

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[1:08 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everybody. We have the agenda before us. What is your pleasure with respect to the agenda? Are there additional items? The Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I would really appreciate if before people start to straggle out today -- and I know it always happens that one or two people have to get out for a certain flight or whatever -- we could book subsequent meetings to this one, Mr. Chairman, because I think this agenda is just a little too long for one day's work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Would you like to deal with the matter of the next meeting? Mr. Hyland, for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I understand you have some commitments in the coming month or so. I wonder if you could share with us the dates you may have, and then we can see what we can do from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Following upon the last meeting, I made some arrangements to go to the province of Quebec with respect to language training. I leave Sunday and I'm not back until very late on the 15th. So Wednesday the 16th is the one hole in time I have before the last week of November, because on the 17th I have to leave for another thing. So if we could look initially at the 16th, which I believe is a Wednesday, 8:30 or 9 in the morning, going through till 2 o'clock, we can supply lunch or whatever. Yeah, the Wednesday is the 16th; thank you. I'm hearing 8:30, 9.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I guess from my way of thinking that probably if we started at 8:30 . . . I will not be able to spend the complete day; on that particular day I've got another obligation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Show of hands. How many for 8:30, please? I'm seeing one, two, three, four, five. Okay. For 9? One, two, three.

MR. HYLAND: One thing we should watch there is that could be the AAMDC. Is that that week, the government luncheon, Alberta rural municipalities? We could break for lunch rather than have lunch brought in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, we can send somebody late.

MS BARRETT: Eight-thirty wins then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eight-thirty. And then we can look at the first week of December.

MR. BOGLE: It would be really helpful if we could identify a date in early December now. The week of the fifth, Mr. Chairman: do you have some openings there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the moment could we settle on this one for November 16? I'll have to ask someone to try and find my date book. Then we'll come back to this when we find it, please. Okay. Next meeting: Wednesday, November 16, 8:30 until 2 o'clock, as far as we know.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. WRIGHT: You always do settle the agenda first, so why don't we just make a rule of having it as the first agenda item -- approval of agenda -- just as a matter of course?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we've been doing it but not listing it; right. Thank you. Approval of the agenda then. Edmonton-Strathcona?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. We always do it anyway, but I just suggest that we have it as item 2 always.

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

Approval of the July 11 committee meeting minutes: 2(a), or (aa) perhaps. Thank you. Moved by Edmonton-Highlands. Is there a call for the question with regard to 2(a), the July 11 meeting?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

July 12 -- 2(b).

MR. WRIGHT: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Edmonton-Strathcona for approval. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Item 3(a), Business Arising from the Minutes -- the report on the universal gas credit card. David, please.

DR. McNEIL: Under section 3(a) there's a decision item there. The experience of the five participants with the PH & H credit card for the most part proved positive. In section 4, the analysis there presents arguments in favour and arguments against the adoption of a PH & H credit card on a broader basis. Our recommendation would be to provide the PH & H credit card to all members to replace the VISA card and the other gasoline company credit cards, based on the arguments presented there. Are there any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm astonished by the cost savings. How does that work?

DR. McNEIL: Using the VISA card for gasoline, we do not get a rebate of the federal sales and excise tax, which is approximately 23 percent. We do get that with other gasoline credit cards but not with the VISA card.

MR. BOGLE: I'd like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, so that we could then further debate or discuss the matter, and the motion is being distributed. The motion would read:

That the Members' Services Committee approve usage of the PH & H Canada auto credit card for purchase of gasoline and related items under Members' Services Order 4/83.

That the cards be ordered but prior to distribution, the Clerk advise the Members' Services Committee of alternative methods for the payment of taxi fares and airport parking ex-

penses incurred by members.

Now, the reason I'm putting that condition on the motion is that while I've used the credit card on the pilot project, I found it to be accepted at every service station I've been to. In fact, most retailers are aware that by using the PH & H, it does not cost them the added service charge of about 2 percent that they pay if you, the customer, use either a MasterCard or a VISA. So it's welcomed by the dealers, and I've had no difficulty using it for oil change or other lubricants that are permissible under our Members' Services order. The only downside to the use of this card rather than the VISA, which has been supplied, is that you cannot use the PH & H for taxis or for airport parking. It was the thought of one of the members of the Assembly that whereas a number of organizations have arrangements with taxi companies -- and I think we do it through our Leg. Assembly with the pages whereby you can use, I think it's commonly referred to as, a chit. It may be that through the Clerk's office, we can identify ways of making that usage easier for members re taxi and airport parking. Then by switching over, not only do we save administratively; we don't have the interest charges. The dealers we deal with save in that it doesn't cost them the approximately 2 percent charge of a VISA card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I have a question for the mover of the motion. Is it the intent of this motion that in the interim the use of the VISA card for those of us who did order them for purposes of non-gasoline or oil changes would still be allowed?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, of course, and I'm assuming that what would happen either at our November 16 meeting or the meeting subsequent to that is that the Clerk will report back to us, tell us how it can be done. In the meantime this motion would authorize the Clerk to order the cards through PH & H so that we can make a nice, neat changeover with all members of the Assembly at a uniform time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The main thing with regard to the chits for taxis being that they seem to apply mainly with Calgary and Edmonton. Then the other thing would be airport parking expenses. I suppose if push came to shove, it could be paid for by cash and then you have to go back through an expense claim process, but that could be further researched.

Okay. Any further discussion with regard to the motion then? A call for the question. Those in favour, please say aye. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Item 3(b), bicycle route. I trust you've had a chance to review the correspondence dated August 31 from the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, which basically does outline that there will be a formally designated bicycle route through the grounds. As for the skateboard business, that will be, as they say there, the "discretionary enforcement of the City of Edmonton Bylaw." Okay? Thank you.

Item 3(c), travel points, members' enRoute or MasterCard credit cards. Clerk, please.

DR. McNEIL: Our office has been in contact with MasterCard, VISA, enRoute. On none of those cards can you accumulate travel points, so that's not a feasible approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, a short but not necessarily a sweet answer. The answer is no; not possible, say the

companies.

Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Well, I've got an enRoute card. Well, no, I guess my travel points are not . . . I got it on a separate card that I got myself and then turned them over to the administration. I don't know what they've done with it, but rather than lose it, I thought it was better to take the card and turn the points over.

DR. McNEIL: Members can apply individually for Aeroplan or Canadian Plus plan as Members of the Legislative Assembly and accumulate points for later use on Assembly business. There was an agreement at the last meeting that that be possible. But in terms of these other cards, including enRoute, they don't have separate travel point plans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Item 3(d), issuance of identification cards showing employee's picture and employee number.

DR. McNEIL: At this point we're in a position, with our new personnel manager on board, to implement an ID card for the purpose of identification only and not security at this time. I can hand one around. That's to introduce you in an indirect way to our new personnel manager as well, whose picture is on the card. Her name is Cheryl Kvist. The logo on the card will be gold, not black as it is here, and boxes and printing will all be in sort of Legislature green. The cost of the cards is \$215 for 500 and another \$420 for the photographs. Our personnel manager will be in touch with the individual department and caucus administrators to co-ordinate photo sessions and issuance of the cards.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's the actual size?

DR. McNEIL: Yes, that's the actual size.

MR. HYLAND: I'll have no trouble with that in my wallet, and I can imagine some of the ladies with this getting in their purse or even the men getting in their briefcase. If it isn't in your wallet, you'll never find it. How come we don't go standard credit card size rather than small?

