

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Friday, November 23, 1930

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

10 a.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: My suggestion, for your consideration, would be that we consider this to be an informal meeting, that we do our discussing and that the representative of the Social Credit caucus might take fairly full notes, and that we might try to bang out some minutes, say, Monday. Fred Mandeville would then have an opportunity, with the benefit of your notes and the minutes, to go over it. Then on Tuesday we perhaps could pass as formal motions the things we have agreed on today with Fred present, except in those cases where Fred might want further discussion or take objection. Does that sound practical? There could be a question about whether this is a properly constituted meeting. I know the common law rule is that where no time limit is specified, you assume a reasonable time limit. I think Fred would be entitled to take the position that he hadn't got reasonable notice, especially since he had left town before the thing -- we couldn't give him notice, and he had agreed to holding a meeting on Tuesday.

MRS OSTERMAN: So anything he wants to debate -- otherwise it wouldn't be fair.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. We can keep minutes in the usual way, but then bless them on Tuesday, subject to Fred's intervention.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Are we having a meeting Tuesday?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, at 3:30. These things happen so fast, and there was so much going on in the House, I wasn't able to concentrate on making sure everyone got notice and so on. Then I was getting representations and suggestions from various members of the committee, and it was all a little unco-ordinated.

MR GOGO: 3 o'clock?

MR CHAIRMAN: 3:30. Again, it's a compromise, as these meeting times always are, in finding the least conflicting thing to fit in with a number of busy people's schedules.

MR GOGO: Well, there's no limit to the number of meetings we can have anyway. I think what I hear you saying is that we shouldn't be making formal decisions without Mr. Mandeville.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well at least without his having had decent notice of the meeting. There are times when he can't come, and he sends a representative. We're quite sure he's coming on Tuesday. He suggested Tuesday without specifying a time. Walter Buck said that if Fred could not come on Tuesday, Walter would come.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Well, we would have entertainment anyway.

MR CHAIRMAN: I won't tell him what you said.

MR GOGO: As I understand, we're going to be dealing with some items that are pretty clear, because he has spoken to them on the past. I don't see that as a concern.

MR CHAIRMAN: Anybody seen Frank this morning?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, he's around. It's usually me you guys are waiting for.

MR CHAIRMAN: There he is. Okay. Frank, we thought that since we hadn't given Fred Mandeville notice of this meeting, we should go through the agenda in the usual way. Any resolutions we pass would be duly recorded, and Fred would be given the notes of the representative of his caucus as well as the minutes. Then on Tuesday, when we have our properly constituted meeting, Fred would have an opportunity to object or ask for further discussion, and so on, and we'd simply bless the resolutions we had passed today. Is that all right?

MR APPLEBY: Fine.

MR CHAIRMAN: Should we start on the policy on mass mailings? We'll approve the minutes of the last meeting on Tuesday.

MR PURDY: I'm the one who put the policy on mass mailings on the agenda. I'd like to get some guidelines from the members here on exactly what we should be doing. I'm working with Bohdan on this, and I have another memo coming out to members of our caucus, trying to lay out the parameters and guidelines they can follow. It will also be useful for the other parties in the House to have that information.

I have a number of questions asked of me by members of our caucus that I'm unable to answer in a clear, concise manner until we get some guidance from here. Bohdan is also of that opinion, too, that we have to come up with a policy on this. Number one, what are mass mailings? What procedure do we use in having them printed? What procedure in getting them mailed out to the constituents in a mass mailing manner? There was a fourth one . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: How often?

MR STEFANIUK: No, there's a budget limitation.

MR PURDY: There's a budget limitation there that we can follow. The fourth one was for fast-growth areas -- how do we handle that? Like myself, Sheila Embury, I guess Connie, Milt Pahl, Myrna Fyfe, who have very rapid-growth areas. In my constituency I had eligible voters of 19,000 in the last election, up to about 23,000 right now if an enumeration were held. The budget has an item in there of 10 per cent for the 1979 election, wasn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: No, there was no increase. It was based on the enumeration for the '79 election.

MR PURDY: So we have to have some policy adopted for that so I, as secretary of our caucus, know how to get a memo out to members of our caucus, and I'm sure the other parties would like to know.

MR CHAIRMAN: You've identified four headings, Bill. One is the nature of a mass mailing -- what you can send out. Number two is the method of getting them produced, printing. Number three is delivery, especially with regard to fast-growth areas. Number four, I would suggest, is application of the budget

guidelines, how it is divided among the members. Is it going to be on a per-member basis or what?

MR PURDY: That's already been done.

MR STEFANIUK: At a previous meeting, Mr. Appleby proposed the formula on which the budget would be based. It would be on the '79 enumeration. The number of voters enumerated would be divided by two, to establish the number of households. I believe that would be multiplied by 40 cents.

MR APPLEBY: We worked it out on what we thought the number of households would be based on that formula, and it worked out to approximately 40 cents.

MR STEFANIUK: So the formula, then, is the number of voters divided by two, multiplied by 40 cents. That's what each member's entitlement is.

MRS OSTERMAN: I thought that was for the initial disbursement of funds. Do we not have to then take a look at that in light of the information the members could bring in terms of the number of people out of their post offices? Under the new Election Act, when are we going to have our first enumeration?

MR APPLEBY: September.

