courtesy, I guess is the proper phrase, it's my intention to bring the last two candidates before the committee for the committee to meet with each one for half an hour and then for committee members indi-

vidually to give advice to the Speaker about the appointment. But I am not empowered to have the committee get into the business of appointing any of those positions.

Edmonton Highlands on this point.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I have a notation about it downstairs. Is it correct that it was by appointment of the Leg. Assembly itself that the Clerk Assistant, I think, was appointed to his job in the 1970s? Have I got that right or no?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I couldn't tell you. Sorry. I see a no and a ... I'll have to do some research, obviously. Cypress-Redcliff on this point, and then we're coming back to Rocky Mountain House.

MR. CAMPBELL: All the points have been made, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HYLAND: On this point. Ms Barrett said the '70s, not the last one. Okay. I was thinking the last Clerk Assistant that was appointed. I wasn't thinking the '70s. Sorry.

The last Clerk Assistant was appointed by the Speaker. I guess Mr. Kowalski is the only other one that was on the committee then, and I don't believe we even saw any sort of a list on that appointment. We just found out about it afterwards.

MR. CAMPBELL: Just one point ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: ... after all the others were made, Mr. Chairman. Where are we in this agenda? Is this 3(b), or are we at 4(a)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're at 4(a).

MS BARRETT: Have we finished 3(b)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we haven't finished 3(b), but we're down to 4(a) because of the ramifications, so we're going around in all directions. But Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I'd like to put the question: are there budgetary implications for effecting this directional planning proposal over the next 10 and a half or 11 months in terms of the budget of the Assembly overall, whether it's within the administration division or any other division? Are there any changes, and particularly with respect to the, well, letting go of some former staff? I understand the current replacement staff, how that's worked out -- I think I do anyway -- and the hiring of Parliamentary co-Counsel. In your best estimate is that going to change the budget for the current fiscal year of the Leg. Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: First off, with respect to the three individuals who are no longer with us, all of the mutually agreed upon settlements were paid out of the fiscal year '86-87, and I trust all of the expenses of the Ernst & Whinney report also were covered out of last year's fiscal. So there are certain funds in any year which can indeed be moved legitimately from one area to another within the department in order to cover off various contingencies that develop. So, just to underline that, the costs of

this report and the settlements were all covered under last year's fiscal regime. And part of that, of course, is the fact that some of that rearrangement of the department took place in mid-January; therefore, there were additional funds available from unfilled positions from mid-January to the end of that fiscal year.

In the budget preparation for last year, our administrative workup on the material after the thing had been produced discovered that there were three or four minor positions which had not been covered off and put into the budget appropriately. These were accounts personnel, so we then had to do some rearrangement of other money in the department, because some of the people who predeceased -- didn't predecease ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Preceded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preceded. Thank you. I didn't leave here till 12:30 this morning -- had not taken everything into account when building the budget. So within the department in this current fiscal year we're having to move some of the funds; for example, the one -- and perhaps Rod or Kathleen can speak to that -- where there was money built in for a personnel officer. That position hasn't been filled as of this date, and the funds available for that which were approved had to be used to help guarantee some positions of some frontline workers who were otherwise going to have to go, which would then have badly deteriorated the service, in particular to individual members and to caucuses.

We still have not appointed a Clerk Assistant nor a Clerk, and I don't think those appointments are going to be in place until at least July 1 -- perhaps August 1. So there's still money within the envelope that can be moved under the appropriate direction and approval from Treasury to offset those kinds of hiring positions. In that respect, Mr. Ritter as counsel is on a contract basis for one year, and a fair amount of his work, obviously, is support to a particular committee which generally doesn't operate and which certainly seems to be operating at the moment.

I don't know if some of the costs associated with that might be borne in terms of the eventual special warrant which will have to be requested by this department to cover off not only the work of that committee but also the search committee for a new Ombudsman. None of that was built in. What the construct of an eventual special warrant will be, I don't know. But it will at least have those components, and some of the cost of the co-counsel may well be factored into the cost of that committee. But we have to wait and see on that. Again we still have some money available until such time as a new Clerk and Clerk Assistant have been appointed, but it's been the tradition within this department to be able to have some flexibility to move the funds around and do the hiring.

MS BARRETT: Two questions follow, then. One is: any of the moving around of money was not done between fiscal years? In other words, after the expiry of the '86-87 fiscal year one didn't call upon excess funds from that year in order to make payments applying to that year? Okay. The answer has been no.

The second thing then is: is it not possible for us to revise the estimates rather than going for a special warrant after this sitting or perhaps after a possible fall sitting? Is it not possible to revise them now and come with a special supplementary requisition Act in the Assembly, sponsored by this committee, as opposed to going for special warrant? My reason for asking that

is probably quite clear. That is, the caucus budgets were singled out for unduly harsh treatment in light of what was not even a 3 percent overall budget cut in the total annual budget of the government, and the effect of that was most profound in terms of the Official Opposition caucus of the three opposition caucuses. It seems to me that if we try to pursue a special warrant later on in the year, where we have no representation on that committee determining approval or denial, we're going to lose it, which is not necessarily the same weighting that consideration of the Leg. Assembly itself has when it pursues a special warrant. Perhaps the fairer approach would be to revise the estimates now and then sponsor a special Bill for the Assembly to debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, on the first part of it, if I might give an initial response -- and in this regard I certainly need to call upon two former cabinet ministers in our midst. My understanding is that once our main budget estimates have been passed, we can't go back to amend them. That's just a response in terms of the process. I don't believe it can be done, but I'll wait to hear.

