

1:08 p.m.

Monday, October 29, 1990

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We might come to order, ladies and gentlemen. I hope you've had a good summer and a chance to catch your breath, a deep breath, before we get into all this wonderful, challenging stuff again.

As we do come to order, I wonder if we might bow our heads in silent prayer for just half a moment to the memory of a former member of this committee, Gordon Wright.

Into thy hands, O Lord, we commend his spirit.

Amen.

I'm sure Gordon has got things pretty well organized up where he is. He's got lots of experience in terms of helping to set agendas.

Okay. The agenda of the committee members is before you. Are there any additions or corrections to that? Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I have a couple of requests. I don't know where you want them. If we're going to go into Communication Allowance, perhaps what we could do under that section is just call it constituency allowance and I could tag on a couple there, one relating, in fact, to Gordon's riding, Edmonton-Strathcona. Another element would be child care, and then I think John has a separate recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. One item would be Edmonton-Strathcona constituency; two, child care, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. BOGLE: Excuse me. Where are you putting child care, Mr. Chairman? New Business?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is child care supposed to be under Communication Allowance, or I assume it's under New Business?

MS BARRETT: Okay. That's fine with me. Sure. Under 5 for child care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mine is a matter arising from the minutes of the last meeting. It deals with the constituency and community office signs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're going to deal with that under business arising, to make that item 4(g), constituency office revisited.

Any others? Welcome, Edmonton-Whitemud. There have been a couple of additions to the agenda. Perhaps Miss Black would be good enough to communicate them to you.

MRS. BLACK: Mrs.

MS BARRETT: She wants her marital status reassessed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, tell her to speak to her husband about it.

Okay. Motion to approve the agenda.

MS BARRETT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands. Question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Thank you for those additions. Copies can be distributed to the media.

Item 3, approval of the minutes of July 19.

MRS. BLACK: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Calgary-Foothills moves the adoption of the minutes as circulated. Do you need a few minutes just to refresh your memory, or is there a call for the question?

MR. S. DAY: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Those in favour of the adoption of the minutes of July 19, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Business Arising from the Minutes, 4(a), Constituency WATS Line. The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services is to report. Clerk, do you have any information on that?

DR. McNEIL: No, I do not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That one we will hold over. The minister is appearing before Heritage Savings Trust Fund and hopes to join us a little later in the day.

Okay, item 4(b), Cost of Phone Calls - Clerk.

DR. McNEIL: Yes. I investigated the situation in terms of whether our billing picked up the specific phone out here and as to whether or not we could differentiate calls. It does not. However, in checking with AGT and Edmonton Tel and the differential costs of a direct dial call versus an operator assisted, a calling card call, there's a dollar surcharge, a calling card charge, on each calling card call. So the difference in the cost of any call would be \$1. Regardless of how long the call is, there's that initial calling card call charge.

MRS. MIROSH: Except to Calgary. We can dial out, 116.

DR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: Did we see an increase in our calling cards over that period?

DR. McNEIL: We're just doing an analysis now of the telephone calls for budget purposes. I don't have the results of that yet.

MR. HYLAND: Because when I think of just the amount of times I use it, if you put a dollar on that, it's a fair amount of money.

DR. ELLIOTT: Especially when you sit for 18 months.

MR. S. DAY: Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman, you said operator assisted calls, but the way it's done now, the voice comes on automatically and you beep it in. That includes that also?

DR. McNEIL: Any calling card call gets a dollar charge. An

operator assisted call, where you have to talk to the operator, is a \$1.50 charge, so there's a difference there too.

MR. S. DAY: Oh. Okay.

MR. McINNIS: I always thought we were supposed to use the calling card for long distance calls. Calling from your community office, let's say: can you direct-dial that and save a dollar?

MS BARRETT: Yes. Oh, yeah.

MR. HYLAND: We're supposed to. We passed that.

MR. McINNIS: My question was whether we do that here.

MR. HYLAND: Well, at one time we had all the phones – you just dialed 1 out, but in the last session they were changed. That was taken out of the system, so you had no choice but to use the calling card. Once in a while you could get away with dialing, and it would go through; it wouldn't kick it back.

MS BARRETT: You're just talking about these phones up here, you mean.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: Oh. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ones at the back of the House and the ones over here. The problem is that at certain times of the day or night, they're not being supervised, so from time to time there have been some people running up some exotic phone calls we can't trace.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe we just have to unplug the phones at night. For a dollar for each call that you would receive, it wouldn't take anybody very long out of their day to gather up four phones.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. The flaw with that theory, though, is that if you know the system, then you can come along with your own phone and plug it into the jack. [interjection] Well, really you can. It wouldn't take much to put your own phone in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as you know, people using the phones are not all exclusively members.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Cypress-Redcliff, you raised that issue. Is that sufficient information for the time being? Then by the time we next meet, hopefully the budget information will have been in.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Others? Okay, so that we'll hear more from.

Four (c), Intern Program. First, with the selection process, Mr. Day was going to report what finally did occur.

MR. R. DAY: Mr. Chairman, the interview list of six was presented to the three chiefs. There was a shortlist of four. The

caucus chiefs of staff met and determined who would be assigned to which caucus. The chiefs of staff may want to comment on it. Per their request at the last meeting, I did go back and research the minutes and the motions going back to when the intern program started back in 1986, and there has never been submitted to you as Speaker of the Assembly a definitive system for selecting the interns for the caucuses. The minutes last year indicated that Edmonton-Highlands, upon meeting with the other chiefs of staff, would compose a memorandum and submit it to you, but apparently after the selection last year that was not done. So there is still no written record of how the three caucuses determine which intern will be placed with which caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since Edmonton-Highlands has stepped out of the room, Edmonton-Jasper Place, would you jog her memory when she comes back, so that for future years we can have that input so we're all in place for the selection process next year?

MR. McINNIS: You're wanting a memorandum to the Chair from Edmonton-Highlands proposing a selection system?

1:18

MR. R. DAY: That's what the minutes last year had said, the three chiefs of caucuses.

MR. McINNIS: Robert, could you just explain to me how it was done this year and how it finally shook down?

MR. R. DAY: I'm sorry, I don't know how the final selection was made. It was made by the three chiefs of staff.

MR. McINNIS: Oh. They met together.

MR. R. DAY: Right. Our offices brought the candidates before them, and the three chiefs of staff met to select the candidates. The minutes from last year indicate that once that determination process is figured out between these three caucuses, then that would be submitted to the Speaker's office. It was not last year, so we had nothing to guide us this year. But I cannot tell you how they were chosen this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sylvia, do you have anything to add to it? Because you're in what had to be the rerun selection.

MRS. AINSLIE: I guess the best way of saying it is that we just agreed to agree. It went very smoothly. We interviewed the candidates. I indicated to the other two chiefs of staff that as we had first choice last year, they could select first and second choice, and they did, and then I made my selection from the remaining. So it was just a mutual consent thing that worked out well, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So what we have done here, because there was a change in the process inadvertently – we think we're all together on the right wavelength, so in the initial selection process and the advertising and so forth, we've got the process for next year.

Mr. Ritter, do you want to comment on how we see next year going, from advertising for interns and so forth?

MR. RITTER: Well, there are no real changes from the way it was carried out this year, or I don't anticipate any. We advertised fairly heavily in the various campus newspapers at the three

major universities and some of the community colleges and other smaller institutions where we've had some response in the past. Seeing as we lost the support of the various faculty members that were involved with the program in previous years, we now have an agreement with the CAPS offices, which are the federal career and placement services offices on each campus, who for a very, very small fee log the intern position in the computer and help us select candidates and kind of send suitable candidates our way. Our experience from this last year is that it was much more effective than actually liaising with some of the faculty members, and we had a better class of candidate by far this year. So it kind of inadvertently worked out better in the end, and we're quite happy with it.

MRS. MIROSH: I have two questions. Did you say you select from U of C and U of A? Is that what I heard you say?

MR. RITTER: All the universities and colleges in the province are eligible. Simply because of numbers we draw most of our people from the three major universities, and we try to have an equal distribution between all institutions.

MRS. MIROSH: Are the chiefs of staff involved right from the onset, or are they not involved until the shortlist?

MR. RITTER: The way it was communicated to us is that we obtained a shortlist, and then the final candidates were interviewed directly by the chiefs of staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many on that shortlist, though, Michael?

MRS. MIROSH: Yeah, because that was the problem, I think.

MR. RITTER: The request of the Members' Services Committee was that they have eight persons on the shortlist. This year, because of various cancelations and people taking up scholarships and other positions at the last minute, we ended up getting six people. But, in fact, significantly more than eight had been contacted.