MR GOGO: I think we're on very delicate ground unless we have some factual information. To me the only factual information we can have is enumeration; otherwise, we're guessing.

MRS OSTERMAN: We're not guessing if you go to the post office, John, which I've just done.

MR APPLEBY: Your post offices, I know in my case, are not accurate inasmuch as they lap over into other constituencies.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, the post office wouldn't respect constituency boundaries.

MRS OSTERMAN: In my case, say, Airdrie, which is the fastest growing community in the province, the number of families in Airdrie is very accurate. It doesn't go into anybody else's constituency. I don't know about others. I realize the problem, but we ought to be able to find some way to address that.

MR APPLEBY: We discussed this in our caucus and my understanding is that we reached the conclusion that we were well advanced into the budget year anyway, and there was probably some possibility the funds would not all be expended by all members anyway. It would not limit you even if with a rapid-growth area. You would still have sufficient to have at least one first-class mailing, because you have sufficient funds for more than two first-class mailings. Then we would have the new enumeration in September, and we would go from there for next year's budget.

MR PURDY: One thing I'm not clear on, Frank: is printing also paid for in that mass mailing?

MR STEFANIUK: It can be.

MR PURDY: It can be, but it's still not clear.

MR STEFANIUK: My major problem in administering this is to define a mass mailing. That results from the kind of query that has been placed before me thus far. When this program was first conceived, it was anticipated that every member might wish to prepare some form of newsletter based on that member's activity in the House or the activity in the House generally, for distribution to every household within the given member's constituency. Now we have a variety of questions coming before us. One which I felt qualified to reject was to reject one which dealt with the printing of a document by a political party. I don't feel that should be distributed through the use of public funds, so I would refuse that to any member. Another one that has come up, however, has been reprinting of speeches through *Hansard*. In other words, a member who has made a speech in the House wishes it reprinted by *Hansard* through the normal service we have available there for reprinting of speeches, and the member may wish only 500 of those, which will be mailed to select constituents. What are select constituents? Is that members of the party in the given constituency? Can we authorize the mailing on that basis? We don't control the mailing list after all.

MR CHAIRMAN: I really don't think we should have a thing to say about the mailing list. If you're going to enquire about any other members, you're going to have to enquire about the Member for Spirit River-Fairview as well. I can imagine where he would tell us to go if we wanted to know how many of his mailing list were members of his party.

MR APPLEBY: This would be a list assembled by the member.

MR STEFANIUK: So I gather that funds that can be used for payment for something called a mass mailing does not necessarily mean a mailing to every household in the constituency? It can be a selected list?

MR APPLEBY: I would agree to that.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, what did you say at the last?

MR PURDY: A selected list.

MR STEFANIUK: It can be a selected list on the part of the member.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh yes.

MR STEFANIUK: Then, what form must this mailing take? Is there any restriction on that? Will items such as the reprinting of speeches qualify for charge under the communications budget, as it has now been identified?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think we've really got to address this whole matter in very, very general terms. As many different personalities as are involved -- you go into the constituencies and the kind of communication that someone does in Edmonton Centre is completely different from the communication that somebody does in Spirit River-Fairview, Olds-Didsbury, Three Hills, or whatever. As long as we really place the very serious caveat that there is to be no party message on behalf of the Social Credit, the Conservatives -- whatever -- I think a member should be able to communicate, whether it's by way of questionnaires, sending out a speech, anything that that member feels is important to his or her constituents, just as long as we stay away from a direct party or political communication. It's whoever he or she wants to address in that way. I'd like to see the budget split fairly, on the basis of the number of households in that constituency. Then if the member uses that

budget in one fell swoop, by personally going to a more expensive form -- I'm sure it costs less to just put something "To Householders". But if they go to a personalized thing and use it in one shot, then they've used it. I would like to see some general parameters like that set, then it's left entirely in the hands of the member. If they use their budget, they use their budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Supposing we gather this together into some resolutions.

MR STEFANIUK: May I ask another question? I think what we have in mind at the moment is something that is mailed. Another question that has arisen is, can the allowance be used to buy space in a newspaper or periodical for the purpose of communicating with constituents? In some instances, members are receiving that kind of service on a no-charge basis. Local weeklies, for example, are quite willing to publish a weekly report from a given member of the Assembly. In other areas, however, I gather that members are not receiving that kind of co-operation from the local newspaper -- it's usually a weekly newspaper they are concerned with -- and the local newspaper is asking them to pay a fee for publishing an open letter to constituents, for example.

In still other cases, the member is interpreting this communications allowance as being an allowance for a form of advertising, if you like. I have been approached, for example, as to whether or not a portion of the allowance can be used for advertising the existence of a constituency office and the hours during which that office is open.

MR APPLEBY: Could the allowance for the constituency office not cover that type of expenditure?

MR STEFANIUK: I suppose under the new legislation -- and I would have to look at it again -- it might.

MR CHAIRMAN: If we agree it can be used for that kind of advertising, and it's in the discretion of the member, then he's got a limit on both budgets, the mass mailing one and the constituency office operation. We could leave it to the member under which heading he is going to use it.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I think we're asking for a lot of problems. I think some fundamental principles should exist. One is that each member should be treated equally. We made that decision of 40 cents per household. I don't like the term "mass mailing". I think it should be "communication". I don't think for one moment I should sit in judgment of a man who wants to hold pre-session meetings in his constituency and put that in the paper, and we not pay for that, yet we're paying a hundred times more than that to someone who wants to have an office. So I think we should divorce it from the offices. I think we should allow a member a communication allowance of 40 cents per household -- I sense from Frank that we arrived at that figure -- to be used however they want to use it. On receipt of valid receipts to the Clerk, that bill would be paid -- whether it's postage, advertising, TV, whatever. I don't even think we should try to get into the political aspect. That should be up to the member.

