

9:38 a.m.

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The meeting is now called to order. I think the first item of business we have relates to the matter of caucus budgets. I'm of the understanding that there's a proposal coming forward. Is it from Edmonton-Whitemud?

MR. WICKMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's all right. Enjoy the rest of your bran muffin. We can wait.

MR. WICKMAN: The subcommittee met yesterday, and we're putting forward a proposal of a 5 percent increase to each caucus budget on a global basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Chair take that as a motion?

MR. WICKMAN: Yes. That's a motion: a 5 percent increase in the three caucus budgets.

I'd like to make some wrapping-up statements, but I think we should have a presentation first by the chiefs of staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. In any particular order? The Liberal caucus, since the motion is sponsored by the Liberal member.

MR. HENRY: Sure. The three chiefs of staff met, and I think we considered a number of issues including the current inflation rate, the settlement given to the public service and the employees of the Leg. Assembly, as well as looking at the fiscal policy of the government. One of the realities we faced is that over 90 percent of each caucus budget is tied up in personnel, so if we're to remain in terms of fairness and some sort of equality with other employees of the government and the Leg. Assembly, then we would want to have the flexibility to give staff in the neighbourhood of a 5 percent increase in salary. If we received less than a 5 percent increase in our overall budget, given that over 90 percent of our budgets are used on personnel, we don't have the flexibility that some departments would have in terms of trimming other costs in order to accommodate a 5 percent increase in salaries. That is the basis on which we made the recommendation. I think we're all agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. From the New Democrats, Cindy, please.

MS HICKMORE: Just to reiterate, what Michael said is that a significant portion of our budget is in fact employee related, so what we're looking at is trying to ensure that the staff get an equivalent increment to that that the government sector has received, and that's the 5 percent that we're looking at.

MRS. AINSLIE: I guess all I have to say is that I concur with the other chiefs of staff.

MR. HYLAND: That's the shortest speech you've ever made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments?

MR. BOGLE: Well, clearly the intent in the process – and it may be that Percy intends to amplify this in his closing com-

ments – was that the chiefs of staff would meet and see if there was concurrence. If there was concurrence, they would come and make their presentation through the subcommittee back to this table. That has been done; there is concurrence. But the matter would now be held over so that we could go back to our respective caucuses, discuss it further, and bring it back at our February meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: As a member of the subcommittee I concur with the chiefs of staff's recommendation. The question of adjusting salaries in caucus staffs is an important one. They have a tendency to be hired at a certain level and left there and have no alternative but to seek other employment if they're seeking any kind of adjustment. Obviously, none of us wants that. We depend on staff, and we're looking at something that's in balance to what is available to other people who work in the Assembly in the different offices.

The 5 percent is essentially a cost of living type of adjustment. It doesn't allow for any merit or any increase over and above a COLA situation. So we're looking at a hold-the-line position. It's a kind of compromise, but I think it's a fair and reasonable one in the circumstance, so I support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll have to ask the vice-chairman to come take the Chair, please.

Are there other members speaking to this? Okay, Red Deer-North, and then when the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud speaks, that will be the summation before the vote on the motion.

[Mr. Bogle in the Chair]

MR. S. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a number of things that have to be taken into consideration. To take some time to do that, I'd like to move to table this motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. A motion to table.

MR. McINNIS: Until what date?

MR. S. DAY: Till our next meeting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A motion to table till the next meeting. All in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried.

Anything else? [interjections] Excuse me. Through the Chair, please. Anything else to report, Percy, from the subcommittee?

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, if I could have that opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

The other aspect that was touched on is not a recommendation. I just want to put it on the table at this time for thought so it can also be dealt with in conjunction with the budget when we finalize it in February.

Let me point out, first of all, that the provincial unions over two years basically settled at 10 percent, so this 5 percent over one year is in line with them. I'm going to put forward at the meeting in February a minimal increase for constituency offices as well. I want everyone here to know it. It will not exceed 5 percent. I think constituency offices if they had to could possibly live with 3 and a half percent, but my concern there, Mr. Chairman, is that we have staff that generally speaking are not very well paid, and it does create problems if we can't give them

some increment in line with what other provincial employees are getting. So at that particular time I'll put forward a proposal that will be somewhere between 3 and a half and 5 percent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You're advising the committee that when we meet in February, you will be putting forward a motion regarding constituency offices. That's helpful information for all members of the committee in terms of communication with other colleagues.

Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: I think the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud flags an important subject. We have to do something on the constituency allowance budgets, although at this point in time I can't recollect 3 and a half percent having been discussed in committee. I recall the 5 percent.

MR. WICKMAN: My preference would be 5 percent, John. I'm saying that if I had to, I could make do with 3 and a half, but my preference would be 5.

MR. McINNIS: Well, maybe we can refer that back to the subcommittee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. Anything else from the subcommittee?

MR. WICKMAN: No; that concludes the subcommittee report. The subcommittee will meet again on February 19 at 1 o'clock for a short meeting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

DR. McNEIL: Relevant to the discussion, Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting there was some information requested as to public-sector settlements and inflation indexing. Just so you can add that to your discussions, I have a handout which relates to that information.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll take a two and a half minute break so you can study the material. That will also give us an opportunity to ascertain how long we expect the chairman to be away. If he's going to be back in a minute or two, I'd like to hold the actual budget. I see Gary Garrison's here. We can get into *Hansard*, but if the chairman's only going to be absent for a few moments, I'd like to wait until he returns. If it appears that he's going to be away for an extended period of time, we'll move ahead into the budget.

[The committee adjourned from 9:48 a.m. to 9:57 a.m.]

[Dr. Carter in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I apologize for the interruption.

There's one item which the Clerk is able to deal with. It's with regard to the printing of the Order Paper and various documents.

Clerk.

DR. McNEIL: Yes. The question was raised at the last meeting about what the cost implications would be of printing the written questions and motions for returns one day a week, and I expanded it to motions other than government motions

and public Bills and orders other than government Bills and orders. In doing an analysis, we immediately came to the conclusion that since nongovernment business is considered on both Tuesdays and Thursdays, we would have to print those things on Tuesdays and Thursdays at the minimum. Based on that analysis, we came to the conclusion that on a budget of about \$53,000 we could save approximately \$22,000 a year by printing government business on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, then printing the whole, complete Order Paper on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

This is an analysis of that approach. You can see the advantages there in addition to the cost savings: less paper waste because the Order Paper is only good for that day and then it's really junk; it would make the production of the paper a little less complex on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Some other jurisdictions use this approach as well.

The biggest disadvantage that we anticipated might be encountered by the House leaders and members planning House strategy in not having the complete Order Paper on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. We thought the way to get around that is to produce a limited number of photocopies of that complete Order Paper on those days and provide it to each caucus. Then members would have to adjust to the fact that the private members' Bills and motions would appear only two days per week on the Order Paper.

Based on our analysis, we would recommend that the Speaker pursue this further with the House leaders in terms of its feasibility, and I would recommend the approach if it's feasible for them.

MR. BOGLE: I certainly support the proposal and, through the Chair, thank the administration for the work they've done in showing how we can save approximately \$22,000 a year. I think the supplemental comment made, that we could be duplicating sheets, may be premature in that the recommendation is that the Speaker approach the House leaders with the proposal. It may well be that internal arrangements may be made by each caucus and we don't have to worry about duplicating and other such factors.

I certainly would endorse that proposal that the chairman of our committee approach the House leaders with this proposal.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I was going to move that the recommendation be accepted by the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have a mover.

Any discussion? We've got one House leader here. Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Well, the recommendation is that it be broached with the House leaders.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: I think it's good. There should be a presumption that on the days when we have a short Order Paper, we're dealing with an abridged Order Paper. That's not the Order Paper for the day; it's just that portion that we would attempt to deal with. Because occasionally, because of emergency circumstances or whatever, it may be possible for a motion or something to change categories. For example, just in the short time that I've been here, I recall one private member's Bill was adopted as a government Bill. As long as we understand that

the rest of the Order Paper still exists even though it's not before us, I think it's a good idea.

DR. McNEIL: We would have the flexibility to generate a complete Order Paper, even if it was photocopied, in those instances when it was necessary for members to have the whole paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other discussion? Call for the question.

MR. HYLAND: Question.

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

We've invited the Editor of *Hansard* back with us, so you might refer to section 10 in your estimates book. Page 15 is where the original estimate was given.

Dr. Garrison, do you have a breakdown of that page now?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, I do. I've got copies of this breakdown on the 1991 *Hansard* conference for everybody.