The other thing that I do need to point out is that in the course of this year, there might be some other savings effected in terms of our total envelope as a department, and we can then perhaps transfer some funds to help cover off the costs of the search committee and the costs involved in the search committee for the Clerk. Then what was the third one that had been mentioned? [inaudible] Thank you. Oh yes, and the increased costs of the committee on privileges and elections.

So it may well be that we don't have to go to a special warrant before the end of the year, but at least along the way we have to keep track of all the costs. I'd prefer not to have a special warrant, but that's just a response to the second part.

MR. BOGLE: On the specific point, I certainly appreciate the remarks of the chairman of our meeting relative to his stated goal to avoid a special warrant if at all possible, notwithstanding the fact that we do have activities taking place at this time that were not anticipated and therefore not budgeted for -- i.e., the work of the standing select committee of the Assembly, plus the search for a new Ombudsman.

There are other matters we may wish to consider in the ensuing months, one of which is phase 2 of renovations to this Assembly and whether or not we would wish to follow up on the installation of the cameras in the little portholes that had been blocked off. That would give us a system comparable with the one we saw in Regina. If that were indeed the will of the committee, then dollars would have to be found to do that. That would require a special warrant.

What I'm really trying to say, based on my years of experience as a minister, is that it's much too early to consider any adjustments to the budget. Once we've spent some months in the new process and determined whether or not we wish to -- and I used it as an example -- move to phase 2 of the renovations within this Assembly, obviously that would have an impact on the budget. So I think that's a matter we should be deferring, with the assurances of the Speaker in terms of his overall objective, until a later meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I respond about phase 2 just for a moment? I haven't recovered from phase 1, and it may well be that you can leave it up to the next Speaker or the Speaker 40 years down the road. But thank you for the comments.

MR. TAYLOR: Could be that the Member for Taber-Warner wants the cameras in before his hair thins any more.

I have just two points on this issue. One is that you're talking about the administration and how much the Members' Services Committee has in hiring, and for the second point I was going to touch on special warrants. To do with hiring, I would agree that there should not be interference by a committee which essentially is going to be dominated by government members. Through the years ahead we may have . . . I think if the committee had power to really hire and fire the Speaker's staff, it would seriously erode independence of the Speaker, because the committee isn't independent. In other words, the committee is nearly always biased and in favour of the government, and I suspect it'll always be that way.

MR. STEVENS: I'm going to quote you.

MR. TAYLOR: However, I want to go on a bit further. I was wondering whether, as often happens -- and I don't always like to always compare with corporations -- in associations, clubs, or corporations, where quite often the top person is on a two-key type of system, where the chairman of the board cannot hire or fire the president without permission from the board, and likewise the board can't fire the president without permission of the shareholders. In other words, there's a check and balance.

I'm just wondering, when the clerk is sort of second in line, whether the committee should think about just having one position that's a two-key thing contingent with the Speaker, although I can see problems there too. I don't feel as strongly on it as I might have been referenced in the past, because I realize that the committee is probably going to be much more prejudiced in fact, through the years, than the Speaker will, and that gives me a little bit of concern.

The second thing is on the special warrants, and this bothers me quite a little. I think part of the price you pay for getting the estimates through the House without debate and without factionalism is almost the implied promise that there'll be no special warrants. In other words, what's the use of passing a budget and asking people not to debate it if you can put special warrants on it later? I think the Speaker, just by the very nature of the thing, is almost -- unless it's cataclysmic or some other way -- caught without being able to put special warrants. I think that when you ask the legislators not to debate something, you're automatically signing your deed in blood that that's it, that's the budget. What they see is what they get.

MR. STEVENS: I didn't want to disagree with the member, other than to make the observation that a special warrant, which is considered when the Assembly is not sitting, may indeed be required for some unforeseen problem, and I can explain one. When you read this report which the Speaker shared with us, it reminded me and probably all of us who have visited other Legislatures. Seeing the Sergeant-at-Arms up in the gallery today reminds me of a recent CBC program which showed the trauma and the tragedy which occurred in Quebec. As this report has identified, the security system in this complex and the communications between the three buildings, the intermix between the three functionary heads, the problems that are in our society today, the media attention on these incidents -- it may very well be, as an example, that changes are needed that could not be foreseen in any budget planning. New technology, new requirements -- suddenly something is required to be done. So while not disagreeing in general with what the previous speaker

has just said, I do believe that a special warrant has a very significant and essential purpose in our process. We just can't foresee all eventualities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on that point, if we had one fiscal year when we had to replace all three of the legislative officers, that would really throw something out of kilter.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, could you explain the shareout of responsibilities between the two Parliamentary co-Counsel, and the reasons therefor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As soon as I arrived last June, I had consultation with all my managers, but one in particular, Mr. Clegg, came to me on more than one occasion and was putting the case that he was exceedingly overworked both in session and out of session and felt his workload had already increased even prior to the session after the most recent election, when you had a very significant change in the seating plan of the Assembly. As you well know, Mr. Wright, a considerable number of Bills which are introduced primarily by Opposition members take up a considerable amount time with respect to Parliamentary Counsel. So that would be one obvious area where the workload increased, I gather quite significantly. It certainly has if we were even just to count up the number of Bills, the motions, the motions for returns, and also written questions.

From that point of view, I think indeed there has been a significant increase in the workload, and the Parliamentary Counsel of the day, Mr. Clegg, had felt for a number of years that he indeed was totally understaffed, because there was simply himself and his legal secretary. So that was one of the major concerns that all through the Directional Plan and the assessment of the department I've been keeping in mind.