MR CHAIRMAN: Except that we don't want party -- soliciting party memberships, do we want that?

MR GOGO: I think there are such things as ethics and good taste. I don't want to see a witch hunt, where a member is going to turn in what he believes to be valid receipts and the Clerk of this Assembly is going to spend seven months, like some ministers of this government do in approving travel claims for

certain people on business. Our job is to facilitate the role of the member. I'm not saying we shouldn't have guidelines, don't get me wrong. I just want to stick to some principles: we treat members equally. The best one I've heard is from Mr. Appleby, 40 cents per household. I believe it should be termed a communications allowance. The way that is used should be very general -- Connie has touched on that. If the member wants to use half of that in putting ads in a paper, saying I'll be in your area in a given week before a session, I think that's a communications allowance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Also if you're telling where your constituency office is.

MR GOGO: Exactly. If we get too niggly, we're going to defeat the purpose. I'd like to speak later on Connie's point about growth, but that's another matter.

MR PURDY: Just to follow along what John said, I don't know if anybody has looked at the parameters of the franking privileges in the House of Commons, but about four times a year I get a mail drop from Joe Clark. Within that mail drop it advertises that his annual meeting will be held in Barrhead on November 28, that he was at a barbeque at Whitecourt, sponsored by the Yellowhead PC Association -- things like that. I'm wondering what their parameters and guidelines are in the House of Commons.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's pretty wide open.

MR PURDY: We could be adopting some of those.

MR CHAIRMAN: Don't we get some of the headquarters PC stuff?

MR APPLEBY: Oh yes. I don't know how they come, but I do know we get letters from the MPs which include a lot of political information.

MRS OSTERMAN: Can I ask a question? If a person advertises an annual meeting -- like when I advertise my annual meetings, it's for all constituents. They don't have to be Conservatives. Maybe that makes a difference, if it's a public meeting. It's sponsored by the association, and certain people at that meeting have a section of the meeting where some things go on, but the rest of it is for public participation. I guess that's the kind of gray area we're talking about. You'd have to have a long discussion in terms of the gray area, then members are going to have to use some discretion to some degree.

MR CHAIRMAN: The consensus I see perhaps coming out of this is that we should keep our cotton picking fingers out of what a member wants to send out. If we have trouble later on, if we get flak because of public funds used for sending out party propaganda, we can take another look at the guidelines at that time.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Does that place too much of an onus? Shouldn't we just say that party affiliation not be mentioned?

MR APPLEBY: I personally would follow along with John's reasoning here. I think the caucus should come to the conclusion on the type of material you send out.

MR CHAIRMAN: Supposing Fred Mandeville wants to use his to tout the virtues of Mr. Sykes in a few days. Should there be any objection to that?

MR GOGO: Mr. Mandeville is communicating with his constituents. That's my point.

MR CHAIRMAN: And they elected him as a Social Credit member.

MR GOGO: Frank alluded to the view of our caucus. I've had a member of my caucus say, you know, an annual meeting is a function of me as a member. It's an annual meeting of my constituency.

MR CHAIRMAN: As Connie says, you don't exclude people who don't carry party cards.

MR GOGO: With respect, the tighter we try to get, the more difficulty we put the Clerk in in trying to interpret. If we come up with the consensus that it's 40 cents per household, a communications allowance, with very general, broad guidelines, I think that's the best way to solve the problem.

MR APPLEBY: Could we resolve it in this manner, that we follow John's suggestion along that it be 40 cents per MLA per household and that each caucus will transmit to the Clerk what they expect to be sent out under those guidelines?

MR CHAIRMAN: Does it have to come through the caucus?

MR APPLEBY: I don't think we should decide for everybody what they're going to send out.

MR CHAIRMAN: Why can't the individual member communicate with the Clerk? And if several members want to gang up on a project . . .

MR APPLEBY: You might create hassles for the Clerk that way, if he hasn't got something to follow.

MR PURDY: The Clerk's has no guidelines and we don't give him any. We're leaving him in a real dilemma.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're only dealing with one thing right now, aren't we? We're dealing with the nature of the communication. We're saying it can be radio time, newspaper advertising, circulars, TV time.

MR APPLEBY: Excerpts from *Hansard*.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right, whatever the member chooses.

MR STEFANIUK: The forum is left to the member's discretion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we agreed on that? It was your idea, John.

MR GOGO: I want to make sure it's abundantly clear here that if Mrs. Osterman in Three Hills, in July of this year -- and I would include this in communication -- decided to have a float in a parade and a poster in her car, "MLA Three Hills", that's communication. That's what I'm getting at. Let's not get niggly. As long as she doesn't go over the limit, I call that communication. You can only spend it once.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Will that create any problem for you?

MR STEFANIUK: No. As long as I have the guideline, I can work within it. That's all I'm looking for -- a guideline. I'm not attempting to recommend policy of any kind.