Twenty thousand dollars was shown in the original estimates simply because we hadn't gotten into the detail of planning. Of course, some of this stuff could still be changed, but as we got more into the nitty-gritty of what's happening on what day and where, this is what we came up with.

You can see that the present proposal is \$15,420. That includes \$3,000 for the transcript of all the business sessions, which is a normal part of *Hansard* conferences. It's a natural thing because that's what we all do. It's a good way for *Hansards* to have a good view of what each of the other jurisdictions does with text by way of editing and whatnot.

MR. HYLAND: This is the first time you get your own words on tape.

DR. GARRISON: Well, not quite the first time.

It's a way, too, of ensuring that things that are discussed at these conferences are shared not only with the other staff back home who can't make it but with Speakers, Clerks, and anybody else who's interested in what's going on nationwide in *Hansard*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So what's happened: it's come down from the other estimate of \$20,000.

Any questions or comments? Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, is there a registration fee associated with this conference?

DR. GARRISON: No. There never has been. This association started up in, I believe, about 1973 or '74, and there's never been anything like that.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the reason I ask is that it flows back to the Public Accounts conference held this past year where the question of a fee was raised. For most conferences that we participate in, there is a registration fee. We're hopeful that the Public Accounts will adjust, but this may be different.

DR. GARRISON: Well, the rationale for this one has been, I guess, at least as it was explained to me, that everybody takes a turn hosting it, and that's basically your turn in sharing the cost.

MR. BOGLE: Well, one last question on that point then: does each jurisdiction send the same number of delegates or participants?

DR. GARRISON: Usually not. The bigger provinces will send more, and sometimes some of the smaller jurisdictions send quite a number. Northwest Territories and New Brunswick have been well represented at some of these conferences. I should mention that the New Brunswick numbers have been up because they've been in the east, so that's a fairly natural thing to happen. Normally the larger delegations are from Ontario and Quebec and the federal House.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the only reason I raise that point is that we found that at the last Public Accounts conference, Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia had by far the largest delegations, and that placed quite a burden on a small province like Newfoundland. You know, Ontario can absorb conference costs so much easier than a smaller province, but I'll leave the point.

12:07

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think the experience the Leg. Offices Committee had was that the one conference fee that was leveled was the auditors general, especially when they were dealing with comprehensive auditing and all that. You tend to pay a conference registration fee of about \$550, along that nature. Of the CPA conferences which we've had members attend, we haven't had to pay conference fees.

I certainly listened attentively to the comments about which provinces can carry the load, especially when you usually do have a tendency from Ontario and Quebec to overload their delegations sometimes.

Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to follow up on the questions asked by Mr. Bogle, does each province and each territory take its turn in proportion? Or is the maritimes, for example, just classified as one region?

DR. GARRISON: Well, for this association each province, each jurisdiction takes a regular turn.

MR. WICKMAN: So you're saying that we're up every 12 years?

DR. GARRISON: I think it works out to about 14, because there are two branches in Ottawa and each of the territories has one, but Prince Edward Island does not have a *Hansard*.

MR. WICKMAN: So Ontario is split into two?

DR. GARRISON: No.

MR. WICKMAN: You said two branches.

DR. GARRISON: The federal House. There are nine provinces with *Hansards* and two territories; that's 11. Then two federal branches; that's 13. So every 13 years we would have a turn.

MR. WICKMAN: The other question I would have, Mr. Chairman. You have a formal association, I assume, and I assume that it is an informal understanding that there is no registration fee, that everyone takes their turn in proper order,

and that type of thing. It's just something that maybe some delegate may want to raise at some meeting further down the road. You know, should there be some type of registration fee? I would feel bad if Alberta was the province that imposed a registration fee – and I say imposed it – over the fact that all the other provinces were providing it with no registration fee. I think it's something that could best be sorted out internally within that association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff, followed by Red Deer-North.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Taber-Warner covered most of my comments. They were related not just specifically to this conference, because this compared to some of the others – the numbers in attendance, et cetera – doesn't cost us as much to put on as the possibilities of some of the larger ones. It was just the same thing. It's not because it's here or anything. It's just that it makes it a lot easier as these things get bigger for the smaller provinces to host if there's assistance in doing it rather than the province having to absorb that cost. I think we went around that issue in – what? – November, whatever it was, when we made a recommendation that we should look at registration fees and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. S. DAY: Well, I don't think we should hesitate to look at the registration fee just because none of the other provinces are doing it. More and more as a government, as are other governments, we're looking at user pay. Not that the registration fee, obviously, has to cover the total cost. We could be the lead in easing things expensewise here in Alberta, and then maybe in subsequent years other provinces would do that. I don't see that being a negative thing.

First of all, with what we're supplying here, is this conference relatively standard to all the other ones, or are we being a little more lavish?

DR. GARRISON: I'd say we're being less lavish than most of them, certainly less lavish than Nova Scotia was last year.

MR. S. DAY: What would be the difference there? What more would they have done?

DR. GARRISON: Well, the main difference, I think, between what we're proposing here and what happened in Nova Scotia is that they basically paid for all the drinks and everything. I think you'll notice that we have a picnic lunch on the grounds on the Friday. They took everybody out to eat every day at a pretty nice place.

MR. S. DAY: Is their Premier in the Senate now? I'm trying to remember.

MR. McINNIS: He is, yeah. The former Premier.

MR. S. DAY: I'm not trying to appear nit-picky. I just think if we go at all of these, whether it's *Hansard* or whatever the budgets are – sometimes we're accused of saying, well, that's \$800, that's \$900, that's one-millionth of the total budget of the province. But when you add all those little ones up over this

whole process, you're actually talking more significant dollars. I don't want you to think we're zeroing in and nit-picking here.

If you did knock out hospitality suite supplies, which I imagine would be the alcohol, and also the hospitality suite, that's over a thousand dollars. That's 6 percent of that budget right there that could come down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments?

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should nit-pick at the budget. I feel that any kind of convention or conference that we have in the province of Alberta always offers extra benefits and spin-offs for hotels, transportation, people in the city of Edmonton, and perhaps even towns surrounding the city. I think it's an economic benefit for our province to host something like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very quickly, Red Deer-North, in response to that point.

MR. S. DAY: Just as an observation, when I represented the government at Idaho's 100th anniversary last summer, they had dignitaries from all over. They had it at their legislative building. There were 10,000 people in the park. They introduced us all on the steps. They had quite a ceremony. The total amount of lavish spending on us as dignitaries consisted of a glass or two of iced tea and a piece of cake.

MR. McINNIS: With sugar or without?

MR. S. DAY: Mine was without. You could hardly swallow the stuff. A piece of cake was supplied for everybody, and the cake was baked and donated by a private-sector organization that wanted to support the 100th anniversary. That was it. Total. It was a wonderfully fabulous time. We were treated very lavishly in terms of friendship but very minimally in terms of expense.

I'm just trying to turn our thinking around a bit. We don't have to impress people from other provinces just by pouring out taxpayers' dollars in a lavish way. I'm not saying this is lavish, but I think it's time for us to be cranking our thinking on this around a bit. They had a wonderful party down there. Everybody, from the representative from Alberta to the Japanese consulate, got the same thing, a glass of iced tea and a slice of cake. It was a huge party. I'm sure all of us who went there spent our own funds in the local area. I know I did.

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

MR. S. DAY: Now I'm going to get beat up by Barrhead.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, as an addendum to the statements made by the Member for Calgary-Glenmore, I'd just like to make the following statement. As it's considerably cheaper to host such conferences in smaller communities like Vegreville or Stony Plain, has any thought been given to asking the Edmonton convention authority for a grant to subsidize this because of the accrued benefits to the economy of Edmonton?

MR. McINNIS: Or Stettler or Barrhead?

MR. KOWALSKI: Sure; agreed. It's much cheaper to host them there, significantly cheaper.

MR. S. DAY: Uh huh. Red Deer.

MR. WICKMAN: I hope Ken's not proposing Stettler.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's an alternative. It's much cheaper.

MR. McINNIS: I only want to make one comment, and that's with respect to the idea of charging registration fees. It seems to me the question we have to decide is whether we want to host the conference or not. I don't think we can go around changing the basis on which the conferences are held, because up to now, obviously, our delegates have been hosted by other provinces, and it seems to me that our decision is whether we want to take our turn hosting it or not. To turn around and try to change the entire basis of it: I don't feel comfortable doing that because up to now we've enjoyed the fact that other provinces have paid the cost when it was their turn. I don't like the idea of us deciding when it's our turn that you're going to pay.

