



Fourth Session, 40th Parliament

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Victoria
Monday, April 27, 2015
Issue No. 10

HON. LINDA REID, MLA, CHAIR
AND SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

ISSN 1929-8668 (Print)
ISSN 1929-8676 (Online)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Victoria
Monday, April 27, 2015

Chair: Hon. Linda Reid (Speaker of the Legislative Assembly)

Members: Hon. Michael de Jong, QC (Abbotsford West BC Liberal)
Mike Farnworth (Port Coquitlam NDP)
Eric Foster (Vernon-Monashee BC Liberal)
Shane Simpson (Vancouver-Hastings NDP)
Jackie Tegart (Fraser-Nicola BC Liberal)

Other MLAs: Douglas Horne (Deputy Speaker)
Maurine Karagianis (Esquimalt–Royal Roads NDP) (for Shane Simpson)

Clerk: Craig James (Clerk of the House)

CONTENTS

Legislative Assembly Management Committee

Monday, April 27, 2015

	Page
Approval of Agenda and Minutes	115
Health, Safety and Accessibility of Parliamentary Precinct	115
Finance and Audit Committee Report	116
Clerk of the House: Update	121

MINUTES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE



**Monday, April 27, 2015
3:00 p.m.
Birch Committee Room
Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C.**

Present: Hon. Linda Reid, MLA (Speaker and Chair); Hon. Michael de Jong, QC, MLA; Mike Farnworth, MLA; Eric Foster, MLA; Maurine Karagianis, MLA (for Shane Simpson, MLA); Jackie Tegart, MLA

Unavoidably Absent: Shane Simpson, MLA

Legislative Assembly Officials Present: Craig James, Clerk of the House; Kate Ryan-Lloyd, Deputy Clerk and Clerk of Committees; Gary Lenz, Sergeant-at-Arms; Hilary Woodward, Executive Financial Officer

Others Present: Douglas Horne, MLA (Deputy Speaker)

1. The Chair called the Committee to order at 3:04 p.m.
2. **Resolved**, that the Committee approve the agenda as circulated. (Eric Foster, MLA)
3. In reviewing the draft Legislative Assembly Management Committee minutes of December 10, 2014, the Hon. Michael de Jong, Q.C., MLA, raised the topic of Members' Capital City Living Allowance and the Committee agreed to refer the matter to the Finance and Audit Committee for consideration. The Chair reminded Members that a review of Members' compensation is also due for consideration.
4. **Resolved**, that the Committee approve the minutes of December 10, 2014, as circulated. (Mike Farnworth, MLA)
5. In addressing the topic of Health, Safety and Accessibility of the Parliamentary Precinct, the Speaker noted the circulation of a document titled *Accessibility Review* to the Finance and Audit Committee on Thursday last week. The document, which summarizes recent accessibility enhancements within the precinct, will be provided to Members of the Legislative Assembly Management Committee.
6. The Committee reviewed the Finance and Audit Committee minutes of February 16, 26 and March 12, 2015. The Committee discussed the proposed changes to restore the provincial cenotaph. It was noted that the federal government has agreed to provide up to \$25,000 in funding to partially defray expenses relating to the overall project cost.
7. **Resolved**, that the minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee for February 16, 26 and March 12, 2015 be accepted. (Hon. Michael de Jong, MLA)
8. The Committee considered the April 24, 2015 report from the Finance and Audit Committee, which provided four recommendations for the consideration of the Committee.
9. The Committee reviewed the presentation titled the *Front Entrance Security Access* and considered proposed changes to install a second controlled access point at the main entrance of the Parliament Buildings.