MRS. MIROSH: How many would normally apply then?

MR. RITTER: This year we had the largest number of applications. For the four positions we had - Robert, do you remember? - 40-some applicants.

MR. R. DAY: Forty-seven.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering. Reference was made to the computer selection assistance program that you said you use. Is that available only at universities or also at our colleges?

MR. RITTER: That is wherever a CAPS office exists. I understand there are full-time CAPS offices on the three major campuses and there are part-time CAPS offices in the various colleges across the province. That's independent, of course, from our own advertising across the province in the various campus newspapers.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. May we take it from all three caucuses that everything's okay in terms of the process for the moment, that we've come back to clarification. As soon as the notices are going out about the internship program, we'll circulate them to all members of the Legislature, and then they know that the notice has gone out. Okay?

MR. R. DAY: Mr. Chairman, just so that it's clear in my mind, we will shortlist to eight, as was the request of the committee this year, and the final determination of the four, including how they will be assigned, will be determined by the chiefs of staff. Good. Thank you.

MR. McINNIS: Do we need a motion for that or just . . .

MR. BOGLE: I think it's in a previous motion, is it not?

MR. McINNIS: Is it? Okay.

MR. BOGLE: That's just reaffirming the process.

MR. R. DAY: The actual selection by caucus has never been determined, and that was one of the problems we ran into in searching the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Then we'd better make it into a motion, at least to add that component.

As a former intern, go ahead.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps, to amend the report, indicate that the program began in 1974 and not 1986.

I move that the Speaker's office assemble the shortlist of eight candidates, with the final selection and assignment to caucuses to be made by the chiefs of staff. Should I say joint chiefs of staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't tell Hussein; they might declare war on him.

MR. S. DAY: Joe Clark already did, didn't he?

MRS. AINSLIE: Actually, we had a very enjoyable time. If the three of us are there next year, we don't foresee any problems.

MR. S. DAY: Glad to hear you all get along.

MRS. MIROSH: That's rare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, then.

MR. BOGLE: Ready for the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I assume we are.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's one thought passing through my mind: when it says selection by chiefs of staff, that means it's three votes. The people who have been doing the initial interviews do not have a vote on it, such as my EA, Parliamentary Counsel, and director of personnel. Just so we all . . .

MR. BOGLE: The chiefs of staff.

MR. McINNIS: Selecting from the eight.

MR. HYLAND: Select four from the eight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, then. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed, if any? Carried unanimously.

The next item of business is supposed to be the Legislature and Annex access cards. I have invited the Solicitor General to come. It's my understanding he's in his constituency today and that he was sending his executive assistant, who is on notice to come as well. So we'll deal with that when he arrives.

Item 4(e), the communication allowance issue. Subsection (i) deals with an appeal. Actually, there are two items there. I've contacted the people involved, the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods and the Member for Redwater-Andrew, and it's my understanding that they will be here when our meeting reconvenes tomorrow. I think along that line, then, we can deal with the other matters that are there; however, with one exception. Let's hear about Edmonton-Strathcona at the moment.

MS BARRETT: Thanks. Yes. I understand that the communications allowance for the Edmonton-Strathcona constituency has been frozen in the wake of Gordon's death, which may at first glance appear to be a sensible thing to do. On the other hand, I've talked extensively with the constituency office manager, John Samoil, and he says that since Gordon died, he's had almost no calls at all because people think that the office is shut down. I've done everything I can to try to alert people that it is still open, that it's a functioning office. When I did interviews on the matter of Gordon's death, I tried to get that information out. Obviously, that hasn't worked. Whether we have a policy on this or not, I would like to suggest that John Samoil be authorized to do a householder indicating the nature of the work that he continues to offer, and if there's stuff that Gordon wrote before he died, he could include that. I know that Gordon was writing at least up to a week before he died, because I was up to visit him and he was still making notes. In any event, you know, something has to go out to all those households. They have to know that the office is still working.

1:28

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, can anybody remember what happened in the case of Grant Notley?

MRS. MIROSH: Or Jan Koper, even more recently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or Henry Kroeger.

MR. HYLAND: Kroeger or Janet Koper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk, if you want to tell what exactly . . .

DR. McNEIL: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, with respect to Mr. Wright's office, we followed the same policy as applied to the other members that you mentioned. The office remains open, but the communications and promotions allowance has been frozen. So those kinds of communications have not been allowed, but the staff are continued under their present contract. When a new member is elected, then he or she makes a decision as to whether or not they want to maintain the staff or move the office or whatever. So that's the policy that has been applied in the past, and it's the policy that's been communicated

to the constituency office, I imagine. The other thing that is applied is that another MLA is designated as the person to sign invoices, and the Clerk has countersigned those invoices just so that there's a checkpoint in terms of ensuring that the policy is maintained.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. The latter part of that system is working. Ed Ewasiuk is doing the authorizing. I'm not sure if this subject ever arose before. Now, I know that we have this policy whereby you can transfer money internally between your three accounts; that is, operating, communications, and promotions. If that's the case and we've frozen the communications and promotions budget, does that mean that if John wanted to do a report, a householder, that he could pay for it out of the operating? I just don't know that this is very clear, but we do have a problem. I mean, it's not like I want to make the guy busy-crazy. In fact, if he wants to do that, he can just come work in Edmonton-Highlands for a while. But, you know, fair is fair. People use the constituency office, and they think they can't now. They think that no MLA means no office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, legal counsel, you were involved to some degree in the drafting of the memo that went out. Have you got some comment about this? My understanding was that we were just following the precedent of the other vacancies as they had occurred.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, essentially the allowance is only one allowance. It's established by the Members' Services order. It is a member's allowance. It is built up of three amounts which are defined separately, but they aren't separate allowances. The total sum of money to be provided for under each heading – constituency, communication, and promotion – is calculated separately. I don't think there's anything in that order which says you cannot use something from another allowance for something which comes under the normal heading of constituency services, for example. So I don't think there's anything in that order – and I would look at it carefully to check on this – which would prevent them from paying, you know, the costs of a mail-out from the constituency service element of that. It was about three years ago that we essentially merged those and put them into three divisions rather than making three separate allowances and regimenting the amount that had to be paid for each.

DR. McNEIL: But the allowance for communication allows expenditure of funds for things like mailers and so on. The intent of that policy is to not allow mailers and so on where there is not a member in that constituency. That was the intent of the communication as it has been applied in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification, is it: if you want to do a mailer or if you just want to send a notice like a letter around that says, "Hey, this office is still operating," period, instead of trying to make it into a full-scale MLA newsletter?

MS BARRETT: I think a notice would be fine. I'm just trying to solve a problem here that I don't think has arisen before, or if it did, we never talked about it in this committee. I certainly would like this committee to authorize John sending out a notice to every household. In my riding that's about an \$1,100 or \$1,200 mailing bill alone, and Strathcona's going to be even more. I don't know what the printing costs are, but it would be nice if people knew that the office continues to work.

MR. McINNIS: I was just involved peripherally in this issue. Some of the people who were with our staff at the time that Grant Notley was killed seemed to recollect that there was some type of a notice that went out under the member's allowance to the entire constituency following his death. Now, the others I don't know anything about, and I didn't talk to anybody who did, so that's what I know about precedent.

It seems to me that in addition to the problem raised by my colleague, there's the other problem that the constituents don't simply go away because their member has expired. When they make requests for things like flags and pins and that sort of thing which are clearly provided for under the promotion allowance, in a sense those funds are their funds. Now, the member generally has some discretion over which requests to honour and which not, and some people will try to take advantage of that service for personal reasons. Nonetheless, there will be requests, and the person in that office will have a difficult time saying: "Sorry. Your member has died. Those funds are no longer available to you."

We don't have a policy on that. Maybe we should. In the meantime it seems to me that the wording of the order is such that the funds are there and calculated on the basis of the population base of the district not on the basis of the identity of the member. So if you take the member out of the picture, the population base is still there, and the demand may still be there as well. So in the absence of an order from the committee it seems to me that those funds have to be available for their intended purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With due respect, hon. members, I think the item might possibly be held over till tomorrow so there is some time to give it a little more reflection and negotiation.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I apologize. It was only late last week that I had talked to John about this, and I've been too busy even to phone him up and say, "Here's what I'd like put on the agenda." So I'm happy to let it sit overnight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you so move: until tomorrow?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. That's what I'm saying. I'll try to bring a proposal to the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the tabling motion? Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

All right. We'll now return to item 4(d), Legislature access cards. The Solicitor General is not able to be with us, so perhaps Mr. Szumlas could speak to the proposal, and then we'll go from there.

