

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[9 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okeydoke. Where would you like to start today? I would assume that we now move on to House Services.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the administration had any opportunity at all to sketch out anything with respect to the motion I made yesterday. Would it be convenient to start there and dispose of that question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've given that some considerable thought overnight. We had time to have some initial discussion on it. I would prefer, for the operation of the committee, that we go all the way through the budget documents with respect to all the Legislative Assembly and all of the government and opposition caucuses, and then we'll review it all. I want to have some more time to think about the magnitude of the cuts and to see how we can best effect it across the board.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Might we move to House Services, then? In that area, of course, again we have the purpose as stated there -- Table office services, security, ceremonial, committee services, House records management, production of House documents, and legal advisory services -- and the organizational chart, followed by the overview. The third paragraph of that overview gives you the main reasons as to why we have some of the increases, and the other increase is travel costs.

Are there any questions with regard to page 1 of the estimate proposed for House Services? General sections there, of course: Salaries, Wages & Employee Benefits, Supplies & Services.

Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: We're on page 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, House Services.

MR. WRIGHT: Insurance: it's a small item, but I just wondered how the difference is explained there.

DR. McNEIL: It's explained by the fact that the insurance is for the three vehicles of the Assembly and the rates are lower than we've been paying in the past, around \$400 a vehicle. So it comes out to the \$1,200 rather than the \$2,000 that had been budgeted in the past.

MR. WRIGHT: So this is insurance on vehicles used by the staff.

DR. McNEIL: The Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, and the Clerk.

MR. WRIGHT: I thought we had a policy of self-insurance in the government.

DR. McNEIL: Yeah, we do, but we pay Treasury the money.

MR. WRIGHT: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions with regard to page 1 of House Services?

Might we look at page 2?

MR. WRIGHT: Who is the executive manager II here?

DR. McNEIL: It's Mr. Clegg, the Parliamentary Counsel.

MS BARRETT: Given my comments of yesterday with what appears to be a sort of discrimination between pay going to women who occupy positions previously occupied by men and men who occupy positions previously occupied by men, is there any intention or possibility that we can change this one pay rate -- I'll be asking for the other as well -- so that they're in line with that which the previous occupant was earning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taking into account the length of time of service?

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, it would seem reasonable -- I don't like to put any individual on the spot -- given that one of the people occupying a position previously held by a man is making more than the previous incumbent, that fairness ought to be extended all around. Yes.

DR. McNEIL: I think that when it comes to the administration of the salaries in the Legislative Assembly Office, equity is a consideration to be taken into account but qualifications, length of time on the job, and so on are also factors. Each of these classifications has a salary range, and people are hired at a certain point in the range and have the opportunity to progress within the range. My perception and belief are that what the previous incumbent's salary was is not the critical factor. It may be a factor but not the only factor that should be taken into consideration in setting the salaries. My personal judgment in terms of the fairness and level of the salaries of these individuals at the present time is that they are quite fair and that both individuals have received significant salary increases in the last six months.

In terms of the overall salary scheme within the office, I think the salaries are fair and reasonable and that there is the opportunity for these individuals to progress, as a function of their performance, within the ranges they're in. If they are given added responsibilities, and we assess those positions as being at a higher level than they are right now in the classification plan, then they would receive increases as a result of that increased responsibility.

As the person who's really responsible for administering the salaries, that's my judgment of where we're at now. I'd be pleased, as I said yesterday, to discuss the details further with any of the members.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that when people occupy a new position, they ordinarily do not earn the same amount as their predecessor because they don't have the experience. My concern is when one individual that I know has been around here for years and, as I said to somebody yesterday, can probably draw a map of this place corner by corner, blindfolded; that's my concern.

Now, it may be that there are other reasons. If there are other reasons that this person is earning 15.8 percent less than her predecessor, one of two things, I think, should obtain. One is adequate explanation so that there is not the perception that there is discrimination on the basis of gender. The other is that we understand the details of how it is that we got the explanation yesterday from the executive assistant to the Speaker that this is accounted for by the fact that some of the duties were

withdrawn from that person. If that's the case, then it should be that the person who inherited those duties would enjoy a commensurate increase in salary. I don't know that that has been demonstrated. Rod, one of the things that was said yesterday was that the new position didn't require certain administrative duties that the previous incumbent had to conduct. If there is no problem of fair play, that's fine with me, but I think that the perception, at minimum, should be corrected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, in actual fact you're speaking about the Clerk Assistant. Miss South's predecessor was charged with the responsibility of being sort of like an assistant deputy minister. Part of that job description was to do a lot of the work on the preparation of budgets for presentation to the Members' Services Committee. One aspect of that that I recall in particular was with regard to budget preparation for committees. In my opinion, while that was part of that individual's job description, it was not carried out. So when we did the reorganization, in terms of that particular job description some of those responsibilities were carried on last year for a period of about six months by Blake McDougall and also in large measure by Rod Scarlett and by Karen South. In each case there was additional compensation given. When we came to the time of filling the positions, taking into account the complete management audit review of the department, we saw that this was one area where we could enjoy the continued expertise and experience of Blake McDougall. Additional compensation was given to him and has been given to him, so he has picked up a number of those responsibilities.

At the same time, because the appointment of the Clerk Assistant was under my control and responsibility, in consultation with Miss South we determined that indeed the new job description would be one she would feel much more comfortable with, and she was not that keen about having to worry about all those budget aspects. So we then did that transfer in the job descriptions of the additional responsibilities to Blake McDougall. So that whole area was then taken away from the job description of the Clerk Assistant. Yesterday when Rod pointed out about reclassification, this is part of the explanation as to what happened.

I for one was very keen to appoint Miss South as Clerk Assistant. As a matter of fact, we even had discussions about whether or not she might apply for the position of Clerk, and she chose not to. But in terms of the development of this present job description, she was entirely happy with that. When you compare the salary she was previously earning with what she is now, she took a considerable leg up and, I understand, was somewhat embarrassed yesterday by the discussion that took place in this committee.

That's most of the background as to what indeed happened. With regard to the Clerk Assistant position, some things have been taken away by mutual consent and also as an outflowing of the management audit. But in addition, please be assured that additional compensation was given to Blake McDougall for the additional responsibilities which he then took on.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, that satisfies the one instance. I might note that there would have been no need for embarrassment if explanatory notes had accompanied this budget with respect to what I believe was fairly obvious when looking through the budget books when it came to the three positions.

That begs the question, I suppose, of the other position that I had inquired about, also now occupied by a woman but at a

lower rate of pay. We're not on that page right now, but given that we're on the topic, I wonder if there is an explanation that would account for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I assume we're now talking about Kathy Bruce-Kavanagh. Well, again with respect to management audit and job descriptions the previous incumbent of that office, in my opinion, was not carrying out the responsibilities adequately. There was an open competition to determine who would be the successor to that position. Again, in this case there was some increase in salary from Kathy's previous job. I am entirely satisfied with her performance, and in the course of this last year we have made some significant increases with respect to what her salary was and now is.

I would bring to the attention of members that last year we were all sitting around this table trying to knock down budgets and so forth. So at that stage of the game, she did not receive the full amount of money which was being paid to her predecessor, who had indeed been in that position for some time, with regard to his responsibilities. But over the course of the year, there has been a significant increase with respect to her pay level, and I would like to be able to do that and to continue that. I would like to be able to reward performance in terms of this department, and we have been attempting to do that in terms of job review. We now have complete classifications, job descriptions, and we've been doing reviews of the positions and the level of compensation.

I want to assure every member of the Legislative Assembly family, those people who do all the work in terms of support services, that I am here and I would like to be able to defend their jobs. Yesterday's motion with respect to General Administration is going to put some jobs in jeopardy. That's why I declined earlier today to go forward with any kind of suggestions. I want to wait until we see what comes forward with respect to the whole Legislative Assembly envelope and the opposition and the government caucuses. Let's see if there's some measure of fairness across the board here, because I for one am not terribly interested in having to let go of staff and I'm sure none of you is either.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, may I just add one thing for the record? A moment ago you said that about a year ago we were all sitting around looking at ways to cut. I'd like to make two exceptions: myself and my colleague were not in that direct pursuit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: On that particular job, which is director of administration, I think, have the duties changed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: David McNeil, in terms of it.

DR. McNEIL: From my understanding, for the most part they have not changed. There may have been slight variations from the previous role, but the core of the job is the same. Not having been around previously, you know, I'm not sure of some of the details. I guess there's one significant change; it just slipped my mind. Previously the personnel manager reported to the director of administration. One of the changes that I made when I came in -- and this is a philosophical belief of mine. I believe that both the persons managing the financial resources and the

personnel resources should report to the Clerk as opposed to one being subordinate. So I made that change when I came in.

MR. WRIGHT: So a piece of the job has been taken away.

DR. McNEIL: A small piece of the job, since August.

MR. WRIGHT: Has the salary range for the position description changed?

DR. McNEIL: No, it hasn't, other than it has increased because of an overall increase in management salaries.

MR. WRIGHT: The relative position stays the same, and the present incumbent has simply entered at a lower step than the previous one.

DR. McNEIL: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions with regard to page 2?

Page 3: this deals with the pages. Any questions with regard to that?

MR. TAYLOR: Maybe I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman. Dr. McNeil mentioned overall raises. I notice that for some here there's no changes. Were the pages exempted or what? Are hourly employees not included?