- 10. Resolved**, that the Committee approve the estimated cost and implementation plan for the creation of a second controlled access point at the main entrance of the Parliament Buildings, with installation to begin in fall 2015 (after peak summer visits) with completion in early 2016. (Mike Farnworth, MLA)
- 11.** The Committee requested an update on estimated waiting time for visitors to the buildings once the second controlled security access point at the main entrance of the Parliament Buildings is operational.
- 12. Resolved**, that the Committee adopt the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee to approve the installation of an automated door opener on the south end entrance of the Douglas Fir Committee Room. (Hon. Michael de Jong, MLA)
- 13. Resolved**, that the Committee adopt the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee to approve the Assembly's 2014-15 Third and Fourth Quarter Financial Results for the period October 1, 2014 – December 31, 2014 (Quarter 3) and January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015 (Quarter 4) as presented today. (Eric Foster, MLA)
- 14.** The Committee considered a draft *Capital Project Review and Approval Policy*.
- 15. Resolved**, that the Committee adopt the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee regarding the *Capital Project Review and Approval Policy* as presented today. (Mike Farnworth, MLA)
- 16.** The Clerk provided the Committee with an update on various Assembly projects: including the Legislative Library Strategic Review; Website Redesign Project; a renewed business model for the Parliamentary Gift Shop; the re-established Display Advisory Committee; and the Legislative Lights Employee Recognition program.
- 17. Resolved**, that the Committee meet *in-camera*. (Hon. Michael de Jong, MLA)
- 18.** The Committee met *in-camera* to discuss the 2015-16 Capital Plan for the Legislative Assembly and a personnel matter from 3:42 p.m to 3:59 p.m.
- 19.** The Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair at 3:59 p.m.

Hon. Linda Reid, MLA
Speaker and Chair

Craig James
Clerk of the House

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2015

The committee met at 3:04 p.m.

[Madame Speaker in the chair.]

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Madame Speaker: We will call the meeting to order. Item 1 is approval of the agenda. Any other items to be included?

E. Foster: So moved.

Madame Speaker: Thank you. Second?

Motion approved.

Madame Speaker: We'll take a moment to, under item 2, review the previous minutes of December 10, 2014. Take a few moments to canvass that while we await committee members' arrival.

[1505]

Any business arising from the minutes?

Hon. M. de Jong: A question on No. 8. We did that, right? That's been done — the posting of the capital city allowance?

C. James (Clerk of the House): Yes.

Hon. M. de Jong: So that's out there. Now or at some point in the agenda we should probably.... There is this notion.... I think in the past we have indicated a willingness/desire, on the strength of the material, to review the living allowance. We should probably talk about how we want to do that and when we want to do that. We don't have to do it at this point, but we should do that at some point today.

Madame Speaker: Would it be your desire that that gets referred back to finance and audit for consideration?

Hon. M. de Jong: Yeah, I think that's the appropriate thing to do. But maybe for their benefit, if there's any.... I mean, rather than just say to them, "Here, have a look," is there any guidance that we can give them?

It strikes me that the issue that has become the subject of some conversation — I don't know if it's the case within caucuses, but outside of caucuses — is one of the options that is available, that members can avail themselves of now. As the legislative calendar has taken hold and we have a sense of how many sitting days there are over the course of the year — whether we want to revisit those options. That's really the question.

I think it's fine for the subcommittee to provide some

thoughts around that. I mean, I've been and others have.... I know what some of the rationale was for the options, but the question is: do we think the time has come to review? And whether we have any thoughts as a committee on.... Candidly, I think the other thing you're looking at is that probably if you were going to make any change, you do it in advance of an election.

Those are my thoughts — long-winded answer. Yes, I think the committee is the proper place to begin that examination, have a report come back.

Madame Speaker: Any other comment at this juncture?

As the minister is likely aware, at every second election we should be reviewing the compensation package in its entirety. So we'll have a conversation regarding that, as well, and come back to the table.

Hon. M. de Jong: Where are we in that cycle?

Madame Speaker: It is due now.

Hon. M. de Jong: Well, my comments were restricted to this, so that's probably a separate matter.

Madame Speaker: Any other comments?

I also have a question, under item 12 on the minutes of December 10.

Perhaps, Gary, this references you as well: "Provide an update at a future meeting regarding work on proposed guiding security principles." Will you be covering off the guiding security principles in your recommendations today?

G. Lenz: I have them ready for the discussion.

Madame Speaker: Beautiful.

Any other items from the minutes of December 10? Any other business arising?

Motion to approve the minutes as circulated?