DR. McNEIL: It goes in a larger package. In other words, there's a coating over it, a plastic case that makes it about the size of a credit card.

MR. HYLAND: It's too bad. It would be nice to read the numbers.

DR. McNEIL: I guess the other factor in relation to the size of the card is the photographic system that's part of the whole scheme of putting the cards together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, while we're dealing with this matter -- one member's gone -- the photographic division where all this can be done up at the other end of the pedway is under the security portion which is under Public Works, Supply and Services. Correct?

DR. McNEIL: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this is using equipment that's already in

place. And the estimated cost again was what?

DR. McNEIL: Six hundred and forty dollars in terms of the cost of the cards plus the cost of the film.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I think all caucus members have recently had their freebie pictures taken, and they're readily available, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Do we? Have you? Maybe it's one caucus.

MR. WRIGHT: At least the NDP caucus, then, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if and when the process goes forward, the logical thing is to have everybody go on through up the other end of the tunnel. The hesitancy I have at the moment relates back to the shooting incident at the front door of the Legislature in the last few weeks. Immediately after that two meetings have been held between those of us that have various portions of jurisdiction. That involves the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, the Solicitor General, myself, and a representative from the Premier's office. An outside consultant has been hired, who has a very extensive background and a good background in terms of security aspects. That report should be in before Christmas and probably sooner. At those meetings I've raised the matter of the identification cards, because they fit, even though they're not necessarily going to help to stall a problem like we had.

So while we've given you the information on all of that today, I think I would hope we would hold on till our next meeting, because by that time hopefully that first report will be back from the person that's doing the total packaging assessment with regard to not only this building and the Annex and the pedway and the parkades and the grounds, so that there's much more of an overview before we proceed. Thank you.

Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we table the item until an appropriate report has been presented and the chairman feels he can bring it back to the committee for a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, ASAP. Thank you.

Those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona. [interjection] It's a motion to table, the way he's phrased it.

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, it doesn't matter, actually. It can be tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: I thought we could settle the problem in another way, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

Additional comments on any issue whatsoever.

MR. WRIGHT: What I was going to remind us of was when we went to the Saskatchewan Legislature -- remember -- and the system they had there in which all members had a card and with that card they could then get entry at several points in the building. I think that had a picture on it too. So you'll bear that in mind, perhaps, when talking about this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The one other thing -- to the Clerk -- is that when the time comes to do this system, it can be done fairly quickly, can it? Thank you.

Item 3(e): one small refrigerator is in the members' lounge; a second is on the way, to be installed prior to a sitting rather than stocking it all the time. Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Oh, on that very point, I just wanted to reiterate that the intent of the motion as I understood it from Ken Kowalski, and certainly the intent of the member who raised it with Ken and me -- that was Bill Payne -- was that the refrigerator would be stocked while the House was sitting. It was not suggested that you have a refrigerator fully stocked 12 months of the year, because it is meant for members' use during the sittings of the Assembly.

MS BARRETT: But there's committee meetings going on for a while. I mean, who else is going to use it but us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Lots of folks drift all the way on through.

MS BARRETT: Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, from time to time. But we could stop that. [interjections] Edmonton-Highlands, Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I take it that members can lodge things in this refrigerator too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, but I'm not going to referee who's stealing whose milk or whatever.

MR. WRIGHT: And will these things lodged be censored -- I mean, scrutinized?

MS BARRETT: Like, who's going to police it before sandwiches start growing things?

MR. WRIGHT: Not sandwiches.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Surely you're not expecting us to hire a dog that has a drug-sensitive nose or something like that.

MR. WRIGHT: Not those kinds of drugs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If someone wishes to store their insulin there, sure.

Now then, 3(f), Taber-Warner, constituency services order guidelines.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, members will recall that ap-

proximately two and a half months ago, when we last met, we did discuss the need for some improvement and refinement to the guidelines respecting the use of members' funds relative to constituency work. Since that time there have been discussions between the chiefs of staff of the various parties. That was clearly the intent of the discussion we had two and a half months ago, that we try to find common ground between the various parties to deal with this sensitive but necessary matter.

What I would propose doing today is to table or make available to the Chair and to all members of the committee a notice of motion that would deal with the matter, that we place the agenda item on our meeting of Wednesday, November 16, so that it may come forward at that time either in its presently constructed form or if members can identify ways through their chiefs of staff with our chief of staff where there can be improvements . . . In other words, if we can come up with something everyone is comfortable with and there's unanimity, great. But the matter needs to be dealt with, and I propose that we do so on Wednesday, November 16.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's notice of motion. I think it would be in order to allow some preliminary response if somebody wants to at the moment.

MR. BOGLE: The other thing, Mr. Chairman, so as not to take up valuable time of the committee, is again to work through the process which has been working very well, I think, in the last number of months, and that's allowing our respective chiefs of staff to get together. If there are other thoughts from the Clerk or administration, we'd certainly welcome those as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does that seem all right as a general process?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then the minutes will just show it recorded as notice of motion for the next meeting. Thank you.  
Item 3(g). The Clerk, please.

DR. McNEIL: Since this was designated as a six-month pilot project, I guess what I have to say today is really an interim report in terms of what we've observed with respect to RITE line usage. I've gone over the billings for August and September and some in October. From my analysis some offices appear to be using the line consistently, and there was a change between July and August and September in the amount of use the RITE line was given. That's based on the decrease in the number of calls to government numbers, especially in Edmonton, from those constituency offices. In others there was very little change.

I'll just give you an example. In one instance, one office went from 40 calls in August to nine calls in September, not using the RITE line. So there were 40 calls that could have been made on the RITE line in August and only nine that could have been made on the RITE line in September. One office had six calls, another 18. On the other hand, there were some that had 35. One office had all their calls, 95 calls, to a tune of a toll charge of \$190, which could have been made on the RITE line and were not made on the RITE line. So there's a lot of inconsistency among the offices, some using the RITE line, it appears, quite consistently and others not at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Questions? Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: I assume that when we're talking about that, we're talking about just constituency offices.

DR. McNEIL: Yes. Correct.

MR. HYLAND: I notice that in my constituency office it's on a totally separate phone, and it's at the secretary's desk. I wonder if there's a possibility there could be an extension put on them so they're in the MLA's office as well. Secondly, why couldn't it be put on the other phone as another line rather than another phone? That way it might get more use. When you're picking up and going to another phone, it just seems natural, force of habit, that you go to the phone that's closest to you. If they were all on one machine rather than having the old system of having to have a separate phone . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; we'll check into that.  
Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Taber-Warner.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand the separate phone business. Maybe it's something that existed prior to the year I was born. Could he explain what on earth he's talking about?

MR. HYLAND: Well, in our case we have the phone with two lines that's been in the constituency office since it was opened, and there are four or five buttons on it. When they came to put the RITE line telephone in, it was a whole separate set. It wasn't connected in with the existing phone. The instructions were for a separate phone apparently. My constituency secretary asked the question, "Well, why isn't it on the phone?" "Our orders say that you get a separate phone. Here's the phone; here's the line." [interjection] Charlene says that they're all like that.

Maybe we should fine-tune it, and that might encourage more -- because if it's right there and you're used to using it, I think it'll encourage more use. It'll come automatically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I don't think you can have the RITE system with hand-cranked equipment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Smoke signals are tough to handle too. Is part of the problem also that it's early yet and we just need to encourage more people to keep using it?