DR. McNEIL: If you look on the next page, page 4, you'll see that the budget last year for pages was \$26,730; this year we're talking \$35,750. There was a decision made last year when the budget was developed to reduce the salaries of the pages by \$1 an hour. During the year that was changed, so the budget there now reflects those changed salaries. The budget for '88-89 reflects those changes.

MR. TAYLOR: So that's actually about a 25 percent raise, then, is it? It's kind of confusing when you put it down 100 percent and up 100 percent and the net is up 25.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's the new math.

MR. TAYLOR: She says it's the new math. Is it?

DR. McNEIL: I never did take that new math, so I'm not sure I understand it totally.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's something here that was just said that strikes me as being very odd. Did the Clerk say that this committee last year approved a certain salary schedule and then midway during the year the salary schedule was changed? Was it changed by a motion of this committee, or how was it changed?

DR. McNEIL: As I say, I was not here at the time. My understanding is that there was -- I don't know whether a tentative decision was made or exactly what the situation was, but there was a suggestion that the pages' salary was going to be reduced and then that decision was either rescinded or not made. That's my understanding of the situation. There may be others here that can comment on that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Let's find out exactly what transpired here.

This committee made a decision, and you're suggesting to me that someone else then arbitrarily went against a decision of this committee? Well, let's find out who did that, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: During the course of the year a number of members got talking to the pages about how much they were making, and a number of members lodged complaints that the pages had been reduced in terms of their hourly pay. As a result of that, we looked around at the pay package envelope, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Kowalski, I in my role of Speaker, as you would perhaps be able to do with some of the funds within your general envelope, took the responsibility upon myself as an administrative prerogative and did it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, why are we going through this page by page? Why are we asking for confirmation or approval of this then? Why don't we just deal with one particular item for House Services and then just let the administration deal with the administration of this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's quite fine by me. It would be somewhat similar to what we have in place with regard to each individual caucus.

MR. KOWALSKI: The one difference, of course, is that the Legislative Assembly expects that this committee would be the scrutinizer of this particular estimate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Also the caucus budgets.

MR. KOWALSKI: Fair game. And that's certainly the prerogative of the House at any time. The important point, though, is that if a motion of this committee is made and approved by this committee, is it then the position of the administration of the Legislative Assembly that they can violate that motion? This is a question of principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, within each of the envelopes, sometimes when you have a little bit of money there that you can move to another, you can do it.

MR. KOWALSKI: But with the greatest degree of respect, if the committee passes a motion, does the administration of the Legislative Assembly then operate in violation of a motion of the committee?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I respect the thrust of the minister's remarks. I don't know a great deal about this general area, but I did think there was some reasonable discretion given to the minister or whoever it is in charge of the budget to make relatively minor adjustments. It would be silly if it was necessary to come back to the committee to change a wage rate from \$6.25 to \$7.25 or in the other direction. It does seem to me that if it's that order of change, it's hardly something that needs to be brought back. But I could be wrong.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest a brief coffee break.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So be it.

[The committee recessed from 9:26 a.m. to 9:35 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, may we assume we're back in now?

With respect to page 3 and the pages, since the Sergeant-at-Arms is in charge of supervision there, I've asked him to come back and give the explanation as to what the variation in pay per hour was and the process: why it went down and up and so forth. Oscar.

MR. LACOMBE: It was my understanding from the previous Clerk that the pages were drawing \$7.13 an hour, and he cut them down to \$5. I then interviewed some pages, and they weren't interested in working for \$5 an hour. So I informed the Speaker of this and suggested that they raise it to \$6, which he went along with. That's basically it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess from that one can then construe the Speaker was out of order. Any other questions on page 3?

DR. ELLIOTT: It's my understanding that there is an allowance made for pages with more experience than other pages. That's what this \$7.25 or \$7 . . .

MR. LACOMBE: That's correct.

DR. ELLIOTT: Is there a senior page assigned as a supervisor or director?

MR. LACOMBE: They're known as the head page and the Speaker's page. They get an additional 75 cents and 50 cents an hour over and above the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, we have decided to leave this at your discretion. Am I correct? I feel that when we nickel and dime young students like this, it isn't very good. These are young people who come from school and spend their time here, and I think we should give them a substantial dollar for that. The amount we cut back isn't going to make that significant a difference in our budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: I hope the hon. member will repeat that speech when the minimum wage is discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Might we go to page 4, ladies and gentlemen. Any questions on page 4: Parliamentary Counsel, Security Force, and Associate Sergeant-at-Arms? The last two items, of course -- obviously the Sergeant-at-Arms is involved with that.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would assume, then, that the additional member in this security force is the one that sits at the desk to check people in, hand out passes, et cetera.

MR. LACOMBE: Yeah, that's correct. It's a female. We have instituted a system where we check the purses of female guests. With just one, if she happens to get sick, I have no one to check purses other than the men. It's somewhat embarrassing. Some ladies, of course, don't like their purses checked by gentlemen. [interjection]

MS BARRETT: I say: try it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't instituted a check yet to throw out French cigarettes.

All right. Might we proceed to page 5. Any comments on that, Clerk? Is it just the natural flow from the previous pages?

DR. McNEIL: Straightforward calculations based on the figures on the previous pages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Page 6. [interjection] Indeed, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Probably you can answer this. I've only ever been on one of those sorts of things. How the heck can you send four delegates and spouses to a National Conference of State Legislatures, which could be anywhere in North America, for \$1,100? Is it that it only happens every couple of years or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fees.

MS BARRETT: Just the fees, not the travel? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last summer the ones that went were Mr. Hawkesworth, Raymond Speaker, Michael Ritter, and myself, and in that case there were only two spouses.

All right. Page 7. Mr. Kowalski.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is one area that in times of hold-the-line budgets and restraints I think perhaps we should be taking a look at very closely. This essentially deals with travel expenses, and listed on page 7 and page 8 are a variety of conferences in North America and outside of North America. I know it's customary to have Members of the Legislative Assembly attend. I think it's extremely important that one of the principles that be maintained in this discussion is that spouses accompany their mates, as I think the protection of the family is a very important aspect as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about the level of attendance, the number of attendees attending these various conferences, and I would like to make a recommendation that there be some reductions in this particular area. Now, during the coffee break you and I had an opportunity to have a brief discussion, and I certainly welcomed the sincerity with which you dealt with the matter dealing with the pages. So in this area, rather than me provide some suggestions as to where these reductions might come in, perhaps I could just make a blanket suggestion that there be an overall reduction and that the overall reduction in this area amount to some \$28,000 from your '88-89 estimate and that then you come back to us to show how this might come about. Now, if you'd like me to provide you with some additional guidance as to which areas there could be reductions in, I'd be pleased to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Twenty-eight thousand dollars over the '88-89 projected, for clarification.

Well, this is one of the areas where we've had some discussion in this last year. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, I think it was, also raised the matter that we would do a reduction in the course of this present fiscal year. We have been doing that, so fewer delegates have been sent in the course of this year. I for one certainly agree that seven delegates to the CPA regional when it's that far away is far too many. You know, I'd be interested in some input into any of these areas as to what

might be better numbers. The matter of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in Australia: perhaps indeed to knock that down by at least one. With regard to the parliamentary seminar in Ottawa, this year, for example, because it occurred while we were just beginning the fall sitting, no one went at all, but that certainly is an area that could be taken down by one. The Conference of Presiding Officers, again -- I think through all these areas we could take it down by one, except for the bottom one, the regional council meeting in Ottawa. It has been the practice to send the Speaker and the Clerk, and it's the one day that the Speaker plays hookey from the House to be able to go down to that conference. Then going on to the next section with regard to the National Conference of State Legislatures, certainly to knock that one down to three. The annual Clerks' conference of two -- I'd like to come back to that one in just a moment. Sergeant-at-Arms, one.

Well, the annual Clerks' conference. In the course of the last year, I've been making the case at the national level that the Clerks' conferences, number one, last far too long in my estimation; there's no need for them to be lasting for five days. In addition to that, I've been making the case, and I believe the majority of the Speakers now concur with me: what's the point of having separate Clerks' conferences? Because they end up having an extra conference than what the Speakers do and the presiding officers at the Table. You can imagine that that has not made me terribly popular nationally, but I really feel that nationally there's been a wastage of dollars, and in particular with the Clerks' conferences.

So the proposal that has gone forward and that I understand will come into play in '89-90 is that they then will have their meetings not at the opposite end of the country from what the previous main conference was and for a week, but they will meet prior to the Speakers' conferences. And at all the Speakers' conferences all the Clerks are there anyway. So we're now trying to rationalize this across the country and to bring those costs back in line at a national level, and that should start to show up, as I say, a fiscal year hence.

But any other comments? I'm certainly open to suggestions and would be willing to go forward with this.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, isn't it also a practice that the Clerks attend the CPA conferences, too, as delegates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was the practice that I inherited, and it was discontinued this year. So it's not automatic to the Commonwealth Parliamentary.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, you asked for suggestions on the regional conference in Regina. I would suggest that could be cut by two delegates. If we have five going, that could possibly be two from government and one from each of the opposition parties represented, or a combination thereof. I think we could cut two off that, which would cut substantial money.

The second comment I'd like to make -- and I'd like to put notice forward -- is that when this Legislature meets the CPA, I think, after talking to other CPA members, that it's not necessarily automatic that the Clerk be the secretary of the CPA committee. I've given it a lot of thought, and I think members themselves should be more involved in it; we should perhaps have ourselves involved in all our offices of our association rather than just some of the offices of our association. That wouldn't change the number of attendees, but it could change the people attending some of the conferences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any other comments? Okay. The Chair accepts the direction on the reduction of \$28,000, and we'll bring it back. Thank you.