When we found ourselves in this interesting and challenging position, the matter which is currently before the committee on privileges and elections, this also meant an increased workload. Given the fact, I've hired the second counsel. The salary is significantly less than what the other Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Clegg, receives, and as mentioned, it's on a contract basis for one year.

Edmonton Highlands, and then Banff-Cochrane.

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to respond to the comments made by the Member for Banff-Cochrane. I am certainly not contesting unforeseen eventualities that do take place in any given department. It is very often the case that departments on an annual basis need to pursue special warrants because they simply could not anticipate particular events happening, and they can be related to any number of things. The point made about the security, for example, might end up being one just such example with respect to the Legislative Assembly.

My concern is that without being able to hire the people we had attempted to hire prior to the budget decisions made by this committee in February or March, the workload in our office is just bizarre. There is not a single human being working for us who does not, as a matter of regular course on an everyday basis, put in a lot of overtime, not just in missed lunch hours but coming in early and staying late. That was not an unforeseen eventuality. We knew that that was going to happen if we had not been able to do the hiring on the basis of the budget we were allocated for the 1986-87 fiscal year. My point is that we don't stand a chance if we go to Executive Council and ask for a special warrant to cover the deficiency which the people in our of-

fice simply cannot keep up with. The chance that a special warrant sponsored by the Speaker, or the chairman of this committee, is much greater for passing than is the chance for a special warrant sponsored by myself, for example. On that basis, I think we have the ability to make some changes to the Legislative estimates prior to the conclusion of this sitting, based on our best possible estimates -- no one is perfect -- and see what happens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on.

MS BARRETT: That was the conclusion.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I want to just comment on a change in the House that has occurred as a result of the last election, and obviously that must be a compliment to the members of the Opposition parties present today. The change in the House has obviously meant a change in the workload that has been normally, traditionally faced by the management team reporting to the Speaker. Perhaps I as a government member should indicate that. Therefore, any examination of the functions of those officers by the Opposition members, who are here as members of this committee, should carefully consider that. When there was an opposition of four or six, the workload on the officers was different. It had to have been different. Obviously, the members of the government would receive consultation, advice, from cabinet members and from their team.

Now we're in a different circumstance. All members of the Assembly have the opportunity to present motions, private members' Bills, and so on, and it is obviously more and a greater intensity on the part not only of the Opposition members but of the government members to ensure that they have good, up-to-date, rapid response to their requests. So I think we shouldn't overlook that. The change in the House has meant a different workload on the Assembly officers. I've sensed that myself. I have been a minister, as you know, and did not require the services of those officers, as now I do, as members of the Assembly who are not on the Executive Council discover.

I wanted to make this comment, Mr. Chairman. Until these key personnel appointments are made and until those officers working with their staffs have the opportunity to assess this report -- and I think it's a unique report; I've seen many consulting reports, and I don't want to comment on the adequacy or inadequacy of any report that I've had no participation in. But I like the manner and the method in which this report has been developed. It has involved a committee of staff. That's rare in itself, when one is going through an organizational change, to have a committee in fact steering the way in which the report is being developed, providing advice as to the present circumstances, developing new thrusts with the Speaker, and then proposing -- a willed, is it? -- a willed future. I think that's a very unique concept, and I compliment the Speaker for developing that. We might have our own willed futures. We might want, as members, to provide some advice on these futures, and I think we could do that individually or together as caucuses. But here we have our staff saying, "If we're going to serve the members, how better? How best? What can we do to do that?" I think this is a very, very fine thing, but I do suggest that much of this needs to be worked out by our staff working with the new appointments, once those are made, and the Speaker.

There are problems with the space that's allocated. I'm very pleased to see the changes in the Annex. I'm not sure about the changes in this building, because I think our Legislative Assem-

bly clerical area is pretty tight. I know there have been some changes made to provide some human space, some space to meet, some space to do the work, but there's much improvement over in the Annex, and I think that's to be welcomed. And of course when you make space changes, that's a disrupting thing. I will give as one example -- members of this committee probably all share it. I received a T-4 slip on the final day on which income taxes could be submitted. I had done mine sometime earlier, since I only have one employer. Those kinds of things will not happen under the new arrangements, but they sure happened under the old system. I'm really glad to see these changes, because that's quite an embarrassment, to have that sort of thing happen and a staff member having to present information that was lost. So I think those changes . . .

The services are improving, and I compliment our team of people, whether it's in *Hansard* or in the Legislative Assembly or in the Clerk's function or the library. They are improving, in effect, probably more than any of us can imagine, and although I don't disagree with my Taber-Warner colleague often, maybe we should have orientation mandatory. You know, maybe it should be. But the morale of our staff is very important, and it has been a devastating problem for them. I believe this report and the work of the committee and the way in which the staff arrangements, the functioning of the offices, have been changed -- I honestly feel from talking with our staff that their morale has bottomed out a long time ago now, and it's improved greatly.

I close, Mr. Chairman, by just saying that I hope we get on with the appointments and that one of the top priorities that you look at is the matter of security.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'm sure the staff appreciates those comments, and I'd like quickly to use some names here. They're here, and they're nice names, because they're people who've worked hard. They worked a lot of overtime, and they were not getting paid for overtime, and they've helped pull this together. And as you know, we've been operating through session with not having the top two positions in the department filled, and they've been operating very well. But we've got one right here, Louise Empson, and Karen South and Deirdre Grist and Jane Pickard and Lorne Buhr, in terms of that group working. All the managers have been very co-operative.

