

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

1:05 p.m.

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, we have a quorum, so we'll begin. I think all of you have had your budget binders updated by Jacquie.

When we left off the other day, we were on a B budget item for the library with respect to the information systems. Is that where you wish to start the discussion today? Taber-Warner, when we adjourned, you were the one who was carrying that on, carrying it forward with some questions.

MR. BOGLE: Some additional information is being handed out now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to be able to speak to that? Mr. McDougall, please.

MR. McDUGALL: This is actually Bill's report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, all right. Then we will interface with the information systems. Mr. Gano.

MR. GANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes; when we left off on Friday, there was a request for some additional information. That information has now been handed out, and I'd like to quickly go through it.

Perhaps to clarify a couple of points, this process started about a year ago after last year's budget meeting with Members' Services. At that point a library EDP committee was formed, and that committee defined the requirements for a proposed on-line integrated system. In addition, the committee sent a request for information to a number of different vendors within Canada and received a number of responses to that request for information. The committee then produced a report, and based on the RFI responses and also some information we received regarding a proposed Edmonton-area library network, we went ahead with the B budget proposal.

Now, the information that was requested on Friday was a breakdown of the costs, and we have that on page 1. In there we're indicating that under phase 1 in the first year we expect to spend \$130,000. That is all-inclusive. That is hardware, software, and data conversion costs. In phase 2 the following year we expect to pay \$45,000, and again that's all-inclusive, including hardware and software, for a total cost over two years of \$175,000.

On page 2 we have proceeded with three different scenarios. Scenario 1 outlines the cost saving if the on-line integrated system proceeds as suggested. We anticipate a cost saving of \$35,000 per year, and also we anticipate a cost avoidance of approximately \$25,000 that would have to be paid to the U of A if the on-line system did not proceed. That gives us a cost saving of \$200,000 over five years. Scenario 2: if we just continued with the existing system but made the changes the U of A would require, we would have to pay \$25,000 to the U of A basically just to maintain the status quo. That's over and above the \$35,000. That \$25,000 would have to be placed in next year's A budget, making a decrease of only 1 percent instead of the anticipated 5.3 percent decrease. If the B budget item were approved the following year, that would mean that this \$25,000 would have been paid for only about six months' usage. Scenario 3 is if the on-line system is not approved and we do not

proceed with the changes required by the University of Alberta. In that case we would have to basically revert to a manual catalogue system, and the interlibrary loan service would be severely limited. The cost there: we're talking approximately \$600,000 to revert. I think this isn't a very realistic scenario, but it does point out the types of costs we're talking about EDP systems saving the Legislative Assembly.

On page 3 we just have some additional considerations. Currently there are four Canadian parliamentary libraries -- Ottawa, Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan -- with on-line library systems. Two others, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, are in the process of implementing. Since 1987-88 the Legislature Library has had an average 2.4 percent decrease in budget, and since its inception three years ago information systems has decreased its budget an average of 6.3 percent per year. The Legislature Library serves not only the Legislative Assembly; it also serves the Premier's office, Executive Council offices, other government departments, and the public as a whole. Also, the EDP Management Committee has reviewed the Legislature Library committee's report and supports this B budget item.

Lastly, acquisition of this system would provide a number of capabilities to the Legislative Assembly, its staff, its members, and the constituency offices. For example, by the end of year one, anyone with a workstation currently on their desk will be able to directly access the library's book and government publications catalogue from their desk. By the end of year two, from their desk they will be able to access the library's serials and well as the catalogue and any local CD-ROM data bases that may be owned by the library. As well, circulation staff will then be able to check books in and out more quickly through an automated process. By the end of year three, we anticipate the system would become part of the Edmonton library network, and as a result anyone would be able to access from their desk anyone else's library catalogues as well as access the Legislature Library catalogues.

That's basically it. Any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, a thank you to Bill for the very thorough overview, which does address many of the questions which were raised at our last meeting. Notwithstanding the size of the request, \$130,000 the current fiscal year and a projected \$45,000 the next fiscal year, I think sound reasons have been given as to why this would be appropriate. Therefore, I'd like to move that the B budget as proposed, for \$130,000, be added to section 12, Information Systems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further discussion or questions?

Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MS BARRETT: Thanks. I just want to speak in support of this motion. I know it's always hard to spend a big chunk of money, but the fact of the matter is that if we don't, we're throwing away \$35,000 a year. This will pay for itself in a couple of years and probably be compatible with systems for a long, long time to come. My experience with computerization is that once you're into it, the changes afterwards are really very minor; they're usually just cheap little software programs. So I'm very, very happy to support this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: I'd just like to echo those comments. I think that as the Members' Services Committee we seldom serve members better than when we approve a service like this, because we're all well served when we have access to good information on a timely basis. I support the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Of course, we have so many members of the general public using the system as well.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

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

MR. McDOUGALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. McDougall.

MR. McDOUGALL: I'd just like to thank the members for their support of the B budget item. It's very important to us. I'm sure you'll see a great improvement in the service over the next few years.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Thank you, Bill.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, this was well done, guys.

1:15

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Garrison, would you like to come up to the table, please, and take us through section 13, Visitor Services.

DR. GARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Section 13, Visitor Services, is pretty straightforward, I think. It calls for a decrease of 1.5 percent from the visitor services budget of last year. The items where the decrease occurred are simply things that have been transferred, in one case to *Hansard* and in another case a small item to information systems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Minus 1.5 overall. Transfers to other sections in the budget under *Hansard*. Are there any questions or comments with regard to this section? As members will recall, this came over to Legislative Assembly in the course of last year, and the feedback so far has been quite positive. Again, the total number of visitors in the year, Dr. Garrison, was roughly what?

DR. GARRISON: It's about 61,000 for this particular building. If you include the pedway and Government House, it comes to about . . . Well, it depends on how you count them. Maybe I should get it out instead of trying to quote from memory here. The total number of visitors, including Government House and the pedway, comes to 98,815.

MS BARRETT: So does visitor services cover Government House as well?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I didn't know that.

DR. ELLIOTT: Are there other locations, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, just this main site, the pedway, and Government House, Edmonton.

Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to move this budget, and I want to speak to the motion, if I could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion, I assume, is to approve.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Speaking to it, Mr. Chairman, this is the one area that is probably the most sensitive in terms of public perception and people's views of, let's say, their legislators. It not only serves those people who live outside the province or outside the city that may come and visit this facility, but throughout Edmonton-Whitemud when I go to various schools and speak with the Boy Scouts and various other groups that come from Edmonton-Whitemud after they've done their tour here -- there are a lot that come, a lot of local visitors to this building, and the number is surprising -- they all have nothing but the kindest words for the services they get from visitor services. I want to go on record noting that the services provided are very, very much appreciated by myself and valued by those people that take advantage of them. It's a good job you're doing; it's a really good job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Cypress-Redcliff, Taber-Warner, and Grande Prairie.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two comments. First, while working on another committee, we were doing some information gathering related to the Legislature and how the Legislature operates, and a number of members were pleased to find out about the papers and that that we've done in the package Gary has put together over the years, the two films and the package. It seemed like a lot; out of that committee of about six, four of them didn't know about the extensive information we have now. Maybe it's time we circulate that to members again for their information and just to renew their memories, because it's been -- what? -- two years since those packages were put together. So we could circulate that.

The other comment is related to Percy making mention of the large number of constituents of his that are able to come to the Legislature. That's why those packages are important; there's a large number that can't afford to come in because of distance. I had a group in last year, but it cost them about \$2,000, which they had to raise, to make their trip to the Legislature, whereas if you're closer, you can come in as part of your classroom. That's why the combination of availability of the building and people to get to it and the continuation of this information package we have and the updating of it is very important for us when we go to classrooms or for libraries in our constituencies. So if you can't get to the Legislature, at least you can see a picture of it and see how it operates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: I merely wanted to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that before we bring Percy's motion to a vote, we proceed through the 15 pages of the section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: Two questions, Mr. Chairman. Do we have many visitors at the Legislature greenhouse, and is that part of the co-ordinated effort through your office, sir?

DR. GARRISON: No, that's not the responsibility of visitor services. Public works handles that greenhouse.

One thing we did do in the past year that you may be aware of is develop a self-guided walking tour of the Legislature Grounds, and one of the items on there is the greenhouse. When we were putting that thing together, we talked to the people at the greenhouse, and apparently they had been thinking about discontinuing the hours they are open to the public because so few people came. But they were hoping that with this self-guided walking tour more people would come, and I believe that's been the experience. So I believe they have remained open. But no, that's not our responsibility.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, the second question: are visitor services and the security we have both here and at Government House co-ordinated or organized or unified or whatever the word might be? Are security people concerned about visitors or about the safety of visitors and accommodating visitors?

DR. GARRISON: Well, the two areas are under totally different jurisdictions, but a good working relationship has developed over the years. Especially with the relocation of the reception desk in this building, the working relationship not only has been much closer but has been visible, really. I'm not sure if that answers your whole question.

DR. ELLIOTT: I don't know enough about it to ask an intelligent question. All I know is that the wife of the MLA for Grande Prairie was turned away at the front door here about three years ago, and she'll never come back to the building, she tells me. I don't know what the problem was in particular or how it was resolved, and that's why I'm asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was she turned away at your request?

DR. ELLIOTT: I will not answer that one.

DR. GARRISON: I'm sure she wouldn't have been turned away by visitor services personnel.