Pages 7 and 8, and now we're at page 9. Back to the three vehicles of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Clerk, the insurance side, a rate reduction.

Okay. Page 10.

MR. HYLAND: Is that a standard cost on upkeep of the vehicle or is the Clerk particularly hard on the upkeep of his vehicle -- at \$500 a month?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On which page?

MR. HYLAND: Page 10. Eleven -- sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I'm sorry. Is everything fine with page 10 then? Thank you. We are at page 11. [interjection] Page 10 then. Okay.

DR. ELLIOTT: The facsimile machine -- is that centrally located? I'm just not sure what the arrangement is there. Is it available to other departments, other people, other MLAs, or is it... Where is it?

MR. SCARLETT: That's a recent purchase. It will be located in the Speaker's office, but there are a number around the building. Members are more than free to come over and use that machine if they so wish. This would be for the use of the department in our discussions with other Legislatures and things like that. If members want to use the fax machine, they are more than welcome.

DR. ELLIOTT: I don't know what the situation is with respect to the fax machines. I have no idea.

DR. McNEIL: It's a rental, not a purchase, but it's available to anybody in the Legislative Assembly to utilize. This is fairly recent technology which a lot of jurisdictions seem to be utilizing. We asked for information to be sent and they said: "Well, we've got a fax machine. Do you have a number?" And based on the frequency with which we think we can use it, we decided this was a good investment, at least for a year, to test it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the particular problems we've been having is when we have delegations that are suddenly dropped on us; they're coming through, say, from Russia or Czechoslovakia or France or United Kingdom. Often the parliamentary office in Ottawa then wants to get the material to us very rapidly. The best way to ensure that it's going to get here is to be able to use this. Recently we had a situation with regard to Speaker Lorrain in the province of Quebec and the fact that he's coming here in the next few weeks with a number of his MNAs. They wanted to fax the information to us so that we could then compare the schedules and get them back quickly. Then we were hung up; we didn't have it.

But as mentioned by the Clerk, we'll try it for a year, and certainly we can work out some arrangements for people to use it -- members. Okay, thank you.

Cypress-Redcliff. Maintenance of the Clerk's vehicle.

MR. HYLAND: I think I just read it over and answered my

own question. I thought it was \$500 a month, but that's somewhere else in the estimates. This was \$500 over and above the monthly allotment.

MR. TAYLOR: Perhaps I could ask one too. Is that one of the three earlier mentioned vehicles, or is that a fourth vehicle that's in the department?

DR. McNEIL: One of the three previously mentioned.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, it gets treated differently from the other two, does it? Is there any reason for that particularly, or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's Supply and Services, isn't it?

DR. McNEIL: The other two are covered under Public Works, Supply and Services; that's my understanding.

MR. TAYLOR: It must be covered by... I guess what I should ask you is: why aren't they all covered the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This one would be a departmental vehicle, whereas for the Deputy Speaker and the Speaker it would be the same as the Leader of the Opposition or a cabinet minister. It's then under that whole cabinet package, which is then maintained under Public Works, Supply and Services.

Might we look at page 12.

MR. TAYLOR: I can't help but wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether with the cancellation of flights to places as far away as Lethbridge, we're intending to replace all the government MLAs from that far away with cars. I want to get in my licks so I can quote it in the speech I make next day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On this page 12, you see at the bottom there, the ACCESS Network, the videotaping of Oral Question Period and the cost of being able to do that transmission. You note that there's no allowance made for doing any extended coverage of the House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on that page. It's the time to ask: are there any investigations as to costs that have gone to putting ACCESS on one of the satellites so the rural people or people not on cable could tap into the question period?

MR. BOGLE: It is. It's on satellite.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry. I'll put it this way. I gather it's on one type of satellite -- isn't it? -- that hardly anybody has the equipment to pick up. I'm not an electronics expert, but I gather there are two types of satellites out there, but the ordinary satellite dish that the people have rurally does not pick up this particular satellite that CKUA or ACCESS is on. There are other satellites that can be picked up, and I was just wondering if it might be in order to request or get some sort of a report from their staffs over the next while as to what the cost would be to put it on the regularly used satellite. I think we brought it up sometime back, but they may have it in storage somewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll have the file checked with QCTV.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, is it possible to be able to charge back that videotape? Is this for people requesting a copy

of the videotape? Couldn't we charge that back to the individual or group?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rod, do you want to answer this?

MR. SCARLETT: My understanding is that that \$1,800 is the cost of the videotapes of ACCESS. So what we're doing is basically covering the cost for them to provide the service.

MR. BOGLE: Well, first a couple of questions for clarification, Mr. Chairman. During the current fiscal year ACCESS have been taping and rebroadcasting *Question Period*. My understanding is that the cost of that was being borne by ACCESS. Am I wrong? Were we, through Leg. Assembly, providing assistance?

MR. SCARLETT: Okay. There is a slight difference here. QCTV were providing it to the local cable stations here in the city through the cable network. What we have done is expand it so that it goes on the ACCESS Network, and that has a cost to it for satellite time, for the videotape to transmit through the satellite.

MR. BOGLE: Possibly I haven't been clear enough, Mr. Chairman. During the past sittings of the Assembly, people in Taber and Coaldale and Milk River and Warner have been able to watch *Question Period* via ACCESS. So the service has been in place. What I'm trying to ascertain is: was there any charge back to the Leg. Assembly for that service? That's question number one.

DR. McNEIL: That's this charge.

MR. BOGLE: It's showing as a new charge for the next fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got the file being brought in, so we'll pull that; we'd have to view that correspondence file. But the original transmission was not reaching all the province. When I came into the House in '79 the transmission was indeed going throughout the province. When we come to '82, then a whole new thing came into effect. They were no longer telecasting gavel to gavel. That's when some parts of the province, including Calgary, were not getting *Question Period* at all. When we got QCTV to broaden its scope, it was then that they had to go into negotiation with some of the cable companies and with ACCESS in part about how they were then going to ship some of the signal around.

MR. BOGLE: But to be clear, Mr. Chairman, the broadcast has been carried by ACCESS for the spring and the fall sittings of the 1987 sittings of the Legislature. Someone was providing the service to ACCESS if ACCESS was not doing it directly themselves. Possibly this matter could be tabled, and we'll come back to it at a later time. But I do want to know whether or not there was any direct charge to the Leg. Assembly in the past. If not, why are we slowly being drawn into it now?

This is a major policy question. I'm certainly not opposed; in fact, I'm delighted to see the service going to cable subscribers across the province. However, I don't believe we should merely accept an obligation that's \$5,800 today, and a year from today we may find there's an expectation that we're going to assume the whole cost. Because I do recall some ex-

tensive discussions between the president of ACCESS and the former Speaker of this Assembly over the cost of ACCESS providing the service and billing the entire cost back to the Legislature, and it was a substantial cost.

DR. McNEIL: I might point out at this stage that in a couple of instances you can see the impact of technology on the costs in terms of the printing of Orders of the Day and Votes and Proceedings, where we have a reduction in typesetting costs. You would have seen that with respect to the Bills as well, except for the fact that the printing costs for the Bills have escalated by about 30 percent. So I think it's important to point out that for the decisions that have been made in the past to acquire certain technology, you see the consequences in terms of the budget subsequently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That information with regard to the telecasting will get straightened away.

Can we go to page 13 for a minute, please? Or we can go there for longer than a minute. This Hosting shows a reduction. Dr. McNeil, have you got any idea how much has been expended, what percentage?

DR. McNEIL: To date this year, I would say maybe \$100, if that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Might we go on to 14: Uniforms, *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*.

Might we go on to 15. Okay.

With respect to this section on House Services the pages which seem to have had agreement are 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. To come back with revisions: pages 7, 8. Pages 9, 10, and 11 seem to have approval. Page 12 requires more information, and pages 13, 14, and 15 seemed to have gained tentative approval. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3 was dealt with previously. Office of the Speaker.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. ELLIOTT: I understand you're on tab 4 now? I was playing catch-up there for a minute, Mr. Chairman. You're on Speaker's Office?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's where we are. This present one shows an increase of plus 1.7 percent, and here on this page of explanation you see some of the reasons why the increases. We also have had in [inaudible] a discussion with regard to making a reduction. Could I have that, please? Perhaps these could be circulated, and we'll have a look at these. This budget for this section, which is now being distributed, reflects a minus 2.3 percent.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: A comment on the first page where it's noted

-- the changes in budget. Was it in your budget or was it in the General Administration budget where last year we allowed a certain figure for special events related to the Olympics? I think what we did was cut an existing program in about half and leave it there especially for the Olympics. Then, of course, it should show as a net reduction this year because it was once -- I'm sorry, I guess it was the Olympics and the 75th anniversary of the building. Two celebrations were rolled into one. Is that in yours, or was that in General Administration?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The money for the Olympics was within the Speaker's Office, and of course that \$10,000 figure as put in is gone. [interjection] It was in General? Sorry.

DR. McNEIL: Last year that was budgeted under General Admin, under Hosting, so it's on page 14 in section 1A. It shows \$20,000 for the Olympics and \$8,665 for the 75th Anniversary Celebration and no funds budgeted for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry. Never mind. Because we were administering it from our office, I thought it was in our envelope. So that's the one that shows it going down by \$28,600.

MR. HYLAND: That was given that the Speaker would administer it regardless of where it was.