Motion approved.

[1510]

Health, Safety and Accessibility of Parliamentary Precinct

Madame Speaker: Under item 3, health, safety and accessibility, at the last meeting.... I think, with the exception of Maurine, the same individuals are present. I apologize. There was an update on the accessibility work that has been done. If I can ask Mr. Farnworth to share that with Maurine. There was no further change since we last had that conversation.

That brings us to item 4, finance and audit committee. The minutes of February 16, 26 and March 12.

Finance and Audit Committee Report

Hon. M. de Jong: Just two questions on the February 26 minutes. Item 9, the cenotaph — has anything happened with that? Have the feds offered up some dough?

C. James (Clerk of the House): Yes.

Hon. M. de Jong: They have?

C. James (Clerk of the House): I think it's at \$25,000.

Madame Speaker: Did you wish to respond?

D. Horne: Yes, they have, and it's \$25,000.

Hon. M. de Jong: Are they cleaning it up?

Madame Speaker: In 2016, so apparently planning to go ahead with this year's remembrance ceremony in November and begin the work directly following. That's the last conversation I was privy to.

Hon. M. de Jong: Anything...? I mean, is it cleanup, or are they going to add a plaque?

G. Lenz: The cenotaph — we're looking to have it recommemorated, very similar to Ottawa, with the recent wars. At the same time the core part of the cenotaph would remain as it is. It's the base that we're looking at and to redo the ground around it to make it more useable for the veterans on that date and to bring it up to a standard that would be appropriate for a provincial cenotaph.

Hon. M. de Jong: All right. So \$25,000 from the federal government, and do we match?

D. Horne: We do match, but it's significantly more than that. So it provides a portion of it but not even half.

Hon. M. de Jong: Is it in our budget somewhere?

G. Lenz: It's in the capital plan.

Hon. M. de Jong: Okay. And then on No. 12, the antiquated telephone room — is that work underway?

Madame Speaker: It's complete, and it came in at just over \$10,000.

Hon. M. de Jong: Okay. That's all I had.

Madame Speaker: Any other questions, anyone, on the February 16, 26 or March 12 minutes?

Seeing none, a motion to approve all three sets of minutes?

Motion approved.

Madame Speaker: I appreciate it immensely.

Madame Speaker: That brings us to (b), report of the finance and audit committee, decision item 1, front entrance security project. Who is starting that presentation?

C. James (Clerk of the House): I'll just lead into it, if I might. Kate and Gary, the Deputy Clerk and the Sergeant-at-Arms, have been working on a proposal for security enhancement at the front main door of the Parliament Buildings. Members, in their package this afternoon, will have this document, which is an abbreviated version of one that was previously circulated to the finance and audit committee. There are some matters relating to this that, in my view, would be best dealt with in camera. But initially, I think either Kate and/or Gary may wish to make some comments.

G. Lenz: The plan that has been put forward that you have before you is designed as a continuation of the seven-point plan that was put forward to LAMC recently. It is designed for the front-door access to create a further perimeter on the exterior of the building. The plan is self-explanatory, and any details relating to it would probably be best handled in camera.

Madame Speaker: That's the presentation behind tab 5. Gary, any further comments?
Kate, any further comments?

K. Ryan-Lloyd (Deputy Clerk and Clerk of Committees): For the information of members, members of the finance and audit committee will recall that the detailed presentation was made to you in late 2014. Additional information and a detailed project plan and costs were requested by this committee before proceeding with the proposal.

[1515]

As members know, the proposal involves the installation of additional security screening equipment at the main entrance to the Parliament Buildings. It would also involve opening up a disused entrance as a new exit to better improve the flow of traffic on the main floor.

As my colleagues have mentioned, we'd be pleased to go into details about the proposal with respect to security details or answer any questions you may have. It may be best to handle some elements of that conversation in camera, but happy to try and answer any questions that you might have today.

As you can see from the plan, the proposed location of that equipment would mean that we would move some operational supports that are currently in rooms 140 and 141, currently the parliamentary gift shop and the tour office. We have been working with them to try and ac-

commodate those programs in an adjacent area not far from the new proposed exit area.