MR APPLEBY: I think the guidelines have to be such, if possible, that Bohdan is not put in the position of having to make a judgment.

MR STEFANIUK: The other question that does arise is the use of politically oriented material. Let me put this one before you as a hypothetical situation. The Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta prints up a communication which is entirely slanted on party lines and which is identified as a publication of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta. Can the member use the allowance to distribute that kind of information?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think we should stay away from it. If that's where it originates, then I think that should be one of the guidelines. Again, the guidelines are loose, but the guidelines should say that -- there just isn't any other content. It is something that the association itself would normally do.

MR GOGO: On that point, Connie, could we assist the Clerk by saying a registered political party of Alberta material is not acceptable?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That sounds like a good idea.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR GOGO: If you want to call the Three Hills Progressive Association, that's not the registered party of Alberta -- that's your business.

MR APPLEBY: It is registered, is it not?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think so.

MRS OSTERMAN: I just wouldn't send it out under my association. If it's just a direct political communication on behalf of the association, they would do it themselves.

MR APPLEBY: Anything under the auspices of a registered political association should not come under this allowance.

MR GOGO: I don't like to keep talking about this, but Connie Osterman has stationery. On that stationery, it's Connie Osterman, PC Member for Three Hills constituency. To me, that's not political.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's mere identification.

MR GOGO: That's identification.

MR STEFANIUK: Let me give you an example. I had a news release come to me in the House, and a request that that news release be distributed. The news release was printed on the political party news release letterhead. I turned down the request on the basis that that was political information coming into the House and the Clerk's office was in no position to handle it. If the news release had come and had been identified as Frank Appleby, MLA, I have no difficulty with it.



MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR APPLEBY: I think maybe we've got something here finally.

MR CHAIRMAN: One other thing. If you're going to have this restriction, what about political party news; for example, a constituency picnic. Can you tuck that in?

MRS OSTERMAN: Run that by me again.

MR CHAIRMAN: A constituency picnic. You've decided to have one at Airdrie. Your release is coming. You're inviting everybody, but it's under the auspices of your constituency association.

MRS OSTERMAN: It's open to the public.

MR STEFANIUK: That's okay. That's probably on the same basis as your announcing your constituency meeting, which is open to the public.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right. I think we've looked at enough examples that you start to be able to get a few categories.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm happy to have the guidelines. Bill brought to me, for example, a question from Andy Little about reprinting of speeches. My reply to Bill was that my personal opinion is yes, this should qualify, but I wish some clarification from the committee.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we sum it up this way? It's at the member's discretion -- radio time, newspaper ads or texts, circulars, TV time, float in the parade, but not political party publications or constituency party association publications, but giving party identification of MLA is okay, also advertising party activities open to the public.

MR APPLEBY: Is this information going to the MLAs?

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR APPLEBY: Could we leave out that one about a float in a parade. I don't want to give them any ideas.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I just wonder if we should mention them, because if we miss something out, then somebody is going to come and want to know about it. Can we just say that any communication . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's just say advertising. That covers a multitude of sins.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That doesn't originate from a registered political party.

MRS OSTERMAN: The things are good examples. It should be stated that they are only examples, and from those examples members may be able to interpret what it is that follows.

MR CHAIRMAN: That, then, would cover the nature of it. Do you want to deal with the production of it? One of the points Bill mentioned was printing.

MR APPLEBY: Anything within your 40 cents. Once you've spent that, you've had it.

MR CHAIRMAN: And there would be nothing wrong with several members ganging up and having the same piece of printing, or whatever.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't see a problem with that from an administrator's point of view. I don't see any problem with a member deciding he wants to handle the thing entirely on his own and give the printing business to a printer in his constituency, or asking the Clerk's office to arrange for the printing of it and the Clerk then uses his discretion as to where he can get the best deal for his dollars. I think there's flexibility in that, and I really don't think there's a whole lot of need for clarification.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we say that printing or any other process of producing the material, whatever it may be, is in the member's discretion?

MR APPLEBY: It just covers printing, and that's . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: No, it could be printing, photocopying, mimeographing.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may throw a monkey wrench into the whole thing. I have X number of dollars. I have a file upstairs on alcohol. I think there must be 75 names in it. Those people were promised communication as soon as there was legislation.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're going to send them the Act.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes. I think I can do that in the normal course of my MLA office. The question I have to ask is, how will we determine what's going to start to fall within our budget?

MR STEFANIUK: You want to send out the legislation, the Bill?

MRS OSTERMAN: I sent out some excerpts by way of explanation and a letter to these people. I considered that to be in the normal course of events. I don't consider that more of a mass communication.

MR STEFANIUK: That's presumably individual enquiries from your constituents. I wouldn't interpret that as falling into this category of a communications allowance. That would be within your normal day to day work as a member.

MR PURDY: You're responding to an enquiry?

MRS OSTERMAN: Right. So it's when we initiate it ourselves and decide to put out a whole bunch of stuff that . . . That's where I think we're going to . .

MR CHAIRMAN: What I hope we can avoid this morning is deciding how many is a mass mailing and how many is a small one.

MR PURDY: That's at members' discretion.

MR CHAIRMAN: It makes a difference in the budgeting, because the small ones come within the administration expenses from the caucus, and the big ones come under this.