Thank you, John.

MR. SZUMLAS: Mr. Chairman, I believe you circulated a document that was originally submitted, I believe, sometime in May or June to all of the respective caucuses and the members present here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May 3. It's in your tabs there.

MR. SZUMLAS: In essence, the proposal as laid out would provide for a simplified yet efficient means of granting and permitting, principally to the members and authorized staff, access to this building and the parkades before and after business hours. The utilization of the card access technology would permit the elected representatives and their authorized

staff to enter the building and carry out and discharge their duties with the minimal amount of disruption and the maximum amount of availability, principally to parking locations. One of the problems that was brought to our attention on quite a regular basis, particularly in the winter months, was that unless the House was actually sitting, there was no way, without leaving their car, for members of the Assembly and their authorized staff to put their vehicles in the covered parkade and plug in their cars. By moving, as was done in the late '80s or the mid-'70s, I believe, to channel all personnel through the front door, we had all of these other access points that were available to the Legislative Assembly as well as to their staff, but we could never get into them.

1:38

Using this technology, we will hopefully by November 15 have in place the mechanism so that members of the Assembly and their staff can use a card, and that will grant them access before business hours and after business hours. The cards are not designed to be worn; they're designed to be carried in your pocket. They operate in a similar fashion as an automatic bank teller card. They're not to be used for purposes of identification in performing their duties. They're principally as a mechanism to access the card readers.

We laid out to yourself, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the members of this committee, a proposal relative to what we perceive as a simplified method of co-ordinating who gets the cards and asking that each caucus be responsible for designating a person who would be the co-ordinator of the paper. It's basically a paper transaction, and should one caucus assign their manager or their chief of staff, then they would be responsible for authorizing the issuance and, more importantly, advising us when a particular card should be discontinued so that we can ensure that the access question before and after hours is dealt with.

Are there any particular questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk, do you have some initial comments on that?

DR. McNEIL: I think I'll turn it over to Michael Ritter to comment on the response that went to the Solicitor General in June with respect to the proposal that was received by our Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ritter and Mr. Clegg.

MR. RITTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The law firm of Michael and Michael.

MR. RITTER: Michael squared, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Neither one of you can be described as square.

MR. RITTER: Mr. Chairman, we were involved once you had received the initial communication from the Solicitor General to examine the Solicitor General's proposal with regard to the legal implications for members, particularly in light of the special rules that are in effect and touch upon every Member of the Legislative Assembly and their staff.

Essentially, the concern of the Legislative Assembly Office is that the independence of the individuals falling under the

jurisdiction of the Legislature, as opposed to government, be maintained. Privileges of the House, which every member here is intimately familiar with, is a lot more than just a nice protocol and, in fact, is essential to the independent functioning of this place. The difficulty arises, of course, when we have a building that is shared and used for both government personnel and Legislative Assembly personnel. The concern of the members is that obviously their safety be taken care of in the most efficient manner, and from that respect we felt that there was no legal problem, as far as the Legislative Assembly Office goes, with co-ordinating a system with the Solicitor General. Certainly the same cameras and the same ID cards could all be acceptable, if the members were in agreement, of course, and could be worked into a co-ordinated distribution system.

However, our problem with the proposal arises when members, who are under the jurisdiction not of the government of Alberta but of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta – and the staff of the members are not government employees; they are employees of the Legislative Assembly, and so on – cannot, without a resolution of the House, submit to the jurisdiction or control of the government authority; they must necessarily remain independent. Therefore, a member signing an agreement with a government department, being the Solicitor General's department, would be very difficult to do. I don't know if it's legally possible without a formal resolution of the House, because these are House privileges. Members cannot be accountable to a government department in the execution of their duties.

Under the terms of the Legislative Assembly Act and the various other constitutional sources of authority for privilege, including our own Standing Orders, the member must have access to this building 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, with or without ID cards. Anyone, including a peace officer, impeding a member to and from the Legislative Assembly on official business is in contempt of the House. This goes to the extent that a member is entitled as of right to designate himself, the servants he finds in his employ and wish to accompany him to assist him in the execution of his parliamentary duties.

The privilege issue, as I say, is certainly one of protocol. The independence of the Legislative Assembly must be maintained from that of government. I mean, for this reason we go through undoubtedly additional expense in making sure that our estimates are printed in such a way that all the government departments are in one book and the Legislative Assembly is in another book. Certainly it's an administrative problem, I'm sure, and it costs a lot, but there are reasons for this. The Legislative Assembly must be as independent as the judiciary.

To allow a member to co-ordinate his access and that of his staff is no problem to put on a common security system, but my concern is that members should be always maintained and seen to be under the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly. For that reason you have a Speaker who is not a minister or a member of Executive Council; you have a Sergeant-at-Arms who is a separate and distinct force. Again, in Legislatures across the country the security for the building – if there are ID cards, such as there are at the National Assembly or the House of Commons, it's the Sergeant-at-Arms' signature that appears on that, the reason being because members, particularly opposition members, do not want to be subject to government. They have the right to be treated on a nonpartisan basis and generally vigorously defend that right.

Those are the issues and the practicalities of practice, and our concern, certainly in the office of the Parliamentary Counsel, was that the Legislative Assembly Act and the various other constitutional authorities establishing the privileges of this House are a

matter of law. For the members to submit to the jurisdiction of an access system which is controlled by government – aside from all the political ramifications that are important to a parliament building as opposed to a government building – may be in violation of the law as far as basically waiving their privileges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg, any additional comment?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would certainly support what Mr. Ritter has said. Indeed, it's possible that even a resolution of the Assembly would not be binding on a member who had voted another way on this. I think an abdication of the security and access guarantees that members have to the Assembly could only be done by legislation. So we might need an amendment to the legislation.

As Michael said, the House is master of its own privileges and it deals through the Speaker. This committee is involved in a great deal of the administrative decisions which lead up to this. There is no doubt that all members wish to support an effective security system. There is no doubt the members would wish to participate in a scheme that would individually authorize the Speaker to prepare a security system, and if the Speaker is satisfied with the security arrangements which government chooses to make for the building, the Speaker can have the system co-ordinated with the government system in all ways to make it fully effective. The cards would have the same electronic system. But it would be a system under which the members would, through the Speaker as it were, have the government act on their behalf; it would be under the House's authority that the members' cards would be under the members' authority. In fact, as Michael has said, if the member doesn't have his card, the member is always still entitled to access to the building.

I don't have anything further to add, anything apart from that which has already been said.

1:48

MS BARRETT: I missed the last meeting, but I don't understand why the Solicitor General is involved in this at all when we have our own Leg. Assembly security. Right? Don't we?

MR. McINNIS: I'm sure there are all kinds of jurisdictions of security there.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Is it too late? I mean, has the Solicitor General's department already spent the money on the system? If that's the case, can Members' Services authorize Leg. Assembly to purchase the system so that it's Leg. Assembly operating it, so that I don't have to ask the Solicitor General to let me in? Is that what this boils down to?

MRS. MIROSH: You'll have to ask the Solicitor General.

MR. SZUMLAS: I'm not sure if the question was to the chairman or to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not in a position to answer. Mr. Szumlas, have you got some . . .

MR. SZUMLAS: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't sure if the question was posed to me or whomever, but if the question was asked of me, I'll indicate the following.

What we are talking about here is an access system to the building, and there is no suggestion whatsoever that members

must have the access card to get into the building. If they choose not to avail themselves of the access card, then they can continue to use the front door before business hours and after business hours to access the building and continue to leave their vehicle to call through the intercom to have someone open the garage door. What we're talking about here is an electronic access system that will prevent access to and egress from those doors that traditionally have always remained locked.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I understand that. My question is: why is the Solicitor General's department involved when the Leg. Assembly . . . And I listened to two legal descriptions of this matter. It seems to me pretty obvious that we govern ourselves in this building. It's like its own riding or something. Why would a government department be involved, and is it too late to undo that?

MR. SZUMLAS: Mr. Chairman, the jurisdiction for the Speaker relative to the Legislative Assembly Chamber and its environs, including room 312, has been identified to rest with the Speaker. The Legislature Building, the Annex building, the pedway, and the physical environs around that, the physical grounds, were assigned to the Solicitor General. They were assigned to him in the month of November of 1989 as a result of a determination that there were a number of jurisdictions, including public works, who were looking after some of the security functions. To co-ordinate it all, it was all given to . . .

MS BARRETT: Assigned by whom?

MR. SZUMLAS: I'm sorry?

MS BARRETT: Assigned by whom?