DR. ELLIOTT: That last exchange lost me, as to which page it was referring to. Are we into the recent handout or the one that's in the binder?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one in the binder, the earlier section under General Administration 1A, page 14. I had erred; I thought it was in ours. It's page 14, which shows that the funds we had in place for the two events don't have to recur.

Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Are we now on page 1 in section 4?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: We're looking at the thing in the binder, I take it, are we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you can look at whichever you wish, but from my own point of view the scenario I've been looking towards actually is the one that has just been handed out to you. So let's deal with . . .

MR. WRIGHT: It's your intention simply to replace what we have in the binder presently with the handout?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that it shows the minus 2.3 percent. So might we keep the questions to that one then?

MR. WRIGHT: What are the Payments to MLAs at the bottom of page 1?

DR. McNEIL: Those are the payments to the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, the deputy Clerk -- the Deputy Chairman of Committees.

MS BARRETT: The Clerk just said "deputy Clerk." Does that mean Clerk Assistant?

DR. McNEIL: No. Deputy Chairman of Committees. I changed my ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have the figures there that break it down as to who's getting what, please?

DR. McNEIL: If you look on page 14, code 515A99, you'll see the specific salaries. Those reflect the 5 percent statutory increase following from the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On page 1, of course, is the summary, so we can indeed come back to that. If we might go to page 2, Speaker's Office, the salaries involved are with regard to Mary Allen and Susan Purdie. Page 3. Page 4, Mr. Scarlett. Page 5, the benefit contributions.

Page 6 brings us to having some staff training money in there; \$600 isn't a humongous amount. Throughout the department we've been introducing at least some minimal amounts to try to do some upgrading for the staff. That was again one of the recommendations that came through on the management audit, and we've been able to get a number of people out on various courses. That has also helped us to have people as backups for other positions should people come down sick or for some other reason, and it certainly has helped, in my opinion, with regard to morale.

Page 7, we're back to the business of cars. To the Clerk: I assume this then goes across as a transfer to Public Works, Supply and Services?

DR. McNEIL: Correct. It's based on the capital cost on the vehicle, a percentage of the capital cost on the vehicle.

MS BARRETT: The last question: then does that mean that these costs really aren't borne by the Leg. Assembly budget but are borne by public works? Is that what that was about?

DR. McNEIL: No, we transfer this. We pay public works these funds. They purchase the vehicles, and then there's a formula through which they calculate what we owe them, based on the capital cost on the vehicle.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just a little puzzled. It was on page 4, the raise to the executive assistant of 15.1. As one who tries to keep the caucus employees we use and tries to fit them into the budget, I noticed not only that but a couple of other places in the book where merit and market adjustments seem to have come in at greater than the normal 4 or 5 percent everyone is trying to keep. Is there no set policy through the administrative staff? Do they do each on his own merit, or is there an effort to try to stick to any form of government guidelines? Or are there government guidelines, I guess I'm saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to this particular case -- and we're seeing this reflected in this budget, as you correctly point out, in different locations with regard to different managers -- it's reflecting the amount of work that was involved in the rearrangement done under the management audit as to certain people who, in the assessment, were being underpaid. So that's the main thing which is reflected here.

In terms of where the managers are being paid, a certain amount of rationalization went on in terms of the whole profile of pay throughout the manager level.

MR. TAYLOR: I think what people are worth and what the government guidelines are are two different things. I would love to give a good, high percentage of our staff raises in the area of 15 percent. But with an 18 percent cut last year and then nothing looking that good this year, I'm just wondering if there is a set of government guidelines that we're trying to follow on salaries -- unless there's a real reclassification of the jobs. Whether it's pages or executive assistants or whatever it is, in some of these areas there doesn't seem to be any reclassification. There were new people coming on. In fact, as was pointed out by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands the other day -- she may have had the wrong reasons, but she had the right conclusion -- there were people going down and people going up without any particular pattern. I thought we were trying to telegraph a message to the House and to the ministers, some of whom we have here, to try to keep their costs at a certain line.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, on two items. First, I want to say something on the item the member just talked about. I know there are government guidelines. I'm not just sure what they are, but I know it causes a problem. We've spent a lot of time making sure the Assembly isn't attached to government, that it functions independently itself. But I just recall that in years gone by when we were doing a lot of building of hospitals, for example, we were under guidelines in departments. What was happening was that we were funding the building, we'd get good people in the department, and they'd be hired away by those doing the building offering them twice as much money. We were funding both ends of it, and we couldn't raise our salaries internally to keep these people. As a result, they were being hired away. I don't know if you can ever cure that. But I would hope this was the action of the Speaker when this change was made, that he felt there was a good person there and that an adjustment should be made to keep him.

Secondly, a question related to the vehicles. Two cars are shown here. The total cars the Assembly supplies would be four, wouldn't it? The Leader of the Opposition, the Clerk, the Speaker, and the Deputy Speaker? So two of the cars the Assembly supplied are in a different division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair [inaudible] behind the driving wheel for the Leader of the Opposition?

DR. McNEIL: I think those charges would come from the Leader of the Opposition's budget. I stand to be corrected, but that's my understanding.

MR. HYLAND: In that case I'd be concerned, because I thought the Leader of the Opposition's budget was for duties as the Leader of the Opposition; it was in addition to the allotment. Because I think that in a department, although it comes out of the department, it doesn't come out of the department minister's salary. It comes out of the operation of the department, not the salary. But maybe I'm wrong. I thought it came out of General Administration. It was over and above what we allowed to operate the department. But I stand to be corrected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, we'll check into that.

With respect to the salary issue once again, in my examination of positions with similar responsibilities, not only executive assistants within the building as to length of tenure and the amount of responsibility but also looking at some of the positions in the various caucuses and the amount of salary that is

being paid to some individuals, I believe this is indeed a fair figure.

MR. TAYLOR: My point, Mr. Chairman, though, is not really what someone is paid; it's that we should either stick to the government guidelines or we should reclassify. To give raises that are outside the guideline and not reclassify I think is wrong. I believe if you want to pay more than the government guideline to an individual, you have to reclassify rather than just ignoring the government guideline. It doesn't seem to me to be a good practice to follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on page 4? Page 5 is a logical follow-along. Page 6 was the courses and on page 7 the business of the vehicles.

DR. ELLIOTT: I was wondering. Some of the discussion we were having earlier about attendance at conferences and so on -- the discussion took place, but did any of that reflect in this Travel by Presiding Officers & Staff item? I'm looking at page 7, an item of \$24,060. Is there a [inaudible]? It was holding the line, but I was just wondering if there is any feel for a possible reduction there in terms of the previous discussion we just had.

DR. McNEIL: My understanding is that this travel reflects the kind of travel that the Speaker has done in the past year on average.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not our expended amount; it's nowhere near that amount. My recollection is that this was an item that was placed into the budget and given an estimated amount of funding until we could have one year's performance for information backup on it. This was the figure used when I go out, for example, to speak to high schools at the invitation of the MLA and the schools, such as has been done in central or eastern Alberta. It's also there if requests are made by service groups, for example, and others to go and speak to them. I'm quite certain that the amount expended is not incredibly high at this stage of the game. Do you have a figure there? We'll get that amount expended for you.

Freight & Postage on page 8, a small amount.

Page 9: Photocopier, Typewriter, Telephone Rental -- and the Mobile. I must say that the use of the mobile has been very helpful in terms not only of relating to the office but also being more readily available when there are issues that arise with various caucuses. I find it has reduced my frustration level immeasurably to be able to get on the phone going down Highway 2 and get in the right-hand lane and be able to get caught up on some of those phone calls. I'm sure some of you find that's a pretty useful exercise, and hopefully they won't bury too many of us from car accidents with phones stuck in our right ears.

Again on page 10 we're into the matter of Telephone & Communications. Page 11: Temporary Staff & Printing. A reduction there. The Hospitality & Gifts shows a reduction of 31.4 percent. The Hospitality & Gifts basically is that...

Perhaps that sheet could be run off, Rod, the one that showed those extra functions of the Speaker. Have we got them here? Why don't you have one of the staff run them off and distribute.

Basically, what this relates to is when we have the ambassadors and high commissioners and other distinguished guests come through, many of whom do not wish to meet with any particular party but wish to meet with the Speaker in his role as representing all members of the Assembly. The normal thing that

takes place would be for them to come up and have a courtesy visit in the Speaker's suite. Then we would meet for perhaps 20 minutes to half an hour. In each case we also then present small gifts and have them sign the guest book.

In addition to that, we are then able to use that budget with regard to visiting parliamentarians and those groups that occur. They're either hosted in Calgary or Edmonton. In this past year we also hosted at Banff. What we have tended to do when it is convenient is have them hosted in surroundings which are much more indicative of what Alberta is or was rather than going to yet another hotel. For example, some of the hosting has been done in the Member for Calgary-Glenmore's constituency at the Wainwright Hotel in Heritage Park. That has turned out to be a great success, especially for the West Germans and the people from the U.K. and Russia. Then again here in Edmonton it's my expectation that we'll have some events at Fort Edmonton and also now in the newly refurbished McKay Avenue school, the upper floor of which shows the Legislature as it was in 1906. After that's officially opened on March 18, it becomes a very interesting facility for visiting conferences or delegations to go to.

DR. McNEIL: There was a question about what portion of the Speaker's travel budget had been expended to date this year. The answer is that of the \$30,000, between rental vehicles and travel just over \$10,000 has been spent to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That was page 7. The amount, Grande Prairie, was \$10,000 expended to date. Does that also include some travel by the Deputy Speaker?