Hon. M. de Jong: Gary or Kate or whoever, just on page 5 of the document we have, at tab 5, someone has kindly laid out the capacity. It looks like the main entrance: 120 persons per hour. In June-August we anticipate 1,600 visitors per day. Have we modelled...? If I come on July 15 and it's a nice, sunny day and we're at the top end, how long am I going to wait to get in?

G. Lenz: Well, for that question if we could handle that in camera, because it's an issue of access. I'd prefer to have it in there.

Hon. M. de Jong: Right. I mean, I'm not....

C. James (Clerk of the House): Maybe I could offer some assistance here. The design as presently presented is one which takes into consideration having the public and others wait outside. We feel that given the constraints of the size and design for the front door, all should be able to be expeditiously brought into the Parliament Buildings.

One of the issues that needs to be dealt with is guidelines in terms of accessibility. A proposal in terms of access is that members, member staff, perhaps school groups and others who routinely enter this building would not likely have to go through the screening process, which is a great volume. Others, who are not routinely entering this building, would have to go through the screening process and would also need to.... We need to establish guidelines for the procedures in question.

Hon. M. de Jong: Okay. Well....

C. James (Clerk of the House): I know it doesn't give you the exact number.

Hon. M. de Jong: No, but I think we're going to need one. I mean, not the exact number. I think if, at the height of the tourist season, folks are waiting outside in a lineup for 15 minutes, that's not the end of the world. I think if they're out there waiting for an hour and a half, that's not good.

Madame Speaker: Certainly, the average wait-time in legislatures I've been screened in.... The last time at the federal House was an hour. The previous time was 15 minutes. It's variable. Certainly, provincial legislatures — I think we've all been in lineups of upwards of half an hour.

K. Ryan-Lloyd (Deputy Clerk): I think the Speaker is correct that the times are expected to vary somewhat. Up to 1,600 persons per day is probably an estimate for a peak summer day, but the hours of access would be quite

variable throughout the day. So the screening capacity per hour would be constant throughout the day, but it would perhaps peak at certain times of day. There may be some points in the day where there is a longer wait than others, but I think the proposed plan — and perhaps Gary can speak more to this — allows some degree of flexibility in terms of expediting access within security parameters.

Madame Speaker: I dare say it's like Sunday night at the airport.

Hon. M. de Jong: It better not be.

Madame Speaker: Some nights it moves swimmingly.

Hon. M. de Jong: "It better not be" is my answer.

G. Lenz: The access to parliament would be based on a threat-risk assessment. When parliament is in session, it's an increased threat to this institution.

[1520]

As a result, the level of screening would vary from that to when parliament is not in session. Depending upon that level will depend on what level of screening we do in the summer, if that makes sense.

C. James (Clerk of the House): As well, the plan does incorporate the use of the Mowat entrance — which, of course, is the first screening point — as a backup. So if we did find that there was a lineup of some sort that was unacceptable, we would start bringing in others through that particular entrance.

We understand what you're saying. It's been something that we've been grappling with all along in terms of putting this plan together. We want to be able to assure you — members and others who are using the entrance to this place — that you will not have to wait. That's our target.

E. Foster: I brought this up at LAMC the other day. You showed 120 to 150 days after approval to get this job done. My concern is, and you can explain it to us how we need to make this work, that that's a pretty big spread, 120 to 150 days. I think we need to tighten that up. We need to get someone to come in and give us an estimate on this and get it scheduled down tight.

Then, the other thing is I don't want to be sitting here next year again with another quarter of a million dollars sitting in the kitty because we didn't spend it. We budgeted. I mean, this year we've got a fair amount of money sitting there because we didn't get projects underway. In fairness, a lot of it belongs to this end of the table, because we didn't get you in gear fast enough.

If that's what we need to do, then we've got to make a decision and move forward with it — get the thing out for tender and get it built so we're not tying up a whole bunch of money that could be better used, rather than it

sitting in a fund somewhere waiting for a couple of years. It could be out on the street where it belongs.

