

THESE TRANSCRIPTS HAVE NOT BEEN THOROUGHLY EXAMINED FOR ACCURACY AND ARE, THEREFORE, UNOFFICIAL.

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Wednesday, April 9, 1980

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

12:15 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we start? The approval of the minutes of the last meeting?

MR. GOGO: I don't have my minutes; I don't know why.

MRS. OSTERMAN: They just came in my mail today.

AN HON. MEMBER: They just got there. They look to be in good order.

MR. APPLEBY: I would move they be passed or accepted or approved or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I would like to be picky.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're picky?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; pick away.

MR. GOGO: Who has read them? Anybody?

AN HON. MEMBER: I have.

MR. PURDY: I haven't got them either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should I have another go at it? Do you want to approve the minutes? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary? Okay, carried.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it should be duly noted that I am now official instead of just officious at this meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. Is that an alternate, or is it both?

MR. GOGO: It's a warning. (laughter)

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Things will never be the same.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, concerns of visitors. Milt, did you bring some special concerns to the meeting?

MR. PAHL: No, Mr. Chairman. I simply wanted to sit in and learn the workings, and I had the opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, business arising out of the minutes. One of them was the question of security, which is also on the agenda -- I think most of it is on the agenda -- our discussion with Graham Harle. Subsequent to that, I had a meeting with Bob Giffin, who now seems to have some function with regard to security. I have received assurance that there will be ongoing consultation. I think at this time, in view of what has happened to previous assurances with regard to consultation, we should diarize it or put it on the calendar, check every once in a while to see what's going on. So that's what I propose to do.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Since they seem to have reactivated a committee that was at one time concerned with security, could we not ask that we be informed of the committee's meetings and possibly either be invited or, at the very least, have a memo sent to us after they have their deliberations?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, do you want to make a motion to that effect?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I would request that we be informed of the security committee's meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that we may send a representative?

MRS. OSTERMAN: If they would like us either to attend, or would they send us the results of those meetings. I think I would like to leave it open-ended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So your motion, then, is that we would like to have notice of the meetings of the security committee, and we would either like to have a member of this committee there as the representative of the committee or, in the alternative, get copies of what's decided, as they may prefer. Is that your motion?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any discussion on that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

(Motion carried)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that's building security. Now, we checked on security in other legislatures, and there is no real uniformity. Apart from the House of Commons and the National Assembly in Quebec, it appears that government seems to predominate in security, right?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which of course is a parliamentary anomaly, as we've said many times here.

Now, the next item also arises out of the minutes; that is, reclassification of Legislative Assembly positions. You may recall that this committee . . .

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: We approved these two classifications . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we directed that two of the staff be upgraded; namely, Lorne Buhr in the library and Charlene Blaney in the Clerk's office. Although we didn't get any reaction to those requests, they were in fact acted on, and their pay has started coming in in the new categories.

MR. APPLEBY: What do you mean, you didn't get a reaction, Gerry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we sent the memo, but got no answer. Is that right?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. We did not seek Personnel Administration office approval for the reclassification, but rather followed up on the directive that had been given by this committee earlier; that is, that we exercise the committee's power under Section 3(3)(a) of The Public Service Act. So we directed the request directly to Treasury asking them to effect the necessary changes, and that has been done as of the last payroll period.

MR. GOGO: We anticipated a hassle; we didn't get one. I think that's what you're saying.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, what has happened is that as far as payroll is concerned they've been reclassified, but you've had no official notification it's been accepted?

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So effectively they're reclassified?

MR. APPLEBY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I mean, we're treating them as being in their new classifications, and they're being paid according to the new classifications, so there's really nothing further to do.

MR. APPLEBY: They just didn't acknowledge it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, it isn't on the agenda, but it does arise out of the minutes of previous meetings; that's the question of space in the building. In that regard we have received a memorandum from Harry Hobbs which proposes the re-creation of a space committee. We had one about six years ago, I guess. And it's proposed that on that committee there be the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, the Deputy Minister of Government Services, and -- who's the chairman?

MR. STEFANIUK: There hasn't been a chairman designated, but another member of the committee would be an assistant secretary of cabinet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. That's it. So instead of replying to that memo, I felt that it should wait until this committee could deal with it. If you approve, then I would suggest that we go ahead with it, and you could direct me to reply to it and say, yes, we okay the participation of the Clerk in that committee.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: As representing this committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As representing this committee and the Legislative Assembly.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Okay, I'd agree to that. But I was going to drag my heels if this committee wasn't going to be represented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mind you, they haven't expressly said that he would be a representative of the Members' Services Committee, but I think it's got to be in everybody's mind that he'd be reporting back to this committee.

MR. APPLEBY: Would you be putting that in your memo when you reply?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you wish, sure. I'll say that the committee has approved this recommendation, and has agreed with the Clerk that he will be reporting back to the Members' Services Committee from time to time. Is that all right?

MR. GOGO: Yes. Actually, reporting back -- would that give him the power to represent us? I would like to see a representative. Now, if the Clerk is going to represent us, that's okay. But just reporting back to us doesn't seem to me that we've got representation.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, maybe we could walk some middle ground there, and the Clerk could -- we would have that we'd be pleased to have him sit on that committee with a view to seeking the advice of the Members' Services Committee from time to time, as may be appropriate, to bring back . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, suppose we said that . . .

