

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Tuesday, July 29, 1980

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

6:15 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: Item one is the minutes of the last meeting. Comments, or a motion for adoption or amendment? Mr. Gogo. All in favor? Okay.

We have no other visitors at the meeting, so we can skip over item two. Business arising out of the minutes, under tab 3a in your book: I've written three memos to Mr. Harle. I've had no answer. I don't know what the next move is. The background on this, as a number of you may know -- the immediate background is a motion by Mrs. Osterman, I think, which we all agreed with, that we should try to have representation on the security committee, or at least be notified when the meetings are, and so on. Going back further into the background, prior to that motion, there was a time when security was practically exclusively in the hands of government, even to the extent that commissionaires who looked after the galleries and the Chamber were engaged by government. Then there was some recognition given to our being a parliament and we started engaging our own commissionaires. Subsequently, after some insistence I think, we were assured that there would be continuing consultation with the Speaker's or the Clerk's office, mainly the Clerk's office I think, on the question of security. There hasn't been a great deal of that.

I don't know what the committee would like to do in regard to this matter. If you want to discuss the question of security generally, there have been a couple of recent incidents that some of you may have heard of. One of them is described under item 3a in the form of a memo of July 18, 1980, from Mr. Stefaniuk to me. That relates to a Saturday morning when the Clerk's secretary came back to work here. Apparently there wasn't a great deal of coverage at the main entrance.

MR PURDY: This would be the time, Mr. Chairman, when the doors were normally open for visitors?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right. In addition, there is a further memorandum, that you can see below it, of the same date, from the Clerk to me, regarding the incident which consisted of breaking into the personnel files in Miss Blaney's office on the 5th floor. Miss Blaney's memo is below that, dated July 14. The Clerk took the matter up with Mr. Walter Loshny, the government's chief of security for the building. You can see Mr. Loshny's reply, also dated July 18, the Clerk's memo that raised that reply having been dated July 16.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, those last memos to which you referred were in connection with special security which we felt was essential for the temporary balcony which was erected for the purposes of the Princess's visit to the Legislature last Friday, July 25. Perhaps I might add to that that since the visit has occurred, the building superintendent has approached me as to the feasibility of leaving that platform in place until September 1, when some ceremonies are to take place on the south grounds of the Legislature in commemoration of the provinces 75th Anniversary. I expressed to him my concerns about security in the event that platform or balcony were to be left in place and recommended that at the very least the stairs be removed and

replaced when necessary, since removal of the stairs might prove to be a deterrent to a would-be, uninvited visitor to the Library premises. I also suggested to him that the possibility might have to be considered of posting a guard in the Library at such times when the Library staff was not normally there.

If I may be allowed, perhaps I should record, for purposes of the record of proceedings, that concern which I mentioned informally earlier; that is, the vandalism which occurred to the automobile of the Leader of the Opposition on the grounds of the Legislature during this last weekend, in that all the windows of the car were entirely smashed; further that when one of my staff attempted to park in the space allocated to her immediately below my office on Monday morning, she could not do so because the area was strewn with broken beer bottles.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Those all take a little noise, don't they?

MR CHAIRMAN: It seems that we do have, I think, some responsibility for security, for both the government side and the opposition side as a Legislature, or for the Legislature itself. When security was under the previous Solicitor General, Mr. Farran, we just had outright, categorical assurance -- I could get the memo for you -- of ongoing consultation. I don't know whether there has been a change in policy or what the reason is that we're not getting any reply to three memos written on behalf of a committee of the House. I'd be glad to know what your wishes might be in this regard.

MR PURDY: Just on another subject but still in relation to security. I've come in the building here after hours, or after the doors are locked -- after the tours are over -- and there have been new security people on the front desk who don't know me from Adam. I walk in and say, good evening, sir, how are you. They don't question me or anything; I just walk on by. I think we have to re-vamp that end of it too. A guy could ring the doorbell and walk in.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right. They have pictures. They don't have a good picture of you?

MR PURDY: No, they don't have a good picture of me. They haven't taken a picture of me in this building since 1973. There's no way a guy can study 75 pictures and be new on the job and know that's a member of the Assembly, as far as I'm concerned. He's got to be pretty darned astute.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, if you like -- I really think it wouldn't be a good thing . . . I'm afraid we may have some more incidents and then blame ourselves for not having done what I conceive to be our duty in this regard.

MR PURDY: I'm suggesting that we beef up the security on the front door. I'm not going to be embarrassed if I'm asked who I am. I'm part of the building here and if someone asks me that, I got no qualms about that whatsoever. Secondly, if you're not getting the answers from Mr. Harle's office, we should hold another meeting, requesting he be at it, and find out: has there been a change of policy within his office or not?

MR CHAIRMAN: We've had him here before. If you like, I'd be glad to pursue it on an informal basis, in a number of directions.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, if we have some concerns about security -- and from what has been noted in the book here and a lot of things said, we probably

have -- would it not be proper then for us to come up with what we think should be done, in the way of making some recommendations to the Solicitor General; you know, come up with something specific in this respect.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're asking me, I'd have to agree, except I'd have some misgiving as to the amount of attention that might get, having regard to our memos not having been so much as acknowledged. Also, I think it would be more feasible for us to be able to make recommendations if we knew what existing plans were, so we would be able to pinpoint possible shortcomings.

MR GOGO: Further to what Bill has said, wouldn't it be wise to have the Solicitor General here again -- I don't recall last time he was here -- and at that time have the points itemized? The difficulty I have is reconciling in my mind areas of responsibility. I haven't seen the written policy, but I look at the Legislature Grounds, the Legislative Assembly building, and the Legislative Chamber, and I say: who is responsible for what? We've heard incidents here that concern the outside of the building. Bill made a remark. I was in here on Sunday, didn't have my key, and asked someone to open the door and wasn't challenged or questioned.

MR CHAIRMAN: But were you known by the person who let you in?

MR GOGO: I hadn't seen that person before, but that doesn't mean . . . All I'm saying is -- that, to me, is another matter when it comes to members' offices. It seems to me there are three distinct areas: one is the grounds, another is this building and the staff within it, and the other is the members themselves and their property. Quite frankly, I'm confused as to who has what responsibility in terms of policy.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you like me to pursue it on an informal basis and see if I can get some answers, if I can speak to the minister. I felt that the memos, since they were based on a properly passed resolution of this committee, that it should be done by memo. If you like, I'll see what I can get by way of informal follow-up. Perhaps then I could share that with the members of the committee.

MR PURDY: I would so move that those are the steps we take.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for Bill's motion? All those in favor?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The next item is Chamber renovations. That's one we have had a number of times. There is some material under that, under 3b. There was a motion in April that we have the government architect come in and deal with this topic at a meeting; that motion was defeated. That didn't exclude the possibility of bringing some plans in, and I've done that. If you'd like to look at those plans, we can do that now and then decide what you would like to do. Is that agreeable?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR STEFANIUK: That is one rendering.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is that to house the new canopy?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, that's incorporating the new canopy, which has been constructed. I have seen the new canopy. That is another rendering, which takes care of the ceiling and the end panels. I have a drawing here which I just received about 4 o'clock this afternoon. That provides for basically an enclosure for the TV cameras which are on the floor. In your books, you will see a memo of transmittal from the deputy minister of Government Services to me of certain plans, which in fact are contained in these books. I don't have enough for everyone, but perhaps I can pass them around and ask you to please share them.

MRS OSTERMAN: That changes the ceiling also, eh?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, it does. The way I received those plans, and while I appreciated that a decision had not been reached by any means as to what would be done with them, I had several concerns myself, which I raised with the architect and with the deputy minister of Government Services. Those areas concerned lighting levels; the future size of the Chamber, i.e. requirements for the future, because there are two floor plans in this book, you will note -- one providing for the existing floor area and one providing for an expanded floor area. Thirdly, I was very much concerned about considerations of the acoustical qualities which might be affected by these proposed renovations. So I raised those three questions with the architect and he replied to me today and, in my estimation, has satisfactorily answered my concerns. If you wish I can share them with you, but perhaps in the meantime you would like to take a moment to look at these proposals.

MRS OSTERMAN: What is the expanded number?

MR PURDY: From 75 to 148; double it.

MR APPLEBY: That's a hundred years from now, is it?

MR STEFANIUK: That was one of the things I raised with the architect. I said, why are you proposing two different floor plans? Why would you not go ahead with the larger floor plan now if we anticipate growth in the size of the Assembly? He answered me today. He consulted the Chief Electoral Officer and they have looked at projected populations figures. Currently we have a population of 2,069,000 in Alberta, served by 79 members. The projected population for the year 2006 is 4,194,000; so, double the existing population within the next 26 years. But no one can predict what kind of representation this province will decide upon. If we consider what we have at the moment, on the basis of the same formula we could be looking at a Legislature of 180 members. However, that is not necessarily the case, because when we consider that Ontario has a population in excess of 8 million, it is represented by 125 members. I believe that is similar in Quebec. In British Columbia we have a larger population than Alberta's is at present and represented by 55 members. The opposite number is perhaps Prince Edward Island, with a very tiny population, represented by 35 members. So the ratio of population to member is much smaller in P.E.I.

So we're unable to predict when the need might arise for a larger floor area than what presently exists in the Chamber. However, it's anticipated that if we removed the cameras we have and change that over to remote cameras, which would be in some concealed areas, and remove the provision for TV cameras on the floor of the House, that House could grow to 90 seats, within the existing walls.

MR CHAIRMAN: Be a little cramped.

AN HON MEMBER: Not really.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, it would only be 11 more seats. You could put them over there behind where the Sacred opposition is now.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. You have a row there, and where the Sergeant-at-Arms is stationed. That is not a traditional location; the Sergeant-at-Arms is traditionally on the floor of the House, near the main entrance. That could probably quite easily accommodate 11 more seats. Our net growth in the last redistribution was four. There is a redistribution following every second election, or 10 years, whichever comes sooner.

MR APPLEBY: I wouldn't anticipate you would see a very great growth in numbers; rather you'll see a trend, which is almost in effect right now, of full-time working MLAs rather than something of a part-time occupation.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that what has been presented answers the directive of the members of this committee from the last meeting. The plans are hereby presented.

MRS OSTERMAN: It would be nice to have the people here to answer questions.

MR STEFANIUK: Perhaps you could try me. I have had some discussions with them. I'm not sure that I can answer all your questions, or any of them for that matter.

MR GOGO: There are no structural changes outside of the canopy, if that's considered structural.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, it wouldn't be structural, unless you go for the larger floor area.

MR GOGO: It's really the wall panelling, the finish on the ceiling . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: The end mural or whatever it is -- is that a mural or painting?

MR STEFANIUK: At both ends.

MR APPLEBY: If you went to the larger floor area, would there be any provision -- it would be this over here as far as galleries are concerned?