If the decision here today is to go forward with this, then we need to go forward.

G. Lenz: If the approval is given today for this project, it would be.... I've spoken to facility services, and within this fiscal year, easily, this project would be completed and operational — well before the end of this year.

M. Farnworth: I'm quite comfortable giving an approval. I'm quite comfortable with going ahead. I agree with Eric, that we want to make sure that it gets done as expeditiously as possible within the parameters of the tender.

My one concern is similar to the Government House Leader's, and that is if we have people waiting an hour. You know, it's fine to say: "Oh, sometimes it's an hour. Sometimes it's...." That's just not acceptable, in the sense that people aren't going to wait an hour. They will go do other things. I know I would. I wouldn't wait an hour to go into any legislative building. Seriously, I wouldn't.

So I will put the caveat on the table. I'm a bit concerned that we may find, after this is operational — and I hope it's not the case — that there are problems and issues, in time, of people waiting. We may, in fact, end up revisiting, having to look at another solution. Whether that is through another access point, I don't know.

I just put that out there because I think it is a legitimate concern in terms of wait time. It is one thing to wait 15 minutes. It's completely another to wait 30 or 45 or an hour or longer.

G. Lenz: From the numbers we have to date, when the House is in session, I wouldn't anticipate those kinds of wait times to go along that line.

At the same time, on your concerns there, they're shared. The front entranceway is also capable of expanding to two units if need be, which would double the number of people that could come in without having to change anything further.

At the same time, I go back to the summer hours, which will be dependent upon what the threat is at that time and how we respond and how we screen.

C. James (Clerk of the House): I think it goes without saying that we understand the problems associated with changing the front entrance of this place to make it more secure for members, staff and others who are in this building. We know that there's a cost. We're very cognizant of that, and we know that we want to be able to demonstrate to this committee and others that we are responsible in terms of the amount of money we're proposing to spend on this operation.

[1525]

We're also aware of the disruption that it's likely to

cause, and we want to be able to minimize that to the extent that we can, which may mean evening work or weekend work or some work when this place is less busy with tourists and others.

In terms of access and wait times outside, we know that that would present a huge problem for everybody if there were excessive wait times, and we know that we want to be able to minimize that. All I want to be able to say to you is to provide you with the assurance that we're aware of all these factors and all these concerns that have presently been raised. They are foremost in our mind in terms of moving forward with this project, which, in the end, we hope will secure this place more than it presently is.

Hon. M. de Jong: I'm okay. My purpose is not to derail us from proceeding. But I wonder if the minutes might reflect this — and I won't presume to speak for anyone other than myself: that we would in the first year of operation commit to a pretty straightforward and simple audit during the high season. I mean, that's not a difficult thing to do — to track how long it's taking people to move through.

Getting in the building efficiently doesn't guarantee that your tour is going to leave every ten minutes. That's a different.... I get that, but in terms of promoting this within the ambit of a more secure entrance, 50 minutes, when you're standing in line, is a long time.

Interjection.

Hon. M. de Jong: Yeah, exactly — with kids. So if it's understood and maybe even mentioned in the minutes that we will, once operational, audit through the first year of operation what standard wait times are. And if they're excessive, we're going to need to address it.

By the way, I get that the people that work here and the members are all going to come through some side door. It's not a self-serving thing. Just the other folks.... If we can add that to the minutes and that doesn't offend anyone, then I'm happy.

Madame Speaker: Now, Gary, when you did your research, did you evaluate the processing time for individuals moving through for the other parliaments — what the minimum and the maximum are?

G. Lenz: The last time I was in Ottawa, I spent some time with their X-ray equipment to look through how long it took them to go through. I've also spoken to the airport authorities to determine how long it takes them to go through. Our numbers, at 120, would probably be on the lower side of....

Madame Speaker: No, but individual wait time. When you checked with them, what's the individual wait time that you...?

G. Lenz: Well, everyone is different, depending upon the amount of volume and how they process through. Like, the House of Commons is....

Hon. M. de Jong: If 500 people show up in an hour, you're going to have a longer wait time.

Madame Speaker: Oh no, I'm more than aware.