DR. McNEIL: Yes. I was going to suggest that it may be useful for the chiefs of staff to communicate to their offices that have RITE lines just a reminder about usage. I can get together with individual chiefs of staff and review the information we have in terms of which offices appear not to be using the RITE line when they have it available. So that might be focused a little more specifically on those offices where there appears to be a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That makes sense.  
Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Could you also get together perhaps with gov-

ernment services and talk about the instructions they issued during installation, and see if that can be checked?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Will that handle it? Thank you very much.

It's my understanding that item 3(h) will take a little while to deal with. Why don't we stretch our legs, and you can check out whether the fridge is in the members' lounge or not. Ten minutes.

[The committee recessed from 1:39 p.m. to 1:56 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; thank you. Item 3(h), EDP Pilot Project. Clerk?

DR. McNEIL: The information on the pilot project is presented in two separate documents. One is a summary report on the pilot project, the conclusions that were drawn, and the second is -- we called it a decision item. It presents specific recommendations as to how to proceed from here, as a result of the outcome of the pilot project. In summary, based on the pilot project, the steering committee, which was made up of staff representatives from each caucus as well as staff of the Legislative Assembly Office and Don MacLeod from Public Works, Supply and Services, and ably chaired by Blake McDougall, concluded that a microcomputer can provide an effective means of increasing the effectiveness of work in the constituency office through utilization of word processing, list processing, and providing the feasibility for electronic mail capability in the office.

There are a number of key results of that pilot project which are presented in summary on page 2. For the most part, and this is going through them briefly, the IBM AT compatible microcomputers . . . Now, those were a variety of microcomputers. They weren't all IBM computers; there were three or four different types. For the most part, they functioned well and appeared to meet the computing needs in the constituency office. The Apple Macintosh II microcomputer, fitted with the appropriate software to make it compatible with the overall system, also was demonstrated to be able to provide the same capability as the other computers. The software packages that the committee chose, based on an evaluation of what was available and recommendations from various organizations, proved effective. WordPerfect, the word processing software; the list management software, PFS: Professional File; and the interface software, called MYSELL, proved to be very effective in the offices. The Electronic Mail functions were used extensively by constituency and caucus staff and were seen by them to increase their efficiency and effectiveness. And so on in terms of those recommendations.

Are there any questions about those results, first of all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Mr. Chairman, my concern is that perhaps because of the terms of reference of the pilot project, not sufficient attention was paid to equipment other than IBM equipment or the IBM AT, if that's different. I do note that the terms of reference of the pilot project, when you look at it closely -- and I'm quoting from the last page of the report that was approved by us last year -- were that

a pilot project be conducted to include the seven constituency offices surveyed during the study, to test and evaluate the recommended microcomputer hardware and software.

Now, at the time, I think, we thought that meant the types of EDP equipment would be tested, but perhaps that was taken as a recommendation for a specific make of hardware, and some doubt there. At any rate, there was no requirement, it seems, to come up with a particular choice of the particular equipment, yet that's precisely what has happened, and my concern is that not sufficient testing was done in the field. There was no testing of alternative equipment by constituency people in the field, and in view of the fact that some of the other equipment is admittedly much more "user friendly," I think is the phrase, than the IBM and so much easier for people who circulate throughout constituency offices to use, we would not be doing ourselves a favour by going ahead with the recommendation in the agenda item here, which ties ourselves to the IBM equipment without further investigation.

So I have summarized in my letter to you, Mr. Chairman, copies of which have been circulated to members, the concerns which have been related to me by Apple Macintosh people. Now, doubtless they're biased, and I don't know which is right, but what I do know is that if the information they've given me is correct, then we should, I believe, make some further evaluation as between at least those two systems. So that's my concern. I don't know whether I've gone beyond the section you have given, and in no way am I attacking the objectivity of the people who did the pilot project, only that they may have felt themselves trapped by the terms of reference.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands, and then the Clerk.

MS BARRETT: Do you want to go first, David? Oh, okay.

Well, high tech splits the NDP representatives on this committee, I guess, because I, with respect, disagree with some of the comments from the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. In the first instance, that comment about user friendly is absolute nonsense. User friendly has to do with programs, not the basic unit of a computer, and I know this because I know how to operate computers. It is the programs. And by the way, the software programs are extremely alike these days. Because what's happened, you know, by good old market forces, is that the nice, easy, user-friendly ones that have the best ability for storage and for sorting and so forth have become the most popular ones, and you can buy one kind that is compatible with DOS systems and one kind that's compatible with Apple systems. So really the user-friendly stuff has only to do with software, and they are very similar to each other. There's a Microm program for Mac; there's a Microm program for IBM compatibles.

The other thing I'd like to point out is that at the end of the report Gordon has given to all of us, he's looked at something that I understand is quite a new feature or program or system, probably, offered by NBI which basically would allow us a link between systems which are currently not directly compatible with each other. I wonder just how difficult that system, that linking program, would be to operate. Because what happens is this: currently if I'm using my WordPerfect, Multimate, or FirstChoice and I want to transfer my stuff from my IBM compatibles to the NBI, I have to transfer it into NBI programs which will accept that language and that type of information sorting. So if I've already got that problem, isn't it going to be made all the more complicated by this system that says it will be universally accepting? I think the problem would just be compounded. I can't see a system being that easy. I'd like to hear from these people as to just how useful this link program would

be.

Maybe I'll come back later if we're going to get into the schedule, attachment C, on the cost, because I also have a couple of recommendations there. But you would probably prefer that to be dealt with afterwards, would you?

DR. McNEIL: I thought we should discuss the summary report in terms of the outcome of the pilot project before we got into what we're recommending based on those summary results.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, to expand a little on what I have said, members can see what I have written in this note here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. If this is a note, how long is a letter?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, it's about as summary as this summary report that we're considering, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me what has happened is that we face the fact that some \$2 million worth of equipment is in there, which is IBM or ...

MS BARRETT: NBI.

MR. WRIGHT: NBI; sorry.

DR. McNEIL: We have about, I guess, \$1.5 million, \$2 million invested in NBI equipment, which is IBM compatible. In other words, you can hook it up to any other computer that is IBM compatible. So in terms of our existing technology, if we want to be able to communicate with it and use it as well as anything we add, there is a constraint imposed by having that investment of requiring IBM compatibility in terms of anything we hook up to that system, including constituency offices. So that was an underlying constraint we had to observe in going ahead with this pilot project.

Now, we used some IBM computers, some AST computers, Best computers, and I think maybe one or two others that are IBM compatible. In addition, we obtained a MacIntosh computer from one company, a MacIntosh SE, which was hooked up in Public Works, Supply and Services because the office chosen by your particular caucus to participate in this project had technology other than MacIntosh. So given the proviso that you wanted us to look at MacIntosh as well, we obtained one from MacIntosh.

The first one did not work with the system, so we had to go to another company, with the assistance of Apple, to provide us with a better Apple MacIntosh computer, a MacIntosh II. We tried the same things with that particular computer as we did with the computers in the constituency offices after the difficulties we had initially with the first one we had. Our conclusion was that that MacIntosh II, with the appropriate software to make it IBM compatible, provided the same functionality as those other IBM compatible machines. Our report is not recommending a particular brand of computer; all it's saying is that the standard we're recommending is an IBM compatible standard. That standard could be met by MacIntosh, by Epson, by Compaq, by AST, by NBI, by numerous computers. So we're not making any kind of technological decision here in terms of what computer to buy. We're not recommending other than a

certain generic standard that we're recommending here so that over the next five to seven years we'll be able to keep up with the developments that are going on in the field right now, new software developments that are taking place, including IBM's Operating System 2. We're making a generic recommendation; we're not saying anything about what computer we want to buy. If we went to the market -- and we're recommending going to the market and saying, "Bid on this contract; we want a standing offer bid." If MacIntosh came in meeting the spec and with the lowest price, then we'd likely choose that particular computer.