MR STEFANIUK: Still the same galleries are foreseen. We'd be going under the galleries at that stage. If you'll look at the main floor area, you'll note that with an expanded Chamber, that calls for the removal of what is presently the Clerk's office and the meeting room which is located in 312. All those facilities disappear.

MR APPLEBY: The architects who drew up these alternatives are of course not involved in any way with making provision for where the Clerk would go.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That puts quite an onus on us, to properly pick out the design, the size for the future. I would think that would be a long way down the road before it would require any more than 11 more.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question would be how much we could justify spending now, with the anticipation that in perhaps 20 years -- you know, if we were going to go for the larger floor area. But as you say, Frank, if we went up to 90

and possibly slightly larger populations in each constituency, we could probably make do with our present space. We obviously can't go into increasing the floor area now without also going into where the Clerk is going to go.

MR APPLEBY: Taking 11 more possibles as a basis, and if you look at three distribution periods -- this could run anywhere up to 30 years, 24 to 30 years -- and if you added the same amount as we had last time, four, this would not even take care of it -- for the next 25 to 30 years.

MR CHAIRMAN: In that case, we could perhaps be less reluctant to do something pretty worth while with what is there.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure in terms of time -- and Frank's projections are quite accurate. But it seems to me that if there were to be a modest upgrading of the inside, which needs doing so badly, it isn't as if there has been a great deal of money spent -- then all that work would have to be undone at another time.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think if we went into the wood panelling and made it match the desks, or vice versa, we'd be running into a lot of money.

MRS OSTERMAN: What do we mean by a lot? When I look at the area to be covered, it doesn't seem to be that great.

MR CHAIRMAN: As I say, when you consider that apart from places of worship it is the most important room in the province . . .

MR PURDY: No estimate of cost?

MR CHAIRMAN: I think it would be a little too soon until we had a general idea where we were going. It would cost something to work that out.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm just not sure about the ceiling and murals in terms of overall concept. There are obviously native people and . . .

MR STEFANIUK: That's art, and I would think that normally art selection is performed by a special committee; you know, some very serious decisions and recommendations made. All I can tell you about the ceiling is that it's foreseen that the lighting in the ceiling would be changed entirely from the exposed bulbs to an indirect form of lighting. That is what is foreseen. Access to that lighting would be made available through the top structure. There is a metal structure in that barrel-shaped dome. The result would be that the maintenance men could get into the area quite readily and change lights as they burned out, as opposed to going through the current exercise of putting up a scaffold once a year and changing the 600 bulbs and then once any one of them burned, we live with it until the next time the scaffold comes in. As I say, that's one of the areas I questioned: the intensity of the lighting in those circumstances. It concerned me as to whether the members, with that kind of proposal, would have adequate lighting for working; secondly, whether the TV people would have adequate light to serve their requirements. The answer I have on that, to quote: the present system is only capable of providing something in the neighborhood of 12 to 15 foot-candles at desk level. The projected system will provide in excess of 50 foot-candles, with capabilities being extended to over 100 for television purposes. This is to be achieved by use of dimmer switching.

So I'm told, then, that the lighting in fact would be increased, with a capacity to adjust. One of my concerns was the effect of the proposed mahogany panelling on the lighting level; it would absorb light. The answer I have is the effect of the mahogany panelling on the proposed lighting levels should be negligible. The psychological effect of the wood panelling on the feeling of spaciousness will be eliminated by the lighting systems and by the introduction of the cool receding blues in place of the warm advancing reds. The television image of the members will be enhanced by the background of exotic wood; the darker background is one of the tricks of Karsh -- end of quote.

MRS OSTERMAN: If it makes us look better, I'm wholly for it. I would think that they've researched effects of lighting on people. I'm one of these people who had to have the fluorescent tubes taken out of my office because I get a tremendous headache. I would just hate to think that that style of light, or something akin to it, were introduced.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm sorry, I can't answer that. I know there are variations in types of fluorescent tubing. I believe in the Speaker's office we had some different or softer type of fluorescence installed. I'm not knowledgeable, and I don't by any means attempt to give the impression that I'm knowledgeable in those areas. As I said earlier, I perhaps have some of the questions answered for you, if I happen to have thought of them and asked them myself. Otherwise, I don't.

MR APPLEBY: What is the thinking behind moving the TV cameras from inside the Assembly?

MR STEFANIUK: That was one of the questions I asked, because the plan -- and you have the floor plan in front of you -- which calls for the removal of the TV cameras . . . If you look at the existing floor plan, in other words, the current size of the room . . . I enquired what they proposed to place in those TV areas -- you see them designated on the plan -- because that would come right out into the existing hallway, and frankly I couldn't see it. Two people have difficulty getting by each other as it is. They said to me, well, we're looking at remote control TV; in other words, the same principle which is applied in the House of Commons in Ottawa, where the House controls the film-making equipment and provides the media with the film copy, unedited. I said to them, we have made no change in policy, insofar as TV coverage of this House is concerned and you can't make that assumption in presenting any plan. You have to assume that we're going to carry on with the present policy whereby electronic media representatives are allowed on the floor of the House, and TV reporting is carried in Alberta at no direct cost to the taxpayer; in other words, the funds are not public funds. Until someone tells me there has been a change in that policy, I can't make that assumption. That resulted in that second drawing, which I showed you earlier, which showed a balcony or enclosed area in the House for the TV cameras.

MR CHAIRMAN: Which could have wood panelling on it, matching the wood panelling on the remainder of the walls and render the TV positions fairly inconspicuous.

MRS OSTERMAN: Why are there so many people from the press down at floor level who have nothing to do with the cameras?

MR STEFANIUK: There is a producer and cameraman for each station.

MRS OSTERMAN: There are people taking notes.

MR STEFANIUK: Those are the producers.

MRS OSTERMAN: And they can't do that . . .

MR STEFANIUK: They're using sound recording equipment as well. You see, they're directing the cameraman as to what they want him to take.

MRS OSTERMAN: I see. I've noticed so much fumbling around. That is very distracting, in my estimation. I wondered if it was because of the numbers. You know, they're jockeying around there and something gets knocked over.

MR CHAIRMAN: I question the absolute essentiality of that. If we use that sort of parapet construction and they found there wasn't enough room for the producers and just enough for the cameramen, I don't think I would shed too many tears.

MRS OSTERMAN: As long as the producer could be of assistance somewhere, you know, if they have earphones on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Or do without a producer. My gosh, surely after they have been there for a while . . .

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I could sit there in my desk and tell them some of the things not to look at.

MR STEFANIUK: What we had hoped, if the Chamber were enlarged as per the second plan, is that the TV equipment could be placed behind windowed areas, so it wouldn't be in the Chamber at all.

MR CHAIRMAN: Remember some meetings ago, I reported that we had made enquiries about how far remote lens TV was away, and it's apparently still some distance away. So I think we have to do without it in the foreseeable future.

MR GOGO: My concern is with the appearance of the Chamber, and I would be happy to see the walls refinished and the canopy. Frankly, I hadn't even considered the ceiling. I'm happy with the light bulbs.

MR CHAIRMAN: A lot of people like those light bulbs. Lots of visitors remark favorably about that.

MR GOGO: The acoustics factor, with the carpeted floor, is not significant in terms of bouncing off the walls, I don't think. But I would like to see it panelled and discussed after it's panelled.

MR PURDY: Taking into consideration what Frank said about a number of years down the road, well, the Chamber is big enough to accommodate it anyway.

MR GOGO: That means we'd get it done.

MR PURDY: Yes.

MR APPLEBY: If you hide the TV cameras, we're going to lose the advantage of your neighbor being able to say, smarten up, the camera's on you.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh no, they'll still show over the top of the . . . You just have to be careful when you scratch your tonsils.

MR GOGO: We're not directing them.

MR PURDY: That's right; let them do their own thing.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is a fairly momentous decision to make in regard to the Chamber. As you know, I suggested some time ago that we perhaps get several opinions about it.

MR APPLEBY: What time frame are we on, Mr. Chairman?

MR CHAIRMAN: Right now we wouldn't be able to do anything until next summer.

MR APPLEBY: So we have a chance to digest this for a while?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think it would be a good thing if the members of the committee had a chance to study it. If we're short copies, we can either get more or pass them around. If you like, we could take down names of those who take copies with them tonight, then maybe after a decent interval give them a reminder to pass them on to other members of the committee. I would like to see you give serious consideration to collecting other opinions. Once you've studied those, if you would like to know more or be in a position to do some shopping, that simply means there is more delay, whereas it could be going on right now. Considering the importance of the room and the projected cost, it seems very modest.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think that's enduring forever, and when you look at places, it doesn't matter how old, whether you're talking about 50 years . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I would like to get another opinion, frankly, on whether the wood would take away some of the feeling of space in the Chamber. As I understand it, it's a fairly elementary rule of interior decorating that the darker your walls, the closer in they appear to be, and the lighter they are, the farther away they seem to be.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, to get an opinion like that, you wouldn't require somebody to make a presentation like this.

MR CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, although my name is on that, that's not . . .

MR APPLEBY: No, but an interior decorator should be able to pass an opinion on the type of lighting and so on as far as the panelling is concerned.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think you'd have a little reluctance on the part of most interior decorators to second-guess an architect.

MR APPLEBY: That would mean we're into a grey area and another proposal such as this wouldn't be of much benefit either.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think it would, Frank. If we had two or three of these and had an opportunity to hear them, maybe at a special meeting, if necessary in a special room where the stuff could be displayed properly. I think we could profit from that. But I really don't think we should confine ourselves, on a thing as important as this, to one choice and one man's opinion, so to speak.

MR GOGO: Well, I wasn't urging you to accept my opinion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, I didn't mean your opinion.

MR GOGO: Seeing that we're going to discuss it then, would it be in order, Mr. Chairman, if we had -- I've been in three assemblies in the country -- if we had interior photographs of the 10 chambers in Canada, for my benefit? Are they available?

MR STEFANIUK: I have P.C. with me here this evening, in another connection -- to deal with the photographs of members.

MR GOGO: I would find that helpful. As I recall, Manitoba is dark, but it's great. But I would be interested in seeing . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Manitoba's is mainly drapery throughout the Chamber.

MR PURDY: Ontario is wood panelled.

MR APPLEBY: The House of Commons is drapery, isn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: The House of Commons is drapery behind the members' desks, at the lower level; other than that it is stone, very grey.

MR APPLEBY: I was thinking of that level.

MR STEFANIUK: The members disappear through the drapery to the back.