MR. APPLEBY: Or representing the views of the members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that we would approve his being on that committee as a representative of this committee -- and of the Speaker, I think would be appropriate -- and that he would be reporting back to the committee and the Speaker.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I'd feel more comfortable with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make the motion, George, that we approve the recommendation that the Clerk be a member of the space committee, as representative of this committee and of the Speaker, with the understanding that he will be reporting back to this committee and the Speaker?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Can I ask a question? How is this committee allowed to delegate any responsibility or extend its arm? In any way it sees fit? Because, very frankly, I'm not aware of how . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it has no legislative sanction except, I suppose, that's it's been approved by Executive Council.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Because the committee, in fact, are all duly elected MLAs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This committee?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I thought you were talking about the space committee; I'm sorry.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I thought you were speaking of the Clerk as being our representative on that space committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, is that possible? Can we delegate that authority, when in fact we are in this position as a result of our appointment in the Legislature?

MR. GOGO: Well, Harry Hobbs is not elected.

MRS. OSTERMAN: No, but we're . . .

MR. CHALMERS: To put it another way, is the Clerk a member of the Members' Services Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: But is there anything in the law that says that a Committee may be represented only by one of its members?

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's what I'm asking, because of the special way this committee is constituted; that's all. I don't know, and I raise that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that in the absence of a prohibition to the contrary, there should be nothing wrong with this committee . . .

MR. APPLEBY: I think you can go that route, and then see if you get a reply that this isn't acceptable -- we'd have to take it from there.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I raised it; I just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you got Mr. Wolstenholme's motion in a form that's satisfactory to you?

(Motion carried)

MR STEFANIUK: May I make reference to these two?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Minute 80/44 and 80/45 dealing with the pages of the Assembly, we had, pursuant to the request attached to these minutes, both the terms of reference and the outline of the subjects that we covered during the briefing session. I wish to report to the committee that in addition to the first briefing session, which is outlined, at Mr. Gogo's suggestion we conducted a second briefing session through the Law Clerk, during which we, hopefully, taught the pages how to retrieve statutes when called for by the members in the House. I have taken the liberty of asking Mr. Gogo to test their ability to do so in the House.

With regard to Minute 80/45, the question of conducting a survey among the members as to the pages' performance, I wonder if I might seek, Mr. Chairman, more specific guidelines from the committee as to the type of survey they wish conducted. I think it was stated that it would be desirable to conduct that survey approximately one month after the pages had served during these sittings, which would be about the third week of April. But I wish some direction as to whether members wish to assess the pages' performance individually or collectively.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I don't know who requested that. I sure hope it wasn't me. I wanted the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to commend

the Clerk, because when I raised the matter of the difficulty pages have in retrieving statutes -- which I happen to think is their primary function, not delivering notes -- within days of that request they'd gone through a training session. I was very happy with the results of that request. I've since asked for a couple, and they're right on. So I think I want to commend the Clerk in front of the committee for that.

As to the other matter, I have no comment.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: You don't know what -- in the request, evidently you're not aware of what they wanted: individually or collectively?

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. And it came out at this committee's last meeting, to conduct this survey approximately one month after the pages had been in place.

MRS. OSTERMAN: What time of the night was this?

MR STEFANIUK: With a view to complying with that request, I would seek further explicit direction as to the basis on which that survey might be conducted.

MR. GOGO: Maybe it was a survey of the members to see how they perceived that the pages . . .

MR STEFANIUK: That's right; yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, would you be content if we just sent a questionnaire around?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Well, Mr. Chairman, over the years, and understandably so, there's been a great variation in the type of performance of the pages. We've been very fortunate that we've had some very, very good ones. Once in a while we've had some that haven't measured up to the standard that we'd like to have; no doubt about that. I think if you're going to do an assessment, it's very necessary that it be done on an individual basis. It's the only fair we can judge their performance. I would think that this would be a challenge to the members of the Assembly themselves to become personally acquainted and be able to recognize each individual page. I'm sure that that would be something they would have to do if they were going to make an assessment. But I would think that if they're going to do this assessment, it should be done before the session ends, rather than wait a month afterwards -- I would say the last week of the session.

MR STEFANIUK: Within a month of the beginning of the session was the instruction at the last meeting, which as I mentioned would place that assessment at about the third week of April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the reason for that was that we felt that if shortcomings were highlighted, there would still be time to cure them before we adjourned for the summer.

MR. APPLEBY: I think that if shortcomings like the one -- you know, the extra instruction you gave them regarding the statutes and so on -- if these are drawn to the attention of the Clerk, these can be overcome, and the overall performance shouldn't be judged that quickly until they've gone through the experience of most of the session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, I've been remiss in asking that we use our names when we start to speak, because somebody transcribing this tape is not going to be very happy with us.

MR. GOGO: Well, your eloquence will be identified very easily, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would say that your wit would be equally identified.

MRS. OSTERMAN: And I would say all the shovelling that's going on here.
(laughter)

MR. GOGO: On the pages, because we're on live television to 40 per cent of the population of Alberta, I wonder, Bohdan, if it wouldn't be wise . . . When Bills are being introduced, I think the members can be clearly identified. When they rise in their place, it might not be a bad idea to have the page next to them -- I noticed recently that the Premier the other day, for example, couldn't find a page when he introduced a Bill because they were still involved with the tabling of reports or whatever, or delivering notes. Is there a way that you know which members are introducing Bills today, for example?

MR STEFANIUK: Two minutes before the House sits.