And, you know, when I look up there and see Gary Garrison and the fact that now we have next-day *Hansard*: we performed a miracle, and most people don't even realize it. [interjection] Yes, Doug's here almost 24 hours a day. And Rod has had to pick up lots of extra responsibilities and carry on there, and the appointment of Kathleen is working out tremendously well, from all the feedback that I have.

And Blake! Blake is a whole new person. He truly is, and the fact that he's carrying on as chief librarian and also being acting deputy head of the department -- I mean, I can't compliment them enough on the way that they've been able to respond, especially under a most interesting sitting so far. But as a group, I think indeed that the morale has turned around considerably, and their efficiency and their joyfulness. So I just wanted to underline that and thank you.

Westlock-Sturgeon, Edmonton Highlands.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want a cup?

MR. TAYLOR: No thanks. This is hot chocolate. Sorry, I was just turning down the hospitality of the Member for

Banff-Cochrane.

I, too, would compliment the staff. I feel there's quite an improvement, although I've suffered somewhat. Blake used to always have a moment to exchange repartee with me as he rushed back and forth to his office, which is past my office; now he's so busy that he doesn't. Kathy has certainly unscrambled a lot of problems we had. I have a tendency to measure the office on the side by the level of the gumdrops as I go by. That's always been well to add up.

Certainly *Hansard* -- it's not the speed, Mr. Chairman, that I really admire in *Hansard*: it's how I can mumble and flub through with my Bow Island accent and come out with really Churchillian phrases by the time they've interpreted it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're not supposed to edit it that much.

MR. TAYLOR: That's what I sometimes wonder, whether there isn't -- I rather like the word "poetic licence" rather than "edit."

But maybe one point just on special warrants to maybe move it along. What would this committee think of special warrants that wouldn't be requested unless they had the unanimous consent of the committee? In which case that takes the question of emergencies that obviously everybody would agree with, but it still reconciles to the Assembly that the budget we are putting there and asking for no debate on will not have a special warrant put on it unless it had a unanimous consent of the committee? That type of thing would maybe be an assurance that the House would feel better with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on that point. I don't know what the background -- Mr. Hyland, you've been on the previous manifestations of this committee. But I see under Legislative Assembly Act 21(2):

If at any time the Assembly is not in session

(a) the Speaker certifies to the Lieutenant Governor in Council that, in the public interest, an expenditure of public money is urgently required in respect of any matter pertaining to the Legislative Assembly Office, and . .

then proceeds. I just don't know what the background practice has been. Rod, do you know? Have there had to be special warrants through the Legislative Assembly?

MR. WRIGHT: Is that not something to do with elections or something?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it seems to go on to supply vote, under which an expenditure with respect to that matter may be made, votes of supply.

Well, if we might take it, Westlock-Sturgeon, as noted, and I'll try to find out what the proper background has been to it anyway, because I'm just not familiar.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, just firstly to answer the last question, at least in part. At the last Members' Services Committee I don't remember special warrants ever being brought to the committee. They're applied for by the Speaker. I'm not even sure if we receive notification of them afterwards. But I don't remember them ever coming to the committee beforehand. They're applied for by the Speaker and the Clerk. So if you're agreeing to at least bring information forward to us, that's a considerable step advancing than what was previous.

Secondly, what I put up my hand to speak about was -- other members have spoken about the staff and the job they've done over the last six or eight months, and I would also just like to agree with that and note that everybody has pitched in. I know that when you go upstairs on the floor over in the Annex, there's a whole new feeling over there, and I think it's grown. They're all doing a good job, and they should all be commended for it. I don't know what Blake is going to do for an encore after he finishes running two jobs for almost a year. The library is going to seem awful quiet in that office of his down there.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back onto 3(b), relating to the blue sheets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask, Mr. Hyland -- Edmonton Highlands was in, I think, on a point that we were on, and then we could come back to . . . Do you want to speak to that, and then I'll recognize you with regard to 3(b)?

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Several comments have been made about how the changes in the Legislative Assembly have been to the benefit of everybody, and I concur. I know that I speak on behalf of members of the Official Opposition caucus. The effect has been very good, but the fact of the matter is that some of the changes were based on demonstrated need. Now, I am making a point that demonstrated need was thrown out as a criterion on which caucus budgets should be considered. Therefore, and I speak against Westlock-Sturgeon's idea about unanimous support of the committee for special warrants, I think what we should do is approve a motion whereby components within the Legislative Assembly may come to this committee in pursuit of sponsorship of a special warrant endorsed by the committee.

I'm quite certain that our demonstrated need is simply not going to be met by the changed budget for the 1987-88 fiscal year for the Official Opposition, and I know that we don't stand a chance by ourselves in pursuing a special warrant to remedy that problem. Therefore, I do move that this committee be available for consideration, upon request of any component within its budgetary jurisdiction, to sponsor a request for disbursement or a special warrant from Executive Council. [inaudible]

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, speaking to the motion?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. I have some difficulties with this motion. The fact is, as a Speaker you run your department; as a caucus we operate independently. No two caucuses know what the other is doing as far as expenditures are concerned. So I have some very grave doubts whether we should be proceeding with this motion on the fact that we're getting into the administration of the Legislative Assembly.

MS BARRETT: Could I clarify, Mr. Chairman, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll take clarification. Do you want to wait to sum up on the motion in case there are others? Any other comments? Cypress-Redcliff, on the motion.