MR GOGO: There's such a richness about the wood, there's no doubt in my mind.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could bring the members up to date on the canopy itself. As I mentioned earlier, the canopy has been constructed. I have seen the structure in the city of Edmonton's shops. I personally am very impressed with it. I have seen a good part of the carvings and they are executed in an excellent fashion. The coat of arms which is currently in the Chamber is now being removed; the work was initiated yesterday. On August 11, the canopy will physically be brought into the Chamber and the installation process will commence. Of course it will be completed within a two-week period, and the official unveiling will take place on September 1, the anniversary date of the province's entry into Confederation.

MR GOGO: So at that point we'll have a wood canopy, with this background of wood.

MR STEFANIUK: No, the red drapes will still be in place. At that time we'll also have in place the Speaker's desk which is in the Chamber at the moment, and it occurs to me that that structure, being somewhat modernistic in its lines, including the arborité top, will in fact appear as a total eyesore in the Chamber. As part of this plan there is a proposal for a new desk. The two pages -- they're not numbered, I'm sorry -- which include the proposal for the desk are near the back of the book. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if members of the committee would care to examine those proposals and, while I appreciate that a decision as to the Chamber itself is being held, if a decision might be taken in respect of the desk so that that structure might appear better than it does presently in connection with the new canopy. Perhaps that portion of it could be executed. As you see, it's a free-standing item.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Could it be executed by the time the Chair was installed?

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not sure about that, but possibly by the time of the fall opening. We wouldn't have the desk in place for the canopy unveiling in any event, because the ceremony has been planned around that and requires direct access for unveiling purposes. But possibly that could be executed in time for the fall opening.

MR MANDEVILLE: I think you're just about going to have to make these (inaudible) once you get the canopy in there. If you don't, you're going to have a clash.

MRS OSTERMAN: It will take away from the . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The Clerk and I for some time have had misgivings about the desk. As far as the desk is concerned, it's very handy to have it there, but as far as the harmonizing in the room goes -- whatever happens it should be in harmony with what we ultimately do with the walls, if possible. Frankly, I rather favor the wood panelling, but I'm just apprehensive enough about doing something in this particular room that costs a lot of money that isn't right on, that I really would like to see us get some additional opinions, even if it were a couple of others.

MR GOGO: The solution is probably very obvious: we should have the members' spouses in and they could probably resolve it very quickly.

MR APPLEBY: Connie, do you think your spouse would do it?

MRS OSTERMAN: He sure as hell would. I think it would be quite in order for us to have the design people and possibly have a discussion at our next meeting, or are we going to be ready to do that then?

MR CHAIRMAN: Well it just depends. If you're going to go this route, if we're going to limit ourselves to this, then we follow along this line. But the thing that concerns me is the time we've lost over this so far and that if we're going to go this route and we find we're not quite happy and still have misgivings, to start then to get other proposals. First thing you know, we won't be ready to have it done next summer. That's why I'd like to see us get at least a couple of other proposals right now, then be in a position to compare them. I think the subject is important enough that we should have a special meeting for it.

MR GOGO: Just for my edification, and I'm only thinking in terms of the canopy and the walls. That's all I've ever thought about, not the ceiling or murals or anything. If it would be helpful, we could have that discussion, I guess. All I think of is you're either going to drape the walls or re-do the walls in that fashion. That's as far as my mind can go. I've already decided in my mind what I'd like to see in that Chamber. I want to see the richness of the wood that I see in our committee rooms. I think its beautiful.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're thinking of 312, for example?

MR GOGO: Yes. I know it's going to be (inaudible). I can appreciate that kind of thing. It has to be something that's grown in Alberta and marketed by (inaudible).

MR CHAIRMAN: Grown in Alberta?

MR STEFANIUK: All of this in the proposal is mahogany, I believe. The canopy is being carved out of Honduras mahogany.

MR GOGO: Do we own that?

MR CHAIRMAN: But they're going to make a heritage trust fund loan from us pretty soon, John.

MR GOGO: I've had my say.

MRS OSTERMAN: Very frankly, I guess mine was about the same as what John said. Because I'm fond of wood. I was always thinking in terms of material, stone, or wood. Marble is too much for that much, also for sound and all the other things I've read about. Material I dismiss for several other reasons. If you saw my home, you'd know I'm very fond of wood. I guess I feel the same way about here. I would be a little distressed at being asked an opinion on the ceiling and the ends, because I would place a great deal of importance in terms of what would be depicted, not who does it or exactly what it would look like. I think that where there is indeed a sense of history, as to what this Legislature would choose at this time to depict in such scenes. I find that to be the most important thing. I'm not prepared to address that at all without -- you know, if that's what is being desired right now. But I'm certainly prepared, very quickly, to address the bottom part of the Chamber and the panelling.

MR MANDEVILLE: It's definitely long-term isn't it? We're not looking at something for a few years. It's long-term. In my own eyes, that wood looks good. But is it the right design we want 30 years from now, or whenever? Would there be any advantage in looking at some other plans? It's something we will have to look at for many years. I really like that rich wood; I like all the design.

MR CHAIRMAN: So what would you propose, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: If there were another plan, I would certainly like to -- what are we talking about, \$10,000 for three plans?

MR CHAIRMAN: That was for four.

MR MANDEVILLE: Including this one?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, we really have had nothing to do with this one. This was done at the cost of Government Services. My name is on there, but I didn't request it. I merely acquiesced and said, if you want to do it, go ahead.

MR MANDEVILLE: Personally, I don't think \$10,000 would be a lot to spend if we're going to come up with a better design for our Legislative Assembly.

MR APPLEBY: We're looking at something long-term here.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are. That's what causes me concern.

MR APPLEBY: I don't think we need to be too concerned about how quickly we get into action here. I would really like some time to think about this one here, also time to think about those drawings and paintings that they've done. I would like to discuss it with these people too before we decide to go further afield.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you what would make me feel more comfortable. John's suggestion about pictures of the inside of other assemblies in the country would be one thing. I can't visualize in my mind's eye, as a result of the few I've seen, that there are that many options open to us, in terms of doing the bottom part of the Assembly. This is what I'm feeling right now. So I think those pictures of other interiors would be very helpful.

Along with that I would like to be able to discuss with whoever has designed this particular set of drawings those kinds of things, even though it may mean a month's delay or so. I would like to have that discussion before making any kind of decision as to whether I think we should have more options or whatever. I would like to do that at our next meeting, if it were possible.

MR PURDY: I think we should sit down with these people, have a look at it; have one special meeting. We've spent about three-quarters of an hour now on this, and haven't gone anywhere. We could spend another hour on this topic. My suggestion would be that we hold a special meeting of this committee to discuss it with these. As Frank has said, it's a long-term venture anyway. If we bring McIntosh and Workun in here and find, in our committee, that it's not satisfactory, then we can take your suggestion and go to industry again and ask a number of other architects to come forward with some proposals. The number of unanswered questions can be picked up through the secretary's notes or off the tape -- about lighting and many, many other things. That can be discussed at one special meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm not going to say it again; I've said it often enough. I just don't feel safe in looking at one option. I don't feel I'm enough of an architectural expert to envision what other options might be, without getting them from architects. Every architect is going to justify his own plan, so we can anticipate that.

Somebody want to move a motion?

MRS OSTERMAN: I'll move that, if possible, we obtain pictures from other assemblies. The size of the one you have is excellent. It gives us a pretty fair idea. I don't know if that's possible.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't know; we can only try.

MRS OSTERMAN: Also I would like to have whatever technical people and architects are necessary to discuss some of the questions we have raised here tonight, that those people might feel in terms of really presenting both the plans and answering questions in general.

MR CHAIRMAN: You've got a firm of architects here and you've got a firm of engineers.

MRS OSTERMAN: I suppose we should have one of each, at a minimum.

MR CHAIRMAN: So, you want photographs of the other assemblies across Canada, and you want to have a representative of the architects and of the engineers at a special meeting. Is that right? All in favor?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR APPLEBY: I know how they get by with 55 members in B.C. They have 14 pages, and we have only eight.

MR STEFANIUK: We have hard-working pages. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the committee wishes to give any consideration to the desk structure, regardless of whether any other decision is delayed.

MRS OSTERMAN: You're talking about the Speaker's desk?

MR STEFANIUK: The Speaker's desk at the top of the dais.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would suggest we hold off on that until we hear from the architects.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: If we were to go with this design, then it has to match.

MR CHAIRMAN: The color isn't going to be that far out, between the canopy and the desk.

MR STEFANIUK: What is planned at the moment is that the canopy would be matched to the mahogany doors which are in place. But insofar as color of the canopy is concerned, the architects have indicated to me that they would prefer to color it slightly lighter than the doors and, eventually, to restore the doors in a lighter shade of mahogany. If in fact the plan to panel the lower level of the Chamber were agreed to, they would prefer to go to a lighter shade of mahogany than what is on the doors at present. So the proposal is subject to approval by Mr. Speaker -- that the mahogany be colored somewhat lighter than the doors are at present. It is assumed that if a desk went into place, that would be matched to the canopy, since those two are in such close proximity to each other. It is also foreseen that canopy will cause the existing Speaker's chair to show its age, including the upholstery, which has faded. It is proposed that the chair be refinished in time for the canopy unveiling and that the color be matched to the canopy.

MR CHAIRMAN: Of course, I have designs on another chair. There is a chair that was the Northwest Territories chair, which was given back. It was given to the Speaker, Dr. Wilson, and his daughter gave it back. It's over at the museum now.

MR STEFANIUK: It's in a special display, as a matter of fact.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, and it's the one we should have back.

AN HON MEMBER: That motion we carried, Mr. Chairman, are we going to set a date at the end of the meeting for that meeting and the time, or . . .

MR APPLEBY: It's somewhat contingent on getting these photographs of it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. As soon as we get the photographs, eh?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Okay.

MR APPLEBY: You want me to go and take the pictures?

AN HON MEMBER: Sure.

MRS OSTERMAN: If Joe were here, he would say: you started out to buy a pair of shoes and you didn't have anything to go with the shoes, and when you bought the dress, by golly, the purse didn't match, and . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, there's a question of the issuance of large blocks of passes. As you know from the previous discussion, that is an eternal issue. It seems to me that the Clerk's office should be made responsible for the issuance of these passes, and that there should be some limit. Because as I mentioned to you, the temptation is for a member who might have something that he wants to make maximum political impact, to arrange for filling the galleries in the afternoon when he's about to read a petition or introduce a motion or make a speech of some kind. Looking down the road, with the way things are going -- we have things going on now, you know, that people didn't anticipate five or 10 years ago -- it would seem to me prudent if we had a practice in place. And it might even head off demonstrations in the galleries. That's one of the things I've been concerned about.

Could you make a note of the members who take along copies of those, so that we can be sure that they're passed around?

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we just pair up and promise then -- if we've looked at it for very long, our partner will certainly get after us and say, I want that book.

MR CHAIRMAN: So that one there is for George and Frank, and you and Bill have that one.

MR STEFANIUK: I think there is another one here.