DR. McNEIL: Some.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Page 13. Yes, Grande Prairie?

DR. ELLIOTT: Okay, referring to the information now with respect to page 7, you say you've only spent \$10,000 to date. Is that because it was a different kind of year, or would that reflect a relatively normal year? Is there a reason for that? The expectations were obviously different from what really happened if you expected to spend \$24,000 and you spent... Unless you have a big travel plan for the next two months?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I don't.

DR. ELLIOTT: The estimates for 1988-89 could be built around that new item -- not necessarily \$10,000, but show a reduction. It would make quite an impact on the total reduction in the estimates.

I'd leave that in passing, but I'd like to go on to page 11 then. Oh, now just a minute; I want to make sure I'm in the right...

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that particular point, though, some of the travel that was done by myself was with regard to visiting the Legislature, state capitol, in Washington state, because the Speakers in western Canada are trying to relate to their counterparts across the 49th parallel. I had previously had meetings with the Speaker from Montana when I was at that conference in Indianapolis. This was a follow-up, with some other meetings that I had with the Speaker from British Columbia in Vancouver, and then I also then went down to meet with the staff of the state Legislature in Olympia.

One of the reasons for that was the fact that a lot of the American broadcasting into Alberta comes out of Spokane, and a lot of their coverage of the state capitol, then, is Olympia, Washington. We're trying to build some of these cross-border relationships.

As Chair, had there not been a fall sitting, I had hoped I would perhaps also meet with the new Speaker of the Northwest Territories. [interjection] And then there would have been some of that happening. So again I say that it's this first year, and it was a guesstimate. By the end of this year we might have a better idea. But I've circled this as an item that perhaps can be moved down further.

Sorry; I interrupted you as to your other comments.

DR. ELLIOTT: I'd like to refer back to page 12 again. I really appreciated the discussion on the demands on the Speaker and on this budget item with respect to his visitors and guests and people who come. I think we all recognize that when we have visitors from out of province and especially from other countries, there is a certain level of performance and expectation, and I am pleased to hear the actions being taken.

A 31.4 percent reduction is a significant one, and I want to acknowledge that, in view of earlier discussion I was making about cuts. I'm assuming that that's not going to be a devastating cut with respect to the program you just outlined to us, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We hope it's okay. We have a document coming, just for your information, to show the extent of some of those extra meetings that did take place in the course of this last year.

Page 13, Materials and Supplies.

Page 14, as mentioned earlier in accordance with Mr. Wright's question, the matter of the salaries . . . My understanding of this section, ladies and gentlemen, is that there has been tentative approval given to pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 -- and 7, but taking into account that only \$10,000 of that has been expended so far this year, so we'll keep that as one to be re-examined; that's page 7.

Page 8: tentatively approved. Pages 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Agreed?

If you would be good enough to take from your binders the other document and shred it, tear it up, I'd appreciate it. I'll just tear it up.

I wonder if we might have a five-minute coffee break, please.

[The committee recessed from 10:35 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, ladies and gentlemen. Any more expense claims to come in while we're here? I believe that during the break you've had circulated to you some of the various activities which I've carried out. I think it came to what? Sixty-four?

All right. I believe now we're going to move on to Legislative Committees, item 9. Yes? No? Item 9, Legislative Committees. The summary's on page 1. If we might go to page 2 then: committee support. Any comments? Clerk? Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, if I read this right, the increase is shown because of a transfer on the advertisement of private Bills from somewhere else into Private Bills. And if one re-

moves that, my question to the Clerk would be: is it an increase or decrease, or just what is it with that removal?

DR. McNEIL: A decrease.

MR. HYLAND: Of?

DR. McNEIL: Of about 2 to 3 three percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2, yeah. If we might now go to page 3 and look at each . . . Sorry. Member for Innisfail.

MR. PENGELLY: On page 2 there, Mr. Chairman, under Public Accounts, why would there be an expenditure there when they only meet when we are in session and there's no remuneration when they're in session?

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this the summary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. The summary's on page 2. To carry on with that line of questioning, we then go up here. Let's look at page 8; page 8 gives you the breakdown. All right, Member for Innisfail, I'm with you. When we look at page 1, Summary of Budget Estimates . . .

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think you need to look at page 9, because private Bills is on two pages. Oh, no; no, sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. HYLAND: Recently wasn't there a public accounts meeting started of public accounts chairmen and public accounts secretaries and/or members in various regions in Canada? Didn't they start an organization that meets once a year? Perhaps this is the travel to and from those meetings?

DR. McNEIL: That's the case, yes. That's what the travel is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I wonder, Dr. McNeil: on page 2 of this, what does the \$124,000 figure really represent for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act?

DR. McNEIL: Of that \$43,000 is travel, and \$77,000 is payments to MLAs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

DR. McNEIL: There's a small portion of that budget for hosting and printing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Can someone explain this advertising increase on Private Bills?

DR. McNEIL: That money was previously budgeted for under General Administration, and it's just a transfer from that account to this Private Bills Committee to reflect that this funding relates specifically to this committee and the work of that committee.

MR. WRIGHT: What is the advertising that the public pays for?

DR. McNEIL: It's advertising of the fact that this private Bill is being considered.

MR. WRIGHT: But that's recouped by some payments by the promoters of the Bill, isn't it?

DR. McNEIL: Yes, it is, but those funds go into general revenue. We don't see those funds in our budget, as is the case with a number of other revenue generators that we do have. For example, last year I think there was \$77,000 in revenue generated by the Assembly in various aspects, but that all goes to the General Revenue Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean the sale of the book?

DR. McNEIL: Yeah. Including the book and *Hansard* and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I assume the advertising also, to conform -- you know, so that notification is given throughout the papers for people who wish to come with private Bills. So that's a fairly sizable amount of money, to put it throughout the various newspapers of the province.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I understand the expenditure. I was just checking that this is the expenditure that's paid for by the promoters of the Bills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we look at page 3? The salaries, telephones, technical and support services; \$14,500. And on page 4 we've looked at the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That's where we are. Yes, Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: To the Clerk: as of probably December 31, if that's your latest cutoff date, what percentage of that was spent?

DR. McNEIL: Are we now talking about the . . .

MR. HYLAND: The Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

DR. McNEIL: The trust fund? Eighty-six percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yes, Edmonton-Strathcona. Are we still on heritage savings?

MR. WRIGHT: No. This is a question still on page 2, concerning the absence of anything for the Privileges and Elections, et cetera, Committee. Does that have a budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It comes in the land of ad hockery, doesn't it?

DR. McNEIL: It has in the past. Because it had met so infrequently in the past other than the past year, we decided not to budget for that. Maybe that's wishful thinking on our part in this.

MS BARRETT: And on our part too.

MR. WRIGHT: We share an optimistic view of the situation; creditable, I'm sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could always put in a figure of half a

million dollars.

All right, 5, Standing Committee on Law and Regulations. The catering at meetings amount stays the same.

Page 6, Standing Committee on Legislative Offices. They have come in with a minus 4 percent. Yes, Dr. Elliott.

DR. ELLIOTT: As a matter of process here, what would be the normal process to truly examine or question any of these particular accounts? Is the administration prepared to respond to questions on any of these committees that we have in here? I have some acquaintance with the one that we have now on page 6, and I was just wondering: is this the only test that it's put to, or what's the procedure, sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The process which was supposed to have been in place was for the Clerk Assistant to have gone and consulted with the chairman and vice-chairman of each of those committees. With Karen South having been appointed as Clerk Assistant, we now have got that in place, that it has happened. It's my understanding that the chairman and vice-chairman of each committee have met, and therefore, it was up to the committee to have met to have discussion as to bringing their budget forward. Now, the exception to that one is Members' Services Committee, so that we have this figure that's here. I'm quite certain that Members' Services Committee can ship the budget back to that particular committee and say: revise it, in whichever direction you wish.

Grande Prairie, Edmonton-Strathcona, Westlock-Sturgeon.

DR. ELLIOTT: Well, if we had some serious concerns or questions about any of these standing committees, what would we do? Send the budget back to that committee and say to take another look at it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could invite them to the next meeting. The chairman, vice-chairman can come to the next meeting. If you'd like to do that, let us know.

MR. WRIGHT: What happens when it is necessary for a committee to meet that doesn't have a budget or which is going greatly over budget for some unexpected reason? Where does one get the money from, in the budget, for it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, in the case of Privileges and Elections, as of last year we are going to have to go to special warrant, and we're going to have to put together in that special warrant the cost not only of the Privileges and Elections Committee but also all the costs involved in the search for a new Ombudsman, because there again, there was no provision made. Now, my understanding of the proposed special warrant is in the nature of what? Fifty, 60?

DR. McNEIL: Those two committees, something like 80, I think; 75 to 85.

MR. WRIGHT: I suppose it's a toss-up as to which is the least inconvenient way of doing it. I mean, to have a budget which usually isn't spent is as inconvenient as is going to special warrants -- probably more so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The advantage of having to go to the special warrant thing after the Ombudsman and after the Privileges and Elections Committee is that then we can come in with the

real figures as to what it did cost, which is much more helpful, I'm sure, to the Provincial Treasurer. But that would be the route if some other special circumstance came along, if one of the other officers, Auditor General or Chief Electoral Officer, resigned or whatever.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, what bothers me a bit is checking through the travel expenses of about four or five committees that come up to about \$75,000. For instance, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is \$43,000. They're the big items of expenditure.