10:17

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any comments on this issue? Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Well, I'd like to go back to Ken's comments. Has any consideration been given to hosting the conference other than in Edmonton? Have we looked at costs? I note we've got a bus rental of \$1,400, \$700 a day for two days. I'm not trying to put you on the spot, Gary, but I'm wondering if another site isn't something that could be looked at. And why not a smaller centre?

DR. GARRISON: The prime drawback that I can see would be that one of the major benefits of the conference is that we always get to see the setting in which the other people work, not just the Chamber that they deal with, the size of it and the architecture and the way it's laid out and the sound system and all that stuff that affects the way we work, but we also get to go through the actual physical plant where the *Hansard* itself is put together. Of course, if we were located somewhere else for the conference, that would obviously not be able to happen, either that or we'd have a larger transportation cost getting to and fro.

MR. BOGLE: If I may follow up, Mr. Chairman. I'm assuming, and I'll use for the sake of argument in this case, because you'd want them to see the plant here, that if you picked a site not far from Edmonton, your delegates from most if not all of the jurisdictions would be flying into Edmonton. You'd be making arrangements to pick them up. They could either look at your plant at the very beginning of the conference, and then you go on to your site, or at the end. It's scheduled to be a three-day conference. I'm just saying that if we use a little imagination, we might be able to show them a little more of this beautiful province than West Edmonton Mall.

DR. GARRISON: One other angle that has been talked about but not fully investigated to this point is the idea of corporate sponsors for some of the events, which could obviously bring the cost down. That's something I think we'll be looking at.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I hope we're not getting a degree of politics entering into this picture. I think this is an internal decision that's made by the association. There are many, many benefits to holding it in Edmonton or Calgary, as far as that goes. It's just so logical. You know, to start talking

in terms of moving a conference of this nature when you have all the in-house stuff right here simply doesn't make any sense, Mr. Chairman. I would hope the Member for Barrhead is simply talking tongue in cheek.

MR. KOWALSKI: No. I'm a great advocate of Vegreville and Stony Plain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Additional comments or discussion? Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: Well, just in terms of process, I'd like it clarified, Mr. Chairman. On this or other budgets, as a member of this august body - actually, this would be a January body, wouldn't it? - is the process for one of us to make a motion if we want to see some item reduced or eliminated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's why we go through this budget in such great detail, and we've been through it, you know, twice in November. That's why this item is back to the table. Whether it's a caucus budget or part of the administrative budget, you can do it line by line. So if you want to make a motion, go for it.

MR. S. DAY: I'd just like to move that the hospitality suite supplies and expenses be deleted from the budget.

MRS. BLACK: Could you be more specific?

MR. S. DAY: The \$300 hospitality suite supply item and the hospitality suite at \$710, with a result of a 6 percent reduction to the budget.

MS BARRETT: I have a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Does anybody at this table recall if we've moved to eliminate the hospitality suites or supplies from any of the other conferences that we host on an occasional basis that are related to the Assembly, say CPA conferences or other types of things?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The answer is no, we did not eliminate those for either the CPA conference or the Sergeant-at-Arms conferences.

MS BARRETT: Or Public Accounts.

In other words, if we support this motion, what we're really doing is saying that from now on we'll eliminate our sponsorship for all hospitality suites for anything that is approved at this budget table.

MR. S. DAY: I don't see that wording in the motion myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. It deals with this particular issue. It starts a precedent which you might or might not appeal to the next time around.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak against the motion from the standpoint that unless we have the thought that we are going to move away from hosting, I don't think the \$300 is extravagant for supplies to a hospitality suite. I've done supplies to hospitality suites on occasion in the past, and I certainly haven't been able to do one for \$300. If we're going

to do that, I think we have to do it consistently with other delegations coming to the province. I don't think the \$300, or quite frankly the \$710 for three days, is out of line, so I would have to speak against the motion.

MR. McINNIS: I certainly want to welcome the Member for Red Deer-North back to the committee. We miss him when he's not here and the taxpayers' money is being spent in great gobs like it was at our last meeting. So now that he's back here and he's moving to take the hospitality room out, I just want to remind him and the other members that when you go to conferences, part of what you do is spend time in formal sessions, debating motions and important matters that the conference focuses around, and the other part of the time you get together socially and speak informally. Now, even when he went to Idaho, he must have had a room somewhere and a spigot of iced tea and someplace to eat his cake. I doubt that just sort of happened somewhere.

I think we have to have a place where delegates to any conference can get together. I think probably it wouldn't be the end of the world if they had to pay for their own drinks, but I think they should have a room, a suitable facility somewhere, where they can meet in a relaxed atmosphere, so I'm opposed to the motion as it's put forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Additional comments or questions?

MR. S. DAY: I'd like to sum up debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Indeed, I'm about to give you that privilege.

MR. S. DAY: The Member for Edmonton-Highlands talked about this maybe becoming a precedent. I wouldn't have a problem if that did, but I'm not saying that every single time this should be eliminated.

Yes, to the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, we all know that at a conference the informal discussion sometimes is as important or even more important than the formal. You do not have to have a separate room provided for that. We did not have that at Idaho. We did not have it in Seattle at the recent meeting establishing the Pacific Northwest economic region. As you know, before, during, and after dinner there is ample time to make those informal contacts. Rooms were not provided at that particular conference, again, a very high-level, high-profile conference. I made some excellent contacts in Idaho without a room set aside and alcohol specifically provided for me.

So this could become a precedent. I think the taxpayers of our province and other provinces that might catch on to this would back and support this type of thing. That's all. I'll sum up debate with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion to delete the items, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know. I just wanted to check. It is indeed defeated. You want it recorded, hon. Member for Red Deer-North?

MR. S. DAY: No, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item was defeated.

Is there a motion to approve?

MR. WICKMAN: I'll move that the budget be approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; I have a motion to approve. Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Well, before we do that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to the budget. As we've had this discussion . . .

MR. HYLAND: We've just been talking about the conference.

MRS. BLACK: Oh, are we doing the conference budget only?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just the conference.

Okay. Is there a call for the question on the motion to approve the conference budget?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. WICKMAN: I'd just like to speak to it very briefly if I could, Mr. Chairman. I think it's very, very important that we respect the internal mechanisms, the internal workings of these types of associations. In terms of the number of delegates, in terms of the expenditure, in terms of the benefit to the economy and such, I don't think we have anything here to gripe about. I'm sure the organizers here in Edmonton will do us proud with this conference, and they'll do great things with it. If someone gets one or two free drinks out of it, I don't think we should shed any tears over it. I think the budget is well thought out and it's to our benefit. Go to it, Gary.

10:27

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Now, Calgary-Foothills, with regard to *Hansard* budget as a whole.

MRS. BLACK: Now we can look at the *Hansard* as a whole. I had a chance to leaf through this as the discussions were taking place, and I was wondering if we could turn to page 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, before you continue, hon. member, I would like to point out that the committee really has gone through this before, in November, that the committee has gone through it line by line and page by page. My notes indicate that this general section was given general approval. It's fine to come back to these items, but I do have a question to the committee as to how many times we come back and go through when certain pages have already been checked off beforehand. So, vice-chairman, let's hear from you.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ. We went through it in a preliminary way. I don't think that we should in any way feel inhibited about raising questions on any of the pages. This is the line-by-line review in the budget process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; well, we disagree, and we'll have a conversation afterwards as to how in depth the review was. My recollection was that it was on two occasions, was it not? Again,

as I've said earlier, I don't mind us doing it, but I think we need to have some clarification for the whole committee as to what constitutes approval at which time. Do we have to finally go to the last day and then go through each section and have formal motions, formal motions, and formal motions again?

MR. BOGLE: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge no motions have been made to date approving any of the budget. That's why I made my comment that we've dealt with the budget in a preliminary way to get an overview of what was being proposed in each of the elements of the Leg. Assembly budget. It's been our standard practice to go through the budget section by section and to sign off that section at the end of the process.

That's my understanding of what we're doing now. We've had our first motion, relating to the conference. We're now going through the *Hansard* budget, and hopefully we'll complete it today, sign it off, go on to information systems and hopefully do the same with it, and then when we come back in February, start at whatever point the Chairman wishes us to begin at and do the same thing with the other sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. As long as that's the understanding of the committee, because we've done some of the revisions and there will be others to come. At that time we'll also do the line-by-line with each of the caucus budgets as well. And out of there we probably have some implications back for MLA administration, if past history's been of benefit to us.