So I have to emphasize that we're not concluding that MacIntosh is not the right computer, because we demonstrated in this pilot project that it would work. A MacIntosh II computer with the appropriate software would work. Somebody, for example, who had to learn WordPerfect, had to work in WordPerfect on an Apple MacIntosh computer, would have to go through exactly the same training as somebody who was going to use WordPerfect on an IBM or an AST or a Compaq or an Epson. There would be no difference in the training required between those two individuals on a MacIntosh versus any other kind of IBM compatible.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I guess the answer to the question is that there's \$2 million in there and it is for the NBI stuff, which is IBM compatible, and this is an underlying consideration. I would say that it seems to be an overriding one, and it should be a very important consideration. I think in the end one should have something that will enable different types of equipment to function with each other. This seems to me, if the quotation I have been given is correct, to be the way of the future. It should be noted that the Apple MacIntosh that was rejected because it cost more is a considerably more powerful computer, and the like one is rejected because the screen is too small, mainly. Now, I can see that for someone who is an operator that does nothing but sit at computers, this is annoying, but I'm not sure it makes much difference in the constituency office. However, I don't want to get into too much detail here but just to outline the heads of difference as it were.

It was reported to me that the IBM AT, which is what the decision item asked us to approve, is out of date, and the operating system DOS which goes with it is out of date. I don't know whether it is or not, but these people who reported this to me were not computer illiterate, unlike me, and I think it's something that should be checked out. The new computer technology that is really up to date that easily makes available a vast array of data bases, representing the NeXT computer, it's called, is not something that could be easily made compatible, so I'm told, with the proposed system, whereas it is compatible with MacIntoshes. The overriding virtue of the MacIntosh, I still repeat, seems to be the ease with which it can be learned by those who know little or nothing about computers. There is even quoted something that the testers said about the MacIntosh II: "Why are we fooling around with DOS when we can have this?" So I think that until my doubts, anyway, are allayed on these points, and they well may be more or less easy to allay, I can't take the step we're asked to take in the decision item.

Lastly, I repeat that the alternative of having a central piece of equipment that can make compatible all the commonly used machines should be considered. Finally, I'm glad that the type of equipment is still up for choice, providing it reaches certain standards. If that is so, it does seem to be inconsistent with the recommendation C in the decision item.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, is it appropriate to make a motion on this at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly; at any time.

MRS. MIROSH: I'd like to move that the Clerk arrange for comparable testing of IBM and Apple Macintosh equipment of the proposed applications identified for the computerization of constituency offices and that the results of this testing be reported to the committee at their next meeting. [interjection] No, this hasn't been done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Edmonton-Highlands to the motion. It'll be here in a minute.

MS BARRETT: Okay. I can make my comments in the context of that motion. In my assessment that really already has been done. That was the project that just happened, in my view. What they've shown is that you can use all sorts of types of equipment and still have a compatible program that will connect with the NBI system currently in place.

MR. WRIGHT: Where does it say that in the report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Order please, folks.

MS BARRETT: The Clerk has just said so, and I know that because of the way the test was done, it was proven successful. You can use a Mac in this context. It is not discriminatory at that level. They themselves have developed . . . I don't know what you call them because I'm not that literate; anyway, I'm not a programmer. But there's something you can attach to either an IBM or a clone or a Mac that will make it compatible with the DOS system.

Now, you say DOS is out of date. There's no such thing as not being out of date in this game. What you have to have, ultimately, is a system that can talk to itself, a closed network. That's all you really need to achieve in the context of Leg. Assembly, government departments, and constituency offices, because technology will just keep racing on. At some point you have to say, "Well, we'll go with a system that will allow us to network with each other." That is the real goal of computerizing constituency offices.

By the way, DOS is not out of date in my view. It's still the most common basic program in the computer world. The software, the disk programs you can use, are also changing, but there's really no difference between MacWrite and FirstChoice as far as I can see. I've used both of them. You know, I can sit on anybody's computer and use any of their word processing or file management programs. They're really so similar to each other that it makes no difference at all.

So the motion is fine except that in my view it's already been done. That is what they tested for, and the recommendation here is a good generic recommendation: 40 megs hard drive and the ability to use the 5.25 floppy disk instead of 3.5 hard. You know, that's good, generic stuff that anybody can accommodate. I don't see why we can't just agree with the recommendations from the committee and move forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Speaking to the motion, Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I support the motion, Mr. Chairman. I

think it's intended that this be the next regular scheduled meeting after that of November 16, right? So that can be understood.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons the committee members are having such difficulty wrestling with this issue, and it's been so adequately covered by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, is that most of us are not nearly knowledgeable enough about computers. We've received input from various sectors suggesting that there are shortfalls in the work that's been done to date. Whether that's true or not I can't say because I don't feel that I have enough of a knowledge base. I know how hard the staff and the subcommittee of our Members' Services Committee have worked to bring the project to the point it's at today. It seems to me that whether the motion requires a duplication of what has already been done or not is secondary in the sense that members need to feel comfortable that all of the avenues have been carefully examined.

As I read the motion, what the Member for Calgary-Glenmore is really requesting is that the appropriate model units by both IBM and Macintosh be compared. Since we're having our next meeting in about two weeks' time, the worst thing that can happen, Edmonton-Strathcona, is that we lose two weeks in the process. On the other hand, if by having that further comparison between the two units we're able to satisfy the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and others, surely it's time well invested. Therefore, I support the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comment, Clerk, or any of the people with you?

DR. McNEIL: I wondered if it might be useful to have our expert from Public Works, Supply and Services comment just in terms of what comparisons were made in relation to Macintosh and the IBM compatibles. This is Don MacLeod from Public Works, Supply and Services, from the project management branch. Don, will you . . .

MR. MacLEOD: Okay. I'd just like to say that the aim of the pilot project was to see if computerization would meet the requirements of the constituency office. It really was not to pick a specific hardware piece of equipment. But as the pilot project got started, we were asked to test the Macintosh, and we were quite happy to do that. They provided us with a Macintosh SE. We had it set up in our public works head office building, and we had it connected through communications, or we were going to, to the NBI in the Legislative Assembly here, so it would be a similar hookup as the constituency office was being hooked up. Expert Knowledge Systems, I think, was providing support, and with the SE they never did provide us with the software or the hardware pieces that we needed to make the Macintosh IBM compatible, which it has to be to interface with the NBI system.