MR GOGO: Well, I have a closed mind on the question, so give it to someone else.

MR STEFANIUK: And Mr. Mandeville has one.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. There's a spare one here, if somebody wants it. Anyway, to come back to the large blocks of passes.

MR GOGO: You know, we've discussed this, I would think, half a dozen times, Mr. Chairman. I don't think we've ever come up with some resolution to it. Unless somebody has something new and innovative in the way of ideas, I don't think there's much percentage in discussing it again.

MR APPLEBY: I don't either.

MR CHAIRMAN: Frank, it was your proposal that said, we table it until this meeting.

MR APPLEBY: Well, okay. I'm sorry. I didn't know we tabled it to this meeting. I thought we had just tabled it.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's in the verbatim report of the last meeting. Page 8.

MR APPLEBY: Well, I meant to have it tabled, period.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you mean you don't want to attend to it, or do you want the Clerk to work something out?

MR APPLEBY: Anytime anybody can come up with a proposal to present to us, I think we should consider it, but unless we have something to discuss, I can't

...

MR CHAIRMAN: You know, in the ordinary case, where you want half a dozen passes for friends coming in from the country, or maybe even a dozen, there's no harm. But we did have two instances where requests were made, in fact, for the capacity of the galleries. I think that's a warning to us. And without being extreme or going overboard, we should be prudent about it.

MR GOGO: I thought we'd discussed 10 passes per member on request from the Clerk.

MR CHAIRMAN: And then, if there's a need beyond that it's open to special . .

MR PURDY: What's the priority of that, then? That's 750 people.

MR GOGO: First come, first served.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, everybody isn't going to take . . . If that doesn't work, we can come back to you and discuss it again. Are you content with that?

MR PURDY: Sure.

MR CHAIRMAN: If anybody wants more than 10, it'll require special consideration. I'm not saying you won't get them, but . . .

AN HON MEMBER: This fall, we'll be glad we passed this.

MR CHAIRMAN: Clerk, do you need some more advice?

MRS OSTERMAN: Right now we get passes, or usually one of our secretaries gets them from you.

MR STEFANIUK: Your secretaries get the blanks in bulk.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Next is the photograph of the members. As you know, we were to decide on having another montage or taking a photograph in front of the building. You have a supporting recommendation under 3(d).

MR PURDY: I think that the recommendation is the correct way to go.

MR CHAIRMAN: Outside?

MR PURDY: Sure.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we can pass a motion, and then it'll naturally have to go to the caucuses. Do you want to move that?

MR PURDY: I would so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want any more discussion on it?

HON MEMBERS: Question.

MR CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, very simply, we'll make it payday, and everybody'll be there.

MR APPLEBY: I think it would be useful if members are notified previous to opening the fall session that this is going to occur.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're more likely to run into more favorable weather in the spring sitting, don't you think? So you want to try for the fall sitting? As in the recommendation, eh?

MRS OSTERMAN: If we're unable to do so, we're unable to do so.

MR STEFANIUK: There's an alternative here: if it's not possible to take it outside, that the photograph be taken on the marble staircase, in the rotunda. But that is still preferred by the photographer. Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose for which I've brought the B.C. photograph, where you see the photographs in the foreground are quite clear, and those members at the front of the Chamber cannot be seen at all clearly, and those persons in the galleries would need to be identified by means of a magnifying glass. That is the difficulty with that kind of photograph.

MR GOGO: The marble steps will just not work.

MR STEFANIUK: The photographer tells me they will. I'm sorry, I'm just going on . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: We had our swearing-in pictures taken there.

MR GOGO: Exactly, that's what I'm going by. And the ones in the front, you get up, and . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I think it's a choice between the front steps and a montage.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR GOGO: In terms of procedure, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know if we'll ever get back to that now we're making the decision, could we leave it in your hands to decide with the Executive Council what seating plan, if any, opposition members, and so on?

MR STEFANIUK: That would be determined in advance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Why don't we work it out with the two caucuses?

MR GOGO: I was going to suggest, rather than dealing with it again, because we've dealt with it, that we'd leave the structure of the photographs in your hands.

MR CHAIRMAN: The two main choices are to give the ministers the front places, or just to arrange people in alphabetical order. I would favor . . .

MR APPLEBY: I think that's the best idea.

MR CHAIRMAN: I see the A's are talking about it. Apart from the Premier, I would suggest that we seriously consider the alphabetical order.

MR PURDY: It's the Legislative Assembly, not the government or . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Darn right. Very much so. All right. Agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Number 3(e), the daily expense charges. That was discussed once before. Maybe we can dispose of that one this time.

MR STEFANIUK: That is simply a reporting item that was given at the last meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: So everybody is aware . . . I assume you've circulated the information through your caucuses, and we'll stop worrying about it.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: The members' lounge, item 4. There was a question about putting back the pictures there. We can't add to them, as you know, because they've used up all the room that was available. The decision was . . . It was moved that we put the pictures back. Is there need for any further discussion on that?

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder . . . There is a motion. I think it's a question of interpretation of that motion. Does that mean removal of the pictures from the fourth floor, or hanging of duplicates in the members' lounge?

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is -- and I don't think we thought of this when we got this motion -- if we simply get further copies from the pictures that have been put away for safe keeping and put them in the members' lounge, we're going to have those pictures in two places in the building: on the fourth floor and in the members' lounge. So if you don't want them in the two places, you either leave them on the fourth floor or remove them from there in order to put them in the members' lounge. In that case we don't need to make any more copies. The thing with the fourth floor is that they get seen there, and they don't get seen in the members' lounge. I realize the resolution was passed, but I think that was an angle we didn't consider.

MRS OSTERMAN: I never thought of that either.

MR STEFANIUK: During the course of the year, the Clerk's office receives a fair number of requests from relatives, next of kin, descendants of former members, to access the members' lounge, so that they may view pictures of their ancestors who were members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. Of course, we have to grant special permission, because that is accessing an area that is reserved for members, and it's not always convenient, particularly when the House is in session. In that case, we have to deny permission to access the members' lounge, since that is restricted to members. That is the difficulty we have. So it could be a question of duplication. I would respectfully suggest that members consider leaving the copies which are presently in place on the fourth floor in that location, and perhaps consider further duplicates, if they so wish, for the members' lounge.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

MR APPLEBY: I would agree with that. I would like to see them in the members' lounge.

MR CHAIRMAN: Both places?

MR APPLEBY: I don't care about the fourth floor as much as the members' lounge. The only other thing is, I would think any relative of a former member making that request -- I would almost think they should be able to have a cup of tea in the Clerk's office and the picture brought down to let them look at it. I don't see why they'd have to go into the members' lounge to look at it.

MR STEFANIUK: What you sometimes get is, he was a member between 1905 and 1935. You know, that kind of thing. That's where the difficulty is presented. "I'm not sure which Legislature he was a member of", so it's not just a question of lifting one. It might be a question of carrying six.

MR PURDY: And you'd find out he's from Manitoba, in the last place.

MR STEFANIUK: Right. That has happened.

MR CHAIRMAN: What do you say, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: I think we should have them in both places, the fourth floor and the lounge.

MR CHAIRMAN: Frank? So we put another set in the members' lounge?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MR GOGO: They don't have to be exact duplicates, you know. They can be 18 by 20 and all identical in size. They can be reproduced in any size, and that might not be a bad thought. Some of them are this big and some are this big.

MR STEFANIUK: Members should realize that the originals are not on the fourth floor any longer. That was a security precaution. The originals are accommodated in archives for safe keeping now, and everything on the fourth floor now is a copy.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think we might have trouble though. So the committee agrees that we'll proceed with putting back in the members' lounge further copies of the pictures which were in the members' lounge. All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: There's just one thing there though, John. If we're going to make them all the same size, those big groups are going to be fairly big. We might not have enough acreage.

MR GOGO: We don't have to. I'm just saying that one time the argument was that there wasn't enough room. That's why they went out.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Legislative interns. That is a very brief subject. We are now making up our estimates. If we go to eight interns, as has been recommended by the government caucus representative on the intern advisory committee, William Purdy, we have to . . . Well, it would simplify our job in alternation. We

have to increase our estimates a little, and so if this committee concurs with that recommendation, we can do that.

MR PURDY: That's for the '81-'82 estimates.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR GOGO: Why was it you wanted an increase, Bill?

MR PURDY: I find from the survey I've done with our members, that more and more members are using the services of the interns, and then the rotation basis works a lot better, too. If we get four and four, we can rotate. This way we have four and three.

MR GOGO: Bearing in mind that we substantially increased both government members' and other members' budgets for research recently.

MRS OSTERMAN: Not substantially.

MR GOGO: Three researchers.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is one further consideration here. The interns start in September, and if we're going to go to eight, we either start this September, or in September '81. For an additional \$8,000, we can start this September.

MR PURDY: We have to get a special warrant for that, don't we?

MR CHAIRMAN: We are probably going to need a special warrant anyway, and it would be my suggestion that we roll everything into one.

MR APPLEBY: How about spatial accommodation?

MR PURDY: There's no problem. We could put one more in where the intern office is now.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think maybe we're reaching our limit with eight, but I think we can manage.

SECRETARY: It doesn't really make any difference, because right now -- and it's the beginning of the year -- there already are four interns down in government caucus. And in January, they just take one and put him back in September.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't understand.

MR PURDY: We rotate the interns, five-month period.

MRS OSTERMAN: But where are they located?

SECRETARY: Room 101A down in the basement. And they have four desks there from September to January.

MRS OSTERMAN: I see.

MR CHAIRMAN: So you have four and four anyway as far as the available positions are concerned, except that with our seven we're leaving one vacant right now.

MR PURDY: And I found during the spring session that the three interns that were working for us were behind by five and six days because of the workload that was being given to them by government members.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does somebody want to move a motion?

MR PURDY: I guess since I made the recommendation . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: And what's your motion?

MR PURDY: That we move to eight interns for 1980-81, and request a special warrant for it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? All in favor? Carried.
Food services. Connie, you raised that point.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, and I'm satisfied with the memo. I think it's . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: My concern there, Connie, is that here are some things that are being done that have far-reaching effects as far as members and members' services are concerned, and I just wonder if it isn't time for this committee to be consulted a little bit.

MRS OSTERMAN: I just felt that it was premature for us really to get into that aspect of it. But I agree. As a matter of fact, that was my concern about future planning, and that's why I wondered how far down the road it was. My immediate concern is the quality of the food downstairs, the hours that the place is open. And that's what I'm concerned about right now, because I feel we have time to address the other. For instance, if we're talking about subsidization, I think that's something both caucuses would want to address themselves to as to whether they want something like that to happen. Maybe we'd have to get estimates as to what meals would really cost. Would members really avail themselves if they had a first class restaurant, and so on. I think we probably have the winter to do that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Have you had a chance to look at Stu McCrae's memo? What would you think about the Clerk going into some specifics on that, and bringing the specifics back to a future meeting? For example, the staff have given consideration to a separate table service facility across the hall, which would utilize a common kitchen. They've also considered the feasibility of longer hours and extended fare in the existing cafeteria. There are of course budgetary and other implications. These are all valid observations, but it might be worth while to quantify them a bit so that we would know what kind of bucks we're talking about.