All right; then we'll go to page 1, not page 3, of *Hansard*. The overview is there. Clerk, if you'd like to speak to that overview.

DR. McNEIL: The major factor here with the budget is the fact of salary, wages, and employee benefit increases. These are as a result of incorporating two years of bargaining unit adjustments and one year of management adjustment into the salaries. As a result, you get the significant 17.8 percent increase in the salaries, wages, and benefits area.

The supply and services increase is primarily due to increases in freight and postage, printing, and other professional services related to putting out *Hansard*.

You've already approved the B budget, for the conference. That's the overview.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do want to go to the wage component. When we talk in terms of significant increases and the impact on the budget, I think that's one of the items that will affect the budget substantially. Now, we talked in terms of a 17.8 percent cost-of-living adjustment over a two-year period budgeted in a one-year period. Just for comparative purposes, in this year of 1991 what average percentage increase will staff in that department be receiving when we talk in terms of the cost-of-living adjustment plus merit increases?

DR. McNEIL: I think Gary can answer that question more specifically.

DR. GARRISON: Well, it varies from person to person depending on what . . .

MR. WICKMAN: What's the average increase in terms of a percentage?

DR. GARRISON: Well, I guess what you have to do is look at page 2. We've got five people there. You can't divide the percentages.

MR. WICKMAN: But isn't that increase over two years?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, this basically is the average: 12.3 percent.

MR. WICKMAN: Over the two-year period.

DR. GARRISON: Basically, the reason it's a 10 percent cost-of-living increase is that for the current year, which we budgeted for last year, the '90-91 fiscal year budget did not include any cost-of-living adjustment because we had no settlement. We had a settlement during the year for the current year and for the next year. So what we're comparing is a '90-91 estimate which didn't account for any cost-of-living increases. The cost-of-living increase that we are paying to people now is coming out of our own resources from moving funds around. But when you compare what we have to budget for next year with what we budgeted for last year, you're looking at a 10.2 percent increase just for cost of living. It's a compound interest factor: 5 percent of the '90-91 and then 5 percent on top of that to cover the '91-92 fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it still on that particular?

MR. WICKMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Remember we're going to come to page 2 in a minute. But that's okay.

MR. WICKMAN: I realize that, but that hasn't answered my question. I'm simply trying to get a breakdown. When we look at those cost-of-living adjustments and the wage component along with merit, I'm just trying to get an idea what percentage increase for the fiscal period coming up.

DR. GARRISON: Five percent within the fiscal year.

MR. WICKMAN: Five percent within the fiscal year is the cost of living and then put the merit on top.

DR. GARRISON: The merit is probably another 2 or 3 percent.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. So we're talking about 7 or 8 percent.

DR. GARRISON: Something like that, yeah.

MR. WICKMAN: See, I'm trying to equate that with what we did earlier for one thing. When we talked in terms of a caucus budget, we talked in terms of recognizing manpower requirements when we talked in terms of settlements that have been reached through the bargaining units. So you're talking in terms of a 7 to 8 percent cost-of-living plus merit increase.

DR. GARRISON: That's basically just for the one year. As I say, the way we've got it here, we're comparing . . .

MR. WICKMAN: I realize that, for the one year. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Actually, I think Al has a question about the COLA. I'm on different matters.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah. Mine is: will we see this through the whole budget? It's a two-year thing. Because we didn't know what it was; it wasn't in the budget last year.

DR. McNEIL: In some instances we knew last year what the settlements would be. In other areas we didn't. It seems to me that the contract Gary's people would come under if they were in the contract was one of the latest ones that we settled.

MR. McINNIS: My question is more general. How many staff does *Hansard* have? How many are year-round and how many are seasonal or temporary, sessional, I guess?

DR. GARRISON: Well, we have a total of 21. One of them is a contract employee; that's the console operator. Of the other 20 we have one person now who is three-quarter time and - the numbers are always changing, so I'm trying to figure it out - I believe it's six others who are full-time. One of those is reflected on page 3. Actually, the three-quarter and the other one full-time are reflected on page 3 as being proposed for the future fiscal year.

10:37

MR. McINNIS: Thirteen are sessional?

DR. GARRISON: Is that what it works out to?

MR. McINNIS: From 21.

DR. GARRISON: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: Well, just a point of information. I think in terms of salaries and the folks who work on *Hansard*, it is a very painstaking job. It calls for endurance, and it calls for efficiency. I mean, it is a unique job requiring a special person.

I just want us to reflect that we're looking at 17.2 percent here, which is a little over 8 percent a year. Just for information as we look at this and other budgets, if you increase your salary just 10 percent a year or if you increase the operating costs of the department just 10 percent a year, you double every seven years. Just so we're kind of aware of that. Sometimes we don't think in those terms, but in fact even in a government department if you only cut it off at a 10 percent increase a year, you double it every seven years. I just toss that out as information, not reflecting on the *Hansard* folks, who do an excellent job and earn every dime they get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're past page 1. Summaries? So the following pages relate back to that and we come to page 2. Any additional comments on that one, Edmonton-Whitemud?

On page 3, Calgary-Foothills, we're now back to where we were.

MRS. BLACK: I think part of the explanation has been given, Mr. Chairman, but I'm wondering why we have what appears to

be a new budget item on page 3 for \$64,000. The explanation is "increased workload, shifted from wages." I'm not too sure what that means. Is that a newly created position or added staff complement? I'm not too sure what that is.

DR. GARRISON: Well, the net increase in staff-years that's being proposed is three-quarters. I believe that's reflected on the overview statement. So out of the one and three-quarters staff-years on page 3, one of those is basically a direct transfer from wages on page 4. You can see the staff-years: 7.3 in '90-'91 and 6.3 in '91-'92. The wages would go down by one staff-year; the nonpermanent would go up by one and three-quarters. So there'd be a net increase of three-quarters of a position. And that's basically due to increased workload in a variety of different areas.

MRS. BLACK: So would that be a part-time person or a full-time person or full-time three-quarters or a part-time three-quarters?

DR. GARRISON: Well, it's a nonpermanent project position basically. This person would get three-quarters of the actual full-time salary. And if a person is on this sort of arrangement, then they qualify for prorated benefits and that kind of thing. So it's not the same as a wage person, but it's not the same as a permanent position either.

MRS. MIROSH: The question I have, Mr. Chairman, is related actually. On page 4, where you've eliminated a supervisor PAO II, moved to nonpermanent, is that reflected on page 3? This particular position now moved from nonpermanent is reflected on page 3?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, it is.

MRS. MIROSH: Is the same person now nonpermanent?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MRS. MIROSH: Does this then mean that if the workload decreases, because I know having a fall sitting certainly has increased the workload compared to the previous year, if in fact the workload does increase if we don't have a fall sitting or if we sit for a shorter length of time, then these positions would be easy enough to eliminate if they're nonpermanent?

DR. GARRISON: Well, in the long term that's right: a nonpermanent position is easier to eliminate than a permanent position. But the rationale for this proposed increase was that not only have we had an increase in sessional work, but there's been a trend toward more and more committee work and there are a number of other areas where there have been increased demands for service from the *Hansard* branch.

One of the ones, which I'm sure you are all aware of, is the on-line search capability, which requires a fair bit of extra staff time. It's a capability that people now have to search the text on-line using their computer terminals. There are a number of other things as well, such as the work we now do on the annual report for the department, which *Hansard* had never done before. We edit and produce and update the *Members' Guide*. Whenever changes are made to Members' Services orders, members' benefits or expense items or whatnot, we have to update the *Members' Guide* and make sure that's printed and circulated.

MRS. MIROSH: The Electoral Boundaries was also an exceptionally heavy workload this year compared to what is normal.

DR. GARRISON: That's right. Maybe I should just mention this. Mr. Bogle is probably aware of this, but maybe the others aren't. The forecast numbers on page 1 do not reflect work on Electoral Boundaries. The money that was spent on our work for the Electoral Boundaries Committee was basically an expenditure transferred to the Electoral Boundaries Committee to come out of their budget. So the expense of doing that work is not reflected in the '90-91 forecast as you see it here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments on that page? Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, so we're clear on the numbers. We've moved one supervisor position at \$19,362, which appears on page 4, over to page 3. Are there any other elements transferred that make up part of the new \$64,386 element?

DR. GARRISON: Yes. Just above that supervisor you see four copy editors. There were five budgeted for last year. It says over there, "One moved to non-perm."