MR. GOGO: I'm just wondering if the pages could be near those members when that occurs. I'm thinking of the television impact.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, normally when they make an introduction of a Bill, by the time they've given their short preamble there's ample time to get to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It would be a nice idea, but I think it's going to be difficult to implement because, as Bohdan says, the government operates with maximum flexibility.

MR STEFANIUK: We get a final list from Sylvia Herbers just before the House sits -- of government Bills, that is. We have sometimes a little more notification from private members as to which Bills they are going to introduce. I believe to a large extent they are alert to that. There may be the occasional slip-up on tablings and introduction of Bills. They do try to scurry around. It may be that for that Routine, we may have to put more pages into the House. We do have more. We may have to put six into the House instead of four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't that be a good idea, during the Routine?

MR STEFANIUK: That might enable them to get there more quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To keep tabs on the Bills and on the tablings, eh?

MRS. OSTERMAN: And a couple of them specifically for that job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think that would meet your concern, John?

MR. GOGO: Yes, my concern is that we're on live television, and it ends up the page runs off. I'm just thinking a page could be almost at the member's elbow.

MR. APPLEBY: Actually, there hasn't been very much hang-up on that; just that one occasion this session, I think.

MR. GOGO: Well, it's just a thought, if we could have six in there instead of four.

MR. APPLEBY: I don't think it's a serious one.

MR STEFANIUK: We could try to remedy it by putting six into the House for the Routine.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It's a very short period of time.

MR. APPLEBY: With Ministerial Statements it might be quite lengthy. The other day it ran over half an hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One other thing. I have some concern about a questionnaire that might go around with the pages' names on it so that you could assess them individually. For one thing, we have a good group of pages and I don't suppose that anything untoward would happen to the answers if the pages were bringing them back. But it makes me feel a little uneasy. There just seems to be . . .

MR. GOGO: I don't like the idea of doing it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, I don't either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Occasionally a word of praise for something that's well done, or a word of criticism or suggestion for something that isn't -- I think that is the normal way. But of course we have the committee's resolution on the books that says we're to conduct a survey.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, in very loose terms that can happen in a lot of ways. If a memo were to go out to the offices asking if there were any comments at all, either pro or con, or suggestions to do with the way the pages are operating in the House, I think it serves its purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we're in the future, eh?

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, and that could be sent directly to the Clerk. It wouldn't go through the pages' hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. GOGO: Because you know what's going to happen? You hold your hand up, and the girl comes running over and you say: oh, you're Deborah; thanks Deborah. That's probably what's going to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Beautiful. Okay?

MR. GOGO: We're still on business arising?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. There are only two other items that I know of.

MR. APPLEBY: Before we leave that, Mr. Chairman, in the instructions to pages, Number 7, I think it is -- right on the last page, anyway -- it would indicate

that the pages aren't allowed to have any refreshments back there in the lounge at all, as far as I read it.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, that's right.

MR. APPLEBY: They cannot have a coffee or a chocolate bar or anything like that? Is that a new policy?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, it's new, because we found that in the sittings last fall, if we allow them to drink coffee, it becomes a bit of a social hour. So they are now allowed to have coffee or a refreshment, but they must come into the Clerk's office and have it. So they still have a facility.

MR. APPLEBY: Oh, I see.

MR STEFANIUK: We felt as well that the members' lounge is crowded enough on some occasions, and the seating is limited. We just didn't want the pages to avail themselves of . . .

MR. APPLEBY: That's fine; I just thought it was eliminated altogether.

MR STEFANIUK: They have that facility in the Clerk's office.

MR. APPLEBY: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the next thing in the minutes was constituency offices. The Clerk was expecting -- I don't know whether it's come in yet -- some word from the Provincial Treasury that the same funding that is used for telephone services in members' offices here in the building, the same appropriation, should be suitable for covering telephone services in their individual offices.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have that confirmation in writing from the Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will that include electronic secretaries?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, that's the telephone answering devices.

MR. GOGO: On that point, I don't know how Edmonton Tel. functions, but as you may be aware, AGT no longer rents that equipment. It runs \$300 to \$500 a unit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To buy?

MR. GOGO: To buy. That's the only way of getting it. I brought some material up with me; I thought I wouldn't give it to the committee until I had enough for all the committee members. Perhaps it could be on the next agenda, if that were satisfactory. But if 20 per cent or 30 per cent of the members went for this, at \$400 or \$500 per unit, it would be a substantial cost. I just wanted to point that out to the committee, so they're aware that unlike the \$18 rental it used to be, AGT honoring those that still have it. But if their equipment needed repair, which happens twice or so a year, they will not replace it. So they'd be faced with -- I'm thinking that Fjordbotten, myself, and several members who now have it will be faced with a capital expenditure. Just so the Clerk's aware that we won't be able to rent them. It would be like a calculator.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no firms other than AGT which . . .

MR. GOGO: Well, I don't know about Edmonton Tel. But (inaudible) Electric manufacture them but don't rent them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But private enterprise sells them, and I wonder if they wouldn't have leasing arrangements.

MR. GOGO: Well, perhaps I could look at it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Maybe we could inquire into what's available, because whether we have to buy or lease, it occurs to me that if there's a quantity involved, we'd be far better off not to have everybody going out and doing their thing. We could get a better price.

MR. GOGO: If it's with the new ones. The AGT rental at \$18 included a hand-set. In the new ones they're exclusive from the telephone; no hand-set. So you would also rent or buy a phone, and then you could buy these units. So they're not combined.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Any idea why AGT went out of that?