G. Lenz: Yeah, if we have, like, three or four bus tours come at the front all of a sudden, well, then there's going to be an issue. Of course, the priority would always be given to people who have booked a tour through public education and outreach and have taken those times, rather than the walk-ins.

Madame Speaker: Can you tell us the range or no? The least amount someone waited was X; the most amount of time someone waited was X?

G. Lenz: I have no idea. It all depends on the volume.

Madame Speaker: I think that's what this committee is, frankly, interested in. Perhaps we can, either through the audit that Mike has mentioned or others, do some more work. We've all waited extraordinary amounts of time in screening processes.

Okay, back to decision note item 1, does someone wish to move the motion?

Hon. M. de Jong: So moved.

Madame Speaker: Second? Eric.

Motion approved.

Madame Speaker: For clarification, if this goes.... When is it starting? May 1? June 1?

G. Lenz: We start the process now, and we move through before, as we've.... I believe that the motion is.... Your question again, Madame Speaker?

Madame Speaker: Do you have a start date in mind?

G. Lenz: We'll start tomorrow. We start the process of what we're doing as soon as this is approved.

Hon. M. de Jong: Gary, it looks like, though, from the motion, that the installation work will begin in the fall, right? Yeah.

Madame Speaker: You said implementation in the fall or installation in the fall?

K. Ryan-Lloyd (Deputy Clerk): Yes, my understanding is that the agreement to move ahead with the installation of a second controlled-access point would, essentially, begin to change operational access in the fall of 2015. So that would be after the busy summer tour season, which is an ideal time to begin this work on a calendar basis. So although work will begin immediately, it will be with a target to change operations over in September 2015.

Madame Speaker: On the last page: "Report to LAMC seeking confirmation of final approval to proceed with the implementation of detailed proposal and costing." So you're coming back to the next LAMC meeting — or no?

G. Lenz: This is it.

Madame Speaker: This is the detailed costing. So you're thinking there's other detailed information.

C. James (Clerk of the House): Either way, we certainly are going to be keeping this committee and finance and audit fully informed as we progress.

K. Ryan-Lloyd (Deputy Clerk): Further to the minister's point, we'd be pleased to bring back any updates with respect to both access waiting times and volume of visitors. The preliminary statistics that were gathered in support of this proposal are not necessarily comprehensive, because we have never tracked a visitor count in a detailed manner at the front door. We have a mix of different visitors, some who enter the building once or twice or even three times a day, that can have multiple counts. So we are going to work towards streamlining our understanding of the numbers and monitor very carefully waiting times on your behalf.

Madame Speaker: Item 2. I touched on it earlier under accessibility review. Does anyone wish to raise anything in addition?

Hilary, are you suggesting this document?

H. Woodward: Madame Speaker, I didn't know if you wanted to mention about the auto door opener.

Madame Speaker: The recommendation that came forward from finance and audit: "Resolve that the committee approve the installation of an automated door opener on the south end and entrance of the Douglas Fir Committee Room." That is a recommendation coming from finance and audit to LAMC.

M. Farnworth: I just want to confirm that it is the Douglas Fir Room that we're talking about and that we are awaiting additional information on the other facility doors that were mentioned — in particular, the Speaker's in the main chamber.

Madame Speaker: Absolutely correct.

M. Farnworth: Okay, good.

Motion approved.

Madame Speaker: That brings us to item 3.

C. James (Clerk of the House): If I could just update members on some of the accessibility initiatives that have been undertaken over the past three years between the Mowat entrance — a bathroom on the second floor that can accommodate persons such as Mr. Sullivan, hand-rails, power door closers, the ramp at the rear of the building and the rose garden, the ramp to the library and a few other initiatives. We have spent over the past three years in excess of \$430,000. There are 59 bathrooms in this place, and 20 percent of them are now accessible.

Madame Speaker: Decision item 3, 2014-15 financial update, third-quarter reports.

H. Woodward: At the April 23 meeting of the finance and audit committee the Legislative Assembly's third-quarter reports for fiscal 2014-15 were reviewed. That material is in your package, as item 4(b)(3) of the agenda and item 3 of the report of the finance and audit committee.