DR. ELLIOTT: Well, security, I'm sure, of some kind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In this last year, as Gary has mentioned, there has been that reallocation of space at the front door, a redesignation, plus they used to watch you with some additional security cameras, and that's put into an adjacent location. What is actually happening, again as far as we know, is that while supervision of visitors to the building as well as those who work here on a regular basis is taking place, the relationship seems to have improved greatly at the front door. But as pointed out, there are some overlapping jurisdictions at the front door.

Calgary-Glenmore, and then Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to compliment your staff and the work visitor services staff provides. A number of my schools that have come here have been elated at the way they have been toured around the building. My comment for the record, though, is: a week ago the press made some comment about the upgrading of the cafeteria and neglected to mention that that cafeteria's there for our visitors. While MLAs do use it from time to time, so does the media, and more importantly, when you've got

60,000 visitors, I think it's important to stress that you have to have this kind of facility available to the visitors. I think it was unfair criticism by the so-called free press to make mention of the expenditure of the cafeteria as though it was unnecessary. Many of our students, who do come here from as far as Calgary and certainly as far as Taber-Warner, really do appreciate those kinds of services that are made available for them.

1:25

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Just a question about the numbers of visitors, the hundred thousand or so. Can you break that down between the three facilities?

DR. GARRISON: Okay. In fact, I was hoping I'd get an opportunity to clarify what I hope didn't lead the committee to believe there were about 40,000 people who came to the pedway and Government House. Approximately 61,000 people come to the Legislature Building and take tours. There were approximately 24,000 additional visitors to this building who were welcomed at the front desk and didn't have the time to take the tour, maybe stepped into the rotunda for a few minutes and looked around and that sort of thing. So there were a total of 84,964 visitors to this building, including all of those. In the pedway there were 10,698; Government House, 3,153. The total is 98,815. That's for 1991.

MR. McINNIS: Well, I'd certainly like to say that the staff has been very good in accommodating all the visiting groups that I have knowledge of, as well as people who just come casually in the door. They also are very well organized, too, in terms of making sure the messages are received so that the MLA can be there to greet visitors. That's a big help as well. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For those of you who like other information, I know that the staff have it even broken down by people from out of province, because it's also one of the popular tour places of greater Edmonton in that respect, with tour buses, especially from the United States, during the summer.

One of the other things that was pointed out about the use of the cafeteria: it's one of the few legislature cafeterias in the country that's open to the general public. Some other jurisdictions have facilities exclusively for MLAs and staff, so this one really carries on a multitude of functions, as you've noticed, no matter what time of day you go down there.

All right. Could we go through it page by page as has been suggested? Page 1 in section 13.

MS BARRETT: I don't get it. Are we on page 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry; that was page 1.

Page 2, Gary, nonmanagement, information officer side.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. On page 2 I have a question. Is the executive director's job changed to a half-time job now?

DR. GARRISON: You mean my job?

MS BARRETT: Oh, good heavens. I'm on the wrong section. I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. You're identifying him by face and overall responsibilities in *Hansard*, I guess. Section 13.

MS BARRETT: Sorry. I don't have a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's easy enough to have happen.

Page 2. The whole section, of course, is under the capable handling of Maryanne Gibson. Any questions with regard to page 2?

On to page 3; page 4. As you've mentioned, we're blessed by the quality of the tour guides and all their volunteer hours that occur and so on.

Page 5. This is consequential to previous pages with respect to UIC and so forth.

Any comments about staff training, Gary, on page 6?

DR. GARRISON: I didn't have any comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 7 shows a reduction of 25 percent in travel. It's been consistent throughout our deliberations these last few days.

Page 8, Edmonton Break Promotion. Gary, what was that?

DR. GARRISON: Well, there are some things visitor services is involved in in conjunction with a number of other tourist attractions in the city. What happens with this particular one is, I believe, a booklet. It takes different forms in different years, but all the tourist attractions in the city that are involved participate in some way. Of course, there's a cost involved because it costs money to print the thing and put it together, because it is advertising. It's one of those things, I guess being the Legislature Building, that it probably would not be appropriate for us to say, "Well, we probably shouldn't be in there," because we're one of the key attractions in the city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Page 9.

MR. McINNIS: Before we leave that item, I wonder: did we ever talk to Alberta Tourism about promoting the Legislature in other locations outside Edmonton? There are lots of good reasons to come to Edmonton, but visiting the Assembly is as good as some of them and maybe better than some. [interjections] We're not here to compare attractions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gary, perhaps you'd comment about the trial project that we did at Red Deer.

DR. GARRISON: Okay. In November we had a couple of staff go down to the Red Deer Agri-Trade. I don't know how many of you are familiar with that show, but I believe the attendance was over 50,000. We had a booth. It didn't cost very much. We had a display which visitor services had had around before; we modified it a bit to suit the needs of the Legislative Assembly a bit better. Then we rented space down there and staffed it from Wednesday -- I believe it went through to Friday night and maybe Saturday. We had about 11,000 or 12,000 people go by the booth. The people that we actually talked to were counted as well, and there were 900 people in that category. Quite a number of fact sheets were passed out. There was a video monitor and a VCR playing all the time, with our videos going to let the people at least glimpse those. Of course, people were there to answer questions and basically to explain what the Legislative Assembly is all about, who their MLA is, and to answer general questions about how democracy works, what the parliamentary process is, and that sort of thing.

MR. McINNIS: I think that's a good initiative. It just occurred to me -- and maybe it's been done already -- whether the Tourism department and some of their publications might also include

information about the Assembly tours and so forth, just for the information of the general public. It may have been done already.

DR. GARRISON: I think it has been done. As a matter of fact, elsewhere in the budget, I think on the travel page, the Alberta Conference on Tourism: Maryanne has been going to that just about every year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the other things along the same lines of advertising the Legislature: when I'm driving along the highways throughout the province, I keep looking for Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund repainted grain cars. I'm hopeful that the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services will have enough money left in his budget to say, you know, "Come and visit the Legislative Assembly." I keep looking and looking.

MS BARRETT: Not a bad idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I don't know if he has any money left in his budget. That's just a general representation.

Any other questions with regard to pages 8 and 9 in Visitor Services?

1:35

DR. GARRISON: Maybe I should just mention that on page 9 postage is up by \$3,000. This is one of those things that sort of slipped through the cracks. When we did the budget with the Leg. Assembly last year and they were just coming from Public Affairs, nobody thought to ask, does the department pay the postage centrally or does the branch pay it? This is one of those inevitable things that happens whenever there's a transfer like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 10.

MS BARRETT: I have a question. I'm going to ask the chairman's question. What do we do at teachers' conventions? Do we go and set up a booth? Is that it?

DR. GARRISON: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: Oh, okay. To encourage them to bring classes out?

DR. GARRISON: That's right, and to explain to them what our programs are for the schoolkids.

MR. HYLAND: Is that just Edmonton or all over? I guess at \$300 it's probably one location.

DR. GARRISON: I believe this one is just for Edmonton.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe we should look at alternating it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is something that's worthy of change, right?

MR. HYLAND: There's -- what? -- about four areas where we have teachers' conventions. You could be at one every four years.

MS BARRETT: Where else? I don't know how they're organized. Obviously in Calgary.

MR. HYLAND: In zones. They've got Edmonton and Calgary. I know they've got one that goes in the Hat and one that goes in Lethbridge. That would be worth looking at also.

MR. BOGLE: I think Alan is on a very good point, not to suggest that we be at every teachers' convention but rotate around the province. They're organized on a regional basis. I think there are at least six zones, and if you were able to have an availability session through a booth once every six years, assuming there are six, that would be a great encouragement for people to come in. I think based on accessibility and availability, we really should be aiming this at those areas that are furthest away because that's where we're constantly trying to find ways to encourage teachers to bring in classes and that's where the greatest costs are incurred in terms of travel and accommodation once they're here. But I think if you did it on a rotation basis, then it's fair to everyone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I agree, but you know what? I think you're going to have to allow for more travel money, then, in the budget. So my question is: do you want to do a revision or ask Gary to do a revision for this year?

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, why don't we hold this section rather than giving it approval? We can put Percy's motion on hold, and when we come back to finalize the budget, Gary can have more information for us on what it would cost to do that and also a schedule of the rotation over the next number of years.

MS BARRETT: That's a good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would that be agreeable to you as mover?

MR. WICKMAN: Uh huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. McINNIS: The concept that's there is space rental for the facility, so presumably each of the teachers' conventions is somewhere in that ballpark. But I'd like to look at us attempting to cover them more frequently than once every four years, as is what that would entail. This probably involves visitor services staff. Obviously, they can't be four places at once. Maybe the only way we can do it is once every four years, but just have a look at what the options might be.

DR. GARRISON: I don't know if they meet at the same time, do they? We can look into that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, having gone to the pilot project in November, part of my follow-up idea with it, too, was to try to put the arm to as many people as possible, to try to get us in there at either reduced rates or free.

MS BARRETT: That's right. It's true; it's a public service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right then. Page 11, Long Distance Tolls. That seems to be fairly standard. The same with Maintenance on Electronic Typewriter.

That sees us at page 13, a number of items with regard to printing. You see that this is an area where a number of items have been transferred to the general printing umbrella, which helped to give the rationale for the increase to *Hansard's* budget. Any other questions on page 13?

MR. McINNIS: The item on pins and badges. To whom does visitor services give pins and badges?