MR. SZUMLAS: Assigned by whom?

MS BARRETT: You said "assigned to the Solicitor General."

MR. SZUMLAS: It was co-ordinated to the Solicitor General for his responsibilities to provide protection services for this building and the environs of this building, so that decision is not something that I am in a position to either debate or expand upon.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. SZUMLAS: We're here discussing the access and the access cards for principally your staff. You know that MLAs continue to and will always have unimpeded access to this building. It's a question of providing a mechanism to assist the employees of this building with an opportunity to come before business hours and after business hours without the necessity of hiking around to the front.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last question, though, was: who assigned?

MR. SZUMLAS: I was just given instructions that we have that responsibility. You know, I believe that determination, Mr. Chairman, you were involved in. So you may be in a better position to identify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Szumlas, I think you're avoiding the real answer, which is that it was assigned by the office of the Premier.

MS BARRETT: Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we need clarification, too, to remember that the access cards also involve the Annex. Is that not correct?

MR. SZUMLAS: There will be card readers in the Annex as well; that's correct. There are a number of employees and staff of a number of the caucuses as well as protection service staff who have offices over there, so this is an after-hours and before-hours mechanized method of providing a modicum of security while ensuring that people can do their jobs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many floors over there are under the direct control or whatever of the government, and how many are under Legislative Assembly?

MR. SZUMLAS: I wouldn't have that. I'm sure someone here may have that information, but I don't have that.

MS BARRETT: The authorities at this end are saying, "One for government, 5 million for the people."

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, my question is short. It's just in response to the information you have here. [interjection] No, I won't repeat that, Pam. You might get after me.

You wrote to the Solicitor General on June 9, and I see correspondence dated after that date between you two, but was there ever a response to your memorandum of identification prior to the proposal?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the best of my knowledge, it's all included here in the file, the Clerk responding.

DR. McNEIL: The response would be the July 6 memo from the Solicitor General to the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you keep working through that section, you'll find there's some other correspondence.

DR. McNEIL: After the Speaker's memo to the Solicitor General on June 8, the next piece of correspondence is a memo dated July 6 on the Legislature Building access cards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I also recognize Edmonton-Strathcona . . . I wish I could.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, so do I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, in your letter of June 8 that's addressed to the hon. Mr. Fowler, you say, "While it is true that the Solicitor General is currently responsible for security in the Legislature Building . . ." Then I caught some comment you made that that responsibility was assigned by the

Premier. Where did this responsibility come from? Obviously, Mr. Chairman, somebody has given you that information, that the Solicitor General is currently responsible, for you to include in your correspondence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As Mr. Szumlas pointed out, after the last shooting incident in the building, which is now almost two years ago, a small committee was convened, and it included the Solicitor General, the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, the Speaker, Mr. Giffin from the Premier's office, and Barry Mellon. Out of that the report on security was commissioned, which was carried out under the general direction of the Solicitor General's office.

With regard to the various elements of security within the building and environs, in time past some have come under the Solicitor General, some under the Speaker, some under the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, and some under Mr. Giffin on behalf of the Premier's office. After discussion a decision was made by the Premier's office that the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services' jurisdiction would be moved out and most of those responsibilities put over to the office of the Solicitor General.

I've raised a number of points in meeting with those in that group from time to time about certain matters of jurisdiction such as are being raised here today, and I lost. So be it.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, what you're saying, then, is that if the Solicitor General determines that he feels access cards are appropriate or if he feels that some type of system of entering the facility is warranted, he has the power to make that decision, and it can't be questioned as it applies to the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Parliamentary Counsel.

1:58

MR. RITTER: Mr. Chairman, the position of the two counsel and other Parliamentary Counsel in different jurisdictions is that we feel the assumption of control by the Solicitor General through the past few years has been a matter of de facto evolution. I mean, it has just been that the government has assumed control for the building. Our feeling is that until the members decide to formally hand over that power, that power can only be assumed at this point to have been acquiesced to by the members and certainly is revokable at any time. The members at all times cannot be deprived of the right to determine their own security procedures in their own precincts. Traditionally, all parliamentarians would say that means the Legislature Building and the precincts of the Legislature Building, those areas that are necessary for the members to carry out their duties.

So we have looked at the situation. It's a little odd here in Alberta, but fine, if the members have acquiesced to it, then we can assume that it's been assumed over time. But the members ultimately in a situation like this I suppose must come to terms with some type of formal action on the subject.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, my point wasn't addressed. My point relates beyond the jurisdiction or beyond the responsibilities or the role of the individual MLA. I'm talking in terms of the public. For example, if a member of the public wants to see me, my understanding is that that person would have to have an access card to get to . . .

MR. SZUMLAS: That's not correct.

MS BARRETT: No, no.

MR. WICKMAN: So there is no impact on the public at all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Szumlas, please give a response.

MR. SZUMLAS: Mr. Wickman, to ensure that there is no misunderstanding, let me be clear. The computerized access cards provide a mechanical means for authorized individuals. We would hope that the members of the Assembly would avail themselves of this opportunity, a mechanized means of accessing the building before and after normal business hours. This is not a method of identifying all those who are in the facility nor their visitors, although there has been some speculation that we would have visitor identification cards.

MR. WICKMAN: That's been dropped?

MR. SZUMLAS: That's not part of the system. Just to reconfirm with you, sir, this access system, for those who wish to accept it, is to grant you an opportunity to enter doors other than the front door before and after business hours.

MR. WICKMAN: But the other aspect that was being considered has now been dropped?

MR. SZUMLAS: Well, I'm not sure where it was being considered, but it was not considered under our protective security duties.

MR. WICKMAN: But there was consideration being given at one time, I believe.

So the only question before us at this particular point, Mr. Chairman, just so I'm clear, is the access cards which would apply after normal business hours, as to whether they should apply to Members of the Legislative Assembly. That's the only question we're addressing now?

MR. SZUMLAS: That's the question that you proposed to the chairman. I sense that's the question, yes.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, that's the only question we're addressing now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the Assembly and their staff.

MR. WICKMAN: Members of the Legislative Assembly and their staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. At this time we're not dealing with the access of the general public, for clarification, because they would be coming here at normal hours of opening for the building. However, if you're talking about a member of the general public coming to see you after hours in the Annex and that question, then they're going to have to sign in at the front door, and I don't know if there's anybody there at the front door.

MR. SZUMLAS: At the Annex there is; yes, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. S. DAY: Well, some of my questions have been answered and others have been . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I thought both your hands sort of went up at the same time. So you're the next. Sorry. Red Deer-North, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. S. DAY: Okay. Just some questions. From what I gather from Mr. Ritter and also from Mr. Szumlas, if I don't want one of these cards, I don't have to bother with them. What degree of work has been completed to this point in terms of the coring and lines and things like that?

MR. SZUMLAS: Through the chairman, Mr. Day, I can advise you that we anticipate that the system will be totally operational on November 15 or a few days before then, so we're about three weeks away from total operation relative to the system.

MR. S. DAY: How much has been done to date, or do you know?

MR. SZUMLAS: About 95 percent of the material has been completed.

MR. S. DAY: These are magnetic cards. Is there some reference in here to photo sessions?

MR. SZUMLAS: Yes. This is what they would look like.

MR. S. DAY: Okay. Is the photo for some future use? Is there some future consideration? I'm wondering about the added expense of the photo.

MR. SZUMLAS: Through the Chair: the reason we have a photograph is for those who are not elected; MLAs excluded, if I could use that phrase. We will have another photograph that will be attached to a document that contains the name and address of the individual or the employee, the residence of the individual. You activate the system by using the magnetic strip on the back of the card, and that will give us an indication as to the nature of traffic flow so that we can identify, you know, if we should move relative to some of the hours of operation. Rather than having, say, the back loading door not being accessible until 7 a.m., maybe it should be opened at 6 a.m. So that type of information becomes available.

MR. S. DAY: But the photo is superfluous, basically, as far as access to the building.

MR. SZUMLAS: One could probably argue that that's correct. Yeah.

MR. S. DAY: Are we going to have the different coloured cards, as this has indicated?

MR. SZUMLAS: That's correct. Yes. I have samples here if you'd like to look at them.

MR. S. DAY: But the magnetic receiver doesn't care if it's a Liberal or a Conservative, so that's basically superfluous.

MR. SZUMLAS: That's probably correct as well. Yes.

MR. S. DAY: And a constituent of mine can come and see me before or after hours the regular way: they sign in through a security person at the door.