MR. BOGLE: Yes. So there's another \$7,000 there that's transferred.

DR. GARRISON: Yes. That's what that \$7,000 meant. But of course there's a lot of cost of living . . .

MR. BOGLE: Well, what I'm trying to get a handle on . . . One of the frustrations – and these comments aren't aimed at you, Gary, or David McNeil or anyone else – is when we move things from one element to another. It happens each year. It's hard for us to keep track of what we're really looking at in a net increase. That's what I'm trying to figure out. So it looks like we're looking at about a \$38,000 increase. Is that approximately right, or is there another number you have, Gary?

DR. GARRISON: So you're adding \$7,000 on and . . .

MR. BOGLE: I guess I take the \$19,000 plus \$7,000 that you've got in your four copy editors for – what? – \$26,000, subtract it from the \$64,000 that appears on page 3 as a new budget item.

DR. GARRISON: In a sense, except if the \$26,000 or \$27,000 had been left on the wages side, you would have to see at least a 10 percent increase in it simply to cover the cost-of-living settlement as well as some merit increase. So what I'm saying is that it's not a straight increase.

MR. BOGLE: Well, will you tell us what the increase is?

DR. GARRISON: I would say . . . Okay, so it's about \$27,000 here. You add maybe 10 or 12 percent on to that. That's about \$31,000. Thirty, thirty-two maybe.

10-47

MR. BOGLE: Thank you. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I assume we can move from page 3. All right, Red Deer-North, which page?

MR. S. DAY: This is a quick question. On page 14, videotapes, is that purchase . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; I'm sorry. Let's keep coming back a page at a time. You're down for page 14 now.

Okay, may we go to page 4? Any other questions there?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

On page 5 we have the flow-through ramifications.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 6 is staff training. Any questions on page 6?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 7 is the conference.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just one comment on page 7. Gary, you didn't mention – I guess we went to the B budget – that in fact that \$15,000-plus is going to be netting out at even less than that because you reduced \$2,907 on page 7.

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's right.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's just what I'm talking about, not a 15 and a half thousand dollar conference but a 12 and a half net.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 8?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, page 9. We're all together on page 9?

MR. McINNIS: Now, on the question of *Hansard* subscriptions, what is the cost for a *Hansard* subscription, and does anybody get complimentary subscriptions? At one time I remember MLAs had lists of complimentary subscribers. I assume that doesn't exist anymore.

DR. GARRISON: Well, each MLA I believe gets three copies.

MR. McINNIS: Personally?

DR. GARRISON: Yeah. Each department is allocated five free copies, and those are the only complimentary copies I'm aware of. Actually, there's another complimentary copy that works its way in there, and that is the fact that each MLA gets a complimentary bound volume at the end of the year, so each MLA really gets four copies if you count that one. There are a number of copies of the bound volume that are required by Standing Orders to go to Executive Council and to the Official Opposition.

MR. McINNIS: Okay. What is the cost of the paid mail subscription?

DR. GARRISON: It's \$125 now, I believe. Actually, it's \$60 for nonprofit. The bound I believe is \$120. I hope I haven't mixed those two up. One's \$120 and one's \$125.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Other questions on page 9?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 10?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
And 11?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Twelve?

MR. S. DAY: I had a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed, Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: Is the binding of those volumes done in-house, Gary? Does that go out to a private book binder, or what is that?

DR. GARRISON: The binding?

MR. S. DAY: Yeah.

DR. GARRISON: Yes, it does.

MR. S. DAY: It goes out?

DR. GARRISON: Yes.

MR. S. DAY: Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Another thrust towards privatization.

DR. GARRISON: Actually, that's been done traditionally. It's always been shipped out, as far as I know.

AN HON. MEMBER: You don't have the capacity.

DR. GARRISON: No. Well, some libraries have the capacity to bind certain types of things, but for the type of binding we do for the *Hansard*, there are really only two companies in town that can do it, and we're not one of them.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, page 12.
Page 13?

MR. S. DAY: I don't want to get the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place upset, but hosting consists of what?

DR. GARRISON: Well, it says "working sessions," and that's actually a way of saying that when people are working very late into the night, long hours, we give them a little bit of something to eat or a soft drink.

MR. S. DAY: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Coffee or whatever.

MR. WICKMAN: That I thought covered the pizza that came at 2 o'clock in the morning when the New Democrat caucus wouldn't give up.

MR. McINNIS: That's the bowl of gruel or something.

MR. S. DAY: Only in the hallway; not a specific room, I hope.

MS BARRETT: A bowl of gruel, no sugar, no milk.

MR. S. DAY: Thank you, Gary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gary, what's the time line, again, after the House shuts down here in an evening? How many hours before the last of your people leave over there?

DR. GARRISON: Well, this fall when the House was finishing around 10 o'clock, the last person would leave probably around 1 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's a three-hour . . .

DR. GARRISON: Pretty near. But you can't just add three hours onto the adjournment time because when the House goes later, we have a natural cutoff time. It's just not productive for people to be working after, say, about 1 or 1:30 in the morning, because the work is painstaking enough, and your eyes get bleary and your mind gets blurred and you can't figure out what's going on well enough to do a good job. So at 1:30 I've been sending everybody home whenever the House sits very late, and then we wrap up the work in the morning the next day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have suitable precautions in place, because most of your staff are female, to get them down to their transportation safely?

DR. GARRISON: Yes we do. They've been making regular use of the security staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Especially into the parkades. Thank you.
Page 14, Red Deer-North.

MR. S. DAY: Videotapes, Gary: is that purchase of or making of videos, or what is that? Purchase of blank tapes, would that be?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's the blank tapes. The production of videos is actually on page 12. That was under Professional, Technical, and Labour. You meant to say something about that?

MR. KOWALSKI: The production of tapes is on 12?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second item from the bottom.

DR. GARRISON: You know, I was talking about our increased workload. This is again one of the areas that *Hansard* had not had until the last couple of years. So that's added an overall

workload that affects the whole branch: the videos, the fact sheets, and everything related to that.

MR. S. DAY: Mr. Chairman, given the fact that my binder has a different page 12 than the one you've got, could I come back to that momentarily?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we just noticed that. Absolutely.

MR. S. DAY: In production of these videos, again, how's that contracted out? What process do you go through, or are these produced in-house?

DR. GARRISON: It's produced on a contract, and it just happens that the person who has done the ones we've produced so far is the same person who runs our console. He does it as a private company.

MR. S. DAY: One reason I'm asking that is that a local video producer has approached me suggesting that possibly government departments are not getting the best deal. Now, I'm saying this is his suggestion. Obviously he's maybe looking at his own company also. But many times a government department is advised that they need broadcast quality when in fact they may not need broadcast quality, or to use Beta equipment when they don't need Beta equipment for the type of work they're doing. I'm looking at this in other departments also. He's suggesting that hundreds of thousands of dollars across government may be being spent unnecessarily. Can you give us some assurance that the production of videos, as far as for your department, is being looked at in terms of from more than just one source? I'm not questioning the existing source, but are you vetting it through other individuals or other video producers?

DR. GARRISON: Well, I've been working closely with the people at audiovisual services in the Public Affairs Bureau. I have discussed with them at some length the technical requirements we had for the videos that we've done, and I've also discussed with them the budgeting and the cost of the videos we've produced. Frankly, they expressed a fair bit of amazement that we were able to get the quality we have for the price that we paid.

MR. S. DAY: Are these broadcast quality, or do you know?
10:57

DR. GARRISON: They are broadcast quality, but I should mention the first two, the *Hansard* one and the one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A day in the House.

DR. GARRISON: How the Assembly works, I think it's called. Now, I've forgotten when we switched to Beta. The one on the building was definitely produced on Beta, but I believe the first two were both produced on three-quarter inch videotape.

Now, when you say "broadcast quality," they are of good enough quality that they could be broadcast on a cable network. The *Hansard* one has been for sure, and I know Robert was looking into getting the others out the same way. They're not the type of broadcast quality that you see on your TV when you're watching a TV show, for example.

MR. S. DAY: Right; 11 o'clock news.

DR. GARRISON: No.

MR. S. DAY: There is quite a substantial price difference.

You get your information through the audiovisual department at Public Affairs, is it?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. S. DAY: Okay. I'll follow that up, Mr. Chairman. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gary, the cost of the videos was about \$10,000 apiece, was it not?