DR. GARRISON: There are badges that are handed out -- I don't know how many are handed out actually, but I do know that if you were up at the Christmas light-up, you would have seen these little square badges handed out to virtually everybody. I don't think these are given out simply to every person who comes into the building. If you like, I could get some more detail on that too.

MR. McINNIS: That was something that commemorated the lighting ceremony?

DR. GARRISON: No; that was just a badge that said "Alberta Legislature Building."

DR. McNEIL: A special occasion type.

DR. GARRISON: I believe it is just on special occasions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's about two inches square, it's plasticized, and just shows the dome on it, the Alberta Legislature. When we're doing a walkabout at the time of the lighting, where we go down to the pedway and then out onto the grounds -- this year we had about 6,000 people show up -- it's a great little item to walk up and hand out to the little kids that are there, that they've come to their Legislature type of thing. That's where the bulk of that would happen.

Okay. Page 14: any questions or comments? Page 15, the matter of uniforms, stationery, and supplies.

In view of the fact that we've had this general agreement, this section will be revisited when we come back to our next meeting, which will be later in February.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, can I make a comment with respect to visitor services, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

MR. KOWALSKI: I want to congratulate the Speaker, the chairman of this committee, and the people who are involved in visitor services for at least one very positive initiative, I think, in 1991 which had to do with the development of a little pamphlet showing the historic side, the various monuments that are on the grounds of the Legislature Building. I don't know if that was the first time that was done, but it was the first time I really had a chance to take a look at it. I think that's very important, because one of the things Albertans should have or take a great deal more pride in is the history of this province. There are some dozen or so monuments that are located on the grounds of the Legislature Building.

All members will recall that a new one was added in 1991, and that was to commemorate the service of Albertans in the Korean war. That monument was erected just a few feet to the west of us. There was also a decision and permission given in 1991 to allow the Ukrainian community in the province of Alberta to have a monument erected in 1992 on the grounds to commemorate the arrival of the first Ukrainian settler in the province of Alberta.

I would like to point out as well that across the street on the other side of the High Level bridge, in concert with the Edmonton city police, there will be a major park that will be built in the early spring and opened on the 21st day of June 1992 to commemorate the three policemen who have been murdered in the city of Edmonton since the inception of the city police. It will also commemorate the 100th anniversary of the city police in the city of Edmonton. That is scheduled to be, in meeting with the chief just the other day, on the 21st day of June. That's part of the history of this whole area. In fact, the more we can do to promote that, the better off everything,

I think, will be for the benefit of the citizenry and of Albertans as well and that historic side.

I want to commend you and those people involved in visitor services. I think we have to do more and more and more to promote that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I know this is not a mutual admiration society, but I have greatly appreciated the fact that through working with the Member for Barrhead and Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, it's a very positive working relationship, which is very helpful because sometimes with overlapping or confusing lines of jurisdiction with regard to the grounds and the buildings, you could get yourselves into a lot of unnecessary toothaches.

The other thing in terms of the number of visitors to this whole site -- it's really incredible. I'm sure many of you have been here at some pretty strange hours; I know you've been here at some pretty strange hours of the day and night. It's amazing how many people are around this whole complex about 4 o'clock in the morning, in the wintertime as well as in the summertime, jumping in and out of all the fountains and pools and so forth. Of course, a Saturday is a very popular day for weddings and photographs around this whole site, and again Sunday is a great day for picnics around here. So there's an awful lot of other things that happen in terms of the whole site.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, it was really something. The Saturday before Christmas I drove around the Legislature Building, and there had to be 250 people out skating. It was a very, very warm pre-Christmas evening. It was really something. It happens once in a while when the temperature is the right amount and the spirit's in the air. It's really something to watch.

1:45

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

We'll then move on to Electoral Boundaries Commission. Mr. Pritchard is with us. Immediately following that, we will then go to committees and go to Public Accounts.

All right; section 14, Electoral Boundaries Commission. Mr. Pritchard, you've been observing parts of this interesting exercise. If you'd like to take us to the overview and go through that, please.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. This budget is built so that the commission can finish their work by the end of June, the deadline that's required. They're starting their public hearings, as I think you're all aware, in February and finishing on March 3.

MS BARRETT: When do they start, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: February 10.

MS BARRETT: Do we have a schedule?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, you should have. It should either be on your desk or to you today.

At this point the commission isn't aware of how the final part of their work is going to go. They don't know if they're going to have to have more public hearings or just what's going to happen. So it was necessary in building this budget to consider that they may have to have more public hearings and, in fact, may have to do very intensive work between the finalization of the public hearings and when the report is due.

If you could go to page 2, the budget on page 2 is basically on half a year because the office will be closed two or three months after the

June deadline. On the next page, page 3, there's a substantial increase in this area, a 76.1 percent increase, because of the work that may be required to finalize after the public hearings, whatever number we have to have. There's a lot of work involved if there are major changes to the proposed maps. Of course, if in fact there are not major changes, the cost will be significantly reduced. But if major changes are to be made, a lot of staff will be needed to do probably overtime and extra time plus additional numbers of people so that we can meet the deadline.

There are four sort of stages that have to be gone through once the public hearings are over and the commission looks at the boundaries. That's basically to sit down and draw a rough map, and then people have to sit down and calculate, based on the 1986 census maps, what the populations will be in those new ridings and to make sure they conform with the legislation. From there they then go to the technical people, which is the most time consuming and most expensive because that's where your professional people are drawing the maps. Legal descriptions have to be prepared as well, and then following that, there's printing and binding. It may be necessary, to meet the deadline, to have extra people and therefore use extra money for overtime or for extra people to complete the work on time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions or comments on that, please?
Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Pritchard. I wonder, then, if with those numbers it will be possible to have two things: one, a total map of the province when the final report is prepared and, second, rural maps in there whose scales match so that people who are in adjacent constituencies that have either been put in a new one or taken out or whatever can put the maps together and see what's happening versus the interim report that nothing fits.

MR. PRITCHARD: Mr. Hyland, those are good points, and I'll certainly take them to the commission. It is their intention to have an overview map, but I'll also discuss the issue of the scale.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Pritchard. How many staff have you hired in addition to staff you already have in your department?

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, over the past year we've hired a number of different people for different sorts of services. You may recall that some time back we hired a consulting company, some demographic people, and they had a staff of five which we hired for some time. We had legal counsel which we hired for a period of time. We have hired, off and on, people to do mapping through Alberta maps. We hired outside consultants and people to do that kind of work. I'm not exactly sure of those numbers; I think there were four or five people there. Plus we were fortunate that the Chief Electoral Officer loaned us a number of his staff, sometimes up to six staff, over a two-month period to do a lot of the beginning work in the calculations.

So to answer your question, I guess it varied over a period of time. We didn't hire a set number of people right the way through it. It's as the job requires.

MRS. MIROSH: But are you using internal staff as well for this, or are these all separate and apart from the staff that the Legislative Assembly . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: The only real internal staff are myself and my assistant, except for the staff that we borrowed from the chief electoral office. The rest are all outside people that are brought in.

MRS. MIROSH: So the executive director is you, so that your budget moves over to this budget then. Is that it?

MR. PRITCHARD: My budget's on page 2.

MRS. MIROSH: You're here all the time, aren't you? I mean, you are permanent staff.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. I am on loan from social services, which is why it's only in here for half a year, because at that time I'll go back to social services, when the work's finished here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: I think this committee would want to be satisfied that this budget's going to be sufficient to do the job, because last year we found that it wasn't and that caused all kinds of problems. You said there is a possibility that the commission may decide to have more hearings after March 3, and that could be accommodated within this budget.

MR. PRITCHARD: Absolutely.

MR. McINNIS: Good. The other question I have is not strictly a budget question. The 1991 census data I think are due for release sometime in February. Is there some possibility the commission may be considering that data in some fashion? I ask because I heard somebody from the Liberal Party say the other day that that was their understanding, that there was going to be all this data available. I just can't see how that would work mechanically at the stage that you're at, but is that something the commission has discussed at all, trying to make use of the 1991 census data in this process?

MR. PRITCHARD: They haven't really discussed it, and of course as you're aware, the legislation refers to 1986. But I think that when the 1991 data comes out -- I mean, if for nothing but curiosity -- they will want to look at it. As you know, with the legislation it relates to 1986 for this process. It doesn't mean the commission can't look at it, but as far as their final results, it refers to 1986.

MR. McINNIS: Just one further. Did you happen to know whether the detail all comes out at the same time, the census tracts, or if that comes out in bits and pieces?

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't know if I can answer that accurately, but my understanding is that it comes out in bits and pieces. So first you get the numbers, then somewhere down the way you get the actual census maps, and then following that you get the data information if you are using a computer system. But, no, it doesn't all come out at once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes. My question is to follow up. Of course, I'm very familiar with the legislation that was passed in the Assembly. I'm not sure if I got the correct interpretation from you. When we look at the material that will be available in the next few weeks and

we combine that with the 1986 stats that we have, are you saying that your interpretation of the legislation is such that even if you know that particular area may have grown by 10,000 people, you have to ignore that 10,000? Do you not have the flexibility to incorporate that in there?

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, my understanding of the legislation is that the commission can look at anything they choose to look at in the course of their deliberations, but the basis for their calculations and the basis for their reporting is the 1986 census.