MR. GOGO: Yes. Somehow they want to make money. They've lost so much money. That happens invariably when you sell garbage like that, because I've had 10 years' experience with those phones, and they're terrible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, they had no business competing with private enterprise anyway at the taxpayers' expense.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, that's what happens when a government tries to get into competing with private enterprise.

MR. GOGO: I've used one for 10 years, and I'm frankly not satisfied.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, in connection with constituency offices I wish to report to the committee that our administrative director, Ms. Blaney, has been successful in completing arrangements with the government whereby constituency offices can now avail themselves of the government's courier service between offices or between a given office and the Legislature Building in Edmonton. With the committee's approval, we will circulate to all members a list of those municipalities which are currently served by the courier service. We have further received an indication from the government that they would consider extension of courier services to those areas not presently served, but where constituency offices might be established, which we hope would facilitate members' communications to some extent. That will be a no-charge service to the Legislative Assembly or to the member.

The other item is another request which has been placed before the Clerk's office for signs. We have no provision at the moment, as we did not for photocopying machines and other items which have been discussed by this committee previously, for signs. We have determined that, depending on the size and the number of words, the range and cost can be from \$75 to \$200 installed. I place that request, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, before the committee for consideration. We have no funding for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are signs indicating that a certain place is a member's office?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any thoughts about that? Milt, you've got an office in with a law office, eh?

MR. PAHL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I've enjoyed very good support from the landlord, who has done that for me. But it does represent a cost, and I think the range is probably appropriate. It depends on the location. In fact, I have three signs planned. One is sort of on a directory of the shopping centre, if you will; another, because of visibility, will be in the window -- these are sort of hand-made things; and another is on the door to the office building itself. It's something I achieved through the good offices of the landlord, but certainly I recognize it was an expense to him. It is a legitimate need, because if they don't know you're there, they can't come in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other thoughts about signs?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I hadn't thought about it.

MR. GOGO: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman (inaudible) to really come to any conclusion about it.

MR. PAHL: The only other thought that I would make, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps that if it were funded, I think there should be some standardization to it, perhaps with the provincial crest or something that would specify how you're doing it. I think, in all fairness, if it's supported by the legislature, it shouldn't be sort of neon lights with high voltage during certain times sort of thing. I think it has to be standardized and of a quality that would reflect the government and not the individual necessarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like the Clerk perhaps to get hold of a sign company and get some ideas as to how this might be handled; for example, the provision of some kind of good-looking but relatively inexpensive, standardized sign that could be used around the province?

MR. PAHL: I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it may be possible to get one of the government departments to make up a set of standardized signs. Government Services has some fairly standardized blocks that we could have one for a door, one for a window, and maybe one outside sign.

MR. APPLEBY: It would be a variation of interior and exterior signs, too.

MR. GOGO: I like Milt's idea of standardized -- and particularly a provincial crest which indicates function as an MLA. If it were standard size -- I think that's a good idea -- and if it were prepared for each member, and let him handle it in the way he saw fit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as of the last . . . Sorry, Ron.

MR. CHALMERS: Well, I would just like to make a note of caution, I suppose, and that is to suggest . . . I appreciate the reasoning behind suggesting standardization, but it may be that opposition members might be a bit sensitive if the standardized suggestion seemed to -- well, if it were exactly the counterpart of that, sure; I wouldn't see how there would be any problem. Once you start getting into colors, for instance, then . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Oh, yes, definitely it shouldn't have . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Blue and orange.

MR. CHALMERS: Right, that's the only . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: It should be black on white with the crest or something. Any more than, I mean, Transportation has its signs, and they're always different when you go around the province and you look at . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Years ago in the Legislative Assembly, when the new Alberta signature came out -- you know, with the leaning "A" and so on -- we just absolutely avoided that. We said, it's government; it doesn't belong in the Legislative Assembly at all.

MR. GOGO: It's not that way on the crest, you notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As of the last meeting, the Clerk had reported that there were about 20 constituency offices leased. Are there more now?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think there are about 35, Mr. Chairman, and as many staff people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, suppose this: suppose the Clerk were to word something fairly explicit and send it to the members who in fact have offices and ask them for their ideas or needs in regard to signs. With that information -- it may take a few weeks to get it, but it might be worth getting -- consult further either with this committee or with a sign company. Then we can deal with it further.

MR. APPLEBY: I think it should be indicated to the members being surveyed that we're trying to consolidate these ideas into something we could standardize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right; okay. And having in mind what you said a moment ago about some being interior and some exterior.

MR. CHALMERS: Did signs raise a wider question of advertising -- notices in newspapers, for instance -- as to office hours?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was a suggestion made by Grant Notley some months ago -- I think it was from him -- that consideration might be given for funding that would advertise in a weekly paper the day when an MLA would be in a certain town. I think the members at that time decided that was going too far too fast.

MR. GOGO: On your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, I would rather go with what Milt suggested. I happen to believe the sign is more important for those without an office, frankly. That's why I'd like to see standardized signs. I had meetings in city council chambers in Lethbridge, and I scrawled a sign and stuck it on the wall, at the entrance to the building. I think a standardized sign would be far more appropriate there. So I don't think it's just for those with offices; I would think it's for all members. So I would like to see us follow Milt's suggestion and have someone come back with outdoor, indoor, window, or whatever categories we want. If this committee approves them, we'd then send them to the members for their response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, then suppose we tried to get diagrams, colored or other, and pictures of possible signs and send those around to the people who have

offices, as well as to this committee, and then go at it from there. Would you prefer that?