MR PURDY: If I'm going to take my membership list upstairs of 500 constituents, that comes under the communication allowance. I've originated that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose you select 100 of them and decide they're the ones who are especially interested in liquor.

MR PURDY: I sent a hundred out, but those were people who made enquiries to me.

MR GOGO: If you want to use the communications allowance to buy a thousand copies of *Hansard*, surely we're not going to get nit-picky because you mail them out of the Assembly and try to identify; otherwise we're going to have to have -- we're just asking for difficulty.

MR CHAIRMAN: You know, there is another safeguard to that. If any caucus member starts to do mass mailings out of caucus funds, he is going to hear about it from his or her colleagues.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just interject again. It is important that that be generally addressed so that members will realize that what they've been doing in the normal course of events won't change.

MR APPLEBY: It probably will in some cases.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is always somebody who will test the limits. You can see, though, that answering the enquiries of a pressure group, for example, and sending form letters -- like the Wabamun people or the engineers last year.

MR PURDY: I have a form letter to answer the Wabamun people if you like.

MR CHAIRMAN: Good. So then on point two we've agreed that the method of producing whatever it's going to be is in the member's discretion. Under point three, the delivery, is at the sole discretion of the member.

MR PURDY: On that point, talking to the Clerk; if you go, say, to the local paper, he has a mechanism set up with the post office and the post office bills him. So if you go to your local printer and say that I want to print up 10,000 of this mailing communication to my people in these post offices, that guy will look after it from that point and then bill the Clerk's office, as I understand it. Is that correct?

MR CHAIRMAN: One incidental question. Is anyone concerned about their choice of supplier? Is that going to be the member or the Clerk who is going to do that? Supposing the members give all the work to party adherents. The president of the constituency association owns a printing plant, and he gets the job. The public gets it and says taxpayers' money funnelled on a political basis.

MRS OSTERMAN: It wasn't done by way of tender, or something.

MR PURDY: It's the same as you buying your car as a minister from your constituent who may be the president of the association and owns the Chrysler dealership in that town.

MR CHAIRMAN: No.

MR PURDY: Oh yes, it is.

MR CHAIRMAN: I mean I haven't done that.

MR PURDY: But it does take place, sir.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm just wondering.

MR APPLEBY: The MLA should have the say where he gets his printing done. If he wants some assistance or requests the Clerk's office to help him in that respect, to provide names, or whatever . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, especially if the MLA has contacts and people are sympathetic and willing to do a job cheaper. It means you will be able to put out more information.

MR CHAIRMAN: This directly affects the financial responsibility of the Clerk. It means that he will accept the supplier chosen by the MLA and the terms on which the MLA orders the stuff.

MR STEFANIUK: We do that now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with constituency offices. The member decides from whom he or she will rent premises. The members decide who they will engage for secretarial assistance.

MR CHAIRMAN: But the member doesn't decide the terms of the lease or the terms of employment.

MR STEFANIUK: No, that's a standard contract. Well, as a matter of fact, the member does. They decide probably the most important term in the lease: how much they're going to pay.

MR CHAIRMAN: I know.

MR STEFANIUK: There's nothing to say that a member couldn't deal with a party member and pay the party member more than they could lease premises for from someone else. That's at the member's discretion. The member instructs the Clerk, according to the legislation, to enter into an agreement. The Clerk doesn't have any discretion there, other than to be sure that limits are not exceeded.

MR APPLEBY: I think we've kicked that around long enough, haven't we?

MR GOGO: One final point, Frank. What if I want to hire the local boy scout troop to distribute something? We're coming now to the payment question.

MR APPLEBY: You'd have to have a receipt from them.

MR GOGO: What I'm leading up to is that my preference would be that the member incurs the expense, the member pays the expense, and the member is reimbursed the expense. I don't know whether that presents a problem to the Clerk. I think it presents a problem to the member.

MR CHAIRMAN: Taxation-wise.

MR STEFANIUK: Here in my role as a protector of the members, I have that concern. If we pay the member directly for anything, there could be a tax question. So I can only recommend that the member make arrangements for the payment to be made directly to the supplier. However, I have no difficulty with the administrative process if the member prefers that I pay the member. If that's what the member prefers, that's great. But I think the member

should be aware that there is that possibility of being taxed for funds received.

MR CHAIRMAN: The payments really should come directly from the Clerk to the supplier.

MR GOGO: All I'm saying, I guess, Mr. Chairman, is that if we hire the local boy scout troop to do something, the bill is \$105. As long as we come up with a statement from X-Y-Z boy scout troop, the member initials it for payment . . .

MR STEFANIUK: In that kind of case, John, I suggest you don't even have to come up with a statement. You can give me a memorandum which will instruct me to pay to X-Y-Z boy scout troop the sum of \$105, to compensate them for distribution of a newsletter through my constituency. I use that as the statement.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we consider that agreed upon?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: What about stamps, if you're going to mail with stamps?

MR STEFANIUK: Just get the post office receipt and we will reimburse you, or your constituency secretary would be preferred.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we just follow that stamp business. I'm so uneasy about members being taxed for this kind of thing. I think if you could arrange it ahead of time, you would be better off to let the Clerk somehow buy those stamps, or pay for them.

MR STEFANIUK: What we have suggested, Mr. Chairman, is that as a rule these things are handled through a constituency office. What we can do is reimburse the secretary in that office rather than the member, on production of receipts.