I'll start with the report No. 1, which is the operating expenses by function. As at December 31, 2014, the Legislative Assembly was forecasting \$6 million, or 8.7 percent, in surplus for the 2014-15 fiscal year. There are forecasted operational savings in all nine expense categories. Those are primarily due to unfilled vacancies, lower than expected operating expenses and a number of planned facilities projects that did not proceed.

Madame Speaker: Any questions?
Any other comments, Madam?

H. Woodward: I'll move, then, on to report No. 2, which is the capital expenditures report. Again, this is for the third-quarter of the 2014-15 fiscal year. At that time we were forecasting to be \$2.4 million, or 70 percent, underspent in our capital expenditures for the year. The primary reasons for the forecasted underspend are the delay and/or cancellation of previously approved facilities projects — that was approximately \$400,000 — and a reduction of capital contingency reserves, in combination, of \$1.8 million.

[1535]

Madame Speaker: Any comments?

So perhaps we'll take those motions recommended from finance and audit to LAMC: "That the committee approve the Legislative Assembly's 2014-15 third-quarter

financial results through the period April 1, 2014, to December 31, 2014, quarter 3, as presented today."

E. Foster: So moved.

Motion approved.

Madame Speaker: Final motion on this question: "Resolve that the committee approve the Legislative Assembly's revised capital project review and approval policy."

Looking for a mover.

M. Karagianis: So moved.

Madame Speaker: Maurine. Seconded? Mike.

Motion approved.

Madame Speaker: Information items are at the bottom of the second page. Anyone wish to speak to the information items? Hilary? The constituency office piece?

H. Woodward: No. Just a mention of information item 1. It is a change to the constituency office allowance payment process. It's an administrative change. The finance and audit committee recommended.... They basically approved the policy but wanted to bring it forward to this committee. For information, the briefing note on that is in your packages.

Hon. M. de Jong: Hilary, thank you. I think I read the briefing note. Can you explain...? I mean, I read the part that said: "No substantive change. No amount change." The rest of it I didn't.... Can you just summarize for the committee what's happening here?

H. Woodward: Yes, certainly. Previously how the constituency office monthly amounts were calculated, it was an estimate based on the previous month. What we're proposing to move to is a real-time process. The information actually will be real time, so it'll be at the end of the month. It will basically streamline our accounting processes in financial services, and in addition it will provide more accurate reporting for members looking at that information.

Hon. M. de Jong: What would change?

H. Woodward: What would be happening, because it was based on an estimate, we would often be doing corrections. Once we had the actual data, we would do reconciliation information for the following. There would always be adjustments the month after. This way, if we move the process to doing it at the end of the month, we can actually give the actual data, which is a lot of time to do with CA salaries.

Hon. M. de Jong: Mostly employment related, I would think, like part-time staff.

H. Woodward: Correct.

Hon. M. de Jong: I got you — okay.

Madame Speaker: Any other questions on any of the other information items found on page 3? Hilary, do you want to just speak to any of these others, or are they fairly self-explanatory?

H. Woodward: Unless somebody has a specific question on any of those other information items — self-explanatory.

Madame Speaker: That brings us to item 5, the Clerk's update.

Clerk of the House: Update

C. James (Clerk of the House): Here we go, just a few items to inform members. We did post for the first time receipts. I thought it went very, very smoothly. It was an enormous undertaking. Financial services advises me that they scrutinized over 11,000 pages of receipts, some pages containing as many as three or four or more receipts on them. Information technology managed to get all of this information up and running without the system crashing — you can imagine that the volume of information was huge — to the credit of both IT and to financial services, who performed yeoman service in terms of putting all of this together in a timely fashion.

We do have a draft copy of the internal audit report by Ernst and Young. The finance and audit committee has had a look at the draft report. The draft report will then be turned into a final report for finance and audit to have a look at and then refer the final to LAMC at some point in the not-too-distant future.