MR. SZUMLAS: Yeah. The normal system operates. You present yourself to the front door, either at the Annex or the building, the individual who is manning the desk at the time will communicate with your office to advise you that you have a party waiting for you, and you will then be asked to give instructions as to how you're going to connect. Either you give them instructions as to where your office is or, alternatively, you'd be asked to either come yourself or send someone on your behalf to greet your party for functions before and after business hours.

MR. S. DAY: Okay. And, Mr. Chairman, my staff do not need this card if they don't want it?

MR. SZUMLAS: There is no obligation being put on anyone relative to this card. It is providing a mechanism to grant mechanical access to doors other than the front door.

MR. S. DAY: Which we already have, except we have to get out of our car down below and talk to the security person.

MR. SZUMLAS: But that's only for the south parkade, not the east parkade. We do have a lot of staff, particularly those who have offices in the Leg. Annex Building, who would like to park somewhere closer to their place of employment in the evenings and on weekends, and this will grant them an opportunity to park in their designated parking stall.

MR. S. DAY: I'm sorry to belabour this point, Mr. Chairman, but I'm trying to get a handle on this. Staff now pull up and do like we do if it's after hours: hop out, buzz, talk to the security person, and they're buzzed in.

MR. SZUMLAS: Uh huh. And this will grant them an opportunity to access the big door and then the top door.

MR. S. DAY: Right. Which now they can access by buzzing and talking to a security guard.

MR. SZUMLAS: Only on the lower level. That's correct.

MR. S. DAY: Only on the lower level. So what happens when they get to the upper level?

MR. SZUMLAS: After November 15, should they have access to the card and they use the card, then the door will come open.

MR. S. DAY: Have you got any idea of your anticipated uptake . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This will be your last question, Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: . . . or demand for this card? Are people filling in the forms yet?

MR. SZUMLAS: At this point in time we've had a very good response from all offices and all divisions of the groups that work in this organization, sir.

MR. S. DAY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd be willing to recognize you again, but I've got a few other folks here: Edmonton-Jasper Place, Taber-Warner, Calgary-Glenmore, Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. McINNIS: When you think about having access to a building without having to go through security personnel, most people think about these keys that we carry around that used to do the same job. I think the difference with this is that you can program the equipment so that it recognizes certain people as having access to certain zones and not others, basically.

2:08

MR. SZUMLAS: With respect, I think when you use the word "zones," you're suggesting that Mr. Ritter's precinct concept is somehow being put in place. That's not correct at all. The computer will be programmed so that different deemed individuals - say, in your particular case, Mr. McInnis, your responsible person indicates that secretary X really doesn't need access to this Legislature Building after 1 a.m. Then that would be information that your authorized individual independently would identify to protection services, saying: "These people should have 24-hour access. These people should have 14-hour access." That's how that computer system would operate.

MR. McINNIS: The system will be in place for all of the exterior doors, and of course the other capability is to identify who's using the card at which time. Did I hear you say that those records are not needed by the government, that there'd be no necessity of keeping an information log of who enters which door at which hour of the day or night?

MR. SZUMLAS: I didn't say that. I'm not sure what you were referencing.

MR. McINNIS: So that would be a part of the capability of the system, to determine that.

MR. SZUMLAS: They would have that capability. Yes.

MR. McINNIS: And will some of the individual offices have card readers rather than the exterior of the building?

MR. SZUMLAS: There are no plans for that whatsoever.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps I'll just comment, if I may. The jurisdictional question is the most vexing aspect of the security dilemmas we face, from my point of view. We heard last time that we had public works involved, the Solicitor General, Legislative Assembly staff, possibly some of the various police forces as well, so there's quite a number of agencies that have their finger in the pie. I would like it very much if we could settle that down to a single authority. It makes the most sense from our point of view as elected members to vest that authority in the office of the Speaker, but I'm not clear at this moment whether the administrative capability is there to do that, because it's the buildings as well as the grounds, the people who hand out parking tickets. If it is, perhaps that's the question we should be dealing with first before we get into the nitty-gritty of the proposals. My sense is that we're going to go around in a lot of circles until we come to terms with that.

As far as the proposal itself, it's much better than the alternative that we looked at last time which did include passes for visitors, which I very much object to. I think this system here really is potentially a convenience for people who have access to

it, to be able to get into the buildings without having to locate security personnel and to sign the register and so on and so forth. If that can be done, there's some benefit to it, but obviously we have to settle out the jurisdictional question first.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, John is on the key point of jurisdiction. Earlier I heard John Szumlas indicate that this will all be in place by November 15. I could be corrected.

MR. SZUMLAS: That's correct; yes, sir.

MR. BOGLE: All right. Then I put it back to the table.

MRS. MIROSH: The decision has been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, I have said before that I tried and I was not able to convince the various authorities of what the jurisdiction of a parliament is. And in some quarters around the building I've been hearing the rumours, too, that the Speaker's on a power trip. I want it clear on the record; I don't need any more headaches. But the real problem of being a Speaker and Members' Services Committee is that we're here to represent not only parliamentary tradition but the three political parties who happen to be represented in this Legislature at this time. There needs to be a meeting of the minds as to what is the proper jurisdiction of a parliament, knowing full well that the difficulty is that we have a building that is supposed to be doing two things, a parliament and a government. That occurs in various jurisdictions across this country, bearing in mind that the full jurisdictional responsibility is one that is in place not only in the House of Commons, with the two Speakers and the way they've worked out their jurisdiction on Parliament Hill, but also in the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan, to say nothing of the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster.

Now, this has been an issue which has bubbled from time to time to these many, many years; I suppose right from the inception of this building. But another thing I mentioned earlier and identified: the smaller group which was dealing with security of the building after that last shooting incident. Various discussions took place, a report was handed back, and out of that, at least one of the jurisdictional players has moved out of it, namely the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. But at the same time and on more than one occasion, there was an undertaking that that security committee would meet again. That committee has not met again in spite of the fact that the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services has, at least on one occasion if not more, tried to get that meeting to be reconvened, and the same thing by the Speaker.

That lets it hang out there. Things are going ahead in various ways, and if we as a committee want to roll over and say, "Okay, we'll let the government run it," so be it, and I'll abide by that decision.

MR. S. DAY: Sir, could I ask for a three-minute break to gain security to some of the washrooms?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. Let's stand adjourned until 25 minutes past 2, if that's agreed.

[The committee adjourned from 2:15 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we might reconvene, the order I have here is the Clerk for clarification, followed by Calgary-Glenmore, Cypress-Redcliff, Red Deer-North, Edmonton-Whitemud.

DR. McNEIL: I just wanted to emphasize the proposal that was contained in the memo from the Speaker to the Solicitor General in June. He proposed that there was a way for the members and staff of the Assembly to fit within the system and maintain and preserve the privileges of the Assembly as outlined by the two Michaels, and that was to have a card that was designated with a Mace instead of the Alberta logo, signed by the Sergeant-at-Arms or the Speaker instead of the Solicitor General or the director of protection services. The photo would still be taken by the Solicitor General's department. The card would still, in the final analysis, be bound by them and produced by them. We thought the proposal would satisfy both needs: the need for the overall system to provide access yet preserve the privileges of the Assembly, its members and staff.

From what I've heard today, I'm not convinced that that still cannot apply, that it still could not be done to meet both needs. I just wanted to emphasize that, because that's how the proposal was designed, to meet the need that the Solicitor General's department has to provide security in terms of that responsibility he's been given yet preserve the privileges of the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. One other footnote just to bear in mind is the matter of jurisdiction. It's this building and the Annex as buildings, as working areas, and, as John Szumlas pointed out earlier, the matter of the parkades. With the Annex, remember, there are vacant floors, and then there's one that applies for the Liberal Party, one for the New Democrats, two for the PCs, and two for Legislative Assembly. So out of the operational floors of that building, technically speaking, six of those floors come under the jurisdiction, in one way or another, of the Members' Services Committee.

All right. Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think in lieu of your comments prior to our break and some obvious misunderstandings and miscommunication, I would like to table this item until such time that we can have some clarification from the ministers who are involved and, in particular, the one who sits on this committee as well. I think we should have some matters cleared up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Kowalski, in theory, should be back with us a bit later in the afternoon or perhaps tomorrow. Motion to table.

MR. WICKMAN: Can you read that motion again? Is it tabling until the one minister is available or until both ministers are available?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, until we clear up the miscommunication with both ministers, but certainly until our minister who sits on this committee is available so he can help clarify some misunderstandings.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the member to be specific as to whether it's being tabled until the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services is here or until both ministers are here?

MRS. MIROSH: Until the minister of public works is here, but I would also like to have some information cleared up with the minister who is in charge of security. Some of the questions are obviously not being answered.