MRS OSTERMAN: That would be an excellent idea. And possibly after getting those figures, we could talk to our respective caucuses. Because after all, we are talking about public funds, and we're not sure how the members would feel about the expenditures of such. Are we paying our way now?

MR GOGO: As I recall, there were three areas when this matter was first raised. And I wouldn't be surprised if I raised them. One was the quality of food, another the hours; namely, because I saw George Wölstenholme twice walk up to Jasper Avenue to eat. Third was privacy, an area involving privacy for members and/or guests, however we want to do it. I find it -- I don't like "insulting", but somewhat not much short of insulting -- that there's going to be a public restaurant within the vicinity of this building, that we're going

to answer those problems. Frankly, that doesn't satisfy me. I think it can be accommodated in this building. The quality of the food is up to us, and certainly the hours of the cafeteria should be up to us.

MR STEFANIUK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, if I might just explain the public restaurant that's mentioned in this memorandum from the minister. A restaurant accommodating 300 to 400 people is foreseen at the north end of the Legislature grounds. So as far as I understand, it is in the area of what is currently known as the Administration Building. That's where it is to be found. It's underground.

MR GOGO: Future home of the MLAs, isn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, that's the Ag Building. Do you agree then that we ask the Clerk to go into the specifics of Mr. McCrae's memo of July 18, and that he might share those specifics by means of a memo to all the members before the next meeting, so that you'd have a chance to read it. And then we'll re-discuss it at the next meeting if we have it by then. Is that all right?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that enough for that, Connie?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, I guess an overriding concern -- to me, it has to be divided somewhat into two portions, and that's addressing the immediate ones, which John has also gone into, and then of course the future things. I just share some of the things other members are saying to me. For instance, if they're presented with the idea that there are X square feet of floor space in this building -- and we're not going to change that. Within that, there are certain areas that it is possible to move. First of all, for the sake of members' offices, would members prefer to stay in this building and then take over the complete bottom floor, which means there wouldn't be any food facilities in this building -- they could walk underground over to the next building, which would be a couple of minutes away. Those are the types of things that are really going to have to be addressed, because we're really stuck. We can say what we like, but we've only got a certain amount of space in this building.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it becomes a question of priorities.

Okay. Number 7, classification of Legislative Assembly staff. This is partly by way of a report to bring you up to date on a rather difficult situation that arose. You may remember that this committee, within the past year, passed two resolutions -- I think they were unanimous -- upgrading the administrative position that is presently held by Charlene Blaney and the library position held by Lorne Buhr. Those resolutions were given effect to, the information was given to Treasury, and the salaries were adjusted accordingly. However, when the increase was going through that is going through to all the civil service -- you know, what do they call that first one? The interim increase they all get before the final figures are bargained out and settled or done by binding arbitration. We got a memo from Treasury indicating that because these two upgradings had not gone through Personnel Administration, those two employees would not be getting their raises with the rest.

Of course, we became very alarmed. We didn't want any embarrassment. We didn't want one of these employees going to the Court of Queen's Bench to get a legal ruling on whether the Assembly had jurisdiction over its own staff, or something like that. So I got an urgent memo off to the Provincial Treasurer,

and to make a long story short, he intervened and preserved those raises; they're going to be treated as they should be according to the reclassification this committee recommended for them. The reason for reporting it is simply to alert the committee and to suggest that we should be concerned about the principle involved here.

As a result of this problem, I got a further legal opinion -- I had had one previously -- as to whether the Assembly has jurisdiction over the classification of its own staff. You have that opinion there, dated June 10, from Mr. Clegg. It's quite clear and emphatic that any common sense interpretation of The Public Service Act preserves the right of the Assembly, not only to hire and discharge, but also to classify its own staff. Now, I'm told that there is a contrary legal opinion. I have asked to see it; I have yet to get an answer. I don't know what it says. For what it's worth, to the extent of my legal knowledge and experience in interpretation of statutes, I would agree with Mr. Clegg's opinion. Besides that, of course, it's eminently in keeping with the best parliamentary traditions that the staff that serves the Assembly, that serves any parliament of the Westminster tradition, should not have its classification done by government, but rather by the Assembly; admitting, of course, that there should be some comparison or relationship maintained between people who work for the Assembly and people who do comparable work in the public service. Anyway, that legal opinion is there. If you have the time, I would suggest that you might read it, because that situation could arise again and it could arise fairly soon; that is, in connection with the Law Clerk. And there will be a question, too, of the category of the Clerk.

I have a memorandum dealing with the Law Clerk. Our basis of comparison there is -- this is under item 7. Frank?

MR APPLEBY: Yes, I've got that. I've looked at them all.

MR CHAIRMAN: And the first is my memo to Lou Hyndman. Prior to that is the June 10 one. Following that, is the July 29 memo from the Clerk to myself as regard to the classification of the Law Clerk. I think this is the third item in the supporting material under tab 7.

As you know, the Law Clerk is a lawyer, notwithstanding the ancient name of the position, and he is giving legal advice to the members regarding their Bills and motions, and also legal advice to the Clerk, the Speaker, the Auditor General, and the Chief Electoral Officer. He does not give legal advice to the Ombudsman, because the Ombudsman has his own solicitor on staff. The Clerk and I have spent a great deal of time studying this. We have had some discussion with the Law Clerk. There was a proposal that he might go on contract, and we reviewed a draft contract. It has certain drawbacks. I would concur with the Clerk's recommendation that we reclassify the Law Clerk as an Executive Officer 2. That will do this to the position: that will put him in the same category as the chief legal officer who serves the government; in other words, the chief legislative counsel, who has overall responsibility for preparing government legislation, is in this category.

MR APPLEBY: Does he have a higher classification than the Deputy Attorney General?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think so.

MR STEFANIUK: The Deputy Attorney General is out of the classification grid, being a deputy minister. He is provided for in an order-in-council.

MR CHAIRMAN: The chief legislative counsel, I think, would be answerable to the Deputy Attorney General.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, he is.

MR GOGO: For clarification. Executive Officer 1, Executive Officer 2; are there also a's and b's and c's in there?

MR STEFANIUK: No, just 1 and 2.

MRS OSTERMAN: What is he classified as now?

MR STEFANIUK: Senior Officer 2(c).

MR CHAIRMAN: Which is as far as he can go in that category.

MRS OSTERMAN: And then the next category up is Executive Officer?

MR STEFANIUK: The next category up is Executive Officer 1 and then Executive Officer 2. So in effect, this would be a jump of two classes.

MR CHAIRMAN: As you know, in the case of professional people, we have to have one eye on the market. What they're making in private enterprise -- although, quite frankly, they aren't subject to quite the same risks. They don't have to invest as much money in office space and so on or furniture and equipment, but I think there has to be some relationship, and it shouldn't be too far out of line. So as I say, our recommendation is that he should be classified as Executive Officer 2. I would see that as being it, eh? There wouldn't be any further need, as far as I can see down the years, whether we have the present incumbent or someone else, to go beyond that category.

MR PURDY: What is that salary range?

MR CHAIRMAN: It would be around \$47,000 plus fringes.

MR STEFANIUK: The ceiling on that is \$49,000.

MR PURDY: With the fringes?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we wouldn't start him at the ceiling.

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR PURDY: What is he getting now?

MR STEFANIUK: About \$43,000.

MR PURDY: Plus fringes, or not?

MR CHAIRMAN: Plus fringes.

MRS OSTERMAN: Have we a comparison with the classification of this position in other parts of the country?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes. In other parts, in some provincial legislatures where we have compared the two, the Law Clerk to the assembly, or the chief draftsman for the assembly, and the chief draftsman for the government are on par.

MRS OSTERMAN: But not all.

MR CHAIRMAN: You can't compare with all of them, because some are part-time positions.

MR STEFANIUK: Some of them are contract positions, you see.

MR APPLEBY: What about Anne's memo to you, Mr. Chairman? The removal from the classification grid and including it in the list of deputy ministers and other senior officers was requested.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, we're talking about the Clerk. This one is the memo ahead of that, Frank, the one from the Clerk to me, dated July 29, classification of Law Clerk.

MR APPLEBY: I'm sorry. You just say clerk all the time . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Sorry. Law Clerk.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is it possible to . . . You say some of them are part-time positions. Why would they be part time and why would they be contracted? Is there any . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: B.C. is one.

MR STEFANIUK: They have taken a lawyer from private practice and contract the work to him. The difference is that he is there then only as a draftsman, and is paid an hourly fee for drafting on the basis of the contract. His earnings for drafting services only, on a part-time basis, compare with the earnings of our Law Clerk on a full-time basis. The difference is that if we were to contract for drafting, legal counsel would not be available to members for other purposes. For example, we now have the committee operating on surface rights. That committee has already requested legal advice from the Law Clerk, and we have to provide it. Similarly, as the Speaker mentioned, we provide legal advice through the Law Clerk to the Chief Electoral Officer and, in some instances, to the Auditor General, those being officers of the Legislature. If we were to contract, we could in all likelihood contract for drafting purposes only, and a contract fee for all of those services currently provided would be considerably in excess of a salary.

MR CHAIRMAN: Partly, that would be offset by the fact that . . . Well we might have to provide space in the building anyway, for a contract lawyer.

MR APPLEBY: Doesn't P.E.I. have a part-time . . .

MR STEFANIUK: P.E.I., Nova Scotia, and British Columbia have contracted law clerks.

MR APPLEBY: I don't think the contract is an issue here, though, is it?

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I know we're dealing with classifications and not personalities, but I have found Mr. Clegg -- and it's his position we're discussing -- to be extremely helpful in a variety of ways when we seek advice. If we had a man on contract, that wouldn't be available. I know when they're appointed, many committee chairmen have sought Mr. Clegg's advice. If you're contracting, that may not be available. I would go along with the recommendation of the Clerk, and if you want a motion, I so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the motion?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Question.

MR CHAIRMAN: All those in favor? Opposed? Carried.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, can I register one reservation? I think that decisions of this nature are fairly major. I don't find myself entirely feeling qualified on the basis of sitting down and looking at them and in one discussion making such a decision. I would say that in future, I really request that such information be provided much ahead of time. I would really like to be able to give it some consideration and also to make some comparisons. I'm not suggesting this decision isn't a good one, but I really do find that I feel uncomfortable with it, to be very frank, because I don't know right now whether that's a good decision or not.