MR CHAIRMAN: The test case of Graham Harle's is still before the courts. Don McCrimmon made no secret of it. I think it cost him close to \$2,000 in back income tax.

MR PURDY: It cost me \$2,700.

MR CHAIRMAN: There you go.

MR APPLEBY: It cost me \$1,400.

MR CHAIRMAN: The reason was, Connie, we were paying money to the members to reimburse them for expenses, and the tax people said . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: You didn't keep track of it?

MR PURDY: It didn't matter.

MR CHAIRMAN: The fact that it was paid to the member. That's why we must always pay -- like the feds. They pay nothing to the member. The secretaries in the constituency offices are all paid from Ottawa. The rents are paid from Ottawa. We're doing that on constituency offices, too. You mustn't pay it yourself and get the money back.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I have another problem to raise under this general topic. It has to do, now that we have in place this communications allowance, with, again, a practice by some members to skirt around use of the allowance for other services which are available. Primarily it has to do with buying extra copies of *Hansard*, for which we make a charge, or reprinting speeches, for which we make a nominal charge. My information is that members are refusing in some instances to lay out the money for extra copies of reprints or entire documents, and are extensively using photocopying machines, over which there is little or no control. I received a report which indicated to me that the machine located on the third floor, which is assigned to the Clerk's office and is located in that office which is located between the library and the Clerk's office, last month produced 61,000 copies. The manufacturer is amazed that the machine did not burst at the seams. I am informed by my administrative staff that much of that work, much of the work on that machine, is in fact photocopying by member's secretaries of excerpts from *Hansard* or entire editions of *Hansard*, as well as speeches.

MR CHAIRMAN: En masse?

MR STEFANIUK: En masse. 61,000 copies is just amazing.

MR CHAIRMAN: Isn't that remedy in your own hands? Aren't you going to have to post a guard over the machine?

MR STEFANIUK: This is why I bring it to the committee. There was a time when the Clerk's office had in this building, back in 1976, a room which was known as a duplicating room, where we had some very elaborate duplicating equipment and where we were in fact providing duplicating services to all departments of government at no charge. It seemed to us that it was wrong for the Clerk's office to be providing this kind of service at no charge to all offices in the building, since they all have budgets for their individual duplication needs. So that facility was dismantled. What we are up against now, and might be even more in light of the communications allowance, is even more serious abuses -- I use that term advisedly -- of that equipment. It is not printing equipment; it is photocopying equipment. Yet we are using it to such an extent that a commercial printer could well make a living on this equipment.

I place before the committee, because it ties in with the communications facility now, the advisability of instituting a system whereby use of the machine would be policed to the extent that we might have to put a staff member in place. We have this problem on the increase since we have relocated, because the machine is in a remote location.

MR CHAIRMAN: Remote from the staff, but convenient for passers-by.

MR STEFANIUK: Right. The machine did not enjoy this same volume of useage when we were located in Room 511, because users were very visible to the staff. But now it appears we are getting party material run on that machine. I have had samples of it brought to my desk and it's strictly party material. There is the normal abuse of recipes being copied, and I don't think we really have a serious argument with that kind of thing. Occasionally that occurs in every office. It's one of the little abuses that is tolerated. But there are obviously large-scale abuses when one machine produced 61,000 copies in a single month.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can you put it in the vault?

MR STEFANIUK: We don't have a vault.

MR CHAIRMAN: It is used as a vault.

MR STEFANIUK: We do not have a vault on the second floor.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is there a lot of printing going on at night? I'm thinking of just a few members.

MR STEFANIUK: We don't know.

MR APPLEBY: I have seen people there that I couldn't identify.

MR CHAIRMAN: The press?

MR APPLEBY: Not even the press.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I've seen people there too.

MR GOGO: We're coming to it later in the agenda, but last week the dental plan that's going to our caucuses. I had asked my secretary to produce a memo with that document, and said the machine in the Premier's office had broken down and she would have to use another machine. I presume that's maybe the machine. That's an example.

MR PURDY: Don't you have a xerox up at your end?

MR GOGO: It was broken down. I'm think now, that would account for four pages times 8,300 copies, I suppose.

MR STEFANIUK: I think that's a legitimate document, though.

MR APPLEBY: Over what period of time was this, Bo?

MR STEFANIUK: One month.

MR GOGO: 61,000?

MR PURDY: At 3 cents a copy?

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, the cost is higher than that. It's about 7.

MR STEFANIUK: The thing is that we can print by much more economical means. We can go to offset printing at the government's Quick Print Centre and produce a hundred copies of that document for a hell of a lot less than what you will pay on the photocopying machine. This may be a question of educating secretaries. But by the same token, if a member says, get this through because I don't want to have to pay anything for it, then I'm going to continue to have the problems with photocopying machines. I'm a little more anxious about this problem because, as you know, even in consideration of the '81-82 budget, we increased the number of machines in the building.

MR APPLEBY: Okay, we've got a problem. How could it be resolved? Have you got any ideas?

MR STEFANIUK: I would hate to have to get into a position where we have to police the machine.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we do.

MR STEFANIUK: I would like to try a system whereby members of this committee would attempt to educate their caucuses, at least on a trial basis. I'm having the figures for that particular machine reconstructed for a six-month period, to show us the fluctuation in volumes.