Consequently, as we kept asking for this support and didn't get it, Apple itself provided us with another support vendor of theirs who came in to help us make this work. The first thing they said to us was that the Apple SE was not a suitable product for the need because of its small screen, which is only a nine-inch screen. So they brought us a Macintosh II, which had the larger screen and had five megabytes of memory, which can store 5 million characters. But, really, the machine was far more powerful than the ones we had in the constituency office. They gave us a hardware solution, which simply was expensive, and it was a 286 chip, which just made it an AT computer, so that wasn't a good solution. But they did have a \$600 software



package which, installed on the MacIntosh machine, communicated with the NBI as well as the MS/DOS machines. So, in effect, if the person with that MacIntosh machine wanted to pay a little more for that software, they could work in their MacIntosh world and then they could use this software to communicate with the NBI system. I said in the meeting already that the reason we did not test specific software packages is that the application software packages are very, very similar. For example, there's WordPerfect for the MacIntosh as there's WordPerfect for the MS/DOS equivalent. So we didn't get into testing the application packages.

So from my own perspective the testing has been done, and we have no qualms in saying that the MacIntosh II met the specifications. I think the problem is that when we're seeing an IBM AT compatible, we're not talking about a computer. We're talking about a level of functionality that is required in whatever computer is purchased. The AT compatible is the minimum configuration that will take the newer OS/2 software. IBM is producing a line of PS/2 computers that may or may not become the standard in the industry; it looks like they might. They may replace the MS/DOS operating system with this OS/2 operating system. On an AT this OS/2 operating system will work. So if in the longer term -- and my understanding and my experience tells me that MS/DOS will be around for another 10 years, and there are thousands and thousands of software packages available in the MS/DOS world. An AT will give a cost-effective solution because, let's face it, in the constituency office the EDP needs are basically office system requirements. You don't need a high level of processing power. But this microcomputer as a platform will enable us to make use of any software that's upcoming, and as well it is compatible with the NBI system, and because of the large investment in NBI it's prudent that we make use of that investment.

The other thing: the OfficeWorks software was mentioned. We did examine it. Unfortunately, it came out after the pilot was completed. I am working on an EDP strategic plan, and testing some of that software would be part of it. The problem is that it costs over \$100,000 and it's not a proved product. It is supposed to allow incompatible word processing formats to change to NBI format. The other thing is that in the constituency offices overall there are only 10 to 15, maybe 20 market computers at the most. They are even upgradable to a reasonable standard to work with the NBI, so it's not as if we're dealing with a large microcomputer base in the constituency offices.

Just one more thing for those that are concerned about the equipment choice. The recommendation that's been made is to have a standing offer and come up with a standard, which means that you prepare a document that has all the generic specifications for the equipment, and you give all vendors an opportunity to bid on the specification so everyone has an equal chance: Apple, MacIntosh, whatever.

So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made. I am going to admit that 90 percent of what you said went over my head, and I can't speak for other members of the committee. Let me put it in my own English. I don't get a feeling that this committee is prepared to go ahead with any system until we're satisfied that we've been dealing with a level playing field. You need to assure us that the appropriate equipment on both sides

has been compared. Obviously we want something that's going to be compatible with what we now have. That's a given. There are those in the computer world who tell us that it can be done by MacIntosh very easily and that the MacIntosh equipment is easier to use in terms of training people. In terms of an office located in a rural constituency, we want to ensure that our constituency office personnel, many of whom have not had previous experience with computers, are able to learn how to operate the machine in the easiest possible way.

So the challenge quite clearly, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Clerk and his staff, is that you have to come back to us and convince us that it's been a level playing field and that the facts are on the table. Because if we continue to be bombarded that it was weighted one way or another, doubts will remain in our minds, and because of our own lack of knowledge in the area I for one don't feel comfortable making a decision. We may then as a committee continue to delay, and that doesn't meet anybody's longer term needs.

DR. McNEIL: Mr. Chairman, a question. Would it be appropriate to set up side by side machines, one MacIntosh, one IBM, and have them demonstrated?

MR. BOGLE: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman, because you could set up two machines that may look alike, and for all I know they are, and you may be comparing apples and oranges instead of apples and apples. I'm saying do whatever needs to be done with the appropriate equipment, with the model numbers and so on, so that those who feel that they haven't had a fair shot at it to date can tell us what's wrong with the comparison, if anything, and if there's nothing wrong with the comparison, we can move ahead. Is that clear enough?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Additional comments? Call for the question on the motion.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion by Calgary-Glenmore, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. Motion carries. Thank you.

Okay. Thank you, gentlemen, very much. Do not despair.

We move to item 4, New Business, 4(a). Is someone prepared to speak on behalf of the Member for Grande Prairie at this point, or will we carry this over to the next meeting? We've already sort of had the report on it in one sense.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, does the Clerk have the details?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; tabled till the next meeting.

All right; item 4(b), Members' Services Order Amendments; 4(b)(i), Payment of Credit Card Interest.

DR. McNEIL: Under tab B(1) there's a decision item requesting that the committee approve the attached amendment to the Members' Services order which provides the authority to pay interest on VISA and gasoline credit card accounts when required. This is here as a result of the recommendation of Alberta Treasury, re the credit card review they completed a num-



ber of months ago, which would provide the authority to pay interest on VISA accounts.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't quite understand why we're going through this. Why don't we just charge the interest to whatever MLA's account is gathering it, the constituency account? Double function of getting the interest out of the MLA rather than out of the general revenue, and secondly, I understand that some MLAs are very slow at turning in the verifications. It might speed it up if the interest was charged to their account. Why do we want this system? Why are we being so nice to ourselves?

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this would be a very short-term measure, in that we've already approved the adoption of the PH & H credit card, where a bill goes directly from the supplier to the Leg. office so that hopefully we can avoid penalties. What we're doing is authorizing the payment of interest charges on the current card, which we're going to phase out.

MR. TAYLOR: But then are you going to use VISA for taxis and stuff like that?

MR. HYLAND: Well, we don't know.

MR. BOGLE: We haven't made a decision on that question, but it may well be that we'll go back to a system of members -- well, I shouldn't prejudge, because we want to see what the Clerk can come back to us with. But we're trying to find a way to ensure that we don't have to pay interest charges; that's the reason for the PH & H card. Had that been available to us a year ago, in all likelihood we would have adopted it rather than the universal credit card. But this, as I see it, is a necessary move to allow the administration to cover these charges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Further comment? Is there a mover of this motion? The Clerk can't do it. Cypress-Redcliff. Thank you. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Thank you.

Item 4(b)(ii), another Members' Services order amendment: Members' Travel Allowance. Clerk.

DR. McNEIL: This order is put forward to ensure consistency between what was discussed at the Members' Services meetings when this order was last amended, the form that was used to implement the decision, and the actual order itself. The way the order reads now, it allows up to a maximum of 45,000 kilometres for rural members and 25,000 kilometres for urban members for the sum of the 52 return trips plus travel within the province. In reading the minutes of the meetings at which it was discussed, in looking at the original order, there had always been up to that point a distinct separation between the allowance for 52 trips between the constituency and Edmonton and the travel within the province. Unfortunately, the order, as it was passed, does not read that way. So this is a move to fix that up,

to make that distinction again and make it retroactively.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, this is still, I think, a bit confusing, because sometime last year when we expanded the number of kilometres that any individual MLA could be compensated for, what we really ultimately came up with, in my recollection, was a total amount of 35,000 kilometres for an urban member. Now, that's not really clear in the recommended motion, because if you look at 2(A), it says:

For a member representing an urban electoral division, up to 25,000 kilometres per year which may be paid without production of fuel receipts in respect of . . .

basically the first 10,000 kilometres but subject to the provision of fuel receipts from the 10,000 kilometre mark to the 25,000. Now, that caps it at 25,000 in my way of reading. But, in fact, what happened last year is that we expanded the number of kilometres both for urban and rural members. I don't recall what the total cap was for rural members, but I do for urban members because I am one of them, and that came to 35,000 kilometres. I think this needs to be reworded to reflect that, so that it would be saying "up to 35,000 kilometres" in the first instance, zero to 10,000 of which are not related whatsoever, 10,000 to 35,000 of which are related, to be consistent with what we approved last year. I'm quite sure that I'm not wrong about this; I checked our files.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is 35,000 km rather than 25,000? Okay.