1:55

MR. WICKMAN: And with the variance of 25 percent you're allowed, that allows accommodation, flexibility, but when it comes to looking up the current data as opposed to '86 data, it's still abiding by the legislation that was passed. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Page 4 of the document, section 14, Public Hearings Co-ordinator and Maps Facilitator.

MR. PRITCHARD: Page 4 is a substantial increase of 306 percent: \$8,000 to \$32,500. This again is because I don't know how the public hearings are going to proceed, and we may have to have substantially more public hearings. No one has been hired for the role of public hearings co-ordinator yet because we want to see how they unfold. A maps facilitator may be somebody that we require to speed the process through and if we get in a crunch because of a lot more public hearings and a lot of changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments?

MR. PRITCHARD: Page 5 again is Employer Contributions and is based on half a year, closure of the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 6, Staff and Commission Travel.

MR. PRITCHARD: A minor reduction here because we no longer have regular commission meetings in Calgary, which we used to have every second week.

MR. BOGLE: So the reason given for the variance, that we have fewer public hearings, is not quite accurate. We really didn't have any public hearings in . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. Thank you for noticing that. That shouldn't say "Fewer public hearings." It should say "Fewer commission meetings in Calgary."

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you'd all like to make that comment, scratch it in on your own.

Next page.

MR. BOGLE: Advertising of Public Hearings: can you tell me the mode you're using?

MR. PRITCHARD: We're using major daily and weekly newspapers. We're putting two ads in: one general ad which covers the whole province and outlines all the places where there'll be hearings and the times and the actual locations, plus following that a set of specific ads that take in the area surrounding that particular public hearing.

MR. BOGLE: And are we going through the Alberta Weekly Newspapers Association to identify the weeklies? Are we going in all weeklies? I guess that's the short list.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, all the major ones. We're having an advertising firm do it for us, Smith & Smith. They did the advertising for the select special committee. It was on a broad base for the province, and I think they were successful in that endeavour, so we've used them for this process.

MR. BOGLE: A final so I'm clear. The ad will go in every weekly in the province?

MR. PRITCHARD: Every major weekly.

MR. BOGLE: I am concerned on that one point. I do recall an experience with Smith & Smith in the all-party committee. We did have to go back and rap their knuckles, Pam, if you recall, because they were not using many weeklies. There is a concern that a surprisingly large number of people outside of the cities do not take the dailies, whereas the weeklies -- in most cases there are contracts with local municipalities and weeklies go into every home. So if I want to contact people in the Taber-Warner constituency, I will cover the entire riding by placing an ad in each of the three weeklies which cover part or all of the constituency. If I use the *Lethbridge Herald*, which is the daily in that part of the province, I'll cover somewhere between 40 and 50 percent of the homes.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, Mr. Bogle, I'll check and find out what they're using.

MR. BOGLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a good point given the significant changes that have been proposed.

Cypress-Redcliff, followed by Grande Prairie on this.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, that was my comment too, and perhaps the best group to do that is the weeklies association; that the firm get in contact with the weeklies association because they have their overlap in their coverage and that sort of stuff. The cost isn't that great compared to the dailies' cost, and you hit virtually every place: at least every rural landowner and probably 70 or 80 percent of the towns.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll check that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: I just want to lean on that very same point for all of northern Alberta, Mr. Chairman. The *Edmonton Journal* doesn't cut much ice in Red Earth and places like that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. I'll check to make sure they are using a full range of weeklies for the whole province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure the *Edmonton Journal* will be sorry to hear that.

Page 8, Executive Director's Automobile.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's the car insurance, business insurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 9, Commission's Mailings.

MR. PRITCHARD: A substantial increase in here because we don't know what our turnout is going to be at the public hearings. We will be sending everybody who attends a public hearing a copy of the final report, so we may have extensive mailings. Plus we have found that we're getting a lot of requests this time for individual copies to be mailed out. Before there were more group pickups and that sort of thing. This time around there have been a lot of personal requests, so I've asked for more money for mail-outs for freight and postage.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just a question, not on this one part of it. How many copies of the interim report were published?

MR. PRITCHARD: We printed 5,000 copies.

MR. KOWALSKI: Do you still have a few left if individuals needed them?

MR. PRITCHARD: We've got about 900 left. I should say that 2,000 were set aside for the public hearings because we want to be able to hand them out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we move on to page 10, photocopier, fax, and meeting rooms; followed by page 11, Long Distance Tolls; and Miscellaneous Repairs and Equipment.

Page 13.

MR. PRITCHARD: Page 13 is a reduction in honoraria. The commission will not need to hold that many meetings of the group. They intend to do a lot of follow-up after the public hearings to come to some conclusions.

Report Printing is actually transferred from another section to this one. It's \$72,000. It's based on about 10,000 reports. Some of the printing costs are not only the actual printing of the report but the preprinting of maps. In the mapmaking process there has to be camera-ready copies made, so part of the printing costs are included in there for those.

Other Contract Services is a contingency item for any specialized consultants that we might have to bring in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff, then Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Pritchard, have I missed it, or where within your budget is the amount of money set aside for the recording of these hearings throughout the province?

MR. PRITCHARD: I will be recording the hearings. I've been asked by the commission to record them manually, handwritten notes.

MR. HYLAND: So there's no verbatim?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. That's the method that the commission has chosen to record the proceedings of the hearings.

MR. KOWALSKI: No *Hansard*?

MR. PRITCHARD: No.

MS BARRETT: But you'll be doing taping, did you say?

MR. PRITCHARD: No.

MS BARRETT: You won't even tape them?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. I'll be handwriting them as we go along.

MRS. MIROSH: Oh, that's not a very good way to do things. Why did they choose that route?

MR. PRITCHARD: They discussed a number of options. I offered them some of the options that I knew we would have access to here, but after a lot of discussion they decided that they wanted their own notes, and they asked me to make a set of notes as well.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, how does the public rebut if there's something that's missed?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's a fair question, and I can't really answer it, because of course when you have people taking notes, there is a certain amount of interpretation involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this particular point, other members?
The Member for Barrhead.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the process, the committee will go out and hear the views of Albertans, then a report will be presented to the Legislative Assembly, and the men and women of the Legislative Assembly then will have to make a final decision with respect to the report. Needless to say, it would be virtually impossible for all Members of the Legislative Assembly to attend these hearings. So without a *Hansard* that would allow individual members to follow back to see what has been said, I don't know how we would be able to deal with this in the Legislature with the fullest degree of background. I don't know how we'd deal with this matter, though, if an independent planning commission has chosen or made a decision not to proceed with the *Hansard*. On the other hand, that is not the final step. The final step will be the decision by the Legislative Assembly with respect to this matter. If we have to rely on, I guess, newspaper articles, hearsay, individual reports that would come back to us, I don't know how we could get the right analysis of what's happened.

I'm in a dilemma here because I don't know how you deal with this. This is an independent committee that's made a decision with respect to this matter. I feel very strongly we should have *Hansard*, but again I'm at a loss as to how we deal with that, plus the protocol.

2:05

MS BARRETT: I can tell you how to do it, which is that you can offer to amend the budget to include *Hansard* costs. Then it's up to them to decide if they want to use it. That's how you can do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That matter should be given further checking.
I've got Taber-Warner, and then we'll come back to Calgary-Glenmore.

MR. BOGLE: Keeping in mind that it is the commission which will decide whether or not to have a record of the meetings, we could follow Pam's suggestion and build in the dollars for the budget. That does not mean that it would be followed. Going back to Ken's earlier comment that the commission is charged with writing a final report, it is then up to the Legislature as to what the members of the Legislature choose to do with that report. It seems to me, based on the kinds of discussion we've had today, that the best position for members and municipalities and other organizations who wish to make briefs might be to copy the MLA from the constituency in which they reside. They could also copy the Premier and the Leader of the Official Opposition to ensure that the brief that's being submitted does in fact have some circulation and that if indeed there

is a need for a review of material which was presented to the commission, there is a record of the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Glenmore, Cypress-Redcliff.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Pritchard. We have a budget before us here for 1991-92, \$400,000, almost half a million dollars. Now again yet another half a million for another -- we're looking at close to a million dollar budget for Electoral Boundaries. To cut *Hansard* is such a minor expense compared to all the other expenses you've put before us that if that was a reasoning, it seems a strange place to cut. To me, as chairman also of Calgary caucus, it is very important that we hear a word-by-word description of the meetings rather than you taking notes, because it's not a simple procedure to take notes. As you say, it's an individual interpretation. I, too, support working into this budget of almost a million dollars *Hansard's* involvement in public hearings. We've always done it with every commission across this province; it's been consistent with every single commission.

MR. PRITCHARD: I do want to just make it clear that the commission didn't decide to not use *Hansard* because of dollar savings; it was nothing to do with dollars. They decided to use the procedure they've decided to use because that's how they wanted to do it. So I just wanted to make that clear. I understand what you're saying, but it wasn't a decision based on money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, in talking to some of the members of the previous committee, two or three have told me in conversation that some of the most effective reports or submissions to them were delivered by the people without notes. They were delivered from the heart. It was then down on paper that you could read, whereas this way, those kinds of things -- even with the suggestion of the Member for Taber-Warner -- will end there; they won't get back. I mean, we all sit in meetings such as this. As well as *Hansard* we take notes for our own use. We all sit in many meetings, some where *Hansard* is and some where it isn't, but we take notes regardless for our own purposes as well. I think sometimes it can be a good cross reference. When we have to go back for something, we've got our own notes versus a verbatim transcript of the meeting just to see exactly what was said.