MR CHAIRMAN: I could have added some information further to what you are getting. If we have a contract . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm not suggesting . . . I would just like to see what other . . . I would like to have the information ahead of time. And when it doesn't come to us ahead of time, I would be pleased if we weren't asked to make a decision about it at the meeting then. If you bring information and want us to discuss it and then we're ready to make a decision for the next time, fine.

MR CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, this has just come to this situation for a decision very, very recently, within the last two weeks. We've had a number of meetings and discussions, and prior to that, we wouldn't have been ready to come and give you background information and so on.

MRS OSTERMAN: But in this case, I feel like a rubber stamp, very frankly. And it may be a good rubber stamp, but I really don't . . . Because I'm usually a little more thorough in terms of making decisions.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay? Now, the next is the classification of the Clerk of the Assembly. Ordinarily, I would ask the Clerk to leave the meeting at this point, but he has information on the subject that is more extensive than mine, and I suggest that you might have some questions.

MR APPLEBY: The recommendation, if we call it that, Mr. Chairman, is that the position be removed from the classification grid. Is that correct?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, as for deputy ministers.

MR APPLEBY: And put on the list of deputy ministers.

MR CHAIRMAN: Legally, the Clerk now has the status of a deputy minister, for financial purposes, as the Speaker has the status of a minister for financial purposes.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Looks reasonable to me.

MR STEFANIUK: I might emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the recommendation does not include any provision at all for any salary adjustment, since the salary would now fall into the provisions of one of the categories in an order-in-council which covers deputy ministers and senior officials. There is absolutely no need . . . And that is salary range 4, as provided for in the

order-in-council, which is the final document under that tab in the books on the legal-sized paper.

MR APPLEBY: Looking at the previous recommendation we made, it would be contingent, would it not, on having this first one, the Clerk of the Assembly removed from the classification grid? Then we wouldn't have the problem of his being the senior executive officer, and the Law Clerk could become an executive officer. Is that not the case?

MR STEFANIUK: That's probably a logical conclusion.

MR APPLEBY: This would mean then, that actually you have to make the one step before you have the opening or the positions available for executive officers other than the existing one, which now would be removed, under this recommendation.

MRS OSTERMAN: How is the salary determined then?

MR STEFANIUK: As you can see in the order-in-council, there is a range in that salary, salary range 4. The recommendation is made that the Clerk of the Assembly be placed in salary range 4, which includes all deputy ministers not otherwise provided for in ranges 5 or 6, which are higher ranges. So it is the lowest range into which deputy ministers fall.

MRS OSTERMAN: And you're falling in that range right now?

MR STEFANIUK: I'm falling in that range now. Therefore I suggest there is absolutely no need for a salary adjustment in conjunction with any action that may be taken on this recommendation. I will note that in the order-in-council itself there is provision for a means by which adjustments are determined; that is, on the covering page of the order-in-council, under item 2.

MRS OSTERMAN: In other words, once a year or whatever, the minister of personnel brings to cabinet a schedule of salaries . . .

MR STEFANIUK: As I understand it, the minister responsible is approached. In this case, that would be the Speaker. It is recommended to the minister what levels of adjustment might be made, and the minister responsible, based on his assessment of the performance of the deputy minister, then makes the appropriate recommendation to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer -- or the decision, as a matter of fact -- and recommends to him that a given amount be paid.

MRS OSTERMAN: And what happens now?

MR STEFANIUK: At the present time, the Clerk is in the category of an executive officer. The minister responsible for personnel provides guidelines as to what adjustments may be made in the salary. The minister responsible, again being the Speaker, assesses the performance of the individual, and recommends what type of adjustment should be made.

MRS OSTERMAN: Recommends to the minister of personnel, in this case?

MR STEFANIUK: Recommends to Treasury. The document containing the recommendation is filed with Treasury.

MR PURDY: Do you need an order-in-council or not?

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MRS OSTERMAN: Presently it isn't an order-in-council, but it would have to be an order-in-council.

MR STEFANIUK: No. The order-in-council provides only for the ranges within categories. In other words, if the recommendation were to be accepted as it stands, the title Clerk of the Legislative Assembly would be included under salary range 4, and the procedure I have outlined would be followed in making adjustments. Basically, there is no significant difference in the way in which the decision on the adjustment is made, because in either case, whether it be for a ~~senior~~ executive officer or for a deputy minister, the minister makes recommendations as to the Clerk of the Assembly. The Clerk does not make it on his own behalf.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is the recommendation always accepted by all -- for instance, when ministers go with recommendations?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't know.

MR GOGO: At the moment, no employee of the Legislative Assembly is covered by the U.C. The Ombudsman and so on, are covered under their own statute. So this would be a first.

MR CHAIRMAN: There would be some question -- and if you want to look at the supporting material, the proper parliamentary tradition would indicate that the Clerk should not be directly answerable to government.

MR GOGO: That was mainly what I was getting at.

MR CHAIRMAN: But the salary could be set by analogy. I really think it would be useful if you could take the time to read the highlighted portions of the support material you have here from this book on the officers of the Commons, by Philip Marsden. In the introduction on page 15, he says: the staff which serves the Commons within the palace of Westminster, on the other hand, are not answerable in any way to the government of the day, nor are they appointed by politicians or political organizations. If they were, their usefulness would disappear overnight. They are only servants of the House, and it is this long-preserved independence from political control that has endowed them with their own special value to the smooth running of the machinery of government.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, can we have until the next meeting to study this material? I don't know how everybody else feels about it.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, there is another section of the report by Sir Barnet Cox, which perhaps -- and that's on page 18. Sir Barnet . . .

MR PURDY: That's really 19, where Charles I, the 1649 challenge . . .

MR STEFANIUK: No, it's not that. That's the excerpt from Philip Marsden's book. It's the one that's typewritten, page 18, under the title, The Linkage System.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, when you're referring to the Marsden report on page 15, the staff which serves the Commons -- who do we include in that staff?

MR CHAIRMAN: We would include everyone in the Clerk's office, in the library, the Hansard staff, the Sergeant-at-Arms. Insofar as the administration of their positions are concerned, it would include caucus staff; people in the Speaker's office. And that's about it, I think, in Alberta.

MR APPLEBY: Not in the minister's offices.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, no, by no means.

MR APPLEBY: That's government.

MR CHAIRMAN: This memorandum by Sir Barnet Cox is a copy that we were fortunate to be able to get. Sir Barnet Cox was for many years the very, very distinguished Clerk of the House of Commons in England, and he has been here in Canada a number of times to CPA do's, for example. The Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan asked him to come and do a review of their staffing situation, and this report is the result. They shared it with us, and you have it in your support material. As the Clerk mentioned, feel free to take along any of that material in the books that you would like to, because the books will be reconstituted for you for the next meeting.

MR APPLEBY: Under that sort of system, which is existent in several jurisdictions, what sort of tenure is provided for for these people? Now you have a group of people in the government, with a large majority, for instance, working for the government members. When the government changes, what is the disposal of that staff?

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we had that situation in 1971. There was caucus staff, and it wasn't a very severe problem until now.

MR APPLEBY: Because the staff situation has escalated so much since then. You have a large staff around here.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's true. Caucuses are far better served now than they ever were.

MR APPLEBY: That's getting beyond the specific request here, I grant you that, but . . .

MR STEFANIUK: We could perhaps consider that question, if Mr. Appleby wishes, and I could perhaps attempt to answer it briefly. That caucus staff, being staff under the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly, would, in the event of a turnover in the administration, be offered to the new administration, and the new administration could well make the decision as to whether any or all of that staff were acceptable to it. In any event, we attempt to forewarn certain staff who were hired for caucus duties . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: They're on contract, right?

MR STEFANIUK: No, they're not on contract. They are on what we call project positions, the term of the project being defined as the life of the Legislature. So our legal commitment, if you like, ends with the dissolution of the House. And that is as far as we are obligated. We took that into consideration prior to 1979. In about 1977 when I came in, I looked at what commitments we had, and quite frankly, they frightened me, because we could have a large number of people expecting to continue in jobs that may no longer exist for them. We needed a legal out, and we found it by identifying this

category of project positions. So our commitment, from day one, when we hire, say, caucus secretaries, is for the life of a given Legislature. However, as I said earlier, if the staff is deemed to be capable and it would be desirable that they return to serve members, regardless of which side of the House they sat on, their services would be offered to a new administration, in the event that such an event took place.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that all right Frank?

MR APPLEBY: And if the government is returned, they're normally offered continuing positions.

MR STEFANIUK: Providing that the new members wish to retain their services. That is entirely the choice of the members. Now we know that following the 1979 election, a number of caucus staff was offered positions within government, by newly appointed ministers, who were familiar with the work habits, the quality of staff within caucus offices, and offered them employment on a permanent basis within their offices. That staff was then relinquished to government, and the Legislative Assembly has nothing more to do with them.

MR APPLEBY: What happens to these government staff members if the government changes?

MR STEFANIUK: As I understand it, an attempt is usually made to place them at positions of equal classification and responsibility within the public service. To that extent, they are protected. So if the government were to change, those who are presently serving ministers of the Crown could be absorbed by the new government, or would alternatively be offered positions in the public service.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions of the Clerk?

MR PURDY: Can this one stand, as Connie indicated?

MR CHAIRMAN: Next meeting? Okay?

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat like Connie. I mean, both of these are tied very closely together. One is really contingent on the other. I know we've made a motion to accept the other one already, but I would feel better if we had them both standing. That would give us some time to consider it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Quite frankly, my problem is ignorance, in that I do not understand various classifications and what, if any, ramifications there are. Maybe there are none, but I would just feel better having a little bit better handle on these different things. It won't take me long to ask a few questions and get whatever information I require, but I'm going to have to do a bit of reading. That's all. Once having done that, I obviously won't have to do it again. But I have to admit I am not prepared to . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. I've forgotten whether it's by you, Bill, or by Connie. John?

MR PURDY: John, wasn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: That we table this until the next meeting.

MRS OSTERMAN: I only made the request. I didn't make a motion.

MR STEFANIUK: . . . vote was taken with regard to the Law Clerk's classification . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I know, but we're discussing the Clerk's classification.

MR PURDY: Connie only asked the question, and I indicated . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: I'll make that in the form of a motion, then, if this . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I think we should conclude the discussion in some way, if you're ready to conclude it.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'll make a motion that this particular item be held over until the next meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. All in favor?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, are we in a real problem? Mr. Appleby has raised a question regarding the compatibility of the . . .

MR STEFANIUK: I think we are, if the previous motion stands, because what has in effect happened is that the Law Clerk is placed in a classification higher than that which is presently enjoyed by the Clerk.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but think of the pressure that puts on the committee to raise your classification at the next meeting.

MR STEFANIUK: None whatsoever.