MR. GOGO: I guess time's important. I visualize the members being very active the latter part of May in constituency offices. So I think time's important.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think, Milt, you made the suggestion -- I'm just wondering within government itself if there isn't a very reasonable way of having things printed up, as opposed to . . .

MR. PAHL: Yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: There is. Because I'd like to just see samples of that. Then there's enough people on this committee; we can ask some questions outside. I mean, how many variations can you possibly have of office locations in terms of window or stand or whatever?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're saying, let's get some samples?

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll get them into your hands as quickly as we can, even if we have to pass them around to various members of the committee. Is that all right?

MR. APPLEBY: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, getting back to Ron's point about advertising. I think something this committee's going to have to do before very long is apply themselves to consideration of the Act itself and to what way it might be modified so that we could take care of such circumstances as advertising and other things that have arisen. We're now trying to find ways and means of getting services which we feel should be available in these offices within the confines of having accepted the Miller report as it was, and it's been quite difficult. I think we have to give some consideration to amending the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The wording was very restrictive.

MR. APPLEBY: So that should be on a future agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion by Connie, then, that the Clerk obtain sample signs for consideration of the committee.

MR STEFANIUK: From government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

(Motion carried)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, what about the question of advertising?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, that would have to be on the agenda for a future time. The Act itself I think we should be taking some looks at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. What sort of record should we make of that, Frank?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, just that it was noted, that's all; commented on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want it on the agenda of the next meeting?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, we'll see when the next meeting is and how much is on the platter for that meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. What do you have in mind by using the word "advertising"?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, you know, just as Grant brought it out that time. I think if you're going to have a series of pre-session meetings, for instance, and you want to advertise in your local weekly newspapers out in the rural areas, you have no provision for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then would you agree that we put on the agenda for the next meeting: consideration of a means by which members might give notice of their plans to attend at various places in their constituencies? Is that specific enough?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, I imagine there's other items we should be discussing as well, but right off the top of my head I can't think of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well then, would you say that -- suppose we put on the agenda for next meeting: consideration of the provisions of the amendment made by Bill -- what was the number of that one last fall?

MR. APPLEBY: I think that would be the item on the agenda: amendments to Bill so-and-so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seventy-four? Okay, consideration of the amendments made by Bill 74 as to their scope and suitability, having regard to concerns such as notices in the constituency. Is that all right?

MR. APPLEBY: Yes -- with regard to constituency services, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed? That's your motion, Frank?

(Motion carried)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, on the question of constituency offices as well, I have a memo here from LeRoy Fjordbotten in which he says that without some additional services, his constituency office will be totally useless. I don't know whether he underlined "useless" or I did; I think he did. The first thing he mentions is postage.

He says: My office is being set up for one reason only, and that's to make it possible for me to handle a volume of mail when I'm not in Edmonton. In a rural setting I can't put an office in one town and not another, so the office is only a convenience to store materials and handle mail. Without postage, how can an office carry on this service?

He realizes there is an abuse, but he doesn't think it would be significant. The other thing he wants is photocopying. He says: In this day and age, an office without photocopying isn't effective or efficient.

Would you like to have those items considered either by the umbrella of that previous motion?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, if I may, perhaps I could just speak to the point of the constituency office. I guess I've probably had one going longer than anyone else, or than most. I would seriously question the value of it in an Edmonton constituency. But I would say that those same resources available to me in this building would make me much more efficient. Right now I find I'm in three places, which makes me harder to find for my constituents, and less effective in any one. That's my home, here, and my constituency office. So I think the ambient of looking at Bill 74 in view of providing better services to our constituents should be looked at in -- would have merit in looking at it in a broader sense. Because right now I see spending \$10,000 of the taxpayers' money at very marginal benefit, whereas perhaps half a man-year, person-year, available to me in this building would be more effective for me, my constituents, and the taxpayers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: George, would you like to be the sponsor of a motion that would add the question of postage and photocopying in constituency offices to the concerns being considered under Frank's motion?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, I don't think we should be specific in my motion. I didn't intend to; I said "constituency services". These things are all . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I'm concerned about, Frank, is that we might overlook some of these topics when we go at it, and I think it might be . . .

MR. APPLEBY: I think we can start making a list of them -- Donna can do that -- the ones that have been mentioned. So far, these items have surfaced.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Between now and the time that we eventually discuss this, I would hope that you would circulate, as they come in to you, things that are raised by the members. Then we'll have read it and thought about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well then, should my answer to LeRoy be that his concerns will be reviewed in connection with the general review of the amendments made by Bill 74?

MR. APPLEBY: I would think so.

MR. GOGO: Frankly, before we close the topic, we've come all the way from the position of beg, borrow, and steal some accommodation with which to interview a constituent or group of constituents, to a pure extension of the Legislative Assembly in terms of members' offices. I guess that's what concerns me. I have a sympathy for LeRoy and other members, but frankly I'm a little frightened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going a long way.