DR. GARRISON: Well, actually the first one was around \$10,000. The second one was closer to \$13,000 or \$14,000, and the last one, I believe, was a little higher, maybe \$15,000 or \$16,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But that program is complete as far as we're concerned.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, to me the term "production" is ambiguous. It could mean making copies for distribution or it could mean more original material. Are we planning to produce any new videos in the coming fiscal year? There is one on the Assembly and there's one on *Hansard*. Are there more videos to be produced in the coming year out of this?

DR. GARRISON: That's yet to be determined. We don't have any fixed plans. I see Dr. Carter shaking his head no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From the beginning we were going to do three, and three it is. There's no need to do any more. There's been a pretty good take-up by members of these videos. They're a very, very useful tool, each of the three and certainly the three as a package. We attempted to get them into the schools through the Department of Education, but that did not meet with success, but the take-up by the individual MLAs has been quite good. Of course, when you purchase the three through your communications allowance, then we're doing the cross-book entry kind of thing, so it offsets. But the answer to any more productions is no.

MR. McINNIS: The three are *Hansard*, how the Assembly works, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The history of the building and province, but mainly the building.

David, do you have the latest stats on the take-up of the information sheets and videos?

DR. McNEIL: No, I don't. Gary may have it there.

DR. GARRISON: This was something I've put together for the annual report. I can just give you the data that I've got for the copies of the fact sheets and the videos. As of year-end 41,231 fact sheets, 1,391 copies of the videos, 11,348 presentation folders, and then in addition visitor services had booked a total of 123 screenings of the videos to show to groups visiting the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So if you give the screenings a rough multiplier factor of about 20, it's been a helpful program in dealing with the, I think they're saying now, 70,000 to 80,000 visitors to this building a year. This is where part of the take-up is, on the education side.

Okay. Red Deer-North, any other questions related to videos?

MR. S. DAY: That's good for now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place asked my question. That was really related to are there any new ones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

We were on page 14. Okay, 15 is the revised one that was already approved. Sixteen. Now, I don't know why he would put in pages. No new sixteen? Okay. Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, now that we've gone through that process and you've made a bit of a point there, I would have anticipated that having gone through it line by line initially when we did, this time it would be open to questions but more on a broad basis and not the second time line by line. I would suggest we reconsider the approach we're using. I did sit through the entire initial discussions line by line. I would tend to think we should just have one motion to give global approval to, let's say, Information Systems. Then if there are any particular questions on any page, members can ask those. Otherwise we're simply repeating a process that we've already gone through.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the question I have back to the member: if we are repeating the process, why are there so many questions?

MR. WICKMAN: Because some members, I guess, weren't here at the last meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, all right. With respect to *Alberta Hansard*, is someone prepared to make a motion to approve this section? Cypress-Redcliff.

MS BARRETT: Absolutely everything.

MR. HYLAND: I would move we accept tab 10, *Alberta Hansard*, as presented with the - what? - two or three changes that were made as we went through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's a motion of approval of section 10, *Hansard*. Thank you. Further discussion or questions?

MR. BOGLE: Question.

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

If you'd like to take a five-minute break, we'll get ahold of Mr. Gano and we'll go to Information Systems.

[The committee adjourned from 11:04 a.m. to 11:17 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we're back in business. The section is section 12. Clerk, with the overview, or do you want me to give it to Bill?

MS BARRETT: Are you trying to call us to order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we've already commenced. Mr. Gano is giving us the overview. Thank you.

MR. GANO: With Information Systems, just the overview and whatnot, we do show a 21 percent increase in the manpower area. This is basically due to an increase in staff and also an increase in training costs. What we've done is move all the training costs that relate to electronic data processing into this budget so that it's all centralized. It makes things a little bit more flexible in that manner.

In fixed assets we do show a 45 percent decrease, basically because of the completion of the constituency office automation project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So with the overview of minus 18.1, thank you. Cypress-Redcliff, Taber-Warner.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think when we talked about this before, I asked the question: is there any thought of the one- or two-day session or whatever that can be arranged and if there'd be enough interest for MLAs to take this course? Somebody has whispered in my ear, "Yes; it's next year."

MR. GANO: Yes. We do have a project scheduled for next year to install machines for MLAs' use, and training will accompany that as well. If there's a need for training prior to installation of that, we could certainly set something up with one or two weeks' notice.

MR. HYLAND: I would think, Mr. Chairman, it would be better if the training was before. Then they could see if they wanted it, if they could handle it, versus putting it in and then trying to learn to make it work.

MS BARRETT: Also, if I can jump in on that, just seeing if they really want to try to learn or if they try one day and say, "Ah, this is crazy; I'm no good at it."

MRS. MIROSH: It takes more than one day to learn.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, but you can tell sometimes if you're interested after the one day.

MR. HYLAND: At least, you could turn the darn thing on and off. As I was telling some of them yesterday, we got a computer just before Christmas. My children were playing on it, and they got into an argument, and they had to leave it. I had to go get one of them out of bed to turn the darn thing off; I couldn't even turn it off for fear I'd wipe something out on them. So at least a guy could learn how to turn it on and turn it off and make something come on the screen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So potential training sessions first, installation second.

MRS. MIROSH: You can do that at your own expense, Alan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, could we just have a quick overview on the staff increases? I know there's some information in the next three pages on transfers, but . . .

MR. GANO: It wasn't so much a staff increase - I apologize for that - as transferring the staff around between wages and salaries and those kinds of things. As a result, that affects the employer contributions and those kinds of things.

MR. BOGLE: Well, may I ask then: what are the total numbers in '90-91 compared to '91-92?

MR. GANO: It's the same. We still have myself and three people in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

DR. McNEIL: Just to add to that, Mr. Chairman. The committee directed at the last meeting that Mr. Gano's position be moved from nonpermanent to permanent and that this budget, on page 2 under permanent positions, reflect that committee's direction at the last meeting to move Mr. Gano from nonpermanent to permanent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Well, am I missing something? I don't mean to jump ahead, Mr. Chairman, but I only count three staff positions in '90-91, only three that show in the next brief pages.

MR. GANO: There's one on wages.

MR. BOGLE: On page 4?

MRS. MIROSH: On page 1.

MR. BOGLE: I'll wait till we go through it page by page, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All righty. Page 1 gives us the summaries. If you want to keep one hand there, now we start going on to page 2. So does page 2 clarify that, then, for us? Bill, any comment on that one, page 2?

MR. GANO: No. Basically, as David indicated, it was a transfer of one nonpermanent position into the permanent area.

MR. BOGLE: Someone help me. On page 2, page 3, and page 4, I count up three positions in 1990-91. What am I missing?

MR. GANO: In 1990-91 there was one permanent position. There were two nonpermanent positions, and there was one wage position, for a total of four people.

MR. BOGLE: Where does the wage position show up?

MR. GANO: The wage position shows up on page 4.

MR. BOGLE: And where do your other three positions show up?

MR. McINNIS: I think there's an error on the bottom of page 3 in the right-hand column. It should be two positions in '90-91.

MR. BOGLE: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: Manager II and the systems analyst.

MS BARRETT: You're right.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you.

MR. GANO: I apologize. Yes, that's correct. Does that clarify it for you? Also, yeah . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Also, yeah" what?

MR. GANO: Sorry. I thought there was probably an error on page 2, but there isn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That then carries us to page 4 as being okay.

Page 5 then gives us the flow-through distribution perhaps. Okay, Taber-Warner, page 5?

MR. HYLAND: No, that was me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, when these people moved off the wage position, naturally we get the employer's contribution, but are adjustments usually made when they're on contract from a wage position? There's a factor in there for building up your own pension plan a certain amount. So is it relatively close to the same amount of dollars, moving those positions? They just appear in different spots on the budget.

MR. GANO: Yeah, that's correct. The other factor in there, of course, is increases in rates for dental plans and Blue Cross and so on.

MR. WICKMAN: Just one general question, Mr. Chairman. Is the Clerk able to provide us with a percentage increase as far as the cost of employer contributions is concerned, you know, in view of the fact of the increased costs in Alberta health care and Blue Cross and such?

DR. McNEIL: If you look on page 5, the things that have gone up are that there's been an increase in Alberta health care premiums. We've been increasing Blue Cross premiums, and those are the two areas where the benefits have increased in terms of rates.

MR. WICKMAN: A substantial increase.

DR. McNEIL: And the dental plan went up as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Additional comments or questions with regard to page 5?

MR. HYLAND: I suppose this would be a question that could flow through any of them. A substantial increase in various

things like our Blue Cross, dental, long-term disability: all that stuff is all up considerably? I know, like, here you can't really say it's 69 percent, because there have been three people added, so there are other reasons.