MR APPLEBY: We made that motion. Would it be in order to make a motion that that one not be proceeded with until after the next meeting?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think any motion is in order.

MR APPLEBY: Okay. I'll move that.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: When a motion is made in a meeting, doesn't it have to have a notice of motion?

MR CHAIRMAN: You mean to rescind a motion made at the same meeting?

MR APPLEBY: No, it's just when we act on that motion. I'm moving that we hold that other recommendation until we have resolved this one.

MRS OSTERMAN: Because we could have actually done something improper. Not exactly, but if you . . .

MR GOGO: Connie made the point that in principle, on reflection, is extremely important. On the one hand, we're charged by our colleagues in the House, when they supported the Order Paper business, that we be the committee dealing with the members' services of the Assembly. So there's no question we have that authority. Connie has now raised the point that when matters of significant importance come to this committee -- as I recall, we dealt with

the tapestry and walls of the Assembly in five meetings, and here we are dealing with matters that are very important to the future of personnel in this Assembly and to members. And Connie suggested, and I think on reflection rightly so, that matters of this nature should be in the form of some notice to the committee members to think about prior to coming and do their research or whatever. And I tend to agree with the substance of that. Looking at the anomaly of the motion that the Law Clerk be executive officer, as a matter of fact superior to the Clerk of the Assembly, which is ridiculous -- and that's now saying, let's put this off until we've had time to think about. It's really unkind, unfair, and quite frankly, stupid.

MRS OSTERMAN: You'd go that far?

MR GOGO: Well, I'm the mover of that motion, so I'm at liberty to say that. If someone would show me a way out, I . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: You considered the other situation on its merits. And I must say candidly that we didn't jockey the thing in this way in order to get around the committee. As a matter of fact, the question of the Law Clerk is of much longer standing than that of the Clerk, although it is an anomalous situation as well.

MR APPLEBY: We should have considered these in the reverse order, though.

MR PURDY: Or at the same time.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. What's the motion?

MR APPLEBY: Put the words in my mouth.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think Frank suggested a rather felicitous phrasing, which was that the effect of the previous motion with regard to the Law Clerk be suspended or postponed until after further consideration of the Clerk's position. Is that right, Frank? Is that enough?

MR APPLEBY: That was it.

MRS OSTERMAN: To hold putting something into effect.

MR PURDY: You have that in legislation all the time.

MRS OSTERMAN: It doesn't have Royal Assent, is that's what you're saying?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's your motion, Frank? All in favor?

MRS OSTERMAN: What is the motion going to say?

MR APPLEBY: That the previous motion not be acted upon until after we have considered the Clerk's position.

MR PURDY: The motion dealing with the reclassification of the Law Clerk to executive officer.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, space allocation. That's just a reporting item, really, something that probably should have been -- I'm not going to ask you

to pass a motion on this one, but probably something I should have brought to your attention a great deal sooner is background information which this particular Members' Services Committee has never had. It is a document that came from Executive Council in August 1978.

MR GOGO: Is this still applicable?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, it still stands. To the best of our knowledge, nothing has been done to rescind this document.

MR GOGO: But we have four additional ministers in Executive Council. I'm wondering if there has been substantial change to the figures.

MR CHAIRMAN: There are probably some changes to the figures occupied by Executive Council. I am not aware of any diminution of area occupied by members.

MR PURDY: Your office here would not be included in that, would it?

MR GOGO: This was my office last time.

MR PURDY: The cafeteria on the 5th floor would not be included in this; 311.

MR CHAIRMAN: Insofar as the actual footage and locations are concerned . . .

MR PURDY: They would probably balance.

MR CHAIRMAN: It hasn't been updated, but the reason I think it might be useful for members of this committee to take a look at this is that there are a number of assurances of consultation in here, with regard to space. Frankly, I'm not aware of any consultation. I checked with the Clerk, and he isn't either.

MR GOGO: On the last page, under the word "Authority" . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: No, that only applies to the space that's referred to above it, John. That doesn't apply to the whole document. You'll find it at the top of that page, for example, dealing with the preceding topic. The comment you have applies to items 4, 5, 6, and 7 above the comment.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I think every one of them, with the exception of page 6, says in consultation with the Speaker and/or Clerk.

MR CHAIRMAN: I just think, as in the matter of security, we really should be aware and alert, and that we should be consulted more than we are.

MR APPLEBY: We have a problem here in that we have government and the Legislature all in one building.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's recognized. The whole basis of this document is the sharing of at least consultation for the building, or to some extent responsibility. For example, the Chamber -- if you'll look at page 7, item G, that refers to the Chamber, the lounge, the Sergeant-at-Arms room, Press Gallery and ancillary room, and the total square footage; then going on to page 8: and the authority is the Speaker of the Assembly. In some ways this goes along the same route that was travelled in Ontario following the Camp report, where there was an order-in-council dividing the responsibility for

the building between government and the Speaker. The minimum that there should be is consultation. Apart from the fact that this is significant information for a committee with the responsibilities this one has, I am concerned that there is just never consultation; things are done.

Now, the request for handicapped accommodation on the 5th floor -- that really isn't accommodation; it's a ramp. You've had a chance to look at it.

MR STEFANIUK: 508 is that area which leads into the members' offices which are located in the old cafeteria. Some strange numbers have been allocated because that was a kitchen before.

MR APPLEBY: That's for a ramp, to get up into 512.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR APPLEBY: Is there not another step up to get to the end of the hall, too?

MRS OSTERMAN: No. That's the only place there is a step. Anyone in a wheelchair can't get into the office.

MR APPLEBY: So what's the problem with putting it in, anything?

MR CHAIRMAN: Just that the Minister of Government Services would like to have the views of the committee; I think that's proper. I thought Connie put it well a few days ago when she said that the ramp should be put in in such a way that it isn't too steep for wheelchairs and, at the same time, results in a minimum destruction of presently carpeted area.

MRS OSTERMAN: I figured the handicapped people must have a designation in terms of grade, that says this is what grade we usually have.

MR CHAIRMAN: So, subject to those two conditions, do you agree with the proposal?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS OSTERMAN: I might add that I'm very pleased about that one.

MR CHAIRMAN: The next one comes from Mr. Notley, although it has my name after it: provision of standardized enquiry forms. You see them there in your supporting material. The question is whether you would like to have those produced for members. We don't often get proposals from the NDP caucus, but this is one. Do you think that form, or a similar one, would be . . .

MR APPLEBY: Probably a form; I'm not too sure this is the most useful type.

MR GOGO: I think that's a terrific idea, Frank.

MR APPLEBY: I think it's a grand idea, but I just wonder . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Andy Little already has something like this.

MR GOGO: I don't know whether this is on built-in carbon, but that's the sort of thing I would like to see -- the inner-office memo type, where you mail a copy but you have a record in your file. I don't know whether that is that type of thing or not. But I'd like to see that kind of thing.

MR CHAIRMAN: Your suggestion is that it be done with one-time carbon?

MR GOGO: Yes. I'm opening my office this weekend. It would be very helpful if I could have the secretary . . .

MR APPLEBY: Actually, you should have triplicate, I think.

MR CHAIRMAN: How do you use them?

MRS OSTERMAN: For instance, at a meeting someone dashes off a memo or question to somebody. You write to me; I receive the copy and you have a copy of what you sent me. I don't know about the triplicate; but sometime the triplicate obviously is useful. If somebody takes a telephone call that's an enquiry, they write it all down. You keep one in your file or it is kept by a researcher, whoever is looking at the problem, and you can make a little note on it without re-doing it as to who is looking after it for you -- something like that.

MR APPLEBY: I was thinking of yourself, your secretary, and your researcher; that's why I said triplicate.

MR GOGO: I don't know what costs we're looking at; it might be fairly costly.

MR CHAIRMAN: One of the cost factors, which would be variable, would be printing up here: directed to the office of so-and-so MLA.

MR GOGO: I might put a caveat on that, Mr. Chairman. I would see Legislative Assembly of Alberta, like we now have.

MR PURDY: You can buy your own stamp and stick it on there if you like.

MR CHAIRMAN: You'd have to stamp each one.

MR STEFANIUK: Personalization would be very costly.

MR APPLEBY: It would have to be a standard form.

MR STEFANIUK: Inventory would be an additional headache.

MR GOGO: Each day I now write "from" and "to" on my memos, and I would gladly continue that. But this way I have a record of what I do or what my secretary does. I think that's a great idea.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you agree, then, that the Clerk look into this -- that he get information from Andy Little, and if you know of any other members who have devised forms, and that he come up with some recommendation for the next meeting, if he can do it that soon? And with possible cost projections?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: That agreed; that's number 10. Number 11: the problem there is with regard to possible duplication of coverage. This one I didn't take you by surprise on, Connie; I wrote you a memo last April. It's a question of duplication, where we're already covered in some other group. You might be covered in Calgary Power. If you have an incorporated farm, you might be covered there; I don't know.

MR GOGO: I would say of 79 members of the Assembly, there are probably six or seven covered. For that reason I don't think it's unreasonable that the other 72 or 73 be covered.

MR APPLEBY: What is the problem?

MR CHAIRMAN: Duplicating the coverage, is all. That's the only question. I don't know to what extent people are already covered.

MR PURDY: Have we got it in the budget to cover everybody?

MR CHAIRMAN: I have been covered for years.

MR STEFANIUK: It was a B budget item, approved in the 1980/81 estimates. We're ready to go ahead.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, what would the Clerk like to have?

MR STEFANIUK: We would like to have some direction as to how we proceed with this item now, because there is the possibility of some duplicate coverage. The estimate was put through; the budget was approved by the House. We have funding for this, and we would simply like to know whether we may now go ahead, knowing we will have to exclude those members who already have coverage by some other means.

MR PURDY: Send a memo to all members of the Assembly, indicating that it has been covered in the budget and are you now included in a plan and what's your number.

MRS OSTERMAN: Does this include families or is it an individual coverage? What happens when your husband is buying coverage for himself and his wife, for instance?

MR APPLEBY: Then you take this coverage and include him in the plan.

MR STEFANIUK: You see, you may have coverage now as a private subscriber. In light of the advantages that are offered by the Legislative Assembly's coverage of one-half of the premium, you may wish to cancel your present coverage and cover your spouse and your family under the provisions of this contract.

MR PURDY: Well, all members of the House are now covered one way or another, either paying it out of their own pocket or by a plan, because if they're not they're outside the law. It's compulsory legislation; you must have it.

MR APPLEBY: The only way is you opt out by notifying them.

MR STEFANIUK: So we have to go ahead with that arrangement; if it's approved then we'll proceed with it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then we can leave it up to the members to try to eliminate the duplication themselves.

MRS OSTERMAN: A notice will have to go to all members.