MS BARRETT: But probably tomorrow, is what it amounts to.

MRS. MIROSH: But probably tomorrow, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. First available opportunity: Public Works, Supply and Services. If he appears and we have time on our agenda, we'll come back to the issue. Failing that, we'll have Public Works, Supply and Services and Solicitor General, if the motion carries. Those in favour of the tabling motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Thank you, John.

All right. Section 4(f) on our agenda items, "Greening the Hill." As you know, the matter was raised by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, and as a follow-up the pamphlet from Parliament Hill was circulated to all members. Copies were given to all members. At the same time, we also sent a letter out to all members of the Assembly, and some of the members were kind enough to reply. I hope all that correspondence is there in your file. As part of that, you'll see that there is a fairly detailed response by the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

Now, since you raised the issue, Edmonton-Jasper Place, do you feel that that is useful for the moment, or would you rather wait till the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services comes to the meeting as well?

MR. McINNIS: Well, as I understand it, this committee defeated my motion to have this committee take on that responsibility and referred it instead to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. I think it might be appropriate to have a report from the minister when he's here with us since he's a member of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

Then on my agenda I think we come over to the one that was added today: to revisit the issue of constituency office signage.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what happened to item 4(e)(ii)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I communicated earlier that all of those items . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Part (i) was tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . that subsections (i) and (ii) were going to be dealt with tomorrow. All right? Thank you.

Edmonton-Jasper Place, on the constituency office.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a document I wish to pass around regarding Alberta's latest language law. The motion was passed in our meeting last . . .

MR. BOGLE: Excuse me. It's coming around, is it?

MR. McINNIS: Yeah, it's coming around. I won't refer to it until you all have it.

Just by way of background, at the committee meeting of July 19 there was a proposed amendment to the constituency services order stating a restricted list of items that can appear on constituency office signage, those being the name of the member, the name of the electoral district, the designation "constituency office," address, telephone number, hours of operation, directions to reach the office, and the coat of arms of the Legislative Assembly. That motion was carried on a split vote, and then there was a subsequent motion delaying the implementation of the new Members' Services order until January 1, 1991.

But back to that second part. I had mentioned that in my office there is in the artwork – and if you all have a copy of the document, there's a rather poor photocopy reproduction of a photograph of the offending sign which will perhaps illustrate one concern that I raised, which is that I have put into the artwork the logo of the Neighbourhood Watch program, which my office has been involved in organizing in the community. That I guess would also be illegal under the language rule that was passed in the committee on July 19.

There's also the matter of a number of other displays and posters, which I'm sure all of us put forward from time to time, sometimes because we're asked to, to advertise events in the community which are being undertaken by community leagues or other organizations, or there are community forums, bake sales, or what have you. I certainly advertise my town hall meetings on posters which I display at the front of my community office, using this poster which also has the term "community office" on it as does my stationery, my business cards, and my staff's business cards as well. Now, I think it was because of some of those functions – I guess you might call it supporting worthwhile causes in the community such as Neighbourhood Watch – that the members undertook to delay implementation of the order, and I thought that meant we were going to have some further discussion. I hope we do.

2:40

Since the meeting I've attempted to discuss this matter with a number of people in my district to try to determine whether they have a view on it. I really can't find anybody who has a problem with the use of the words "community office" from any perspective whatsoever. It's certainly not intended to convey any partisan advantage to me, which is the spirit of most of the restrictions that are in the Members' Services order, that the office is not to be used for that purpose. Whether it's a community office or a constituency office doesn't seem to create that problem. It doesn't seem to create confusion especially, but there is the matter of what to do with the investment that's there in terms of the signage.

One member of this committee – I believe it was Red Deer-North – said: well, you know, you just get a bucket of paint and change the sign. Well, it's not quite that simple. I actually have another estimate which is almost double the cost of repainting the sign. Apparently, there is a reason why you can't just change one word on the sign. They have to redo all of the artwork, which undoubtedly could be done to Members' Services' specifications as soon as we're absolutely clear what those are going to be, but that's basically an \$800 job just to change the artwork on the sign. Then I have as well a couple of banners which are on display in the office window which have the same offending word therein. Those would cost some \$400 to redo as well. So just on the signage that's almost \$1,100, plus the posters and the business cards and so forth which are presently there. Now, it does create some problems financing that from

an allocation which was barely adequate to the intended purpose at the outset. I mean, we had budgeted fairly carefully, and I don't know where those funds would be found.

I suppose I'm appealing to the committee to reconsider whether it's necessary to undergo this type of expenditure in order to satisfy a concern that apparently arose over a matter of security. I just can't see, in talking to my people, where any matter of security arises from this. I think it's a political question fundamentally just in the sense that there is a communication that exists under a communication allowance between the member and the constituent. That generally either operates to the satisfaction of both parties or it doesn't. So the check on that is usually, you know, that if you don't like the style of the communication you're getting, you might get a different member, I suppose.

So I was kind of stuck trying to figure out the cost of observing the new language law as passed in the committee on July 19. If I have to do it as a matter of not wanting to be in breach of Members' Services orders, then I'll do it, but the members have to be aware that there is a cost, and I would like some indication from the committee. If the committee feels it's necessary to sort of retroactively look at what's on display in constituency offices, or community offices as the case might be, and to retroactively alter those, then surely you have to identify how that's to be paid for. Again, you know, my position is that I don't think it's really necessary for the committee to interfere in something that has caused no complaint that I'm aware of from within the district. The only complaint that I'm aware of arises from this committee and for that reason may itself be political in origin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Taber-Warner, followed by Calgary-Glenmore.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, could we have clarification on the original motion? We've debated the issue; let's just make sure what decision was made. My recollection is that the motion was made and there was an amendment to it that would ensure that the implementation would be delayed till the end of the year to give the offending members an opportunity out of their own budgets to correct and comply with the procedures.

MS BARRETT: I'm not an offending member.

MR. McINNIS: I take offence to the word "offending."

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. McINNIS: If the member will look in the minutes of July 19, page 42 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, hon. members, we could not get too worried about offending things. You know, there's a phrase, "language law," that's hardly appropriate there too.

In the minutes of July 19: 90.103.

One other item needs to be . . .

MR. BOGLE: What line again, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; 90.103. It's under New Business.

The matter, Edmonton-Jasper Place, has no security overtones whatsoever. The matter arose when the Sergeant-at-Arms, carrying out part of his responsibilities anyway, noticed that a sign said community office instead of constituency office. It has nothing to do with security. I think, as I pointed out last time

I raised the matter with the Parliamentary Counsel, that since all members are elected in a constituency, I didn't want at any time any member to get fouled up in terms of Members' Services orders. So that was part of the reason for clarification.

So there were no heinous motives involved in it at all other than trying to make absolutely sure that members are being protected in their eligibility to be receiving funds and so forth according to the directions from this committee from time to time. It's nothing any more complicated than that.

Taber-Warner, were you finished? Okay. Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, it does seem like we have debated this before, and I don't believe for a minute that it's a political issue. It is spelled out in Standing Orders as to what every member is supposed to follow with regards to signage and what have you. It's like saying, "Oops, I made a mistake," and beg for forgiveness. We're setting a precedent here by allowing change, and it means then that anybody can go along and put whatever pictures they want on their signs or put whatever name they want on their signs, come back to Members' Services and say: "Well, now it's costing \$1,800. Do we want to waste taxpayers' dollars in changing this?" I just feel it has been very clearly spelled out as to what our signage should be, and we should all abide by those rules. Any diversion from that should not be allowed, and he should change his signs back to the way it's spelled out in the section here.

MS BARRETT: Hey, just hang on a minute. This is changing the rules, folks. Just a minute. When I did my signs, there was no rule that said you couldn't use "community." I have yet to discover any reason for this, and you might be tired of the argument, but I sure am not. I want to hear this. I have not read an explanation that makes sense. I would like to hear from the lawyers about whether or not we can call ourselves the bloody action centre if we want to, just like Mr. Scottie does. This is nonsense. I'm the one who's got to find the money. I have a very finely tuned constituency budget, and I'm not paying for it. First of all, I don't agree with your decision. Secondly, I haven't heard a modicum of an explanation. Thirdly, I am not paying for it. If you guys want to make the rules and change the rules, then you come up with the money. I'm not paying for this.

I'd really like to hear the lawyers tell me why it is that if Scott Thorkelson can call his constituency office an action centre, I can't use the words "community office." Have you ever heard of a rule that wasn't made up prior to July 19, 1990, by this organization that would prohibit that?

MRS. MIROSH: He doesn't fall under our parliamentary rules.