DR. McNEIL: What's gone up are the Alberta health care premiums, Blue Cross, and I believe the workers' compensation percentages. What I'll do for next time is bring a you summary of the actual rate increases so you have that in front of you.

11:27

MR. WICKMAN: I think that's important, Mr. Chairman, because again that reflects on additional costs that will be incurred in other budgets like constituency offices and such, because there we pick up the employer's share. On Alberta health care I think the increase was something like 27 percent - 27.8 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Other questions related to page 5? Page 6.

MR. HYLAND: "Association dissolved." Mr. Chairman, just out of curiosity . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Somebody pulled the plug, and they were erased.

MR. HYLAND: That little bug - what do they call it? - that gets in.

From what little I know about information systems and these sorts of things - they change so rapidly - I would think it's a funny time for an association to fold, vis-à-vis the changing times.

MR. GANO: Yeah, I guess it kind of reflects the situation in data processing in general. Data processing companies and associations are continually folding and starting up new ones and so on. This happens to be one that folded over the last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May we move on to page 7? Bill wanted to just quickly tell you that most of this, the lower half of the page, is staff going out to deal with constituency offices, right?

MR. GANO: That's right. Constituency office support is costs for my people to go out. If there's a trouble call in a constituency that we can't handle over the phone, our people go out to handle it. Just basically we try to visit each constituency office at least once a year, and we'll be doing that again this year as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Page 8. In spite of the increases we can still cover it.

Page 9, fax machines. One of the questions we have is a follow-up item from previous minutes to analyze the advantage of leasing versus outright purchase of fax machines. Mr. Gano.

MR. GANO: Okay. I do have a handout here that may be of interest to the committee. Basically what it is is just an evaluation of the different fax machines that we're currently renting versus how much it would cost to buy them. Depending on the fax model, the buy out is anywhere between three to five years. These prices and rates are constantly being reviewed, and when

it becomes a little more advantageous for us to buy the machines, then that's what we'll be doing at that point.

The handout also indicates some pros and cons of leasing versus buying and whatnot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: Just a question. Which of these are plain-paper fax as opposed to coated paper?

MR. GANO: Those are all plain.

MR. McINNIS: They're all plain paper?

MR. GANO: Yeah.

MR. HYLAND: What does PA mean?

MR. GANO: Per annum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The question just raised by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place was also on our November 23 follow-up: the cost of plain-paper fax machines. So that's covered in this memo, because these are all plain-paper usage.

MR. GANO: Depending upon the machine you acquire, of course, you get different bells and whistles. That's why the price varies so greatly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Another question from November 23: to research which allowance the purchase of fax machines was charged to.

DR. McNEIL: There was some confusion, I think, because in the library budget there was a notation for a fax machine. That was there in error. All the fax machines are considered under this budget, and the purchase or lease costs here are included in the information systems budget.

MR. GANO: We've tried to clarify that by indicating that that cost there is for the rental of four fax machines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Page 10.

Page 11. Do you have comments on this one, Bill?

MR. GANO: Okay; on page 11 we're talking about the maintenance costs for both the caucus offices, the constituency offices, and also fax machines. This is basically for any repairs that we would require on the equipment, not for replacement costs if it proved that the repair would be too expensive. We have money in another budget to replace the equipment if the repair is too expensive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions with regard to page 11? You'll notice back on page 1 where you have the summary that as requested, quite appropriately, at one of our meetings prior to Christmas, we now have this other column in here with your '90-91 forecast for the comparisons. Okay doke.

Then we go on to page 12. Earlier in *Hansard* we talked about the on-line search project; so there are some costs in there.

Page 13.

MR. McINNIS: Before we do that, what's DFS/CFS? I've forgotten.

MR. GANO: DFS/CFS is the Alberta government financial system, the accounting system we're required to tie into and feed into.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Indeed, Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: On page 12, library on-line retrieval. I'm going by memory, but is that an item we dealt with a year ago and was up substantially? Is this the second big increase in a row?

MR. GANO: Yeah, it did increase last year as well. I'm not quite sure what the figures were last year.

MR. BOGLE: If I recall correctly, there were some questions asked in the committee about getting a handle on it. I'm just wondering where we're at if we're going up another 28.6 percent.

MR. GANO: The rate increases are due basically to the increased demand and whatnot of the users. A lot more users are becoming aware of the facility and requesting the library to do more on-line searches and those kinds of things for them.

DR. McNEIL: To add to that, the university has increased its rates. One of the things we're doing in order to avoid these kinds of increases in the future is that the library is planning to develop its own on-line system, which would, hopefully within two years, given the committee's approval to expend some money probably in the year-after-next budget, eliminate the need to even go to the university to provide this service. We don't have an alternative right now to the book cataloguing, but we're attempting to plan to develop that alternative so we're not dependent on those rate increases that the university has imposed in addition to the increased usage that this particular system is getting.

MR. GANO: It's a fairly extensive project, and it's not something that would just happen overnight. As the Clerk indicated, it would take a couple of years to get something like this in place, and we're just beginning the studies right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's not in this current budget.

MR. GANO: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Glenmore, a question.

MRS. MIROSH: I just wanted to know who the users were.

11:37

MR. GANO: All members, researchers, caucus staff, research staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Plus some members of the general public.

MR. GANO: One example that was presented to me from the library was an instance where the Premier's office requested some information. They needed it right away type of thing. It

was supplied to them within 15 to 20 minutes, but the cost of that particular search was over \$40. So those kinds of things add up. We don't have a whole lot of control over it.

MR. S. DAY: People from the general public have open access to this?

MR. GANO: Not open access, no. They go through the library staff.

MR. S. DAY: And who from the public, then, would have access? Who would clear that? How substantial a demand is it?

MR. GANO: I'm not sure what the comparison is between the public and our own Assembly staff, but the public demand is very low. It's mainly research staff and so on.

MR. S. DAY: Like 5 percent?

MR. GANO: Yeah, if that.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should approve the increase as proposed, but I would like to recommend through you, sir, that there would be a report back to our committee in approximately six months' time on progress we're making on the review you're doing, so that we're not again looking at the issue with surprise and astonishment a year from now.

MS BARRETT: I certainly agree with that. I think that in-house capacity will save us money in the long run. So I'd just like to add to Bob's request that Bill or David also present us with even their first indication of the plan for bringing the project in-house, if that's possible within six months, so we can get, you know, sort of a glimpse of another three- or four-year period and see what it's going to look like.

MR. GANO: Certainly our initial indications are that we should have some kind of a preliminary report available within that time frame.

MS BARRETT: Great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In addition, we'll have the Clerk speak to the chief librarian to bring back some information about users for the next meeting.

DR. McNEIL: I'll bring back a summary of this particular item in terms of what the costs are and more detail as to why the increases are there.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: I'd be very surprised if the public makes very much use of the on-line retrieval capacity here in the Legislature Library, because (a) the library is essentially closed to the public when we're in session, and (b) I know the times that I've used this, the library will try every other alternative before they go on-line, because of the cost. I'd be very surprised if they agreed to a request from a member of the public to go on-line and retrieve information, but we could find out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We do have some interesting visitors to our library though.

Page 13: any questions on there? We go on to page 14 then.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, the first project, the LAIS project, what is that project about?

MR. GANO: The Legislative Assembly information system. Basically, it is an umbrella project to try and begin pulling all of the pieces together now that we've got some equipment in place and we're now accessing a number of different items. This project has a view of pulling all these things together into one co-ordinated kind of approach.

MR. McINNIS: Replacing unmaintainable and obsolete hardware: that's the last of the NBI? We're getting rid of that this coming year?

MR. GANO: That's part of it. But also it's an item that will continue to be in the budget to ensure that we don't get into the same position we were this year where we had to replace a whole bunch of equipment, the idea being that equipment does wear out. Even the equipment that we first put in is now two years old, and by the end of next year will be three years old. Some of that equipment will need to be replaced at that point. So the point of this item is to allow us to begin turning over equipment on a gradual basis as needed.

MR. McINNIS: A quick supplementary. Is this basically a five-year cycle or something like that that we can use?

MR. GANO: With data processing equipment it's more of a three-year cycle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Scary.
Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: The question's been answered, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any others?

MS BARRETT: I have one, yeah. Are you saying the hardware wears out in three years?