I well understand it's an independent commission, but as far as my feelings would be, and it seems like it's most around the table, if there's anything we could do to encourage them to rethink that position and use *Hansard* -- or it doesn't have to be *Hansard*. It can be any verbatim reporting group to record their hearings so that there is something that everybody can look at and so people can see that their own words that they've given actually entered into the decision-making and the fact that it appeared in the printed material that went through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is: what goes around comes around. Not long ago I remember the justice who headed the commission coming to this committee asking for funds for population studies and the committee saying that we couldn't fund them for reasons of financial restraint. Now we have them coming here not asking for funds for something, and the same people who voted against it want to put it in the budget over top.

MRS. MIROSH: That's not what he said. It had nothing to do with the budget.

MR. McINNIS: It sure had to do with the budget, because I've heard two members -- if you can let me finish -- who've said already that they want to put something in the budget to allow for something that the commission hasn't brought forward.

MRS. MIROSH: You'd cut out other . . .

MR. McINNIS: May I complete my remarks, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You absolutely may, hon. member. Order please.

MR. McINNIS: I think perhaps what's happening here is that we don't trust the commission to make judgments about how they do their own business. I agree that the Legislative Assembly has to make judgments at the end of the day as to whether or not to approve any report that's brought forward, but we don't necessarily have to second-guess their decisions step by step along the way. What I'm hearing is that some of us may take a different view of the evidence that comes forward and want to come to different conclusions as a result of that. That could perhaps be the reason that the commission doesn't want to go this route. I don't know. What it does seem to me is that we have to respect the fact that we have a commission that has been asked by the Legislative Assembly and the government to do a job, and I think to some extent you have to go with their judgment on how the job is to be done. I felt that way when we were asking for funds for population studies, and I feel that way now; that they're suggesting that they want to do the hearing process in the way that they feel comfortable with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, there's no motion on this, so then we'll move over to Edmonton-Whitemud.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, can I just make one additional comment, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: It seems to me that in almost any event each MLA can attend the hearing in his or her area and take his or her own notes. Presumably that would be the case for most MLAs. I assume that I'm going to be sitting there all day on March 3.

MR. KOWALSKI: What's the point?

MS BARRETT: The point is that if you . . .

MRS. MIROSH: I'm not going to rely on your notes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MS BARRETT: Well, that's your limitation, not mine. You can go to the hearings in your own area is what I'm getting at. I mean, if you have some concern about not having things recorded, at least you can go and listen for yourself and take your own notes. Right? I mean, there's no prohibition on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes. I'm still on the same page, but I'm not on the report. On this same page, 13, my question: where we look at

this \$72,000 for Report Printing, how many reports are calculated to be printed?

MR. PRITCHARD: I based it on 10,000.

MR. WICKMAN: On 10,000.

Farther down we see: "To meet June report deadline." In other words -- and correct me if I'm wrong in my understanding of the process -- the process is such that these 10,000 reports will be printed prior to the June report deadline. Or do you basically do a master copy which goes to the Leg., with maybe a hundred copies so each MLA has one copy? Or do you funnel 10,000 out there without knowing whether the Leg. is going to reject, accept, or whatever?

2:15

MR. PRITCHARD: Basically, we'll be doing 10,000 copies and hopefully have them done before the deadline.

MR. WICKMAN: And have them mailed out before the deadline.

MR. PRITCHARD: The commission wants to send them out, right.

However, in the event that they got right down to the wire, they may just do a hundred or whatever they need to do so that they can meet the requirements of presenting a copy to Mr. Speaker and the courtesy of getting it out to the MLAs. So that's a possibility. In a staging sort of thing is what you're talking about.

MR. WICKMAN: But it's the commission's intention to distribute those copies prior.

MR. PRITCHARD: Once their work is done, they feel it's finished and it should be distributed. Whatever happens with it after that is . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. My second question, and again it pertains specifically to the piece of legislation, the Act that was passed. I can't recall off the top of my head. The wording is such that that report has to be delivered to the Legislative Assembly, to the Speaker, prior to the end of June?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's correct.

MR. WICKMAN: And then from there, is there any provision if, if, if? Or does the commission simply disband?

MR. PRITCHARD: My understanding is that as soon as the report is presented to the Speaker, the commission's work is finished, that they're disbanded.

MR. WICKMAN: Because my understanding is that in that legislation there is provision, even though traditionally I don't believe it's ever happened in the history of Alberta, that the Legislative Assembly could send that back to the commission for further thought.

MR. PRITCHARD: It's not in the legislation, Mr. Wickman. Probably the Legislature could reappoint the commission or do something else, I guess, with the commission if they wanted to, but as far as that piece of legislation is concerned, once the report goes to the Speaker, the commission is finished.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Glenmore, on this page, 13.

MRS. MIROSH: Yes. Under Other Contract Services, is that just built in in case you need contract services?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. If there was some kind of specialized consultant that we needed to get very quickly to do some work for us.

MRS. MIROSH: It's just in case though? It's not . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, it is.

MRS. MIROSH: You've got that built in over and above Administrative and Clerical Support. So you may not necessarily use that \$20,000.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right. This isn't a budget where we're hoping to spend it all. We're hoping to not spend it all, but it's just in case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Can I ask another question about whether *Hansard* does this type of work? I understand that *Hansard's* primary purpose is to record the debates in the Assembly and the debates in the Assembly committees as an extension of the Assembly. But a commission appointed by -- I guess in this case it's the Lieutenant Governor in Council that made the appointment. Is it in fact part of the role and jurisdiction of *Hansard* to provide that type of transcription service?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner, followed by the Clerk.

MR. BOGLE: Well, John, Mr. Pritchard has made it quite clear that it's not the intent of the commission to have a written record. They've considered it, and they've chosen, not for budgetary reasons but for other reasons, not to do so. So it seems to me, unless someone else has another idea, that there are two main options that come to the surface. One, presented by Pam, is that MLAs may go to the hearings in their own areas and keep their own record of what's been said by various individuals. The other position put forward -- and this won't address the concerns that Alan mentioned, where someone may come in and give a presentation, someone who does not have a written presentation to distribute -- is that for the vast majority of presenters who will have a written transcript, they may copy that to their MLA, to the Premier of the province, and to the Leader of the Official Opposition. In that way they will know that their comments are indeed receiving circulation, so that in the debate in the Legislature once the report is presented, members will have a copy of briefs presented across the province, which indeed would be helpful.

MR. McINNIS: I don't disagree with that, but I still have a question whether it's part of the mandate or jurisdiction of *Hansard* to do this type of thing or whether the option would be to do some type of a private-sector transcription service, of which there are several.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why I've asked the Clerk to comment.

DR. McNEIL: We could provide that service, and the approximate hourly charge for providing that service is \$400. It's not something that we were asked to do. We could do it, but outside transcription services could do the same thing.

MS BARRETT: When you say \$400 per hour, does that include the actual transcribing from tape and stuff?

DR. McNEIL: That's the overall cost.

MS BARRETT: That's the overall cost, eh? No kidding. I never knew that.

MR. PRITCHARD: I wonder what they're going to pay me for my notes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's go on to page 14, Computing Services. Any comment there, Mr. Pritchard?

MR. PRITCHARD: Computing Services is a reduction because the commission has not really used the mapping system to date. However, I've left something in there because there's potential that they may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 15.

MR. PRITCHARD: Working Lunches: a reduction of 16.7 percent because of fewer lunch meetings and fiscal restraint.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you make it to minus 25?
Page 16, Legal and Security Services.

MR. PRITCHARD: Legal and Security Services is a reduction. The commission doesn't require legal counsel. Certainly many of the questions have been answered that they required. However, I've left some money in there for legal, and a good part of that is for security services, security personnel that will be working with the commission as they travel to the public hearings.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, if this is not for legal services, what kind of security services would a five-person commission need? Sorry; just to help me understand this. What conceivable security would be required?

MR. PRITCHARD: The commission had some concerns at some of the public hearings. There's no basis for this, but they just felt that there could be some sort of problems involving security. I think part of it surrounds the fact that the chairman is a judge, and he does feel, I think, that there could be problems, not related to electoral boundaries but at a public hearing with people coming that perhaps would cause him some problems. That's why basically as a safety measure they decided it would be a good idea to have some security people at the public hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional questions?

MR. KOWALSKI: I don't understand that at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 17, Office Supplies.

MR. PRITCHARD: Office Supplies: no change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 18: that shouldn't give too much of a problem, nor does page 19.

What is the pleasure of the committee with respect to the proposed estimates of the Electoral Boundaries Commission? Do you have enough information for the time being, do you need to hold over, or are you prepared to give a motion to approve?

MR. WICKMAN: I'm prepared to give a motion to approve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there any discussion? Call for the question. Those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried.

We are now going to move back to the section with respect to committees, and the first one in the book is Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Mr. Jonson is with us. Thank you for coming. Come on up to the table there, please.

MR. JONSON: Good day, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What time is your next meeting?

MR. PASHAK: At 2:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I'm sorry; I didn't realize that. Mr. Pashak has a meeting at 2:30. Maybe we could slip over and do that committee first then, please.

MR. JONSON: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or is your meeting at 2:39?

All right. Then let's go quickly to Public Accounts.

Mr. Pashak.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. With the overview page, take us through the section. Where does your first page begin? Page 1 or page 2? Page 1 of Public Accounts, the overview.