I do have some other matters which I thought we might canvass if the committee does revert in camera. But in the meantime, I just want to alert members to several initiatives by the Deputy Clerk, including a strategic review of the Legislative Library, our website redesign project, our gift shop business model, display advisory committee and legislative lights program.

Kate, would you like to talk to any of these matters?

K. Ryan-Lloyd (Deputy Clerk): As the Clerk mentioned, I've currently been focused on a number of projects on behalf of the assembly. I'm pleased to provide members with any particular information at this juncture or at a future meeting.

[1540]

I'll mention briefly that we have been working with the management team at the Legislative Library and other

client groups to develop a five-year strategic plan for the library, which we'd like to bring forward to the finance and audit committee in the coming weeks, and then to the Legislative Assembly Management Committee for your input and review.

As Craig mentioned, we are also moving ahead with the website redesign project. As members know, we have been working with a contractor to renew the look and navigability of the current website. We are currently in phase 3 of that project and still on track for a launch in September 2015.

Our office has also been working with Madame Speaker on the renewed display advisory committee, which is an interdepartmental group of staff which meets regularly to receive and review applications for a number of display projects around the building and the grounds and offer recommendations to the Speaker.

I've also been working with the parliamentary education office and the financial services branch on a new business model for the parliamentary gift shop — which I'd be pleased to provide an update on to you — for the finance and audit committee in the coming weeks.

Finally, working again with the Speaker and the Clerk on the second annual legislative lights employee recognition program, which is planning an event in mid-June of this year.

Madame Speaker: Thank you very much, and I thank the Clerk for his update.

Hon. M. de Jong: Just one question on the library thing. Maybe I can spare the finance and audit committee. I wonder if that's a report that is better to come to the full committee first, if it's kind of a high-level strategic plan. It might not be fair to say to finance and audit.... It's not really a numbers-crunching exercise at this point. It's, I take it, a little of what's the library going to look like in years out. Maybe that's better to come here, and if we need to drill down further, then we can fire it off.

Madame Speaker: That's the will of the committee?

Some Voices: Sure.

Hon. M. de Jong: One other question. Maybe I will just do this to satisfy the throngs that are undoubtedly listening to our every word. Craig, you mentioned an item or items that you wanted to refer to an in-camera session. They would fall within the category of things that the committee would generally deal with in camera.

C. James (Clerk of the House): That's correct, yes.

Madame Speaker: The Chair will accept a motion to the effect that we move in camera at this juncture.

Hon. M. de Jong: Are we done?

Madame Speaker: Unless there is other outstanding business.

So moved.

The committee continued in camera from 3:42 p.m. to 3:59 p.m.

[Madame Speaker in the chair.]

Madame Speaker: We have moved back from in camera into the regular meeting.

Now the Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment.

M. Farnworth: So moved.

Madame Speaker: Thank you all.

The committee adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

HANSARD REPORTING SERVICES

Director
Robert Sutherland

Manager of Reporting Services
Christine Fedoruk

Publishing Supervisor
Laurel Bernard

Editorial Team Leaders
Janet Brazier, Karol Morris, Robyn Swanson, Glenn Wigmore

Technical Operations Officers
Pamela Holmes, Dan Kerr, Yvonne Mendel

Indexers
Shannon Ash, Julie McClung, Robin Rohrmoser

Researchers
Liz Belsten, Mike Beninger, Mary Beth Hall, David Mattison

Editors
Kim Christie, Deirdre Gotto, Jane Grainger, Betsy Gray, Iris Gray,
Linda Guy, Martin Hicks, Barb Horricks, Bill Hrick, Jessica Hutchings,
Treava Kellington, Catherine Lang, Paula Lee, Donna McCloskey,
Bob McIntosh, Anne Maclean, Jill Milkert, Lind Miller, Erik Pedersen,
Janet Pink, Amy Reiswig, Murray Sinclair, Antoinette Warren,
Heather Warren, Arlene Wells, Kim Westad

Published by British Columbia Hansard Services,
and printed under the authority of the Speaker.

www.leg.bc.ca/cmt

Access to on-line versions of the report of proceedings (*Hansard*)
and webcasts of committee proceedings is available on the Internet.