MS BARRETT: What?

MRS. MIROSH: An MP doesn't fall under these rules.

MS BARRETT: I'm talking about parliamentary principles. If an MP can call his constituency office an action centre and if there are no other limitations exercised by the House of Commons or even in the United Kingdom, I'd like to hear the reason that this committee has decided that I can't call my community office a community office. I've been doing it for years. No one ever barked before. What's the matter? Who got sensitive? What's the problem?

MR. S. DAY: It sounds like you're sensitive.

MS BARRETT: You've got that right. I'm not paying for your . . .

2:50

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Would Parliamentary Counsel like to make a comment of whatever you feel the interpretation is? It makes no difference to me.

MR. RITTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only involvement as far as a legal interpretation is the analysis of the words that are used in the legislation: constituency office. Certainly there's no suggestion by this office that this Legislature does not maintain the right to call their offices whatever they want. However, there has been an enactment of this Legislature that used the term "constituency office" throughout all the various sources, and our only concern is that . . .

MS BARRETT: But is that limiting? That's my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. I'm sure he might have some more stuff. Hang on.

MR. RITTER: Well, it's just that the legislation has used the term consistently, Mr. Chairman, and it's largely an administrative decision that's got to be made by this committee, but secondly, it's for the ease of being consistent with the terminology that has been used in the legislation passed to date. Various Members' Services orders have referred to the term "constituency," but ultimately the interpretation of the matter is one for this committee to make. I think there's both a legal and an administrative element here, and we can only comment on the legal element that the term "constituency" has been the term that's been used and adopted by this Legislature. The administrative ramifications of that are up to the committee itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Both lawyers concur on this one?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the committee has passed this order now on the background of what they assessed before, that there was an administrative element to this, a matter of consistency. The question really now is: what was the exact interpretation and effect of the order as it stands? This order was drafted quite quickly, and I think one of the reasons why the committee didn't wish to put it into effect immediately was in case it was found to be lacking in some certainty about how it's to be interpreted. Certainly the way it's written would apply to expenditures on signage which were paid for out of a constituency allowance, those expenditures which were authorized after the effective date of this order. Whether it relates to signs which are already in place is a different matter. It doesn't specifically state it's retrospective.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get an answer to the question that I put. My question is: this motion notwithstanding, is there anything that you guys know of that says that just because we always refer to ourselves or our offices in our laws and in our Members' Services orders as a constituency, does that mean we can only call it a constituency office, in the legal sense? Is that limiting? I mean, that's what I'm asking. Pretend that this doesn't exist right now.

MR. M. CLEGG: Well, Mr. Chairman, it does exist.

MS BARRETT: Prior to July 19 how would you have answered that question?

MR. M. CLEGG: In the record, Mr. Chairman, I believe that what I said at this meeting was that I felt it was not a strictly legal issue, it was a matter of administrative consistency, and that we'd leave it to the Members' Services Committee to determine whether that should be regulated by an order. Prior to that it was a matter of administration, essentially, and a matter of reference. Then the committee passed this order to provide a legal background with a legal basis for it.

MR. RITTER: It puts us in a very difficult position, Mr. Chairman, because the whole issue of if something is a good administrative issue – a judge often deals with these things where a statute is not really specified, and he'll say: "Well, by this judgment I'll be clarifying it down the road just for those of you who thought it was an iffy issue. Let's clarify it right now and give a judgment." It's very difficult for us to refer to something and say there's a definite yes and no on an issue that has consistently used an administrative term and has appeared in all the statute law but the Members' Services Committee has now decided to clarify the issue. Speaking about what might have been before this order is clarified is a very difficult decision to do for counsel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Calgary-Foothills, Edmonton-Jasper Place, Taber-Warner.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think in our last meeting, as I recollect, the Sergeant-at-Arms had been out on a tour of constituency offices. I think your argument falls short, Pam, from the standpoint that you said that just because the terminology is used in our legislation and in our Acts that deal with the constituency office . . . It was deemed that there would have to be a clarification from this committee, and it was brought forward to this committee to have a clarification put forward. Hence, the committee put forward a clarification with a clause that said that this was not going to be enacted until January 1, 1991. Conformity of information for constituents and for Albertans we felt was important. Naming something a constituency office in all of our legislation Acts that deal with that is consistent with having the office called a constituency office. It wouldn't make sense to call something a constituency office in legislation and then call it a drop-in centre or something else when everything that's dealt with that office is called a constituency office in the legislation and the regulations that govern it. So that's why it was brought forward. That's why it was basically something that is simple to conform to, because it is called a constituency office in the legislation. It's not a big item to change it from . . .

MS BARRETT: Then we just need a minor amendment: designation constituency office or . . .

MRS. MIROSH: You don't have the floor, Pam.

MRS. BLACK: Then I would suggest you would want to change all the legislation to have constituency office or whatever else you might want to call it, which would not be rational. So I would think you would want to leave it as constituency office. It's not a big item. It was passed at the last meeting. It was dealt with. I thought the discussion was over, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly.

MS BARRETT: Well, who's going to pay for it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Edmonton-Jasper Place, Taber-Warner. Then we will bring this issue to a close or else it will be tabled because we have a guest coming at 3 o'clock.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, it is abundantly clear that there is nothing in law and jurisprudence aside from this Members' Services motion which makes it illegal to use the term "community office" on a sign, which is why the motion. That part is clear; otherwise we wouldn't be in the situation that we're in. Therefore, I have to object to Mr. Bogle talking about "offending members" and Mrs. Mirosh saying that we have members who say, "Oops, they've made a mistake," and they're asking forgiveness of the committee. I'm not asking anybody's forgiveness because I didn't do anything wrong.

MS BARRETT: I didn't either.

MR. McINNIS: I think what was wrong is passing rules like this which retroactively require reinvestment in capital items which are of a nonrecurring nature. Signs and banners are of that sort. Once you've purchased them, you don't reckon on having to replace them on an annual basis. Therefore, there's nothing in our budget that would provide for redoing the signs.

Under this system it is open, you know – we've now given ourselves to create whole new categories of illegalities – once members have invested their constituency funds, to declare those things illegal as well and require that they be done and redone endlessly. I guess it's sort of a branch of simply saying that because we voted something in, it doesn't make it right.

We do have the problem of: how do we implement this thing? At least two members on this committee and possibly others, because I don't think a comprehensive survey has been done – I'm aware of at least two others in our Assembly that use the term "community office" to describe their operation, again with no difficulty or no problems from the point of view of their electors, who may be faced with some expenditure as well. So we haven't done anything wrong. What's happened is you guys have changed the rules effective a certain date in time, and in so doing have given my office at least an \$1,100 or \$1,200 bill for capital alterations, disregarding what we may have to do in terms of printing and reprinting things. Even though the motion doesn't say so, presumably somebody's going to come along and say that you have to answer your phone in a certain way and that you have to have your business cards printed in a certain way. I mean, those things can't be very far behind, essentially some members of this committee feeling that it's up to them to screen the communication that occurs between a member and the constituents, that constituents aren't bright enough to determine whether communications are appropriate or useful or any of those other things. We have a trend that way. Now we have one that just so happens to have the effect of causing a substantial waste of money. On that basis I think it should be reconsidered.

Then we have part 2, which is that the way the thing is written doesn't allow for things such as the Neighbourhood Watch logo or any other type of display that a member might put in front of their office. It could be a poster advertising the community facility enhancement program and the name of the minister that they could contact to obtain information about that. That seems to me to be a legitimate thing that an MLA might do, but nonetheless the wording of the amended order is exclusive. It

lists things that may be shown and everything else that may not. Obviously certain things will have to be done, certain borderline cases will have to be rejudged. So that's the secondary aspect of the new reading. I believe it was to come back to this meeting in any case.

3:00

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, it's regrettable that we're into the issue again. It was dealt with at a past meeting. The mover of the motion accepted an amendment to allow a time when the members who had not followed previous orders of this committee could make adjustments.

MS BARRETT: Hey, that's a real misrepresentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Excuse me.

MS BARRETT: There was no rule before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I go back to the constituency services order dated July 27, 1983, which called for the creation of a constituency office allowance and expenses code, and the order goes through and identifies what is permissible under a constituency office. That was 1983. It's regrettable that out of 83 members of the Assembly the two offending members are also members of this committee.

MR. McINNIS: Objection.

MS BARRETT: Now, just a minute. Mr. Chairman, this is outrageous. He can't prove that there's a rule saying . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order.

MS BARRETT: . . . we couldn't call it community office because the rule wasn't there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, hon. member.