MR. GOGO: Because in next year's estimates I'll probably move an amendment that MLAs do not receive indemnities but they receive salaries, because very clearly they become employees, and they want all the attributes that go with those. Frankly, I am nervous about whoever follows me as the Member for Lethbridge West. I'll be speaking that way when we deal with it.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, I think this will get due consideration at that time. I appreciate the restrictions of time we're into today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what do you think, then, about the caucuses developing some positions as to principles that should apply in the extension of services

in constituency offices? How far should it go? Would you like to sponsor a motion like that, Connie?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, I think it's inherent that when we come to a meeting, if we know ahead of time what's going to be discussed, that we've consulted our colleagues.

AN HON. MEMBER: We can do that before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know. But I think it might be useful, if you agree, that the caucuses give this some consideration, because you've indicated some real concern, John, and I'm sure that it's shared.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I agree, because I was sitting here thinking: what is the expense allowance we're given for, if not to . . . So we're wandering into a gray area, and maybe we're almost going to get into a black and white side on one side or another.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, I think in that memo of LeRoy's that that's a factor that comes out pretty loud and clear. If you're going to be using your own expense allowance, you're not going to have any abuse, are you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. On the other hand some people -- especially if you make it even across the board, the city MLAs are going to be overfunded.

MR. APPLEBY: I think most of them will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Especially the ones in Edmonton. Is there anything else about constituency offices? Okay.

Now, Chamber renovations. I think you got my report and memo on that. We've got several things coming up in the Chamber. One of the urgent things -- we haven't funding, but there is an indication that we might be favorably considered for a special warrant, provided this committee approves the idea -- what we had in mind was to go to a maximum of four architects and get their views as to what we should be doing, first and foremost with regard to replacing the soundproofing material. Now, if we judge from what's been done before, this is going to be something that's going on for a long time. But there has been a suggestion made by the architect engaged by Government Services that we should perhaps be considering wooden panelling around the walls. It's a little bit drastic, perhaps. It may be in keeping with what was originally intended when the Chamber was built; I don't know. A study that has been made -- a master's paper that was done on the legislature buildings of the four western provinces -- indicates that there was a change of architects here while this one was under construction, and perhaps the original theme wasn't continued. How valid that is, I don't know. It's not a statement; it's only a doubt that was expressed.

So what we were thinking of was . . . Well, I discussed this with an architect first of all, whom I know well -- and who incidentally refused to go on the list; it would just be too obvious if he made a recommendation and then were one of the guys down on the list, so neither he nor his firm will agree to go on the list. But what he suggested was that we pick four architects who are known for having a reasonable amount of interest in older buildings and tradition and offer them a fee of, say, \$2,500 each for the purpose of doing a study of the Chamber and coming up with recommendations with the possibility, although not the assurance, that if a (inaudible) the architect who made it might then be charged with carrying it through.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in light of the time -- and I read your memos carefully where you raised this -- I'll tell you my view. I partially share your view, let's say that. Since we are going through these renovations outside and so on, I think that we should endeavor to have a flavor carried through and have some consistency. I don't know this person that's working right now for the government at all, but I would like to see that person develop several suggestions for renovations to be brought to this committee. I don't feel comfortable with getting more people involved and spending that kind of time; I'm just not sure that's the kind of thing we should be putting our heads to. I realize it's very important, but to get into having bids submitted and plans coming from different people, I would like to see, within the kind of design that's now going on and with that in mind, that person submit something that would be compatible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well frankly, I would find it a little tenuous to have to connect the decor of the Chamber with what's going on across the moat.

MR. APPLEBY: What are we doing about installation of the canopy on the Speaker's chair, Gerry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there are two considerations that make this urgent -- and my own feeling is that this should be done independently of government, that it should be by this committee and it shouldn't be done, for example, by an architect whose time is taken up by all sorts of government considerations, although we should certainly listen to what he has to say. But there's the canopy that's going in and the soundproofing on the walls, which a number of people, I think, have said is unsightly, and I agree. The reason for stalling that -- well, you know what it is from the memo that I sent around. We've got to the point now where that excuse or reason for not going on with it no longer exists. There simply doesn't seem to be any likelihood of any technology being available in the near future that will enable us to get the cameras and all the gear out of the Chamber. We're going to have to have them in there, or else have no television.

So I think the importance of the Chamber is such that we should not be limited to the ideas of one person. We're dealing with something that is a very central part of the heritage of the province; and as I mentioned in my memo, outside of places of worship it's definitely the most important room in the province. I think it would warrant getting the opinions of a maximum of four people who have some concern about tradition, antiquity, and older buildings.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Are you saying that this person who's working for us right now isn't of that sort of group?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. He wasn't on the list that was given to me. I didn't make any suggestions on the list. Certainly we could see what his ideas are. In fact, the wood panelling is his suggestion.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Would there not be a number of factors to be taken into consideration as to the complete atmosphere of the Assembly, the building, the construction features that perhaps somebody who has been employed on contract would be familiar with as far as wiring, heating, all these sorts of things that will have to be taken into consideration?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly when the work is done it will have to be done by someone who has some rapport with the people. We're not at the stage now, as I see it, where we ask somebody to do the work. What we're after is concepts.