MS BARRETT: You might want to ask a rural member, Mr. Chairman, but I'm not sure if it was a grand total of 45,000 or a grand total of 55,000 for rural members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

All right. The Clerk, and then Mr. Clegg is the one who's charged with having to draft these orders, so perhaps he's got recollection about that minute.

DR. McNEIL: I reviewed the minutes for the meeting in February last year, where it was first discussed, and then the meeting in March when the decision was made. From my reading of those minutes, my understanding of that -- the form that was used and, I understand, approved by the committee to implement the decision shows two separate categories. A category for mileage for 52 return trips between the constituency and Edmonton, and that's going to differ for each member as to what that would be as a function of how far away they are. Another component, the B component on the form: for urban members a maximum of 25,000 kilometres for travel within the province and for rural members a maximum of 45,000 for travel within the province, with zero to 10,000 of that mileage for urban members without receipt and zero to 18,000 for the rural members without receipt. That's my understanding of the discussion at the meeting in terms of my review of the meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner, Cypress-Redcliff, Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, the Clerk has described the process identically to my memory of the meetings, and I'm sure the transcript would verify that. So I have to ask the question: what's the problem with the current order?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the current order was drafted in consultation with members of the committee and staff working with them prior to its debate in committee. I was present, and I participated in the drafting of the order as it is presently in the book. I recollect asking those present, and I do not recall who they were, whether the intention with the increased distance was that the 52 trips would be included in the upset limit of 25,000 and 45,000 or whether they would be separate. Maybe I misunderstood, but my understanding from that consultation was that they were supposed to be included, and I therefore drafted the order so as to make them included. The members appeared to be satisfied with that. That was the motion that went into the committee, and that's what was passed by the committee. I had no reason to believe that the discussion would indicate anything -- that this wasn't in accordance with what was required.

We later discovered by reading the transcript that the members were discussing a scheme whereby the 52 trips per year would be entirely separate from and in addition to the zero to 25,000 and the zero to 45,000. Therefore, the order which I had drafted before the meeting and which was passed did not reflect what the members apparently wanted, in reading the debate, and therefore this order is submitted as an amendment to properly reflect what was debated. What is in the book was what I drafted before the meeting. I didn't draft it after the meeting. Of course, at the time the debate was going on, I think I was on my way back to my office to listen to the rest of the debate, and by the time I got back, it had been passed, and I wasn't aware that the debate in substance had diverged from the substance of the motion. So unfortunately we had an order which did not reflect what members apparently wanted, and I think it's appropriate -- without getting into retroactivity problems, we can review that order and make sure it properly reflects what the debate indicated the members wanted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minute we have here reflects the figures of an urban electoral division: 21 cents per km up to 25,000 kilometres per year. The allowance

may be paid without production of fuel receipts in respect of 0-10,000 kilometres and subject to ... fuel receipts in respect of 10,000-25,000 kilometres.

For a rural member: 21 cents per km up to 45,000 km per year. Allowance

may be paid without production of fuel receipts in respect of 0-18,000 kilometres and subject to ... fuel receipts in respect of 18,000-45,000 kilometres.

MR. BOGLE: I don't want to prolong things, Mr. Chairman. I'm still somewhat confused as to how we mixed the 52 trips per year, which ... Can the Clerk help me? Was that even part of the discussion a year ago or last February?

DR. McNEIL: I missed that. Again, I wasn't here, but my reading of the transcript of the meetings indicates a discussion of that. You know, that's a separate item, but that was discussed.

MR. BOGLE: Because we don't have a copy in our book of the order as written and passed. That's not in our books today, or if it is, I can't find it.

DR. McNEIL: It's right behind the proposed order.

MR. BOGLE: Could we have a five-minute adjournment? And

could someone produce the order that we did pass last February?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's even adjourn till 5 to 3 and get a cup of coffee as well. Thank you.

[The committee recessed from 2:46 p.m. to 3 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll move on to item 4(b)(iii), Payment of Committee Allowance -- Conference Attendance.

MR. BOGLE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to request that that item be put over until our next meeting. The Clerk is examining the matter relative to requirements under legislation. I think if he's able to come to some conclusion and then share it with the members of the committee in our binders prior to the next meeting, we could deal with it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to table on 4(b)(iii).

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

All right; 4(b)(iv), Constituency Reference.

MS BARRETT: Motion to approve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a motion from Edmonton-Highlands to approve. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: I have a problem with it in that I understand -- it's because of the name of the constituency. I thought that in earlier times when we were talking about it, Spirit River-Fairview was included, which is now Dunvegan, because some of the northern areas ... I wonder if the member would consider withdrawing the motion so that at a future day we could bring that forward. We should probably look a little closer at the carve-off of Athabasca-Lac La Biche vis-à-vis the chunk that came off of Lac La Biche-McMurray, and maybe some of the northern area of that should be included in this as well.

MS BARRETT: Well, sure. I'd be pleased to withdraw my motion.

MR. HYLAND: I'm just concerned that we'll do a shot at it, then we'll be back changing it again. Maybe for the sake of time -- you know, it would only be a few weeks -- we could consider looking at the chunks that came off of that redistribution, how it affected it.

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

I guess we're now back to 4(b)(ii), since additional paper is being circulated. Perhaps Mr. Clegg could speak to it, as to what we now think we have.

Committee members, if in your folder you go to 4(b)(ii), the last page in that sub-subsection which shows you some printing with a heavier print, it shows you how, in theory, it's going to fit into the overall order. But before we look at anything else, what you have printed on that last page are two subsections (iv). The second one would be deleted, so if you want to do your 'squirly-jigs' through that, that would be useful. All right.

Mr. Clegg, if you'd like to explain the pieces of paper now, and how they fit.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the two pieces of paper that have been distributed to the members in the last few minutes: first, there are copies of the portion of the transcript, part of the minutes, which reflects the motion as passed by the committee, which is in the form I had drafted it before debate commenced. And as I said, I had thought I had clearly understood my instructions were to make it so that the two portions, the 52 round trips and the general travel in the province, were together to add up to the new limits which were increased. That went into the committee, there was a debate, and the motion was passed. The second piece of paper is the order that was signed pursuant to that, which you will see is the same wording.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. And the next step is with regard to today's. Will this regularize the preservation of the 52 trips?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The motion before the committee today will make it quite clear that there are two portions: there is the 52 trips and there is an amount of general travel. The amount of general travel is defined in the new (iv) as being 25,000 for urban and 45,000 for rural, with different portions requiring different documentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm much encouraged by your saying it will be very clear.