MR APPLEBY: That machine is available 24 hours a day?

MR STEFANIUK: It is turned off at the end of a normal working day, Frank. Somebody who knows how to operate it can activate the damn thing again.

MR CHAIRMAN: But your outside front door is locked.

MR APPLEBY: But you can get in it.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not talking about my own office; I'm talking about the second floor.

MR CHAIRMAN: When the House is sitting nights, it's open.

MR PURDY: Oh, that's the one you're talking about. I don't even know where it is.

MR STEFANIUK: There is a small room between the library and the offices we now occupy on the second floor. It stands there by itself.

MR PURDY: What about the copy machine on the third floor?

MR STEFANIUK: That one is reasonable.

MRS OSTERMAN: I have a feeling we're not talking about members so much then.

MR APPLEBY: We are, because I know that Barbara -- quite often I've asked where she was, and they said she's down on the second floor xeroxing.

MR PURDY: I think there is an answer to it if you want to go this means, and you could have xerox look at it. Put a mechanism on there, as near as I can determine, that just keys it. It will cost you 10 cents a copy to get a copy out of it.

MR CHAIRMAN: The libraries have those.

MR PURDY: In the daytime, when you're going to use it for ordinary use, you can key it off.

MR STEFANIUK: That means that members' secretaries will have a wad of dimes.

MR PURDY: What I'm saying is that from 8 o'clock in the morning to 4:30, you key it where it works on the ordinary principle, but after that it is locked out; you have to put a dime in.

MR STEFANIUK: But Bill, even during the day, we know that some of the political stuff that has come off the machine has come off during the day.

MR GOGO: Take the machine out of there until we get a complaint.

MR CHAIRMAN: That won't take long.



MR STEFANIUK: About 5 minutes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe Bill has the solution. Let's try to get a library model with a key to deactivate the pay mechanism. The pay mechanism is on all the time, but when a secretary comes, because her machine is broken down and wants five or 10 copies, the pay mechanism can be unlocked and deactivated.

MR STEFANIUK: Does that resolve the daytime abuses?

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure, because the pay mechanism is on 24 hours a day, unless somebody on your staff unlocks it.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't think that's realistic.

MR CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR STEFANIUK: That means that we have to post somebody on that machine, because what we have right now is line-ups to use it.

MR APPLEBY: No wonder, it's a bonanza.

MR STEFANIUK: We would have to put a staff member on that machine.

MR CHAIRMAN: What we're talking about is cheaper than a salary.

MR PURDY: 61,000 copies at 10 cents, that's \$4,270.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think it would be useful, for me anyway, to get copies of some of the legitimate material that has been printed as an example. When next our caucus meets, I can use some examples.

MR APPLEBY: I think those would have to be applicable to our caucus.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's what I'm saying.

MR STEFANIUK: We don't always get them, because some people are careful in cleaning up; others are sloppier.

MR CHAIRMAN: The time is running out, and we're going to have trouble if we're going to deal with this in detail as a committee. Could I suggest that we delegate to the Clerk the responsibility of developing proposals for practical safeguards, which might include a sign posted on the machine and periodic, random checking as to who is using it. When that happens, let's circulate it immediately to all the members of the committee so they will have that before them for whatever meeting of the committee happens afterwards.

MR APPLEBY: Maybe he could bring it back on Tuesday.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's a little soon.

MR APPLEBY: Not really.

MR GOGO: Frankly, it's during the sitting that I think we're exposed to that problem.

MRS OSTERMAN: More so.

MR STEFANIUK: That's why I've asked for a six month.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would like to have some sort of an example of the abuse, because I think there is an educating process to do. Maybe I would even fit in this category of sending out -- like when you were talking about the other methods of printing. When an Act or a certain part of a discussion, because you've got so many enquiries about it, has to be sent out, should I be taking that *Hansard* and have somebody xerox that page, or should I have that page extracted in a different way if there are 75 people to send it to? I don't know. I'm thinking that maybe all of us maybe need some sort of education, as well as the secretaries. If there is a question about what the secretaries can do, I would be happy to receive -- and I once in a while do -- a concern about whatever is being done. I will talk to members of my caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: A lot of this could be very innocent. A member could say to a secretary, get me so many copies of this. And he doesn't have any idea where the secretary is going to get it.

MR STEFANIUK: I realize that. What I'm saying is that we don't normally like to go into a caucus office and say, we're going to tell you how to operate. But if the members of this committee authorize us to go in to the caucus offices and brief them on how certain things ought to be done, then we'll be happy to do that as an educational process.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you agree with the suggestion that the Clerk develop guidelines and, in the meantime, adopt such temporary safeguards as may seem practical, and that the guidelines be circulated to the members of this committee as soon as they are ready?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that your motion, Connie?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR GOGO: Is that item one dealt with?

MRS OSTERMAN: The high-growth area, and I want to raise one other thing, Mr. Chairman. When we pushed for the principle of a communications allowance, we did it on the basis of what we thought would be so many communications a year. With the way now, the kind of discussion we've had I think has been beneficial for my part, because I didn't consider all the other things when we developed the philosophy and decided to go this route. Our communications allowance really isn't going to cover what we originally thought was the basic or minimum amount of communications. We had to develop it somehow so I think we sort of pulled something out of the air that had to do with mailing. I just want to serve notice that I think we're going to have to look at this very carefully. Depending on how it works and how much communication is done, I'd like to see this come back on the agenda, because I may forget myself at a point in time, which may be next spring or summer. Maybe it's something that has to wait until our next enumeration. But I don't think it's going to cover as much as we would like it to. We've already developed our '81-82 budget. It may well be that we'll have to look at a special warrant to really do the job that's going to be necessary. Our members have some expectations; I had some expectations, and they were generated by the way we developed this in the first place. Obviously a lot of us didn't think of the ramifications of what all the costs would be.