2:25

MR. PASHAK: Okay. In terms of the forecast, the expenditures for this year, there is an update. The total expenditure that's given there in the 1991-92 forecast, which is what the committee will spend up to the end of March 31 of this year -- it's the column on the far right -- for this year will be somewhat greater than the \$25,000. It'll be approximately \$27,834. That's considerably less than the estimate. That's mostly because the members of the committee did not take the money that was budgeted for committee meetings while we're in session. In addition, the actual expenditures for travel are substantially below what was estimated for the year.

MRS. MIROSH: On that point, Mr. Chairman, regarding Members of the Legislative Assembly not taking that. You don't anticipate, if they haven't taken it in the past year, that they should take it in this next session. Since you basically have meetings only during session, why would you need to work that into your budget? Why couldn't you show more the actual?

MR. PASHAK: I believe that we're required to do that because the provision is in a Members' Services order. Members can theoretically claim that, so we have to provide for that possibility even though the past practice has been to not claim it.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, to Barry. I think the committee has the ability to override that, if that impression is there. So with that understanding would you have a new figure you'd like to propose?

MR. PASHAK: For the budget for 1992-93?

MR. BOGLE: Yes.

MR. PASHAK: It would be exactly \$25,200 less than that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Less?

MR. PASHAK: Yeah. Now we're going to the '92-93 estimate of \$55,241. Well, \$25,200 is the amount that's budgeted.

MR. WICKMAN: Your figure would be \$30,041.

MR. PASHAK: That's right, \$30,041.

MR. McINNIS: What would the corresponding figure be for pay to Members of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. PASHAK: Where it says Pay to Members of the Legislative Assembly, that figure would be reduced by \$25,200.

MR. McINNIS: What figure do you want there, \$12,730?

MR. PASHAK: There would have to be some other adjustments made as well if we took that out because there's pension and LTDI related to that \$25,200, so it would be some dollars below that as well. I just can't make that calculation right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It would be in that general neighbourhood in a new document, taking into account that the changes will be in place for us at our next regular meeting, so we're dealing in the ballpark.

Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: That's my point. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So our reduction would be significant there.

Any questions with page 2 with regard to the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, which relates to page 3, hon. members? Any comments to be made there, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pashak from Calgary-Forest Lawn?

MR. PASHAK: Are there any questions? I think that's fairly explanatory.

MR. BOGLE: It's not a question, but it is a comment. I'd like to compliment the Public Accounts Committee through its chairman. The role played by our legislators at these conferences has been important over the years. I think the nonpartisan way in which you've been able to approach it, where yourself and the vice-chairman, who's a member of the governing party, try very hard to get a mix of your delegates, is wise and appropriate and speaks well for the committee.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 4. We'll go on there. Insurance for the Chairman's Vehicle. It's standard.

The same thing with page 5, repairs.

Page 6, the cost of printing the annual report. That seems to be economical.

Page 7, the last page in this section.

MR. HYLAND: Would corresponding reductions occur there?

MR. PASHAK: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Corresponding reductions there.

Any other questions on the section as a whole, hon. members?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I was going to congratulate the chairman for not accepting a salary for this committee, but I don't know if that's in order.

MR. PASHAK: No.

MR. KOWALSKI: Do you accept the salary?

MR. PASHAK: I accept the salary.

MR. KOWALSKI: Oh. Well, who doesn't accept the salary that they're eligible for? I don't understand this.

MR. PASHAK: Individual members are entitled to claim an allowance for attending meetings during session, and members have declined to do that.

MR. KOWALSKI: All members?

MR. PASHAK: All members. That's only during session.

MS BARRETT: Right.

On that subject, Mr. Chairman, I just had a look at the Private Bills Committee, which also meets primarily when session is on, and it would appear that they do the same thing. Did we already pass their budget? I think we did, didn't we?

MRS. MIROSH: Yeah. Pat Black is the chairman.

MR. HYLAND: But we didn't pick that out.

MRS. MIROSH: We did the same thing.

MS BARRETT: No. We didn't pick it up. That's the point.

MRS. MIROSH: Yes, we did.

MR. BOGLE: I've got it circled in my book.

MS BARRETT: Do you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have too.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Did we actually formally change the budget there as well?

MRS. MIROSH: She's coming back to us. She's going to meet with her members.

MS BARRETT: Oh; okay. That's fine.

MR. WICKMAN: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the motion I made there was that we approve it on the understanding that she'll make the appropriate reduction. That motion passed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the collective memory of the committee, not having our verbatim transcript immediately available.

MRS. MIROSH: That's why *Hansard* is nice to have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That agrees with my scribbles if not my notes. Yes, Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we accept the budget of the Public Accounts Committee with the appropriate amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call for the question on that motion accepting this in principle, looking forward to the revision coming in next month. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much.

If you run quickly, you're only three minutes late.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Jonson, please, with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee.

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe committee members have copies of the material.

Just two general comments. I think the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee has been able to stay well within budget this year, and I guess we could put it all down to good management. However, the year was somewhat unique in that due to circumstances beyond the committee's control, the investigative visits that were planned, mainly the one to Prince Rupert, were canceled. Therefore, the actual expenditures for this year will come in dramatically under budget with respect to travel expenses.

The proposal is before you. I'm prepared to answer any questions or see what the committee wishes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Yeah. The first, then, would be with regard to Travel Expenses on page 1. Are you able to reduce your estimate for '92-93 so that it would be 25 percent less than your estimate for '91-92?

2:35

MR. JONSON: Yes.

MR. BOGLE: The second one would be on hosting. Would you be able to reduce that by 25 percent?

MR. JONSON: With respect to hosting, Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make one point. I would like to point out that this is not hosting for the benefit of committee members. It is for those people who might receive us on an investigative visit, and we wish to have a bit of money there to do that kind of hosting. But once again, it is certainly the type of expenditure where the committee controls it, and yes.

MR. BOGLE: I made that comment keeping in mind that your forecast for the current year is \$150, so it should still give adequate leeway.

You were here for the discussion with Barry on payment to members of the Assembly. Would you agree that that could be brought in line with the forecast for the current year?

MR. JONSON: In the case of our estimate, that would be moving it up.

MR. BOGLE: In the estimate that I'm looking at, in the current year you've budgeted \$96,978. The forecast for the same fiscal year is \$6,128.

MR. JONSON: Oh, I see.

MR. BOGLE: I'm merely asking whether we can reduce the 1992-93 estimate from \$94,731 down to a more realistic number. Apparently, you have a lot of your meetings when the House is sitting as well.

MR. JONSON: No, we don't.

MR. BOGLE: Well, is there a typing error here then? Why the difference? We have a forecast of \$6,128.

MR. KOWALSKI: The sheet Mr. Jonson has has a different figure than what we have.

MR. BOGLE: Can we take a five-minute break and catch up on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. Five minutes. We're back here at 17 minutes to 3.

[The committee adjourned from 2:37 p.m. to 2:42 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're back with Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can give assistance. I've been assured that I have the updated and more correct figures. For the benefit of the committee could I just quickly run through them in terms of the right-hand column?

In terms of Pay to Members of the Legislative Assembly, the figure should be, as of today, \$39,631. Two comments there. One is that between now and the end of the fiscal year the committee will be having one more meeting to deal with the annual report. So that will have to be adjusted upward somewhat. The other thing I think I would ask the committee to keep in mind is that because of the special circumstances this year whereby we did not take any investigative visits, that figure to date is much lower than normal.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we can get back to the debate on that basis.

MR. BOGLE: Well, does the vice-chairman of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee wish to proceed today, or would he rather wait until he can do a review of the last couple of years where travel was incurred by members of the committee before coming back with a final proposal for 1992-93? Or, in fact, is he proposing that the figure of \$94,731 stay in?

MR. JONSON: I think, Mr. Chairman, I could come back with a revised figure if I knew one thing, and that is if it's the committee's intention to proceed with the 25 percent cut in the travel expenses.

MR. BOGLE: This isn't travel, Mr. Chairman, to the vice-chairman; this is payment to members. What we've been trying to do with other committees is come up with a more realistic figure.

MR. HYLAND: What is the actual amount?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe what he then says is: the overall travel of the committee diminishes; therefore, if they, for example, went to the Prince Rupert grain terminal, then you indeed would have to pay more per diems. That just sort of clicked in on me.

MR. JONSON: That's right. If we know what travel budget we have to work within, then we have to plan our investigative visits within that amount, and that then affects the amount of . . .

MR. BOGLE: Why don't we table it, do some work, and then when we meet in late February, come back?

MR. JONSON: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: Could I possibly ask a general question before it's tabled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Indeed; a general question.

MR. McINNIS: Just in general, I was curious how the committee decides on an itinerary for travel, if all the committee goes to essentially the same sites every year or if you have a list of them and you try to get to them every second year, every third year. A related question, if I may: whether all of the committee makes all of the visits or whether you sometimes send panels and groups to gather information and report back to the larger committee. Maybe you have to have a budget figure before you can answer that; I don't know.