Cypress-Redcliff, and then Taber-Warner.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It may be very clear, but I can read this, I think, the opposite way when -- section (ii), anyway, where it says about the 52 trips. It uses the phrase "for general travel within the Province." And further down in the new suggestion for amendment we have a separate section that says, "general travel within the Province . . . shall be [whatever]." If this is the problem, why the heck don't we just take out the words "for general travel within the Province," and the other two fall into place. Instead of saying what it is, let's take it out -- the other two sections explain what they're entitled to -- instead of trying to qualify it. You know, I think we could even be compounding it more when we're trying to explain it.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, if we take out the words "general travel within the Province" in the new proposed (iv), then in fact we're back in the situation which we don't want, whereas the amount for which the allowance may be paid will be limited to 25,000 and 45,000. The actual amount for which the allowance is to be paid is the 52 trips and the -- the 52 trips aren't limited in distance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's on a different number on the bingo card, I think.

MR. HYLAND: I'm talking about the phrase "general travel within the Province," out of the section relating to the 52 trips, subsection (ii):

the allowance is limited to payment for up to 52 trips per year between the Member's residence or place of employment or business, and the City of Edmonton, and for general travel within the Province.

I suggest we stop it where it says "City of Edmonton," period, and omit "and for general travel within the Province."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes or no out of Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I had considered that as a so-

lution when I was preparing the new draft for the committee, but that would not leave it particularly clear. Because if we do that, we'd then have a statement that first of all says it's limited to the payment of 52 trips a year between the residence and the place of business. In fact, the allowance is to be paid for two separate things. I think the wording in subsection 2 should stay the way it is. I think that clause would create other problems, because we would then have a clause which specifically said that the allowance is limited to payment of 52 trips per year, whereas in fact it's 52 trips per year and the general travel in the province. Then later on I have defined the kilometre limits on the general travel in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. If we took it out, I wouldn't get anything at all, for example, because I would only operate within Edmonton. All we're doing here is just inserting the words at the beginning of section 4, linking the 25,000 kilometres or the 45,000 kilometres to subclause 2, making sure that we are simply defining what general travel is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do I have a mover for this motion? Edmonton-Strathcona. Thank you. Further discussion?

MR. HYLAND: Can I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. HYLAND: I guess not being a lawyer I have trouble understanding when you say, "[The] allowance in respect [to the] Member's use of a . . . automobile shall be on the following conditions:" and we list the conditions. Now we're being told it doesn't matter a damn what the conditions say; we have to chuck something else in the middle of it to say, "Well, the condition maybe didn't say that, but we should say that in case it doesn't say that."

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, this thing could be completely rearranged, I suppose, and we could say that an allowance in respect of a member's use of a private automobile shall be made at the rate of 21 cents per kilometre for 52 trips per year between the member's residence and place of business and for general travel in the province at the rate of so and so upon the following conditions, and then list the ones which you haven't already hit. But they have chosen to lump the rates along with the conditions. It all adds up to the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Chair will exercise a certain amount of prerogative and request Edmonton-Strathcona and the Parliamentary Counsel and the Member for Cypress-Redcliff to go have a cup of coffee and work it out, please. [interjection] Well, I don't see how else we can resolve it until we can have our members . . .

I see one member is perhaps leaving. I would like to suggest Monday, December 5, as another date and, if needs be, Tuesday, December 6.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Are we talking afternoon or morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whichever is more convenient. I suppose afternoon. One o'clock on the Monday afternoon of December 5. Have a good trip.

Okay. Those three folks could perhaps enjoy the view of the South -- of the North Saskatchewan River. You can try the South Saskatchewan if you want. Meanwhile, let's see how we do with 4(b)(v), Staff Use of Credit Cards.

MR. WRIGHT: If we had been on this, there would be an allowance for bicycle travel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We got you a bicycle path.  
Clerk, 4(b)(v), Staff Use of Credit Cards.

DR. McNEIL: I put this forward because of recent difficulties the Clerk Assistant has had in terms of being away at a conference and being required to pay for meals on a personal credit card. That was a fairly significant expenditure. The committee secretary or administrative assistants have had this difficulty in the past. They've been required to incur fairly significant expenses when traveling with the committee to pay for meals or accommodation. They are issued enRoute cards, but the present Treasury policy does not allow those cards to be used for accommodation or meals or anything like that, just air travel. I'm just proposing this: that specific individuals who are stated in the recommendation, and maybe should be incorporated in the order, be exempted from this particular policy. It also applies in terms of the gas credit card for myself, in that in using a personal credit card, the Legislative Assembly incurs about 33 percent more expense than they would otherwise do if I had a card issued in the name of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The basic use is the problem we have paying off hotel bills and meal bills with committees in strange places.

Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Taber-Warner.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. With respect to, say, the enRoute cards, are MLAs allowed to use them for these other purposes? Oh, okay. No, I didn't think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I certainly support the intent of the proposal that's put forward. I wondered if the Clerk could identify the staff that would be covered in such a motion, because I think we should indicate how far into the administrative staff we're going. So who would be covered by this?

DR. McNEIL: At the bottom of my recommendation: "Clerk, Clerk Assistant, Parliamentary Counsel, and Committee Administrative Assistants."

MR. BOGLE: I would also move that the proposed board order authorizing credit cards for staff of the Legislative Assembly include the listing of those staff persons entitled to hold credit cards: Clerk, Clerk Assistant, Parliamentary Counsel, and committee administrative assistants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Further discussion? Call for the question? All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, just so we don't get into difficulties after the fact, I believe that what we just voted on and approved was the motion that the proposed board order authorizing the credit cards, et cetera, would stipulate the various positions entitled. I think we will also need a vote on the order that's written in our book as well. It would be like voting on an amended motion. Wouldn't we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because this has board order in it?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That's right. Thank you. Rod was picking that up too.

Now we want to have a motion to amend the Members' Services order to bring everything into line. Thank you; moved by Taber-Warner. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Four (c), Travel Bonus Points. A letter has been circulated to you today. Mr. Scarlett would like to speak to it.

MR. SCARLETT: This is an item that arose as the result of a request by a particular caucus to send a member to a nonpartisan event by using bonus points accumulated by his travel as a member within the province. What we are asking for is the ratification of the policy that bonus points accumulated by a member on member's travel can only be used for travel that all members would be eligible for: again, travel to and from the constituency or CPA-related travel. That's why I referred to the two budgets. The CPA budget is the House administration budget. The MLA administration handles MLA travel to and from the constituency. The difficulty we had was that if a caucus can determine how the bonus points are used, a caucus member may attend a political function using bonus points or something like that, and we just want to prevent that from occurring.

MS BARRETT: I agree with the intent in that regard. I don't think the caucuses should be allowed to do that. On the other hand, I think that in this instance, where an MLA was asked to attend an international function related to, I guess, an international organization that is nonpartisan -- it's something like a parliamentary association. You know, the person wouldn't be asked if he wasn't a sitting MLA or MP or that sort of thing. And given that the current policy does allow the Speaker of the Assembly to approve or deny the application, it would be reasonable to say that in special circumstances of being invited to something in your capacity as an MLA, the Speaker could have the discretion to approve. I don't really see that that's a problem. I mean, I get the point about the caucus being able to control where the points can be used, and I don't like that; I would never approve of anything so broad. But I think the instances are probably pretty rare, although they do exist, where an MLA might be invited to something and be able to make it a little bit cheaper by using the points accumulated from in-

province travel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.  
Yes?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, this has been a discussion for a great number of years around this building, and there is a policy that the government has implemented with respect to the utilization of bonus points within the public service. I wonder if hon. members might find it useful, first of all, to see what that overall policy is for the whole public service in the province. Perhaps it might be worth while to simply table this today so that we can get a little more information to basically look at it and understand it to a greater degree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough. Motion to table?