MR. HYLAND: On the motion. Mr. Chairman, I would wonder if that would be getting right back into what we in the last committee, the previous Legislature and this Legislature, have

worked very carefully towards, and that was that we do global funding: a caucus divides its funds itself. If we get into a special warrant this way -- and I'd like to hear the hon. members' feelings -- my fear is that then the committee is going to be telling the caucus that brings it forward how they're to spend their money rather than the global funding. If you're supporting additional funding, somehow it's going to have to be broken down to prove need. That's where I have a problem and the fear that we are getting involved in internal operations. We'll just use your caucus, for example, because you brought the motion forward. I don't think it should be my business to tell you how to run your caucus; that should be your business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other members on the motion? Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Chairman, any budget for anything must proceed on the basis of need, so that if the particular budget is misplaced in underestimating or conceivably overestimating needs so that the money isn't justified, it should be open to the people involved to go to the appropriate area. The appropriate area in the case of caucuses is Members' Services Committee and the budget that's appropriate thereto. It is true that in the end it comes out to a global figure which can be shifted amongst the subdivisions, but still it has to be based on need to serve the public. So I don't really feel that there is any incompatibility at all between demonstrating a need and overmuch control of individual budgets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May the member sum up?

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I'd like to address the concerns that were raised. I know that I, and we of the opposition, will never convince this committee not to deal with global budgeting in the estimates process. I know it. We tried; we failed. We tried; we failed. I mean, it's getting pretty obvious. We try once more; we'll fail once more. I have never endorsed, as a principle, that process, but I have endorsed it because I know I'm going to face defeat, and we need to get on with allocating budgets. My point in the motion does not necessarily imply opening up caucus budgets for consideration in severe detail or discrete detail on the annual basis.

My motion says that we, the components of the Assembly, may bring forward a request to this committee to sponsor a request for disbursement, a special warrant. That obviously assumes an after-the-fact process, because it's obvious that the estimates would have already been dealt with, as is the case for any department. The reason that I bring forward the motion this way is to allow that option to occur. I strongly suspect that, for example, if the government members' caucus had unforeseen difficulties within their estimated budget and pursued a special warrant independent of this committee, that would be fine. I have every reason under notions of common sense to assume that if the Official Opposition were to do the same, it would not be fine. It probably wouldn't pass.

Therefore, what I'm requesting is that provided a component can prove to the satisfaction of the committee demonstrated need for additional funding, then the committee may consider the motion to sponsor on behalf of that component a request for disbursement. So it doesn't necessarily imply the worries that were mentioned by the members for Cypress-Redcliff and Rocky Mountain House. In fact, it's worded in such a way that it could avoid that pitfall, because I know that I'm not going to

win that particular issue and I'm not even pursuing it. It's an option for us to exercise, and it is, I think, moved expressly on behalf of opposition caucuses, who I think will run into real difficulty financially later on this year.

I urge the members to support it. It doesn't mean that it necessarily would occur. The intent of the motion I think has been spelled out by the mover in such a way as to allay the concerns as expressed by the other members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we might pause for just half a moment, and I could invite Edmonton Highlands over to the Table with Louise so we could just be absolutely certain on the words. Could we sort of take a two-minute break? And a notice to the committee that I have an appointment at 10 o'clock, and I understand other people have to go, so we would sort of like a 9:55-57 cutoff time.

[The committee recessed from 9:19 to 9:21 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, ready to hear the motion? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. EMPSON: It was moved by Ms Barrett that this committee be available for consideration upon request by an element of the Legislative Assembly so that it may sponsor a request for disbursement or special warrant from Executive Council.

MR. STEVENS: Could the Speaker just define the word "element"?

MS BARRETT: I actually got the word from Rod. The intention was that the large divisions with which we deal in annual estimates for the Legislative Assembly qualify, so the components under our budgetary jurisdiction would qualify, but it would be by component as opposed to by individual. That was the intent. It's true, I think, that the common phrase we use in both the Leg. Assembly estimates and in regular estimates is "element," so that's what's meant.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, to explain it a bit more, we could say "caucus division" or "administrative division" or "other element" to give a context?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it could be construed as an individual caucus, but not meaning an individual member.

All right, you've heard the motion. Those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MS BARRETT: Imagine that. [inaudible]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Failed. Standing vote? Division? I never get to ring this bell.

Before we came to the motion, Cypress-Redcliff wanted to refer back, I gathered, to 3(b).

MR. HYLAND: Right. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about

communication between Leg. office staff and members and the two-way communication, wherein one of the recommendations here is about senior staff attending Members' Services meetings and then transferring to members. What's happened at those meetings -- and we had that before, yet we still had some Members' Services orders that came back not the way our intention was to write them. There's that, along with the other small things, that makes one wonder.

It's meant as no offence to the writer, but a memo was sent out that was addressed to a number of people; I think it was the one about the use of phones. The Members of the Legislative Assembly were the bottom ones on the list to which the letter was addressed. I think these kinds of small things need to be tuned up in that the Assembly -- as per one of the recommendations, the office is set up as a service to members as their prime responsibility, on about page . . . I forget what page of this report, but it's stated in the Directional Plan.

I think we have to be cognizant of that, and it is important that these communication policies continue and improve so that we're all on the same wavelength and understand exactly what's going on and that we communicate to other members -- either ourselves or through the Leg. administrative office -- what our intentions as Members' Services are, and that we continue to express those intentions clearly to members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification, that relates to 3(b). Item 66; that takes in part of it. This will be . . .