MR. JONSON: I can answer, Mr. Chairman, in part. First of all, it has been the procedure of the committee for it to be possible for all members to go on any investigative visit that we take. Secondly, in terms of where we visit, factors are considered. First of all, are there developments with respect to a particular site that would mean that there's been a change in the operation as it affects the considerations of the committee? For instance, one item that I'm sure will be high on the committee's priority list next year will be a visit to the upgrader site, because that is a new project, basically. Also, we always try to make sure that there's an opportunity, when there's a significant changeover in the membership of the committee, to look at the different projects and investments of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. McINNIS: If I may make another perhaps representation as much as anything, I see the Alaskan trip has been cut out of the itinerary. Probably at a time of restraint, cutting international travel seems to make sense. I'm not certain that we want to lose the liaison all together. I'd encourage the committee to establish some method of obtaining information about the Alaska Permanent Fund on an ongoing basis, because I think there are some interesting comparisons to be made between the two of them. I don't think it's necessary to send all of the committee to Alaska every year, but I think it would be appropriate that the Chair and perhaps a smaller number maintain the contacts and maintain the information flow because it benefits us.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, the trip to Alaska during the past year was a one-time effort. It was not something that was built into the budget each year, nor was it intended to be. I think, though, that we've established contacts and acquaintances with the people who run the fund so that from this point onward we should be able to, via the mail and phone, liaise with them over any information we might require.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Any other comments?

MR. JONSON: Could I just make one other comment with respect to going back and asking for help in preparing further figures? Certainly I think the committee is prepared to look at restraint, some modification in line with respect to pay to members. What is the information that the committee wishes, so I'm sure that we have it when we come back?

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

MR. BOGLE: Well, the thrust of my questions directed to Halvar were in travel and hosting. Yes, we were trying to achieve in all of our committees, if at all possible, a 25 percent reduction. We left the caveat that if there were some extraordinary reasons why that was not possible, we wanted to hear and the committee would certainly take that into account.

Under payment to members, where we have been budgeting dollars far in excess of what has been used -- and we've done it for two years now; we're going into our third year -- it was the committee's view that this didn't make any sense, that we should try to get that figure closer to actual, closer to what we really believe we'll need. That's why I think it's important that you go back and review with others in your committee usage over the last couple of years, meetings that you're going to have outside of session, any travel involved outside of session, and come back to us with a figure. We're not here to question it line by line or in a detailed way, but we wanted to come to something that's more in keeping with what would actually be needed.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, certainly I will undertake to do that. There is one factor here that leads to the differences which come out at the end of the year between what I think you have to budget for and what's actually spent, and that is that you have to budget for the full attendance of all members at meetings. If there is not full attendance, which frequently is the case, you're going to have that gap between what you budget for, for every committee, I guess. It certainly happens with ours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cypress-Redcliff has another comment.

MR. HYLAND: Bob made the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Jonson.

It's my understanding, ladies and gentlemen, that we've gone all the way through the budget estimates with the exception of the three caucuses, and I assume that while they're in here as a zero at the moment, I await further direction from the committee. We also have some other feedback on this.

MR. BOGLE: We discussed the question of freight and postage paid. That comes under which section?

DR. McNEIL: MLA Administration.

MR. BOGLE: MLA Administration. There were several sheets distributed by David at the end of our last meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be section 2, page 7.

MR. BOGLE: Okay. That was distributed? Yes. Rather than have a motion on it today, I thought we might hold that until our late February meeting. I just wanted to ensure that all members did indeed receive the material.

MS BARRETT: What does it look like?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a handout with regard to postage. It relates to section 2, page 7, MLA Administration.

MS BARRETT: Yeah; I've got it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Is there additional comment?

2:52

MR. BOGLE: Just to recap, it is based on a formula that we did discuss, although we did not approve it, at our subcommittee meeting, a point system, if you like. We used 50 points for the Liberal caucus, 100 points for the Official Opposition caucus, and 125 points for the private government members. That was on the freight/postage category. We were looking at the expenditures on behalf of the constituency offices, and if we divided that up by the 83 constituencies, there's an adjusted figure for the projected 1992-93 here of \$1,207. It was not my intent in requesting this information that these dollars would be transferred to our caucus budgets. That was not the intent, so I think we need to do some further work on how it might be administered through administration, but I think members have the material and can look at it. If there are any questions, let's get it on the table now before we come to a decision-making mode on the matter in late February.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. My understanding is that the information has been distributed. It's to be discussed at the meeting in February.

Here's Edmonton-Jasper Place and Edmonton-Whitemud on the list.

MR. McINNIS: I'm not on this subject. Perhaps I can defer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Thank you.
Edmonton-Whitemud, on this topic.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. When we deal with this in late February, I'm not sure if it is intended at that time for additional information to come forward. Of course, it goes without saying that it's of considerable concern to me, the figures that have been presented and the formula that Bob has proposed. I think to try and get a better feeling of how it relates to other types of expenditures, it's very, very important that we have some of that additional information. I would like to know, for example, how much postage will go through, let's say, the office of the Minister of the Environment, to put this in some type of perspective so we could see that \$17,000 a month for an eight-member caucus -- is that reasonable when we gauge that against, let's say, the Conservative caucus that has access to the budgets of cabinet ministers? I would assume that the figures that are used for government members would only be those government members outside of cabinet.

MR. BOGLE: There's no motion on the floor right now, Percy.

MR. WICKMAN: No, but I'm just asking if it's your intention to pursue this matter, and I'm not sure if it is, Bob. If it is your intention to pursue it, I think in fairness to those of us that will debate it at that time, I would appreciate that additional information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, with respect, hon. member, I don't believe it's up to this committee to have to go to each department of government to ask that type of question. We have in time past tried to facilitate, to give you as a group some information related to some of the various departments, but I don't see this as being the ongoing function of this department. That's properly under public accounts.

MR. BOGLE: The point raised was taken into account by the subcommittee when the formula was discussed, in that if we were using X number of dollars per member, you would be crediting the private government members at 200 points, not 125. We discounted

that, recognizing that some departments -- I believe that was the point Pam made -- send out material and, therefore, some government members may choose not to. That was taken into account. But, clearly, if there's other information you think should be considered before we make a final decision, then this is your notice. You're on alert that the matter is coming back.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, that information, Mr. Chairman. The other information that would help me if we had it here again -- it was here once before -- is the information that pertains to what other jurisdictions do when it comes to mailing privileges. In other words, we did have the information that shows what the provinces of Manitoba, B.C., Ontario, and so on did. I think that's vital as well because we have to look at ourselves as legislators in the same light as those persons in British Columbia. So I would appreciate again having that information if we're going to proceed with this item in late February.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, with respect to that point, I'd like the Clerk to comment.

DR. McNEIL: We did that survey, I believe, of the other jurisdictions in terms of postage and so on. I'll have to go over it again to see. I don't recall the specifics of the information, but I believe that that was covered to some extent in terms of what other jurisdictions do with respect to postage.

MR. WICKMAN: It would be handy to have it here at the appropriate time to refresh members as to what happens in these other jurisdictions.

DR. McNEIL: It was provided to members at their request.

MR. McDUGALL: We can put it in the book next time. I have all those reports. We'll put them in the book for the next meeting.

MR. WICKMAN: That would be useful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would you be good enough to send it to committee members in this next week so they could have the time to do it?

MR. McDUGALL: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Part of my concern, hon. member, is that we've had staff doing this; are we going to have to have them update it every single month that we have a meeting or something like that? I mean, they're quite willing to do it, but hopefully the committee will move forward at some stage of the game, because as was pointed out by members last week, this item has been on the agenda for about 18 months.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a very, very critical issue here, and it involves a little more than just money. There's a principle involved. It's part of the process within a democratic system to communicate with those that we represent and those that we would like to represent, and that would allow people to participate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't disagree at all, hon. member. It's just a concern that 18 months seems to be not moving at too fast a pace. Thank you.

All right then. Anything else to do with the estimates other than this? Yes, thank you. Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to draw the committee members' attention back to a very helpful document that Robert Day handed out, I think the first day we looked at these, called MLA Allowance Distribution. It highlights how the allowances are constructed and then where they're distributed in the various budget items.

I simply want to raise the question of the levels of the constituency office allowances. In the past year the constituency office allowance was frozen at \$38,036 per member. From that I think most members know that we have paid staff salaries, office rent, and other office-related expenses. I think this might be the year to have a look at that, given that we froze it last year. There is an apparent difference to me in the way we treat the staff who work with us under the dome, here, and those who work out in the field, often by themselves. I think a proposal is coming forward from my colleague. In any event, when we come back, I think it would be something to think about, because in these last two years it's apparent that the Assembly staff have been entitled to some degree of market adjustment in their wages and some ability to move on the grid according to performance, whereas I don't believe that's been available to anybody who labours out in the community offices. I think they deserve it, quite frankly, because one of the things about a recession is that you can guarantee there's more constituency casework. I think most of us have probably noticed that in the last year.

The communication allowance, I think, is traditionally adjusted according to changes in Canada Post's rate structure. Of course, they've hit us with another 2 cents on January 1, so that may also be something we'd look at when we return in February.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes. Mr. Chairman, with respect to what the member to the right has referred to, this particular item, I had the opportunity to chat with Pam outside on it. When we look at constituency staff, when we look at caucus staff, we have to realize that these are people that work side by side with other provincial employees. I think when we talk in terms of fairness, those are the people that we can't forget. In most cases they are not highly paid persons, particularly the people in the constituency offices. Most of the people on our research staff are not what you would call well paid by any standards.