MR. GANO: Well, not necessarily wears out. However, the capabilities of the hardware do not keep up with the software and those kinds of things, and as people become accustomed to the new hardware, they begin asking for new, additional capabilities and so on. The NBI hardware was fine when it arrived. It did what it was supposed to and it continued to do what it was supposed to, but people began asking for more capabilities, so we had to go out in a great big lump and buy these things. Now, with this item in here, we will be able to gradually turn that over instead of having to spend \$300,000 or \$400,000 all at once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other specific or general questions with regard to section 12, Information Systems?

If not, is there a motion to approve? Thank you, Edmonton-Highlands. A motion to approve. Is there a call for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

In view of our agreement that we would adjourn at 10 to 12, we could maybe do some tidy-up items. Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, we were talking about the issue of registration fees earlier when we were talking about the conference related to *Hansard*. I guess I'm asking what the thoughts of the committee would be if I put a motion that asked you, as our representative on CPA, to take that topic to the next meeting, not just simply for our benefit but more for the benefit of the smaller provinces that host these things, so it would help them carry the cost of it. Would that be in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly. I'm going to a meeting of presiding officers Thursday, so I can certainly raise it when I'm there.

MR. HYLAND: I would so move, if Louise has got enough out of that to make a motion. She's nodding her head.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll raise that matter. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.
Clerk.

DR. McNEIL: Mr. Chairman, additional information that may be useful in relation to the next budget meeting is just a survey of constituency office rental rates.

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah. I'd be very interested.

DR. McNEIL: It just gives sort of the range of information, the average and so on. If the subcommittee as it's working requires additional information, a more detailed analysis, don't hesitate to . . .

MS BARRETT: Thank you. Sixteen hundred?

MRS. MIROSH: Oh, I'm not so bad after all.

MS BARRETT: What range are you, Dianne?

MRS. MIROSH: Nine hundred a month for a middle . . .

MS BARRETT: I'm in the \$700 to \$800 range.

MR. WICKMAN: How can we have 99 constituencies?

MS BARRETT: Because you can have more than one constituency office, especially if you live in a rural area.

MR. BOGLE: I have two offices, personally, for example.

MR. WICKMAN: So that's 99 constituency offices.

MS BARRETT: So, Dianne, you pay \$900? You pay the third-highest amount. Do you realize that?

MRS. MIROSH: I thought I was the highest.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I wonder who pays even more. Who pays \$1,600?

MRS. MIROSH: Maybe it's a total of three offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some members who have more than one office, you know, don't have a fully equipped office. It might be just a mailbox drop in a general store, as I think is the case in Ray Speaker's constituency, or something like that.

MS BARRETT: But still, the total must kill the budget, a total of \$1,600 out of your budget.

MR. S. DAY: I'd like to know the lucky turkey who's getting it for \$100.

11:47

MR. CHAIRMAN: You get your amount, and you can work your miracles with the amount you get.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Who's paying a hundred or less? That's great. That's what I want.

MRS. MIROSH: Those that don't have one, I suppose.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, right. That's it: zero to a hundred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quickly, along the lines of other tidy-up items. Bill Gano, there was one issue raised November 23, some comments with regard to the use of laser printers to assist caucuses in personalizing stationery. Bill, was that a . . .

MR. GANO: Okay. What has been happening in the past is that on the Legislative Assembly letterhead paper there has been overprinting. In other words, that paper has been sent out to the printer to print the members' names and addresses onto the paper, the paper would come back in, and then they would run that paper through for their letters. With the equipment that's now installed with the laser printers and the different fonts on those printers that are available, you can produce some fairly nice-looking letterhead without having to send the paper out for overprinting. That would suggest that we could cut down on overprinting costs for letterhead.

In addition, what has been happening as well is that scrolls and those kinds of things have been sent out for printing. With the new printers those scrolls can be run through the laser printers, and again with the fonts that are available, they produce professional-looking types of scrolls, again cutting down on printing costs. It's just that you may want to consider those options.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So you're available to assist if asked. The Clerk, and then Edmonton-Highlands.

DR. McNEIL: Mr. Chairman, it's our intention to send a memo out to all members with a little more information about the feasibility and the approach to doing that so that each member has that information at hand.

MS BARRETT: You know, I think we've certainly got the capacity for in-house. In my office we haven't sent a scroll out in a couple of years, I don't think. We do them all on the printer, and it's very easy.

With respect to letterhead, the only thing I would suggest is this. On the basic letterhead you get the full colour coat of arms at the top centre ordinarily; underneath is written "Legislative Assembly, Alberta." Because that would be a different typeface if we were going to move into the new system where we

all do our own - it's really easy; you just retrieve document for every one that you're doing and you build your own; right? - I would like to see that "Legislative Assembly, Alberta" taken right off so that we could put it on ourselves so that the typeface is consistent, if you see what I'm getting at, and the type quality is consistent, because it does show a difference. A laser printer is a lot more powerful clear bold than the printing of those three words.

Anyway, I would just like to point that out to the Clerk in terms of when he looks into it. If you get the letterhead just with the coat of arms and nothing else, you can build your own that says "Legislative Assembly" and centre it right underneath, exactly the way it is, but the print face will be consistent with the rest of the document. N'est-ce pas? Merci.

MR. GANO: Just to expand a little bit. What we can do, as the Clerk alluded to, is set up special functions within the machine that would automatically put your name and address in the appropriate typeface and font size and everything else without your secretary having to type it in every time or things like that.

MS BARRETT: It's real easy. You hit one button.

MR. HYLAND: Yeah, Pam. Tell us about it.

MS BARRETT: It's true. It's real easy: retrieve document. Right, Sylvia?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. There's one other item, quickly, that I would ask Robert Day to speak to, and it's the matter that we had a visit last week from Northwest Territories with regard to a very special project.

MR. R. DAY: Mr. Chairman, for three days last week - Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday - we hosted the principal architect of the Northwest Territories. They are constructing a new Legislature building. They're going to be moving out of the hotel office tower they currently reside in. In addition to the principal architect, their interior designer and technical people involved with security and information systems quite literally went through this building and the Annex with a fine-tooth comb. The Legislative Assembly hosted them because a lot of the services that they want to put into the new building . . . They chose Alberta because, quite frankly, they admitted that they thought that in comparison to the other Legislatures, Alberta does a very good job in the area of service to MLAs but also the administration of the Assembly itself, House services, et cetera.

I would also like to comment to the appropriate ministers here that the assistance we got from public works, Mr. Kreiborn in particular, was exceptional. They were most grateful for that. They looked forward to the day it would open and left with the promise that the first invitations would be issued to Alberta.

We may see them back. They have a site chosen; it will border the lake. They have not finalized a design, but that's one of the reasons they were here: how do we accommodate chambers, lobbies, meeting rooms, et cetera, and then put a functional building together? They have one unique requirement in the structure of a territorial government: they're not resident in Yellowknife for the entire year - the government, the Speaker, or anyone else - so are accommodating members for certain portions of the year before they return to their constituencies.

I think it was enlightening for both groups. They left with sincere appreciation for the job the members of the Clerk's and Mr. Kowalski's staffs did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the last five years in particular we've been deliberately building upon the bridge with regard to Northwest Territories and to some degree with Yukon. Because the territories oftentimes are just left out there hanging and partially because, in a previous existence, of having worked in Yukon, we've kept that relationship going. Of course, we ourselves are products of the Northwest Territories in various previous manifestations. In particular for the people traveling from Yellowknife, we certainly are a jump-off point. It's convenient when they're going somewhere else for them to stay for another few days here to get the benefit of our experience here. So that works very well.

One of the other areas where it's worked out has been with the internship program. In particular each year, thanks to the generosity of one of our corporate sponsors, Canadian Airlines, we make certain that the program does visit Yellowknife for the experience of the way they do government, which is radically different than ours, and also for the multicultural experience which is there. I must say that the reception for the internship

program has been the absolute best. They have been invited to sit down around the table and to participate with members of cabinet as well as members who represent the various constituencies, and it's been a very free, frank, roving discussion.

So it's one small way of being able to try to further enhance the wonderful fabric of this country. Northwest Territories and Yukon have been very appreciative of our visits, and in this last effort, the fact that they're in this exciting period of building a new Legislative Assembly building, they need all the help they can get. It would be interesting just to spend some time thinking about what went through the minds of our predecessors when they came, to have to think about trying to build this particular building.

Okay. Any other items to be dealt with? We have notice of our next meetings, so if there's no other business, would someone like to make . . .

MR. S. DAY: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Red Deer-North, a motion to adjourn. All those in favour, please signify. Carried. Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 11:56 a.m.]