MR STEFANIUK: Absolutely.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would have a suggestion for the Clerk. I think this would be a bit of a problem in that if they would like coverage, it is provided for. If it's an affirmative answer, reply. That way you will indeed get a reply. The other way around, you could easily be duplicating.

MR STEFANIUK: The other thing I would simply mention here, Mr. Chairman, is that we have had a request for Blue Cross coverage. It should be understood that that is not provided for in the budget item. It is simply Alberta Health Care.

MR GOGO: That does present a problem.

MRS OSTERMAN: Why?

MR GOGO: If you pay your Blue Cross premium with your Alberta Health Care premium, that is to AHCFP, you get your Blue Cross at the group rate, \$5.

MRS OSTERMAN: So each individual member will have to resolve that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Your suggestion, Connie, is that we write to the members . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Saying that this is available.

MR CHAIRMAN: And if they want it, they have to write back. That's a motion?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other business?

MR PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to give notice of motion at the next meeting that we should have discussion of spouse's allowance for any Canadian trips.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you want us to prepare some information on it?

MR PURDY: CPA type of events. On many occasions you take your spouse with you and you have to pay air fare and all the rest of it. We should get some background information, have some discussion of it, and see what's happening.

MR STEFANIUK: We have that on file. We could provide it in advance if you wish.

MR GOGO: Bill, could we sort of re-word that to get information on both -- as CPA members; I think that might be the best way because we're all CPA members, I understand. I wouldn't like to restrict it to the one; I would like to have information for both. Bohdan, unless you already have it, could we include what other jurisdictions do? I know what Quebec does.

MR STEFANIUK: We have other Canadian jurisdictions.

MR CHAIRMAN: But not under CPA, though.

MR STEFANIUK: No, as part of members' travel. We can research it a little further.

MR CHAIRMAN: So the notice you're giving, then, Bill, is that at the next meeting you would like to raise a motion or discussion of the possibility of funding travel for spouses in connection with travel by members on Legislative Assembly or CPA business. Is that what you're . . .

MR PURDY: No. CPA business, not Legislative Assembly business. You could be a member of a select committee of the Legislature and you're doing Legislative Assembly business then. But I think with the CPA -- that's what I'm getting at.

MRS OSTERMAN: You're talking about meetings of the Canadian Parliamentary Association?

MR PURDY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay, we can try that.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether that would be the appropriate time, but I would like to see some discussion at some future meeting on travel arrangements for spouses within the province to travel to the capital city, either by air or by Greyhound.

MR PURDY: That was my next point.

MR STEFANIUK: We have that information readily available.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we have this notice from Bill on CPA, and now we have your notice that you would like to raise a motion or discuss the topic of travel of members' spouses within Alberta, between their homes and the capital.

MR GOGO: This would be similar, Frank, to what the MP gets.

MRS OSTERMAN: In other words, so many -- it raises the spectre of conjugal visits.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, have we ever had an update or anything further for Calgary members with regard to parking at Calgary airport?

MR CHAIRMAN: We ran up against a stone wall there.

MR STEFANIUK: Still nothing successful.

MR CHAIRMAN: We just can't budge them. The proper thing to do of course would be to charge it up on the credit card, an MLA credit card. The airport won't take it.

MR GOGO: It's not run by the airport; it's franchised out.

MR STEFANIUK: We could have one more crack at it and see if there has been a change of personnel.

MR GOGO: What I'm thinking of is that discussions could be held with the airport manager. At the one end of the Calgary airport there are 3,000 to 4,000 stalls -- George, you may be aware of it -- for airline personnel and MoT personnel. I purposely drove into that. My Member of Parliament has his parking covered, and I don't know how because he doesn't have anything else

covered. It's all-inclusive in his indemnity. Could you discuss that? We're probably not talking about more than 20 stalls or 30 stalls.

MRS OSTERMAN: But the same thing applies to Edmonton, does it not?

MR GOGO: No.

MRS OSTERMAN: But whenever I have to go to a meeting in Calgary, I have to leave my car out there and have to pay parking.

MR APPLEBY: It doesn't happen every week, though.

MR GOGO: I'm thinking of the regularity of Mr. Wolstenholme, Mr. Zaozirny -- you know, the 16 Calgary members. Don't get me wrong; I would include all airports in Alberta. But Calgary in particular.

MRS OSTERMAN: I utilize that too. In fact I would more. Right now what I do is leave a vehicle sometimes at my parents. My father drives me so I don't have to pay it all week. Then he takes the car back to his place.

MR GOGO: Frankly, I think we can do it at the municipal with no difficulty.

MRS OSTERMAN: It certainly would be helpful.

MR GOGO: I know the ministers of the Crown have no difficulty.

MR CHAIRMAN: Whose motion was that? John's. Okay: that the Clerk enquire again and further into providing by the Assembly of necessary parking for members in connection with their necessary travelling between their homes and the capital.

MR GOGO: I don't know whether I should say Calgary and Edmonton municipal airports, because Calgary doesn't have one. Maybe there is no need to mention that.

MRS OSTERMAN: Parking in relation to air travel.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'd better say airport parking.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Has it been decided who is going to the CPA to Saskatchewan and . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Not yet; the names are still coming in.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'll remind the caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: Five to B.C., of whom one is going to be an opposition member I expect; two to Saskatchewan. As you know, the joint celebrations, which are being run in conformity with plans approved by the CPA advisory committee -- Saskatchewan/Alberta joint -- we turn over the parliamentarians from all the other parliaments of Canada to the Saskatchewan people, at Lloydminster on Tuesday, September 2. From there on, it's Saskatchewan and we're entitled to two members, plus me, to go to Saskatoon and Regina.

I think the Clerk has another item of business.

MR STEFANIUK: I have one more item, Mr. Chairman. I apologize advance notice of this wasn't given, but it deals with the Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980, which are in the final preparation stages now and will be printed in 1981. We require to make budgetary provision for distribution of the new sets of statutes to members of the Assembly. I would be grateful for guidelines as to whether it is necessary, firstly, to distribute a full set of statutes to each member. Members should be mindful of the fact that they are going to be published for the 1980 revision in two forms: bound volumes and loose-leaf volumes. It is intended to update loose-leaf volumes quarterly. There is a further consideration and that is the possible requirement of statutes for constituency offices. In order that we may budget adequately, because the bottom line figure is significant, we would appreciate some guidance in that regard.

The cost per set is going to be in the vicinity of \$300.

MR APPLEBY: That's the bound . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Either one.

MR CHAIRMAN: The same for both?

MR STEFANIUK: Well, considering the update on the others, it's going to work out about the same thing because the quarterly updating service on the loose-leaf ones is included.

MR CHAIRMAN: You pay at the beginning and you get the updating service?

MR STEFANIUK: You get the updating service.

MR CHAIRMAN: The custom has been to give each member a set of statutes. Once the Revised Statutes of 1980 come out, pretty well everything we have now is obsolete. We start afresh. We can probably get rid of the ones we have. They would be of very little value except for historic purposes. Then, as you know, the next volume will be the annual volume for 1981, 1982, and so on, and we start the whole business over again; except for those who get the loose-leaf set, where instead of getting an annual volume will get supplementary pages.

MR APPLEBY: The revised statutes will come out each year in the bound volume, will they?

MR CHAIRMAN: The Revised Statutes come out only every 10 years.

MR STEFANIUK: But the annual update, in the bound form, will continue. We have to do that because the courts will not accept the loose-leaf version. So we're legally bound to provide the bound volumes of revisions.

MR CHAIRMAN: So members will have a choice between the bound ones and the loose-leaf ones. The loose-leaf ones are very nice.

MR APPLEBY: Well, what is the question?

MR STEFANIUK: The question is, do we continue to provide one set to each member? Or do we now provide two sets to each member, the bound and the loose-leaf? And do we make any provision for constituency offices?

MR CHAIRMAN: A further consideration is that there could be a change in the membership of the Assembly after the next general election, and the statutes won't again be revised until 1990. So it may be prudent for us to have a supply on hand.

MR STEFANIUK: Well, that's outside of this particular question, Mr. Chairman, because we take that into consideration in a separate budget item. You see, the Legislative Assembly is responsible for the cost of printing the new statutes. We're into a separate item of approximately a half million dollars to produce the statutes themselves. We recoup that to some extent in those sets we sell, to the legal profession mainly, and to anyone in the private sector. However, we must know what we're going to make in the way of budgetary provision for distribution to the members, which is our responsibility.

MR PURDY: The ones that I have taken home, because I find them useful there -- and I take the update every year home. When somebody asks me a question, I pretty well have the information at hand. I have the resource, set, here in the building if I need it. So my view is that every member should have one set; you make the determination whether it is the bound or the loose-leaf.

MR APPLEBY: And whether he wants them in his constituency office, at home, or wherever.

MR PURDY: Wherever he wants, but he only has one set.

MR STEFANIUK: One set without charge.

MR PURDY: One set without charge.

MR STEFANIUK: And the member is given the option as to which he chooses?

MR GOGO: I don't think there should be the option.

MR CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR APPLEBY: I'm a little curious about the updating, Bohdan. How is that going to be proceeded with? How is it going to be physically done?

MR STEFANIUK: A list is maintained in our records of all holders of statutes. We will send to each holder of a set a batch of pages to update it, with instructions as to what is to be deleted and what is to be inserted.

MR APPLEBY: Cost-wise, it doesn't vary much, you say? Okay, one set, with the option of what type.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay? Nothing further?

MRS OSTERMAN: Could I just raise a couple of things I forgot when we were going over business arising from the minutes. The signs -- I have been asked about signs.

MR STEFANIUK: My latest report on that is that signs have been ordered for perhaps 25 or 30 members. I had a report with the list of names of those members who had ordered them. The program is under way.

MRS OSTERMAN: Good, because all the members would like them, whether or not they have an office. They will find a place to put them.

MR STEFANIUK: They will have to place their individual orders, because the signs come in various forms. There are directional signs, outdoor signs, which are treated.

MRS OSTERMAN: We haven't had any word of that.

MR GOGO: Thank heaven you notified me, because I assumed mine was being done.

MR STEFANIUK: Individual orders will have to be placed.

MRS OSTERMAN: Then I'll have to inform our caucus of that.

MR STEFANIUK: Those orders will be handled.

MRS OSTERMAN: The other item is from way, way back, in terms of materials for members. Are we going to get a "with the compliments of"?

MR CHAIRMAN: They're on hand.

MRS OSTERMAN: With our names on?

MR CHAIRMAN: You insert your card.

MR STEFANIUK: It's a little card that says "with the compliments of", and has little cut slots in it where you insert your business cards.

MRS OSTERMAN: Wow; I haven't seen them.

MR CHAIRMAN: They're in your caucus supplies, I think.

MR CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. We have had a good meeting; we've covered a lot of territory.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.