MS BARRETT: Well . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. You've interrupted a number of times. I'm sure I can recognize you again if the committee wants to keep on going.

MS BARRETT: He's saying I broke a law that didn't exist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order.

MS BARRETT: No. I'm leaving then. I'll come back when the subject is dealt with. Jeez.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Watch your language, please, hon. member.

MS BARRETT: I said jeez, j-e-e-z.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We've got that spelling for the record. That's useful.

MR. BOGLE: It is regrettable that it appears we must build further guidelines around certain orders . . .

MRS. MIROSH: That's just like a two-year-old.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. BOGLE: . . . to ensure that individuals don't stray from the intent. The intent is very clear when you go through the order created in 1983, some seven years ago, and we went for at least six years without a problem.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that the matter was dealt with; it was voted upon. It should be noted that it was not a decision made unanimously in the committee. There was a split vote. In fact, one government member voted with a couple of opposition members on this particular matter. The matter was dealt with, and clearly the responsibility to comply with the constituency office order rests with the members.

MR. S. DAY: Well, Mr. Chairman, in deference to the fact that apparently we have a guest waiting to address us, I don't want to belabour the point. We'll probably have to come back to it. This started out strictly as, and still is in my mind, an administrative matter, that we have certain administration notation that clearly talks about constituency office. We have statute law that follows constituency office, and for the sake of consistency the matter needs to be resolved. I brought forward a motion that I felt would resolve the issue which reflects the administrative situation, the statutory situation; I think there's some reflection on the legal perception of the situation. Then after that was passed, which I thought was simply an administrative item, some other considerations were raised by members of the opposition, which I thought were good considerations and thereby agreed that let's take a look at some of the implementation factors here.

I think this thing has been blown way out of proportion. We hear talk of wrongdoing, illegality. I think we have a couple of members raising phantoms and blowing this thing to a proportion to which it simply isn't, and I'd like to keep the discussion at the practical, administrative level. Again, I think the discussion becomes skewed when you have the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place talk about, you know, next they're going to be saying how we can answer the phone and screen communications. I don't think those types of words or the type of dramatic high jinks by Edmonton-Highlands are really adding to what is basically an administrative item to which we've allowed an amendment so we can look at all the ramifications of it.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I for one haven't heard from all members to hear what the implementation factors would be. I'd still like to do that. I don't think this can be resolved today. That's why we've allowed considerable time, and I'd like to move that this be tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would have to declare the motion out of order because of the fact that a motion was carried at the previous meeting, as pointed out by the Member for Red Deer-North. In actual fact we're in violation of Standing Order 23(c). I should be calling any member to order who

persists in . . .

and this is not "needless repetition," though some may think so . . . or raises matters which have been decided during the current session.

Again, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place asked permission to raise the issue, we all assume for some number of comments. We approved the agenda earlier in the day, and I think the committee has indeed gone the extra mile in having the extra discussion to try to pick up points. The item, then, stands.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, that's not quite good enough. You ruled that it couldn't be tabled because a motion was not on the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. McINNIS: I'm prepared to put a motion at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm sorry. There was no motion on the floor to be tabled.

MR. McINNIS: I know. That's why I'm putting a motion at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, hon. member. You'll have to wait till a bit later because we've made other commitments for 3 o'clock.

MR. McINNIS: So we're returning to this item later on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It'll now drop to the bottom of the Order Paper.

MR. McINNIS: Well, that's not good enough either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. That's the decision.

MR. McINNIS: What's the basis for just dropping an item? I don't understand it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I said "to the bottom of the Order Paper," which means to the bottom of the order of business, which would be at the end of tomorrow.

MR. McINNIS: Is that a ruling from the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It certainly is.

MR. McINNIS: That's nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, hon. member.

MRS. BLACK: Maybe you should go out with Pam.

MR. McINNIS: That's enough cheap shots out of you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yeah, the master of cheap shots.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think under the circumstances, group, it's time that we all took a little walk around the building or something. We'll see you back here in 10 minutes at a quarter after 3. It might do us all a lot of good.

[The committee adjourned from 3:07 p.m. to 3:19 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, L and G, if we might come back to order, please. We need to move to section 6(a), Impact of Federal Tax Legislation. There's a couple of items there that need to be discussed.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we go in camera to deal with 6(a), please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call for the question.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, could I ask for an explanation as to why there's a requirement to go in camera for Impact of Federal Tax Legislation? Are we talking the GST?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the committee needs to stand adjourned for another two minutes.

[The committee adjourned from 3:20 p.m. to 3:21 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're back here, folks. There is a call for the committee to go in camera. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously.

[The committee met in camera from 3:22 p.m. to 4:40 p.m.]

MRS. MIROSH: I move that we adjourn.

MS BARRETT: [Not recorded] schedule starts getting chewed up, can we look at just dates now for the next meetings, because we've got budget stuff to do, and then adjourn? Diane, is that all right?

MRS. MIROSH: I move to adjourn with that slight amendment.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The chairman is awfully deaf here, so what are the possibilities of the mornings of November 13 and November 14?

MRS. BLACK: No. You can have the 12th.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the 12th is a holiday. What have you got on in the morning of the 13th?

MRS. BLACK: Heritage trust fund morning and afternoon for one, two, three, four days.

MR. M. CLEGG: The Ombudsman committee, the Legislative Offices Committee, is sitting on the 13th and 14th.

MRS. BLACK: We can meet on the 9th.

MR. BOGLE: Legislative Offices is in the afternoon of the 13th. We've canceled the 14th.

MR. WICKMAN: Why are you proposing two days?

MR. BOGLE: Well, we're trying to find time to deal with the budget. You need a full day. Somebody's proposing two half days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or the 9th if that's another . . .

MRS. BLACK: The 9th all day? Forget it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. [interjections] Unless you're into some things about Remembrance Day, or maybe not.

MRS. MIROSH: Not until Sunday.

MRS. BLACK: That's not till Sunday.

MS BARRETT: What about the 15th?

MRS. BLACK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you can have the meeting without me; that'd be fine. I'm on my way to Manitoba.

MRS. MIROSH: No, we can't. That week's bad.

MS BARRETT: Okay. What about – this is really looking close now – the 7th. Is everybody booked on the 7th?

MRS. BLACK: We have caucus.

MS BARRETT: Okay. How about Friday the 2nd?

MR. WICKMAN: What about Monday, November 26?

MS BARRETT: I'm pretty sure the House will be sitting by then.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. Just asking.

MRS. MIROSH: What date did you say, Percy?

MR. WICKMAN: What about November 23, Friday?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Friday the 23rd, after 1 o'clock in case the House is in?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Sure.

MR. BOGLE: Is that enough time?

MS BARRETT: Not necessarily.

MRS. BLACK: Why don't we take the 9th and the 23rd?

MS BARRETT: The 9th I can't be here, but that's no sweat.

MR. BOGLE: Well, why can't we agree to a date subject to the sitting of the House?

MRS. BLACK: How about the morning of November 5 and 6?

MR. WICKMAN: Why don't we go to the 23rd at 9 o'clock if the House is sitting?

MR. BOGLE: Sorry. What about both the Thursday afternoon and Friday morning?

MRS. BLACK: Of what?

MR. BOGLE: The 22nd and 23rd, so that those who drive can get away by 1 o'clock on the Friday.

MS BARRETT: It's good with me.

MR. McINNIS: That's assuming we're not in session.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MRS. MIROSH: What if we are? Then what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, then we'll adjust, because we're such a flexible, versatile, well-meaning, and graciously spirited group.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. So we're saying Friday at 9 in the morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thursday the 22nd at 1 in the afternoon and the 23rd at 9:30.

MR. WICKMAN: If the House is sitting on those days, then we simply redo the whole thing?

MRS. MIROSH: We go on the afternoon of the 23rd.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, on the 22nd, though, the House would sit that afternoon.

MS BARRETT: She said the 23rd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the House is in, then we would go to 1:15 on Friday the 23rd after the House rises.

DR. McNEIL: May I ask a question re the budget? It would be our intention to develop the budget based on . . . [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

DR. McNEIL: . . . 90 sitting days. In the event that the House sat more than 90 sitting days, we'd have to go forward with a special warrant. I think that's a better way to approach it as opposed to budgeting for 100 days and significantly increase the budget.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Isn't that what you normally do?

DR. McNEIL: Yes, that's what we normally do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's agreed. That's on the minutes.

Now the Chair recognizes Calgary-Glenmore, who has something important to say.

MRS. MIROSH: I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Till tomorrow morning at 11. Those in favour, please take up your equipment and leave.
Thank you all.

[The committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.]