I'm sure that there isn't going to be any problem as far as wiring is concerned, and we're not going to be doing anything structural, although structural details are easily available in floor plans and so on. What we really need is concepts. Milt?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, as a visitor please forgive me for my participations here. But I spent a number of years involved in the Old Strathcona Foundation, and the matter of having an architect who is both sensitive and knowledgeable in the challenges of working with old buildings -- particularly the interiors, which have implications in terms of the type of woodwork and that -- is not insignificant. I think that the scale of the outside is totally unrelated to the scale inside and the sensitivities. So I think it's a most wise move; I think there is a developing expertise in Edmonton in architects on old buildings, and possibly in Calgary too with some of the things I've seen there. So I would support it highly, based on my background with the Old Strathcona Foundation, as its being both necessary and important in a historical sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The urgency of it is that -- I realize that we're running out of time -- the city will probably want to present the canopy on September 1. I have sent word out to the people who, as far as I know, are organizing the events of that day. We will have present here, under the auspices of CPA, three members from each of the other parliaments in Canada, including three from the House of Commons and three from the Senate. The preliminary information we have is that if we don't get cracking just about right away, there's no real hope of having this done for September 1. So that's the urgency of it, and that's why I sent the memo out ahead of time. I did get an indication from two or three of the members of the committee that they approved this, but since they didn't all approve, I felt that I had to leave it go until the meeting.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Maybe I'm misunderstanding you. I thought we were talking about replacing that terrible material we've got on the walls, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: We're not talking about doing anything to it structurally; it's all just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, structural is out.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's redecoration.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It's just a redecoration inside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the decor in the interior of the Chamber.

MRS. OSTERMAN: You're not going to change anything except for those walls, that wall part, and behind your chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, the whole idea arose out of the suggestion by this architect who was working for the government that we should consider the wood panelling and that it should be extended to the back of the Speaker's chair, the wall behind the Speaker's chair, behind those four columns. That scared me a little bit, you know, the consequences of that. Everything that's been done in the Chamber so far has really not caused any drastic change. If anything, it's sort of increased the harmony of it. But this goes a little

further, and that's why I thought, although it's a worth-while idea, that we should independent advice about it, and include at the same time -- because these people will all study the Chamber; they'll probably read up on its tradition and history. They'll likely be interested to know that we're increasing the membership gradually about every eight years and so on, and the possibility of improving the arrangements for the sound system. I would think that it could be worth our while, and that we do have a possibility of getting this in place for September 1 for our birthday.

MR. CHALMERS: Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that both the proposed design competition and the actual renovations could be completed by September 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's what I was told: if we started right away. It's going to be tight, but I was told we could do it if we started right away.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: We'll all come back with ideas to this table, and then we'll make decisions, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: See, we would ask them to be back by the end of April.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But we're going to have to put funds out to get them to do this. Is that what you're saying?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, there's no doubt. The suggestion is that they'd each get \$2,500, and that they'd be asked to have their plans in by the end of April or, say, the first week in May. Then we would come back to this committee -- possibly the best way would be to have a special meeting to deal with it.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Well, maybe I'm a little naive, but do I just understand that all we're going to replace is that -- what looks like gunny sacking on the walls?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the suggestion was that we might go to wood panelling.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Yes, but just to replace that portion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not structural changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, and behind.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: All the way around the Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. If we did that, that would be a very, very noticeable change.

MR. APPLEBY: That was a suggestion on the part of the government-contracted architect. Now, if that wasn't acceptable, or if we didn't feel that we wanted to agree to that, then no doubt he would be quite happy to come with some other suggestion, would he not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suppose he would, but Frank, I'm very reluctant to see us do anything in there on the advice of one person. You know there have been some things gone on in this building, some of the painting and stuff that has been done here, on that kind of advice, and I really think that we should go with the utmost caution. If there's a doubt as to being more or less cautious, it should be decided on the basis of being more cautious.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would say first of all: I agree this committee should be involved. Secondly, I'm just not sure, and I'm not comfortable, for whatever reason, with going to some sort of competition and laying out money in that regard. I don't really understand the implications of it. To me, it's not as broad -- I'm not convinced that it's that broad in terms of replacing, either with new material or wood or whatever. I would like to see some ideas brought forward. I would like to sit down with a person who is working for the government right now and get some advice -- I don't know how costly it would be; we wouldn't have to shell out any great quantity of money -- just in terms of round-the-table discussion as to what really is involved and the kind of costs we might be looking at, in order that we rationalize the spending, right off the top, of \$10,000 to even get a design for that. I mean, I appreciate the history and everything else to do with it, but I find that to be a too extensive thing. I'm not convinced of that, and I would like to be convinced of that.

MR. CHALMERS: Mr. Chairman, isn't there a presumption in what you're saying that once the question of what goes on the walls gets put up for grabs, really what may become necessary is a comprehensive redecoration of the whole room?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the thing is that in fact it was Government Services that pressed to have that pleating replaced. I said, hold on; there's not going to be anything done in here without the consent of the Speaker and the Members' Services Committee. It was in the course of those discussions that the question of the panelling came along.

There's another point in it as well; it's a matter of principle. We have an architect who is engaged by the government. He's going to be doing various things in this building. And I really think we should be on neutral grounds. I think we should get an architect who is not engaged by the government.

MR. APPLEBY: But even so, this architect who is engaged by the government, as long as he is reporting to this committee and we are discussing his ideas and modifying or not accepting and having him re-do them and come back with different ones and so on and so forth, would we not be achieving the same objective?

MR. CHAIRMAN: By no means, because we get one man's opinion, or one firm's opinion. I would be most reluctant to act on that without having a check. So what would happen would be that we could go ahead and possibly within the next three or four weeks get this man's proposal as to what should go on in the Chamber. Then I would predict with some degree of confidence that we would look at that, and I hope we wouldn't decide on our own, with our various degrees of expertise, that we would just do that on the basis of one man's opinion. Then we would say, well now, let's get some other opinions on this, because of its critical importance. What I'm suggesting is, instead of going through that exercise: we have his general suggestion; let's go and get the other opinions right off.