MR. KOWALSKI: I move that it's tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Those in favour of the tabling?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. We can get that from his EA. Thank you.

Is it the will of the committee to continue on to the next item or to wait for the other members to come back? All righty. Thank you. The next item is Benefits, Members Sub-Committee. Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There has been consultation between the parties represented in the Members' Services Committee on the need to strike a four-member subcommittee to examine the benefits to members, and possibly former members, to determine whether or not we're current in all areas or if there should be some adjustments considered by the full committee. I would like to move that a committee be struck and that the committee be made up by the committee members Nick Taylor, Pam Barrett, Dianne Mirosh, and Alan Hyland; that Alan Hyland act as chairman of the committee; and that following their review they would report back in the near future on their findings.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a call for the question. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, is it possible to request as a committee that this subcommittee make a report no later than the December 5 meeting? Is that okay? The sooner the better.

MR. BOGLE: I agree. You're a member of the committee. I didn't want to tie the hands, and yet it's my view that you can come back fairly quickly with recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As an understanding: that at least an interim report come back by December 5.

MS BARRETT: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

DR. McNEIL: I would just add that if there's any support that the committee requires from the Legislative Assembly Office, we're there to serve you in whatever way we can, either through myself or the new personnel manager, Cheryl Kvist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. [interjection] It's all right; you're already chairman. That's the way it goes.

Now, for the third and last try today: 4(b)(ii), Members' Travel Allowance. Who's leading this, Edmonton-Strathcona? Oh, Cypress-Redcliff, thank you. Four (b)(ii), Members' Travel Allowance.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we amend the order as outlined in our books. I'm convinced by the legal minds that this is an interim step and that we should consider sometime in the near future cleaning up and redrafting the whole order, when we're not pushed for time, so we don't make mistakes. This would reinforce the intent that we all understand is in there and make sure we've got our backs covered and then at a later date, when we have more time, get it redrafted so it reads more understandably.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: Anyway, the motion is to accept what it is, minus the second (iv), of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. We had noted that deletion. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you. It perhaps might even be dealt with in the members' benefits subcommittee.

Four (e): '89-90 Budget Development. Clerk, please.

DR. McNEIL: This is really an information item just to make the members aware that in putting together the '88-89 budget, there are a number of factors that appear to be significant that we're going to have to deal with. I just wanted to make the committee aware that they were there and that we would be in a position on November 16 to have the budget for review, if that's the wish of the committee. [interjection]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Try it again.

DR. McNEIL: Yeah. The information in the tab here is just some factors we're looking at in relation to the development of this budget. I thought it would be useful to apprise the committee of these factors. We can be in a position by November 16 to have the first draft of the budget completed, if that's the wish of the committee.

MR. WRIGHT: Can you explain the increase in printing costs? I think you've mentioned something about this before, and I've forgotten.

DR. McNEIL: It's just that it appears as though the costs in the

private sector in printing have gone up by about 10 percent. Now, that's an estimate. Because we are contemplating going to the market again on the printing, it may result in that increase not taking place -- if we want to go to the market with competitive bids on all our printing in the next month or so. This is a worst-case scenario; that's all I'm saying.

MR. WRIGHT: What is the alternative to putting it out to tender?

DR. McNEIL: I don't think there is an alternative. The government is getting out of that business, on the whole. We've always gone to the private sector for the printing of Bills and *Hansard*, and we don't have the capability in-house to do it. We typeset it in-house, but we don't have the facility to print it, given the deadlines that we have on *Hansard* and Votes and so on.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, is there not a Queen's Printer any more? I'm about two decades behind.

DR. McNEIL: Yeah, there is a Queen's Printer.

MR. WRIGHT: He doesn't do any printing?

DR. McNEIL: Some. Again, I'm not totally familiar with this, but in the past in terms of the printing contract it was cheaper to get outside than inside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the turnaround time . . .

DR. McNEIL: That's the biggest factor, given the constraints of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we're discussing '89-90 budget preparation, have guidelines been submitted by the Treasury Department?

DR. McNEIL: We've not received anything. We're going on the basis of no growth and sort of our first pass at the budget to get a rough idea of what's happening. But we have yet to receive any indication from Treasury as to what the government guidelines are for '89-90.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's one of those blissful positions: being in the middle but not knowing where you really are except that you're somewhere in the middle.

Okay. I wonder if members could turn to the page immediately following our agenda's second page. We have Follow-up Items from the minutes. If we could just go through this, I think we'll find that most of them have been dealt with now, but let's double-check.

Minute 87.403, vision care for members under the extended health care package, was tabled. I would assume that this will be looked at by this new subcommittee.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. The next one, universal gas credit card: that's been done today.

The RITE lines: that's been done.

Assessment of EDP project: partially done and then tabled till next.

Mr. Taylor, I assume, got not only his connection but his disconnection of his EDP equipment.

MR. TAYLOR: They fixed it up five days before they came to take it away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You got better service than what happened to the equipment in my office, so I wouldn't want you to think we're playing favorites. The next one was dealt with, the bicycle route. The next one also was dealt with today. The answer was no. The next one is pending till we have the review of the security for the whole building. And the next one has been done, plus the second one, coming. Good.

Any other items for today? The Chair is willing to entertain a motion to adjourn. Rocky Mountain House.

MR. TAYLOR: Maybe just one small item. I gather there's a committee looking into the security of the building. Will that report come back to Members' Services also or does that stay . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot give that undertaking. As mentioned earlier, it involves the Solicitor General, the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, the Speaker's Office, and the Premier's Office. But I'll raise the matter with regard to the other members of that committee. Certainly there would be a synopsis to come forward.

MR. TAYLOR: I just thought it might be one of the ways of getting input from MLAs in general into this thing before it's finally adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, before major things are adopted. My feeling would be that at that stage there would be a discussion in camera. Because one of the problems, in my estimation, of the last incident was that there was too much information given to the media as to what really is going on. That's pretty stupid when it comes to the security of the building, no matter how open we want to keep it. But I'll raise the matter.

MR. KOWALSKI: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be most appropriate if an individual member of the Assembly wanted to have a discussion with the Speaker in private with respect to the security matter, but it would be of questionable merit if we were to have any type of public discussion at all on security matters related to the Legislative Assembly. I would feel comfortable if the hon. member were to have a discussion with you in your office about this. I would not recommend that we even have a complete discussion with respect to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Along that line, though, if any member or any caucus has some concerns, please jot them down and pass them over to me as quickly as possible. That would be great.

MR. BOGLE: With the indulgence of the Chair and the members, could we go back to the agenda item "benefits" and the motion I put forward?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Surely.

MR. BOGLE: It was my original understanding that Dianne

Mirosh would be pleased to be part of that committee along with Pam and Nick and Alan. I am now advised that Dianne will be away for the next two and a half weeks. If she's away for two and a half weeks, either the committee functions without her or if the committee waits until she returns, that's putting you very close to your deadline. I would therefore like to bring the motion back and replace Dianne Mirosh with Jack Campbell.

MS BARRETT: Does Dianne agree?

MR. BOGLE: Well, speak with her. I just learned that she's going to be away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that she leaves next week for a couple of weeks.

MR. BOGLE: Two and a half.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The motion as the Chair hears it is to replace the name of Mirosh with that of Campbell. Those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Any other items?

The Chair now hears the echo off these golden walls that the Member for Rocky Mountain House has moved adjournment. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. Carried. Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 3:35 p.m.]