In view of a couple of things -- one is the government's stated intention, or the Premier's, to cut down a bit on travel and entertainment, and second is this committee's what I think rather unwise decision to limit travel to five trips a year outside when the House is sitting. Well, that's going to put extra pressure to get the traveling in under the guise of committees. In other words, you're going to get all kinds of split meetings starting at 4 in the afternoon or 3 in the afternoon, going overnight and back again in order to get around the five-trip category. We're going to have a great deal of pressure on pushing these travel expenses or against the travel expenses. I'm wondering whether we shouldn't ask the chairmen -- some of them have made some efforts, and I notice they're cutting 10 percent, but others haven't -- whether or not they couldn't come up with a new budget on the travel expenses.

I mean, my impression is that what we're doing is doing nothing, and they're going ahead and just sending in the bill. We're in the position of guessing what they're going to spend. But in view of, as I repeat again, that five trip a year thing, there is going to be a hell of a lot of pressure on trying to get to Edmonton through the guise of a committee if you can't do it directly any other way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, the point by Grande Prairie that this committee can direct that these chairmen appear before us at the next meeting. Then they'll have to go back and . . . [interjection] Certainly you can make a suggestion to them to do certain things. Then we'll have to get into the process of, you know, the time line thing. They'll have to have meetings to approve their budgets, to get it back to us to get it into our budget so we can get it in in time.

MR. TAYLOR: Is any motion necessary to support the Member for Grande Prairie's . . . Was it a thought or a move that the chairmen appear before the committee?

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, in view of this discussion, I think it behooves us to visit with a couple of committee chairmen. I would assume that time is still available to us, that we aren't creating a problem for ourselves by asking these questions at this particular time on the calendar. I would like to see the representation from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act come and let us ask some questions about their budget, page 4. Another one I would like to include would be page 8, Public Accounts Committee members. Those are two that I'm recommending.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Public Accounts and Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Did I also hear murmurs about Legislative Offices?

MR. TAYLOR: I think all the chairmen, because if we're going to go through a philosophical change of trying to put a bit of a

bridle on them -- and that's what I gather we're doing, instead of just in our budget trying to guess what they're going to spend -- we want to set them targets. My understanding, the way this thing is put together, is that no chairman knows he or she is supposed to try to come within the number that you have here. All this is is a guess as to what they might do. If nothing else, the chairmen should know what you think they're supposed to be spending and, as the year progresses, have some sort of control mechanisms of how they're doing.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I sit on the Public Accounts Committee. If I recall, Public Accounts have never traveled outside of session. We've always kept our meetings during session to avoid this kind of expense. If I recall, we decided to remove any type of travel expense because of the budget. Have you received anything from that committee chairman with regard to this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, with respect to this particular committee, Mr. Pashak and I spoke. And this is where some of this comes in about the national public accounts committee, of which he is the new chairman, and the fact that in the next . . .

DR. McNEIL: In the '88-89 fiscal year he is hosting a conference here, and there is some travel related to that. But in terms of the committee this year, the travel expenditures to date are about \$4,000.

MRS. MIROSH: I would certainly support the motion that we bring that person back. I don't ever recall this being discussed in that committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's good to know. Would the Chair assume, then, that we are inviting back the chairman of every committee, or not?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments. Firstly, as a member of this committee for a number of years, I recall back a few years ago -- which I remind members doesn't bind the committee -- that budgeting on committees was done; a figure was stuffed in and often wasn't used. At some point in time we decided that that wasn't the best way of budgeting either, that we'd try to more realistically budget what the committees used. So in answer to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, that's where about two or three of the committees that don't meet that often -- it was decided that if they need it, they would be budgeted under different forms rather than just sticking a figure in and having that carry year after year after year. Then if the committee didn't meet, it could be used as a fund for other occurrences in the same vote. Thus you weren't getting a true reading of what committees were using.

Relating to the trust fund, when I had discussions with the chairman about what we should put in -- and probably maybe we didn't spend enough time on it -- we put in the same as we did last year. I know last year we didn't spend the allotment, and I was very concerned. That's why I asked the Clerk how much money Heritage Savings Trust Fund spent last year. He says that as of December 31 it was 86 percent or something like that, which concerns me because the only travel that was done last year was back and forth to Edmonton for the meetings. It wasn't any tours, I don't believe. I believe the tours were in the previous year. So that's the numbers that concern me. Last year we just had the meetings, and the meetings weren't held till

fall, with about half of them being held and half of them being held this month. So I believe that why trust fund shows substantial travel is that if we come up for trust fund and still do other work in our offices as part of our 52 trips, it's tagged to the trust fund committee. That's where the trust fund committee gets a higher travel rate than other committees. With other committees, unless you're specifically in the committees or specifically get travel, it doesn't show to the same extent as travel does in heritage trust fund.

If the committee wants the chairman to come back from trust fund committee, that's fine. But he and I can look at the budget, and rather than him coming back, as vice-chairman I can answer questions related to that at the next meeting, if committee members wish.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I think it'll be a waste of public money and the time of members to get most of them. Going from the bottom here, Private Bills doesn't spend any money basically. Their advertising has nothing to do with the committee; it's the going through the committee of expenses footed by the promoters of the Bill. Public Accounts should be a very important committee. A budget of \$6,000 for it, particularly in a year when it's hosting some others, does not seem to me out of line, unless it's thought that they aren't spending enough. Members' Services: we are here anyway. Legislative Offices: I'm not familiar with the functioning of that. Perhaps there's a question there. Law and Regulations: forget it -- \$850. Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund: its meetings go on for a long time when they're out of session. The budget does seem reasonable there, but it is one of the larger ones. And then of course there are the committees that aren't even on here, and to have a blanket suggestion that we corral all these chairmen and quiz them is impractical.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Westlock-Sturgeon. I'm sorry. Innisfail and then Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, referring back to page 2. What is the rationale for decreasing the budget of Members' Services and Leg. Offices?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, with respect to the Members' Services Committee, earlier in the fall this committee approved the budget that we have here in the book, and I assume it was just a [inaudible]. I assume that within the Legislative Offices Committee, they're just doing their own attempt to try and equal things, cut the suit to match the cloth or whatever.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I think it's partly a question of information. If indeed these estimates have been made up from a budget submitted by the different chairmen to you, then I think the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona is correct, that we should only ask a couple to appear. But I am under the impression -- and you can correct me if I am wrong; this is where the point of information is necessary -- that these budgets are not made up by requests from the various chairmen. Instead, they are made up by our own people in-house here guessing from last year's performance what they'll do next year. Is that ...

DR. McNEIL: No. Those budgets were developed by the chairmen and deputy chairmen of those committees. We requested

them to submit the budgets and they developed them.

MR. TAYLOR: In which case I would go along with the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona then. It's only those that seem to be out of the phase that should be invited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say that, because I remember having discussions with the chairman of Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I didn't see the correspondence that went forward, but he and I did have discussions.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, do we have a motion as to which chairman should be invited, or are we still on the general discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair's understanding is a motion to have the chairman of Public Accounts and the chairman of Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Sorry.

DR. ELLIOTT: I think that was the motion I made that you're recording. I would like to withdraw that if I may, Mr. Chairman, in view of this discussion and have other members reconsider where we might go with this. There's been considerable discussion within our committee here since I opened the discussion, and I have found the discussion we've had rather enlightening, quite frankly, and would want to withdraw that motion with a view for preparation for another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have consent to withdraw?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, on the contrary. I thought the member's motion was very good, and the only addition I would have made to it is Legislative Offices. So I'll move that we invite the chairmen of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee, the Legislative Offices Committee, and the Public Accounts Committee to appear before us at some point during our regularly scheduled meetings in February, at mutually convenient times between the chairman of our committee and the chairmen of the respective legislative committees, so that we can discuss in more detail the budgets and the possibility of further reductions in those budgets.

MR. TAYLOR: Would it be fair to add that they bring their own defence counsel with them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, on the motion by Taber-Warner, those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Notification by ... [interjection] Indeed. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: I know the member specifically said "chairman," but in some cases if the chairman can't come -- and I'm thinking in the case of Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I am the vice-chairman. I believe the Member for Grande Prairie is either the chairman or vice-chairman of Leg. Offices. It could save bringing one or two people in just for a few minutes.

MR. BOGLE: Well, with respect, I think the chairman should be invited; if it's not convenient or possible for the chairman, then the chairman designate, the vice-chairman, or someone

else. But I think there's an opportunity for us to communicate more fully with other committees, and if we can bring someone else in, I think that's a good idea, Al.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments with respect to page 7, our own budget, as approved November 12? Further reduction in travel expenses? Leave the budget as approved? No comments? All right. Most of that section we'll come back to.

We might go to the legislative interns program.

DR. McNEIL: The intern program represents a reduction from last year's budget, the major component of that reduction being the reduction in the salaries paid to the interns to bring them in line with what's paid in other jurisdictions in similar programs.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I think that's fair. One of the reasons is that, for instance, the Ottawa interns, the national interns, are paid at a relatively low rate, but one of the perks associated with that low rate of pay is that when they travel to other Legislatures -- they're going to Germany or the United Kingdom -- that's sort of in lieu of a half decent pay rate.

It seems to me that last year, against my objections, this committee cut the number of interns from eight to six. Given that we'll be facing a cost of living increase of around 4 or 4.5 percent and given that some variations exist between provinces as to the basic costs of what are commonly called the little basket of goods that most households need to survive, I think it's unfair to single out the interns' pay packet, which is hardly substantial to begin with, and chop it effectively not by the 3 percent it shows nominally but more like the 7.5 and 8.5 percent it would be in real terms. The cost saving is so miniscule compared to the overall budget we're dealing with but does make the difference, I guess, between being able to afford to turn the heat up an extra degree in the house during the winter.