MR. GOGO: The issue seems to be the money. There's no question that whatever we do is going to be there for 25 years. So perhaps the money doesn't sound nearly as important as the principle of having the independent . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a lot of money; it's \$10,000.

MR. GOGO: Three or four people's opinions. Yes, I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it's a most important room in the province, and I really think that to act responsibly, we really have to keep that uppermost in our minds.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, I guess because I don't know why, Mr. Chairman, \$2,500 per idea -- if that's legitimate. I would just like to discuss this with somebody that's familiar with this area. Because I'm really uncomfortable with it; I really am.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, suppose you got it done for \$2,200 each, or \$1,800 each?

MRS. OSTERMAN: But you see, you're picking -- we get a suggestion about who this should be presented to. We could be accused of not making it broad enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I shouldn't . . . I'm cutting George off.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Of course, maybe things have changed a lot in the last few years, but I'm going back to my years on council. Could these people not submit proposals, and then the winning proposal get paid? Could the others not submit proposals?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a way of doing it, but my advice from this architect was that that would perhaps not elicit very many responses because the architects are busy enough that they're not prepared to do a heck of a lot of work on spec, on the chance of getting paid for it if they win (inaudible). So the idea of saying it's too limited and going to all the architects in the province and offering them to participate in this competition, from what I understand, is absolutely not practical. So the only alternative is to get a reasonable number who have some interest in this area, and to say to them: look, we'll pay you for your proposal and if we like it you might get the work.

MR. PAHL: The advantage that has, Mr. Chairman, is that you own the ideas, in a sense; that you can use the best of the group and not have any obligation. Maybe the numbers are high, but I don't think the amount is, nor the concept.

MRS. OSTERMAN: You see, I think the Chairman makes such an important point about the importance of the room that I would think it would be a great honor. I would think that some architects, if we were to put it open, would be pleased to be able to say they in fact had submitted a design that was most acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you know, I canvassed that, and I was advised that that was not practical.

MR. PAHL: The other point -- and forgive me, but in the consulting business it takes \$2,500 to \$5,000 just to present any kind of proposal. So \$2,500 is not doing anything but recognizing some . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the way the thing sits now, we're going to have the pleating in there for the next year or two; that's for sure.

MR. GOGO: On a point of order, before Connie leaves; I know the government members have to get to their caucus and I really don't want to interrupt. There were two other items of business that I wanted the committee to hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have note of them, John.

MR. GOGO: One was the photograph of the members of this Legislature, which I think is essential. It wasn't done last time. I don't know when our next meeting is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we did it with a montage.

MR. GOGO: And I would like to see it done. That's one point. The other point was: I've had a concern by two MLAs that they would like to see some provision for messenger service in the city. That is, if there's a document they want at Government House -- and God knows they spend enough time there -- there's presently no system of delivery. There is out of ministerial offices, but not out of members' offices.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Can we call another meeting quickly, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Any suggestions as to time?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm amenable to that, another noon hour very quickly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Any time for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about week after next?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I've got to get (inaudible) for my caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Week after next?

MR. GOGO: Sure, fine. No problem with me.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: What day next week?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest week after next.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, the Monday-Tuesday-Wednesday is out because of the premiers' conference. I'm away for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about two weeks from today?

AN HON. MEMBER: 21-22-23 is out for me.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're not here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not here?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not until the afternoon of the 23rd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I come in in the morning.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: What about next week? Are you going to be away next week?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I'll be here. It's a week from this week-end that I'm going.

MR. GOGO: Well, next week's fine with me.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I won't be here on the 16th, but any other day next week would be all right for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what about a noon meeting, say, a week from tomorrow?

MR. GOGO: Well, Thursdays are bad, as you know, because we're in caucus till 12:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, is Wednesday the best day?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Wednesday would be all right for me; it's Tuesday that I have to be away, the 16th.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Tuesday's the 15th.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Yes, that would be all right for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next Tuesday? Well, the premiers' conference is on, eh?

MR. GOGO: No, 21-22-23. Next Tuesday is the 15th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well is next Wednesday out? Oh, it's out for you, George.

MR. GOGO: The days that are out are Monday and Thursday for me, so Tuesday's fine with George, Tuesday's fine with me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it's not fine with you, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday I have got another meeting on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, could we have one early in the morning, or right after the session was over at 5:30?

AN HON. MEMBER: Well there's Sheila Embury or Shirley Cripps or seven other chairmen, so those days are booked solid from their end. They get priority. Noons are the best time, frankly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To me it looks like two weeks from today.

MR. GOGO: I'm in Lethbridge that day, the 23rd.

MR. CHALMERS: I don't suppose tomorrow morning is any good?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'd like to get the minutes done.

MR. CHALMERS: I thought the next meeting was going to be a continuation of this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about tomorrow morning?

AN HON. MEMBER: Caucus tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. Sure, it's Thursday. Well, the only thing I can see is three weeks from today. Well, unless I hear otherwise: three weeks from today, lunch again? Okay? A little earlier, you say, John? Monday morning? We won't get Fred Mandeville. We used to try for Mondays and we never got Fred and he hasn't changed his habits.

MR. CHALMERS: Well, I liked your \$10,000 idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the soundproofing is going to be in there for another year, that's for sure.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.