MR. HYLAND: And 51 as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And 51. I trust from all that then, each individual caucus will bring its director or whatever. [interjection] Chief of staff is the phrase that's used; thank you. I'd like to put this question to Members' Services Committee, though: which of the members of the Legislative Assembly staff do you want to have in attendance at all the meetings? Do you want to have the whole lot or just the Clerk? Because it's a two-sided thing. Who do you want from our side? Taber-Warner. Cypress-Redcliff first, and then Taber-Warner.

MR. HYLAND: No, it's okay.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, my first reaction when I read initiative 66 was to get very angry because, first of all, there's a written Hansard of everything that is said and done at Members' Services Committee. For the Directional Plan to suggest that the problem is poor communication and therefore we should have a member of the staff, a senior member, sitting at the meeting listening, to me ignores the fact that we have a Hansard. A cabinet meets; there are not 29 deputy ministers of the various departments sitting around the cabinet table listening. There's no Hansard of the cabinet minutes. There's a record of the cabinet minutes, but there's no Hansard taking every word that's spoken, and yet departments do not seem to have, under most circumstances, difficulty following the directions they're given by the Executive Council.

I believe that item 66, and to a degree 51 as alluded to by my colleague the Member for Cypress-Redcliff, require greater sensitivity. In fairness to the existing staff, I've seen a vast improvement over the last few months, where we've seen less directives coming out via memo that either ignore a decision that's been made by the Members' Services Committee or skew it in some way. If we check back in our own records through

the Hansard, we will find that the recommendation has been made at previous Members' Services meetings that if indeed the staff have a problem interpreting a recommendation or wish to see an amendment or a change, that rightfully should be referred back to the Members' Services Committee. It would be wrong to have two staff members arguing over what Members' Services meant by a motion and trying to give an interpretation. If there is that kind of question, bring it back here. Let us deal with it. I'm speaking solely of those matters that relate to the services that flow through to members.

I'm very supportive of the comments made by our colleague the Member for Cypress-Redcliff as they relate to item 66 and item 51. Specifically, what we're talking about is members' allowance policies. We do have a good example. We've combined the three services that we generally relate to constituencies: the constituency office, the promotion allowance, and the communication allowance. We've combined those three into one, and it's now a members' service allowance. That to me was an attempt to simplify the process to allow the administration to do one calculation rather than three calculations, so they're not transferring money from promotion to communication or vice versa.

There may be other areas where the staff can recommend back to the Members' Services Committee where other changes could be made to help the administrative process to ensure that we are working hand in hand. But I, for one, would be very, very distraught to see additional people attending meetings so they can listen to what's being said when there's the written record of what has been said in addition to the . . . You know, I haven't seen anyone around here lately with a broken arm, and if there's a problem, they can pick up the telephone and ask someone in the Speaker's office as to a matter, and if further clarification is needed, it can come back to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Others? Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe it's under new business, but if I can use as an illustration -- you know, I guess it's a difference in opinion between what I would consider and what administration would consider -- the listing of members in various telephone directories. I shouldn't say in various telephone directories but in various towns. Now, to us as rural members it's important that your number and your name be listed in every town in your constituency. That was an understood given before. Apparently now, according to recent correspondence, it's being questioned that under Leg. Assembly you receive the heavy bold type in one area or in one town and not necessarily in the other. Now, I'm a little unclear about that, but I use that as an illustration that if we have it in all the towns as was common before, then it comes out of communications allowance rather than general administration. Before, I took that as a given; that was the way it was done, and it was understandable that it was done that way. It's been done in that manner as far back as I can remember, from the time I got elected.

MR. TAYLOR: Could I raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman? Just take a moment. I may have missed something, but my chief of staff is in the gallery and the government's chief of staff is in the meeting. Is that okay? Has that question been decided? Are the chiefs of staff going to be moving in and out of meetings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Come on down. You can bring another hot

chocolate for him.

MR. CAMPBELL: Nick, we decided that at 7:30.

MR. TAYLOR: Is there any limit then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'd assume one staff ought to be enough. Do you need more?

MR. TAYLOR: I need four desk beaters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Kathleen, in response to the question raised by Cypress-Redcliff and then Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, you can rule. That may be new business, but I use that as an illustration of understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps just quickly respond to that on this issue.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: One of the problems with it is that we don't have enough budget to have bold listings in all the telephone books. It's simply monetary. If you wanted other listings, we could take it out of your communication budget, but in terms of our budget we just can't afford it. I can go over the figures with you later if you'd like. They're terribly expensive. AGT really soaks us for those listings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there'd be room to do it if we could switch over, because most of it's being covered out of this budget. I see. All right. Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Just for clarification, in the most recent AGT directories, I've noticed -- and I'll use my own constituency as an example -- there is a listing under the various communities. It's not in bold print; it's regular print. Is it contemplated to change that? In other words, as I understood the memo, if I want to enhance the listing, that's my responsibility, but the listing would stay in the various communities as it has in the past.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: Yes, I believe that's the plan. It's just that the bold is extremely expensive.

MR. BOGLE: If a member wants to enhance it, then the member would pay for that out of his members' services allowance.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: You're not taking anything away then.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: No, that's just the way the listing -- the bold as opposed to plain.

MR. BOGLE: Could that be clarified? Because some members are under the impression that there was a withdrawal of service; i.e., that you might be able to list in one community, not if you have six or eight through the constituency. It's obvious if a person from Warner wanted to call, they'd first look in the Warner listing.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: Surely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this the follow-up on that one? Okay. Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I had expected to make a short report to members on the computer services subcommittee at some point. It would only take three minutes, if you can remember that, Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee willing perhaps to even entertain that now, because it does relate on the second of our blue sheets: the impact and utilization of technology. Item 82, for example, relates. Please, Gordon.