We did face a freeze last year for some of our staff people. Meanwhile, we've got the reports from the provincial Clerk earlier that there are union agreements that apply in principle to people on this scope, so I certainly wholeheartedly support what John has said here when it comes to those kinds of increases for staff. I think we're talking constituency staff and caucus staff, and provided we're only talking about those portions of our budgets increasing, not the overall caucus budget or not the overall constituency budget but only the merit increases, whatever terminology is used, for those appropriate staff members. Is that what's being said?

3:02

MS BARRETT: No. I have a proposal that I'll make.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah. I have no problem with that. I think to do anything other just is unfair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This has been raised as a question, hon. members. Now, are we putting the budget aside here for the moment, so that I now hear that somebody wants to make a motion? I know it has impact upon the budget, but this particular document

we can put to one side for the moment; we're now coming back to the general business of the committee?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. HYLAND: Well, I have one question on the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's keep this straight. Thank you. We haven't got a motion yet, so on the budget generally, Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move a B budget item for the library. In a year like this I hate to move it, but I don't know any other way, even though it will be cost recovery: some amount of money related to producing a history book that we're looking at. Unfortunately, the money doesn't come back to us; it goes back to the General Revenue Fund. I think we should perhaps look at a \$25,000 item there to front-end the cost of that book so that when it goes to printing and stuff like that, the printers can be paid to do the project.

MS BARRETT: Al, can you explain to everybody the bottom line, what we came up with as a final estimate of the overall cost? I can't remember.

MR. HYLAND: I don't know if I've got that stuff. I had it at the last meeting. Somewhere in that area; it was a recovery of about -- what was it? -- \$15 a book that we had suggested?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. HYLAND: So the actual layout of money is going to be zero. It just doesn't come back to us; it goes back to another spot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we take it as a motion, then, "that \$25,000 be included in the budget of the library with respect to that"?

MR. HYLAND: I would guess the library or *Hansard*, somewhere in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Research on publications, along the lines of what we had agreed upon the other day.
Question?

MR. WICKMAN: I support what is being said here, Mr. Chairman. My understanding, then, if we're talking in terms of the equivalent amount on the other side -- it shows payable to the Provincial Treasurer, of course, and revenue. I don't know if that means that somewhere along the side somebody gets a \$25,000 bonanza at our expense. How do you balance these things off?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't. It just goes into the General Revenue Fund. The same thing is occurring with the amount that we incurred when we published the book on the Legislative Assembly, which seems to have been used to good effect throughout the province, and that was the money that was in our budget. But the money that comes in for that just goes back into the General Revenue Fund. There are a few other items we have along that same line.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, as long as it's clearly understood that it's not an additional expense to the taxpayers to produce this, because

in the end run it balances off. I guess it's sort of like the security systems. I notice it was reported in such a fashion that it could give one the impression -- in fact, we had some calls at the constituency office: why was I proposing an additional expenditure of \$70,000 for security in constituency offices? In reality, that was not the motion at all. The motion was that each constituency out of existing budgets could implement that system. So just that we're clear on this one as well, Mr. Chairman, it is a cost-recovery budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All those in favour of the motion, please signify. Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much. Let the record show unanimously.

Now, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands has a motion, I understand.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I'm not sure I'll put it in motion form until I've described my proposal first. That is that if you review the salary components of many of the subdepartments or departments of the estimates that we've just concluded, or almost concluded, you'll see that there are a number of market, which really means cost-of-living, increases that are being allocated and, of course, some merit increases as well to the staff of these various departments. Now, our staff are necessarily opted out of union agreements, so it would be a little offside to suggest that we have a look at the results of collective agreements in the public service to determine salary levels for our staff, both constituency and caucus.

However, it seems to me what we could do is take a glimpse, say, a picture of approximately what management staff in the Assembly are getting for pay increases, nonmanagement in certain categories -- broadly defined categories; we don't want to get down to a fine-tuned comparison between jobs -- and allocate that average increase to both our constituency and caucus staff. What this will entail, quite frankly, is more work for the chiefs of staff, because I think what they would have to do is go through their caucus staff and decide who is in what category of pay, maybe get it down to a couple of categories that are similar to those we find in front of us under the other estimates, and come back with those stats at the end of February and then deal with a motion to look at which amount their salaries would increase.

So I don't really want to make it into a motion. I mean, if we haven't approval for this proposal in principal, then we can just proceed with the work and come back in February and actually look at the facts we are able to accumulate.

MR. WICKMAN: Do you want a vote on it, Pam?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. We're not voting without having a motion. We've got to have some framework here.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Then I'll move that
we ask each of our chiefs of staff to undertake this project and come back with proposed figures for the staff based upon their categories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Now I have Cypress-Redcliff, Taber-Warner.

MR. HYLAND: So this would be along with Blake, for example, as a resource person from the Legislative Assembly, with the figures here.

MS BARRETT: Well, the figures are actually in here. They range between 4 and 8 percent in total. Okay?

MR. HYLAND: Okay, I understand. I thought you just wanted the chiefs of staff to do it versus having the Legislative Assembly involved.

MS BARRETT: I'm open to amendment which way you want to do it. I mean, it needs to be done, and I ain't the pro; I can't do it.

MR. HYLAND: In reality what you're suggesting is that the first time we've ever done this is because of the percentage of manpower in our budgets -- being as we're people versus a delivery of service, we've got a high manpower cost versus a low capital cost -- and that we have a look at splitting that and seeing if there's something we should do on just that portion.

MS BARRETT: Yes, and I'm recommending an approach for a formula, although it's not too specific. That is that we take a look at on average what an admin. support, dot dot dot -- I don't know the numbers -- was getting in a whole bunch of the divisions we've just approved. If it's 4 percent, then we decide how many people we have that are doing admin. support, dot dot dot, program work versus . . . You know, we can compare apples and apples and basically apply on average the increases that will be going in the coming year to those people whose budgets we've already approved and apply them to caucus and constituency staff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, in reality what we've got -- and it's somewhat the same problem because of the size of the Leg. Assembly, being a smaller size than the departmental size, and then caucus is just magnified -- is that on zero or whatever percent, if we go through with zero percent, then we're sitting at a high percentage of people service. We've got no room for any increases.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: Whereas in other organizations or other departments, because of the service aspect, there's a little more room for it. Even though our figures for service are given and stuff like that, we're going to have a high cost. We know that because it's the nature of the thing, and that's what you're trying to balance out.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Actually, the effect of this motion, if I could, Mr. Chairman . . . It will just take me another minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I know, but we're going back and forth here like a whipsaw. Just a little bit, please.

MS BARRETT: The effect would be to return to the detail sheets we used to use on caucus and constituency staff, but the real emphasis is on the staff components because the assets and the fixed requirements are already there. That component budget is really relatively small. We spend most of our caucus funds and constituency funds on staff. In a way it would be like going back to the system we used to use.

3:12

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taber-Warner, then Clerk.

MR. BOGLE: Just so I'm clear, since 1986 we have been dealing with caucus budgets on a global basis.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MR. BOGLE: We've been following a formula. Pam, are you suggesting or recommending, then, that we go back to identifying for budget purposes staff and breaking staff into management, recognizing that there's a freeze on for managers, and contract and opted out, and then treating the contract and opted out for the three staffs in a consistent way with the Leg. Assembly?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. BOGLE: Okay. And the chiefs of staff should meet to work out those details, presumably with someone in David's shop.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk is next on the list. Clerk.

DR. McNEIL: Just for information, we can provide you with information as to what the contract increases are for our various categories of staff for '92-93.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

DR. McNEIL: There's no projected increase for the managers in '92-93. The funds that were in the budget reflected increases that were given to managers in June of 1991. We can give you information on what the average management increase was in June of 1991. So you'll have that.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Then if the chiefs of staff will get together -- and maybe get together with you too -- and decide how they're defining apples and oranges and pears and so forth, they can come to a quick agreement. They know the stuff by heart; they're dealing with staff every day. I'm sure they can present to us or to our individual caucuses, which we can bring back here, a proposal that will meet with agreement and would be fair and fairly decided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there's consultation with three caucuses plus the Legislative Assembly. I take that as concluding remarks on the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

There's one item of business which follows from what the committee decided on the 10th. That's been handed out too: Members' Services Order 5/92. We just need someone to move that this be passed as of this date. So moved. Thank you.

Discussion? Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of Members' Services Order 5/92 following from the other day, please signify. Opposed? Carried. I understand some other discussion is to follow for the next meeting. Thank you, hon. members.

Other items of business? Is it my understanding that most of the other items we can pick up at our next meeting which, roughly, would be about February 19 or so.

MS BARRETT: You mean we don't have to meet tomorrow? Hallelujah.

MR. BOGLE: We'll hold the date till we consult -- but late February?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Late February, but I would suggest February 19 as a possibility. Let's see what else we might try.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I believe our caucus in meeting on the 19th and 20th.

MR. McINNIS: It would be vastly preferable to get into the next week.

MR. BOGLE: Well, could we wait till we consult and find out? I may not be right on those dates, but as long as we can consult, as long as we all understand that it's late February . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Late February. Well, okay. We might suggest either February 18 or 19 as one set; otherwise, into the last week of February.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask you to take into consideration that Wednesday is a day the Liberal caucus caucuses for the entire day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Wednesday seems to be a fairly holy day.

MR. BOGLE: We normally stay away from Wednesdays for you.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah. But one of the dates he mentioned was a Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Might we have a motion to adjourn?

MS BARRETT: You bet. So moved.

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

[The committee adjourned at 3:17 p.m.]