I don't think that's very fair. We're not doing it to anybody else, not that I can see, not that's been approved. It seems to me quite wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Other comments: Westlock-Sturgeon, Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm not so sure I can agree with the Member for Edmonton-Highlands on this particular case. I look at it more as postgraduate work, and I think \$18,000 is quite sufficient. In fact, if the money would go into bringing in a seventh intern, I would rather do that. In other words, I think it's quite important to educate or give as much opportunity as possible. You must remember this is going from full-time university for an interim into, as intern implies, the marketplace. I think \$18,000 is a fairly noble salary for that in-between.

The only fear I would have cutting -- in fact, I would suggest cutting it if he could put a seventh intern on. But I would be afraid that if I suggested cutting, I'd end up with still six interns. If I knew I could get seven, I would do it. So I don't think the salary is bad, and I would rather keep it down with the idea of possibly moving to expand to one more intern rather than trying to save money on the project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I remember, when the intern program started there were substantial private

donations in it. It was intended to be a cost-shared thing -- I believe about fifty-fifty -- as a learning experience for postgraduate work for some students. It was nearly 50-50 percent private-sector donations and government payment. We've moved a long way from that. I believe now the private sector donations cover or barely cover the travel arrangements by the intern program. So it's become another program attached to the Assembly. There's been a lot of discussion on it. I've said a lot, questioned it a lot through the years.

I would like to put forward a motion that the Legislative intern program, as it's budgeted for, be dropped in the next fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure this motion will engender a certain amount of discussion.

MS BARRETT: I object vehemently to the motion that's on the floor, Mr. Chairman. I think it's indicative of a lack of recognition that this program, nationally and internationally, contributes to some very high-calibre people in terms of what is a relatively inexpensive form of training that results in very well-qualified people who more often than not end up serving in a public capacity by way of being elected officials or by way of working in Legislatures or their related departments.

The cost of sending somebody to university for an additional year is way more than this. It costs the public about eight times what it costs the individual, for instance, just in tuition and fees, plus the inevitable costs associated with living, textbook purchase, and so forth. This is a relatively wise investment. Not only that, but it serves to enhance the various caucuses that benefit from having these people working within their organizations and from the transfers that occur halfway in the year when the straws are drawn and people go to other jobs. That is an extremely valuable asset to this Assembly, an extremely valuable program nationally. For what is a relatively small sum of money compared to a budget of -- what? -- \$10 billion or \$11 billion a year, I can appreciate no fiscal reason that this program should be abandoned.

MR. WRIGHT: I completely concur. It's a mean piece of economy. These young men and women are getting a bit of a leg up financially, but more importantly in terms of what they learn about public life, which stands them in good stead and stands all of us in good stead, I think, in the future. It would be a false economy to chop it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess this severe motion -- that would be the way to put it -- takes me aback. I know that in the years I've been around here, from time to time there have been concerns about the interns. I think by and large everyone has been very much knowledgeable of the fact of how hard the interns work.

I think one of the concerns has been the switchover process. I understand that in some jurisdictions the interns do not do the swap about halfway through their internship year. I sort of thought about this with regard to our program. If that's one of the things that's a bur under some people's saddles, maybe that could be addressed by taking interns and just having them stay with one particular caucus for the 10 months they're with us. Now, that to some degree certainly diminishes the challenges the interns have by swapping about halfway through so they then gain some experience, in most cases, of having worked with an opposition party and also with a government party.

I really stressed with the group of interns last year, as well as this year's group, that they have to be very cognizant of the fact that some members -- granted, very few -- are a bit concerned. You have them work very closely with you for half the year; then can you really trust them when they go across the floor? The interns, of course, take an oath of secrecy and, in my estimation, have been very good at keeping themselves to that oath.

I understand some of the difficulties about trying to raise the funding. I did not know that when the internship program was set up, it was supposed to be roughly fifty-fifty between funding through this committee and by industry. It's not easy these days to be getting the money from industry. With our three sponsors here, that's still -- you know, it's difficult enough to keep in contact with them and hope they will continue with their funding. So I would hope that maybe there's some middle ground here if indeed we want to reduce the size of the program. Granted that we had it at eight, and now we're down to six.

But if committee members are indeed energetic as they are with regard to trying to shape up this whole budget book in a more fiscally responsible manner, rather than have a motion of such severity, maybe there's some other middle ground. We came down by a couple of interns this year; maybe we can come down by a couple of interns and have it at four. If the other concern about working for one party and then going to another half-way through the year is indeed a real issue, perhaps go down to four interns and then have each caucus get one intern for the whole year.

The Chair apologizes for intervening, but I had to say that.

MR. TAYLOR: If I may speak on the motion, I do think it's a draconian move and a motion you could rank with bookburning and witchcraft. But as far as the enlightenment of the Legislature is concerned, I do think -- and through the years since '74 I've either been around the Legislature on the outside or, just the last few years, on the inside, but interns are one that you run across quite often. I've always been fairly proud of Albertans as a group. They've kept politics out of the recruiting, I think, of the interns and even administration of it. I think it's been one of the highlights that all parties can take some joy in, in how the process evolves of selecting the interns and how they are supervised at work and, in turn, the quality of the interns that have been picked. I wouldn't say I've known every one, but I've come very close to knowing every one for 12 or so years now since it started under way. They've done an outstanding job. They've gone a long way to sending many people on to careers that are really ambassadors for Alberta, ambassadors for the system we use here. So I think we'd be absolutely foolish, because if anything we should expand it.

But if this motion is defeated, I would certainly be willing to move that the subcommittee of this committee that has been selecting interns be empowered over the next year. It would take that long to investigate the process of maybe fifty-fifty financing again. I don't like to see an ad in between periods of the hockey game saying, you know: "Smoke du Maurier. Come visit an Alberta intern." But if there is some way of using private money without it being rubbed on our noses -- I forget, there's another type you could smoke over there too; nevertheless, whatever you're pushing, or the alcohol -- it could be set up in such a way that if this motion is defeated, I'd certainly then move that a committee look into what the price is of going back to fifty-fifty community public financing of the intern program. But I think it would just be a shame and something we would be

shamed for some months to come if we canceled the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the motion. Innisfail?

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, if the motion before the House is defeated, I would be prepared to recommend that rather than abandon the program altogether, we cut the number of interns by two and keep them at the present salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff, summation.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, it's obvious -- I can count two -- in the numbers. So that being the case, rather than having it defeated, if other members are prepared to put the motion forward somewhere between existing and my motion, I would withdraw this motion with unanimous consent, I guess.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: I would then move, Mr. . . . Oh, I'm sorry. Don't I get a chance to move first, because I said I would move if we withdrew?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: I would move that we accept the funding as is but ask the committee selecting the interns to also investigate sources, possibilities, and amounts of private funding and report back to our committee during the next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion on that motion? The motion reads:

That this proposed budget would stand, and that the people in the program would be charged to go out and find additional funding to try to get it to a matching basis, fifty-fifty.
Member for Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, there's so much discussion relative to an issue, I'm not really sure which stage we're building on or where we're taking off from. But I was of the opinion that the mover of the previous motion withdrew it on the understanding that the discussion implied we would be coming in with a new budget item, a reduction in the number of interns, and we would be taking a look at rebuilding our process with interns. I think we all agree that the role of the intern from the intern point of view is extremely important, and like some of the members have said, I'm very proud of what we have done here for these young people. I just want to see it built into our system with a little more study behind it. The motion that's on the floor now does not do that, and I will vote against the present motion.

MR. WRIGHT: If the hon. member's proud of the performance of the interns, the motion on the floor attempts to keep the interns and at the same time reduce the funding, so I would have thought he would have been in favour of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the motion before us, nevertheless, is

this one to approve this budget item and then to have that additional study. The motion withdrawal by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff was simply a motion to withdraw; you can't withdraw on a caveat that another motion will necessarily follow. The motion before us is Westlock-Sturgeon. Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion, please raise hands. I see three. Those against, five. The motion is defeated.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, as a compromise I would move that the number of interns be cut to four and retained at the present salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The present 1987-88 salary or the salary level as proposed in this '88-89?

MR. PENGELLY: Well, that's another thought. They are the highest paid in Canada. I would suggest that they remain at the '87-88 salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So keep them at the present salary, if this motion passes. All right. Thank you for clarification.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, could we also have for clarification whether or not the mover of the motion intends that if there are four interns, following on your suggestion, they be assigned to caucuses for a full year rather than moved, or was that not the intention of the mover? Because if it was not, I'll make an amendment to the motion.

MR. PENGELLY: No, that wasn't my intention.

MR. BOGLE: Is was not?

MR. PENGELLY: No.

MR. BOGLE: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we distribute the second motion if the original motion passes?

MR. WRIGHT: I understand that he's moving an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, as an amendment. All right.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, the amendment would be that the four interns be assigned to the four caucuses for a full year and not be rotated after six months -- one per caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Speaking to the amendment, Edmonton-Strathcona, Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. WRIGHT: I believe that is opposite to the intention of the internship program, Mr. Chairman.