MR. WRIGHT: After somewhat of a slow start we got cracking, and there are eight sample constituencies in which the people from public works who know about computers and communication...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt, but could I ask you to lean forward a bit, because of the mikes and then Hansard being able to pick up. Thanks.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. There are eight constituencies that are being sampled by people from public works who know about computers and communication: four government seats, town and country of course; two NDP, one in the country and one in town; and one from each of the Liberals and the Reps, especially the Reps' of course, because Ray Speaker has a record number of suboffices in his constituency -- 25, I think.

The survey is currently being conducted and will be conducted both when the House is sitting and when it isn't. I don't have a list of the actual constituencies in each caucus, but you can get them from your chiefs of staff. Any suggestions or complaints or ideas should be conveyed to the person on the committee from your caucus. In the case of the government members it's Greg Stevens. We expect to have the report by the fall, and I believe there is provision made in the budget for this sort of communications. Perhaps we can hear from Mr. Scarlett on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I also ask that a list of the constituencies be supplied to Louise so she can incorporate it in the minutes, please?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. SCARLETT: Well, really there is no budget set aside for this, but part of what I was saying when you were discussing the implications of the report on the Legislative Assembly budget -- this is one area where the report does have some financial implications, your committee's report. What this report, the Directional Plan, recommends has some financial implications in the long term or the short term, depending on how Members' Services wants to proceed and the speed at which they want to proceed. Now, you're saying this will take until the fall until we get a report. Perhaps it will be implemented in the next budget year, the equipment needed to continue on with the program. But as it is out of this report, there is that financial implication in there for electronic mail between the members' offices here in the city and back in their constituencies. As you can see, that's very big dollars we're talking about.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I should say, however, that the

idea is not to involve the government in any great additional expense. In the first place, the survey is being carried out by government, so there's no additional cost there. In the second place, the idea is to work on the basis of a pool of equipment being funded by the government but hired by the constituencies out of their communication allowance, so that (a) it will not penalize those that have already set up their own computers, and (b) it will be an economical move from the point of view of Members' Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's useful information, and the experience will be good. But we should also keep a weather eye on projected costs because we will be in the budget construct sooner than all of us want to be. Thank you.

Any other items this morning in regard to this? Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Pardon me. I'm not on the computers; I'm back on the blue sheets. I'll wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please go ahead.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you. I made a general observation at the beginning under initiative 19 when I made reference to the greater involvement of the chiefs of staff of the various caucuses. As you go through items on both pages -- and it may be that when the Directional Plan was prepared, there wasn't a great enough knowledge of the role that the chiefs of staff in our various caucuses play. I would like to see inserted in a number of these initiatives the caucus chiefs of staff, and I look at 72 as an example, where we talk about:

fix the responsibility within the Service to Members' Group for liaison with the constituency offices.

Or the next one, 82, at the bottom: again we're talking about improving

communications between the constituency offices and the Legislature, and amongst Legislative Assembly Office staff.

The key involvement -- and if we want to ensure that there's good communication flow, then I strongly urge that our chiefs of staff be directly involved here. Because it should be recognized that at our constituency office level -- I'll speak for myself as an example. My main contact is between my secretary in Edmonton and my constituency -- I have three part-time offices -- and the three part-time secretaries. That would be followed by liaison with myself directly, and the next person involved in that process is our chief of staff. I think that we have an opportunity to build on our strengths, and the communication has to be done in that way. So I would respectfully recommend that in a number of these initiatives we insert our caucus chiefs of staff for better communication.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. One of the other areas involved, too, comes to my mind. I made a request to Mr. Ritter to also look at, when the House is not sitting, the various contracts we have for leases and for hiring of staff, because the form of contract needs to have some review. But then that would be in a general way, so there would be needed input there. But the comments about chiefs of staff are indeed good reminders and quite fine by our operation. I'm only too willing to have you carry out those responsibilities. Okay.

There's one housekeeping matter with respect to another Members' Services Committee order that hopefully would take

less than five minutes, if we could save that time to be able to deal with that, because as you know I have to report these back to the Assembly while it's sitting.

Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: I think you'd better deal with this before you deal with my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kathy, would you distribute those to members, and Rod, would you speak to that, please.

Okeydoke. Order 6/87.

MR. SCARLETT: This Members' Services order is a housecleaning one, and we found an error that we had in our calculations under members' services allowance, section (3)(c), where previously we had the number of electors minus 14,000. Our calculations in administration have always been based on the census for a constituency for a member's promotional allowance. We noticed that we had an E instead of a C. As I say, there is a budget ramification. The calculations have always been done on census, so what we did is we corrected that information by making it C minus 14,000 and putting the explanation for what C represents at the bottom of the page.

MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry, Rod. Can you read what we had before? What I would like to ask is is that when we get something like this, we have what we had and what is now proposed, rather than just the explanation for what is in front of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to invite Mr. Clegg to come in here with the original, please? I agree with the comment by Banff-Cochrane entirely.

[The committee paused briefly]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 6/87. If you'd like to explain the reason why it wasn't right the first time, please, Mr. Clegg, and then what we're attempting to effect here, please.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the order as written here is what the committee did resolve and intended when they discussed this. They intended to place the reference to the census figure into the order instead of the number of electors. The reason that the order wasn't drafted the right way in the first place was my fault. I misunderstood both from the minutes and from the reading of Hansard what the intention of the committee was.