MS BARRETT: I believe, further, that it indicates a sense of paranoia that is completely unnecessary. I've worked in this building for several years as a researcher prior to becoming a

member and worked with a number of interns who had, in some instances, already worked for the government side and, in some instances, were going to work for the government side. It's been completely apparent to me that those interns uphold their oath to maintain a level of secrecy with respect to caucus activities and that they treat the individual caucus with which they might work at any given moment with the utmost fairness. I have no idea as to where this sort of paranoia comes from, but I do think it is entirely unwarranted.

MR. TAYLOR: I too, Mr. Chairman, would like to speak against the amendment. I think it's well intentioned, and it's fairly logical if we have four to, say, four caucuses. What I'm afraid we're doing is painting ourselves, maybe unknowingly, into the corner of just extra help for the caucuses which then would fall prey in time to the budgets of the caucus itself. The next move you'd see, I suppose, is to transfer the cost of the intern to the caucus budget, and then it goes on and the whole program goes down the drain.

I think the very purpose of internship is to give as broad a base of knowledge as possible to these people. That's one of the arguments we have, and I'd like to see it still under the guidance of the Speaker's office. I see nothing wrong with switching them half-year, and if you would decide to switch a third of the year down the road, that would be all right too.

I have never had any feeling that they were going to have some deep, dark secrets that I had locked away in the computer somewhere, unloaded and given to the Tories even if they could understand what it was. But the thought that they'd be running around with secrets doesn't bother me. I think they're people of integrity. They're people also that are here to learn, not to be extra Joe boys to caucuses. I think this motion starts us along that trend, whether we like it or not. I would rather leave the education and the training and the selection of them more in the hands of the Speaker's office. Therefore, I'd like to see it defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: I'd like to ask the people supporting this motion if there's any evidence of interns in the past having broken their promise.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I take some offence to the innuendo by certain members of the committee. The amendment was meant to be a friendly amendment, speaking for myself only. The budget process is a difficult process, particularly when you're trying to find ways to reduce costs.

My original intent was to support the motion put forward by my colleague, the hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff. That was to be done, even though it would be painful, on the basis of further reducing the overall deficit of the government of Alberta. I was persuaded by the eloquence of the chairman of the committee that there may in fact be some room for compromise. The chairman of this committee further suggested that we may move, if there were indeed to be four interns and with four parties in this Assembly, to a situation whereby each of the four interns would be assigned to a specific party. On that basis, I was prepared to support the motion put forward by the Member for Innisfail, and I so moved an amendment to ensure that the original concept as put forward by the Chairman would in fact be followed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question on the amendment. Those in favour? Opposed? The Chair needs to call again. The Chair seems to have an even show of hands. All those in favour of the amendment, please signify. Sorry; I see it. Four. Thank you. Opposed? Three. It carries 4 to 3.

On the main motion as amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the main motion as amended.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I think this motion can be fairly said to be mean minded, not in the interests of saving money. It seems to me to be indicative of a mentality that I discovered last year in this committee at about this time of year, in which there seems to be either a reluctance to access mechanisms that will help people make informed decisions or a deliberate decision that an intellectual component within the body of the Legislature can be diminished and still result in adequate workings of the Legislature. I think the notion is tantamount to cutting off one's nose to spite one's face, and I speak strongly against this motion.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm speaking against it, Mr. Chairman, although sometimes you get the feeling in this committee of the old farmer shoveling wheat against a high wind. We started out with eight interns here a couple of years ago. We're now going to be down to four. That's a 50 percent cut in a couple of years. We have a Premier going back and forth across this province, saying that they're going to help education and put more money in it. We cut one of the education programs that is under our handling by 50 percent in a couple of years. We sit there and dangle our bonnets and plumes, worried to death about cutting travel expenses or entertainment, yet we can cut an education program, a scholarship program I think for interns, by 50 percent.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I think we would be telegraphing a message to the world that we're the original flat earth society here, that we're worried in any way, shape, or form about encouraging scholarship or having people participate in the process and learn our process to go out around the rest of Canada and the rest of the world. Indeed, I just don't understand the thinking of a group that will take a program that was one of the best acknowledged programs, one of the best recognized programs and cut it by 50 percent in two years for the measly amount of \$100,000 or so compared to an \$11 billion budget. I think it telegraphs a message that, as Liberal leader, I'll find easier to disassociate myself from than some of the rest, but it's a message that even I am going to find hard to explain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question I would have -- and I don't know if anybody can answer it now or not -- is: what was the size of the intern program when it did start? I don't think it was eight; it was less than eight. I thought it was four back when the program was initially started. It's been expanded. I thought the initial start was about one member from each university.

MR. SCARLETT: I believe you're right. It started at four and then expanded to six the next year. Originally it was at four.

MR. WRIGHT: Perhaps the Provincial Treasurer could be approached to see if they would refrain from funding one-fifth of

an oil well being drilled to save this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the motion as amended. Is there a call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion as amended? Opposed? Carried, 5 to 3.

The Chair needs a moment to read a memo from Parliamentary Counsel about some of our orders. What we're waiting for is clarification with respect to the changes to Members' Services orders which come into effect because of the three motions passed yesterday. There's concern as to whether we need to have them all clarified now, since they were passed. So we're waiting for Parliamentary Counsel to explain our dilemma at this moment.

While we're waiting, it's the Chair's understanding that we were due to adjourn at 12 o'clock . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . and that we were again going to come back on February 8 or 9, unless you wish to come beforehand. My understanding is that on Monday, February 8, we were to begin at 1 o'clock and continue to 4, and on Tuesday, the 9th, from 9 in the morning until noon. Is that correct?

MR. TAYLOR: Nine in the morning till when?

MRS. MIROSH: And p.m. on Monday?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One p.m. Monday, the 8th, till 4.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to make a motion if necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. We had it set aside, so we'll take the formal motion. Thank you. Moved by Cypress-Redcliff: Monday, February 8, beginning at 1 o'clock till 4, and on Tuesday, the 9th, from 9 in the morning until 12.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, during the coffee break I had a discussion with the Parliamentary Counsel -- and I believe it's the same matter -- related to should we use the date of passing of the motion or the date of January 1 or some definite date. There was some question about the date of January 1 regarding retroactivity if that's still the same advice that he's given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what we have here is this. It's been communicated to the Legislative Counsel that the intent of the three orders only be passed and signed when the administration reports the financial impact of the three. Mr. Clegg then read the motions literally to provide that the administration certainly has to report the impact, but it does not say that it is a precondition of any of those three motions to passage. So literally the orders have indeed been passed now as of yesterday.

What is the position? If it's not clear, the committee should clarify it. Have you reported the impact yet? The answer on that is no, from an administration side. If not, can you do it before you adjourn? No. And if not, when should these orders be deemed passed? At the next meeting? My understanding is that since we had the three motions yesterday and passed them yes-

terday -- and we have them in draft form -- one of them relates to being effective on the first day of April, the second was effective the 18th day of January, and the third was effective the 18th day of January. So . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

This has to be clarified before the meeting adjourns today. We must be specifically instructed as to whether these are to be signed as passed or suspended, and it must be a committee decision.

MR. WRIGHT: I just wanted to say that there was a discussion on only one of them as to the effective date, I think.

MR. SCARLETT: Originally, the motion presented a January 1 date. The Members' Services Committee cannot, according to Parliamentary Counsel, pass a retroactive motion. So the Parliamentary Counsel revised it to the effective date of passage, which was yesterday. And that was one of the changes that was put forward in that order.

MR. HYLAND: When I moved that motion, I said that I didn't know which was the preferred date, but I picked a date and it ended up being not the right date.

MS BARRETT: Well, I move that Mr. Hyland's motion of yesterday be dated effective yesterday, January 18, 1988, and that Mrs. Mirosch's motion moved yesterday be suspended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not going to take two motions like that in one. Sorry.

Well, it's the Chair's opinion -- and we're willing to be challenged -- that since each of these three were passed yesterday, they indeed came into effect yesterday with the exception of the one which is the air travel service, and it was specifically spelled out as coming into effect the first day of April.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. WRIGHT: What were the other two, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Effective yesterday. Now, what we're just declaring, the first one with respect to regularly scheduled air travel service will come into effect April 1.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the number of days for a period of which an allowance has been paid, not exceeding five so one can go elsewhere in the province, that one came into effect yesterday. And the third one, with respect to telephone ser-

vice, came into effect yesterday. Okay? Thank you, group, for your understanding.

Well, how many more sections do you want to go through today?

MS BARRETT: Let's finish it.

MRS. MIROSH: I suggest that we adjourn for an hour for lunch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to take a break and have a little mutual discussion about what you want to do? Some want to quit, some want to go on, some want to adjourn for an hour.

AN HON. MEMBER: No lunch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No lunch. Can't afford lunch.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I do have something scheduled at 12, and I know that at least one other member of the committee has. I'd be glad to come back at 1 or any other time, but . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I have to leave too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to leave.

MR. HYLAND: I do have a problem in that the notice posted said 9 to 12. So in relation to that notice the Heritage Trust Fund has scheduled a meeting from 1:30 or 2 o'clock -- 2 o'clock I think -- which, you know, obviously if we can set up in another room or they can set up in another room, doesn't prevent it happening. But it was scheduled because of the posted notice of 9 to 12.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As always, the chairman is at the disposal of the committee. Motion to . . . Excuse me, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, given that other people have made various plans because they thought we were adjourning at noon, even though I personally would like to stay until midnight to get the whole thing done, I hereby move we adjourn until February 8.

MRS. MIROSH: Okay, Pam. We'll agree with you once. Only once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion to adjourn, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you all very much.

[The committee adjourned at 11:57 a.m.]