I was a little misled by two facts. One is that when we first established this method of calculating, we were told that census figures did not correspond with constituency boundaries and therefore they couldn't be used, and this is why we used the number of electors. We were told also when the boundaries change, as they have done recently, that the most rapid reflection of the delineation would be through the Chief Electoral Officer's system. Therefore, when we originally conceived this formula, which was based originally on electors, we thought that we would have to use the Chief Electoral Officer's figures. I wasn't aware of the fact that it was later discovered there were census figures that corresponded exactly to the provincial electoral division boundaries and that they had been used for some time. I wasn't aware of that and wasn't aware of that when I saw the committee minutes.

There was also the statement made at the time in the committee that the result of the change would not have any fiscal im-

plications. Now, to me, where I stood, not knowing that they were already using the census figures, this indicated of course that there would be no change, because if they go from election figures to census figures, there is a fiscal change. So I assumed that there were not in fact, that the amendment was only relating to the combination of the three and not relating to a change from electoral division figures to census figures. And that's how I drafted the order. So it is indeed my fault; I misinterpreted what the committee wanted.

The version you have in front of you reflects what the committee apparently wanted, and now I know the background and know what had been happening over the last few years. You can see where I made my mistake, and I'm content that this is exactly what the committee intended when they passed that resolution. I would apologize for any confusion this has caused, but this is now reflecting what apparently has been done for some time. There are no current fiscal implications because the fiscal change in fact took place when at the very first instance they started using the census figures, which is some time back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the effect could be that if this motion carries, we have then corrected what the committee originally intended.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we then have to bring it back to yet another meeting to confirm it before I have to report it to the House?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, if I can go into this separate issue, it's my opinion that the orders should not be brought back to the committee for confirmation in any event. I think that once the committee has passed a resolution that such and such a thing be ordered, the Speaker should then have that order prepared, and if he is satisfied with the order, he should sign it. Once it is signed, it is in fact law. It is an order pursuant to the Legislative Assembly Act. I don't think that a final stage of ratification should be necessary.

After the committee has made a resolution and has adjourned and then we're in the process of drafting the order, if at that time there is confusion or doubt about what the order should contain, I think the matter should be referred back to the committee or discussed with members to resolve the confusion at that stage. But ratification causes problems, because if it then opens up the possibility of amendment, we've had a legally binding order in effect for some weeks, which has then to be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Banff-Cochrane and then Edmonton Strathcona. And we'll deal with the business of this motion, not the reporting. Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Could I just ask then, Mr. Chairman, only because I don't have the material in front of me -- the \$26,000 item (a) is our as-approved, authorized amount for the offices. The next two items are formulae. Could you remind me, Mr. Clegg. The formula in (b) is based on ... Is that the postage one, or is it the one that we're ...

MR. M. CLEGG: One is the communication, and one is the promotional allowance.

MR. STEVENS: Which one is which?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) is communication.

MR. M. CLEGG: (c) is promotional allowance.

MR. STEVENS: That's the promotional allowance?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes. It used to be the promotional allowance.

MR. STEVENS: I have never seen a census figure and would appreciate, probably all members would, a census figure for Banff-Cochrane based on whatever. I have never seen one, and that's perhaps my fault for not being very observant. I know what census division 5 is; I know what the enumeration or whatever they call those areas are. I have never seen a census figure other than what is provided by the Chief Electoral Officer, which is a count of the electors. So you have said to us today that this is what was intended by our committee, that this formula will not result in any increase or penalty to any constituency or therefore any member, and no change in the budget. It's just putting what you feel was the committee's intention all along. And C does exist. Can every one of us ask for that and have it?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to refer that to the administration because they were the ones who told me that they have those figures.

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: Yes, those figures are done up by the Statistics Bureau, and I can provide a copy for you if you like -- for all members actually.

MR. STEVENS: Am I the only one who has never seen these?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you're not the only one.

MR. TAYLOR: I want to agree with the member. I've never seen them either. I would love to get a copy of it. Is it broken down by poll or town or village?

MS BRUCE-KAVANAGH: No. I think it's by the constituency boundaries. It's a global figure for your constituency, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I gather that in fact the administration has been working with this formula for some time. Might it not be necessary then to have a transitional provision pointing that out in case the Auditor General gets sticky, tumbles on to something?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should do that because we can't pass a retroactive order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Call for the question.

With respect to Members' Services Order 6/87 ...

Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Pardon me. Just before the vote, under item 4.1, transfer to caucus office, are we clear that when we use the word "allowance," and we're using it in 4.1, and when we use that in future, we are referring to the members' services allowance and not one of the components within the members' services allowance? Because the word "allowance" is used on the same page under communication and promotion. As long as it's clear. I know that was the intent of the original motion as approved by the committee, but are we satisfied?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the term "allowance" is defined in the order in section 1(2) of the order as being the total of the members' services allowance, and for simplification, I think we can standardize that use. The important flexibility is that any or all of the allowance may be used for any one of the purposes: the constituency, the communication, or the promotion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Banff-Cochrane.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, bearing in mind the Parliamentary Counsel's advice and although we've approved three orders earlier this morning, would it be appropriate therefore, with the explanation we've had now, simply to receive this for information, given the advice that you have just heard? I'm happy to do whatever you ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Parliamentary Counsel can advise, but the Chair is a touch nervous about that because this is a slightly different wording than what was there before. I think that this one needs to be approved so we're absolutely certain this is the one built the way the committee indeed wants it to be.

MR. M. CLEGG: I think in this case, Mr. Chairman, it might be a good idea because we had one order which I presented for signature and then I had to change it because of my misunderstanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call for the question. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Motion to adjourn. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 9:57 a.m.]