I really want that to be looked at closely. I for one, and I think Bill and others in our caucus, will have to let our caucus members know that there isn't going to be the ability to maybe do the same number, if they were just thinking of it in terms of, say, mailing communication.

MR GOGO: I'm sure, Connie, you'll agree in principle that if we put in place a system, we thought, of 40 cents a member, we'd have members dangling. You can't even use that because we haven't clarified it. I think that we've resolved the 40 cents per household. Get it out of the way. Let members do what they want to do, then address the issue of . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: How it has worked out.

MR APPLEBY: I think this is correct. If you were coming up with a mailing for all the householders in your constituency, work on that basis. I have a feeling we won't need a special warrant, because I also have a feeling there are a number of members who won't utilize their total expenditure for the rest of this year.

MR PURDY: This year is okay.

MR APPLEBY: Then we have the new enumeration, and we'll go on that basis. I think people should work on the basis that they can provide that they have this number of households and work on the 40 cents basis. If we need a special warrant later in the year . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Does someone want to encapsulate this in a motion?

MR PURDY: Maybe next Tuesday.

MR GOGO: I'm reaching the point where I'm going to move that we make this an official meeting so you can buy my lunch, because it's going a hell of a lot longer than I anticipated. I so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: And what is your motion?

MR GOGO: Whatever you say.

MR CHAIRMAN: You might regret that, John.

MR APPLEBY: We've already got it somewhere, haven't we?

MRS OSTERMAN: We're now talking about a policy that is not just applicable to the end of this year, but next year's policy.

MR APPLEBY: Well, let's make it this year.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Clerk is waiting for guidelines.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's fine, because I'm concerned about going into our next year's budget, which we already have in place, and that it's not going to be fair to members who have high growth areas. Rather than getting into a per-household allowance, I think there has to be -- we leave it for this year, until the end of this fiscal year. Then in the spring, if certain members can document, by way of bringing in an official statement of the number of households from a given area -- and it might have halved again, or doubled -- then we should recalculate the amount per member.

MR PURDY: But I think for the remainder of this year, we go the 40 cents across the board.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm agreed to that.

MR APPLEBY: How are you going to identify for the Clerk's benefit how many households you're going to have?

MR STEFANIUK: Based on the '79 enumeration. Mr. Chairman, could I offer, one, some information which might help clarify where we're at now and, two, ask a question. First of all, the increase from the current year's total budget to the 1981-82 budget is a straight 9.5 per cent. That's what has been done by this committee already in terms of the '81-82 budget for that particular item. The question I wish to ask: will the committee accept transfer of funds for communications allowance from one member to another?

MR CHAIRMAN: How could that arise?

MR STEFANIUK: Mrs. Osterman does not need to use all her allowance and Mr. Purdy needs more than he has. So Mrs. Osterman makes an arrangement with the Clerk's office whereby she says, I'll turn over 25 per cent of my allowance to Purdy. Can she do that?

MR CHAIRMAN: Trouble.

MR PURDY: Trouble.

MR GOGO: March 30 is the only time it could happen.

MR APPLEBY: At the end of the budget year.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'd say it's a limit, and if it's underspent, fine. If it's overspent, the member covers it.

MR APPLEBY: I don't agree with you.

MR PURDY: Why can't I this year, because I have 40 cents in place -- and theoretically that will take up at least three communication mass mailings. So why can't I use it in one mass mailing to my 23,000 constituents?

MR STEFANIUK: You can.

MR PURDY: You say I have to go on the enumeration of '79.

MRS OSTERMAN: No, no.

MR STEFANIUK: It's the budget that's based on '79. That doesn't mean you can't go to all your constituents and fit it in.

MR PURDY: Okay. That's clear, then.

MR APPLEBY: That's right. You've got that much money so spend, based on that enumeration.

MR CHAIRMAN: There's a motion, then, that the budget will be based on 40 cents per household of the 1979 enumeration.

MR STEFANIUK: Which is the old formula we described earlier.

MR PURDY: My budget is 40 cents on 19,000 constituents, but I could go 23,000 constituents and knock it back to 27 cents.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR STEFANIUK: No, we can't do that, because it's your budget that's arrived at.

MR PURDY: It's still total dollars. If you multiply 27 by 23,000 and 19,000 by 40, it comes out to the same.

MR STEFANIUK: No, the dollars are based on your 19,000 constituents.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's what Bill is saying. But when he goes to spend it, because he has 23,000 constituents . . .

MR STEFANIUK: He can spend it any way he likes.

MR APPLEBY: You've got 20,000 constituents at 40 cents each, you've got \$8,000 to spend -- all at once, or spread it out whatever you like.

MR PURDY: That's what I'm getting at, because this is the question that has been asked me by a number of members. Am I tied to that 13,000 voters I had last time?

MR APPLEBY: You are in the amount of money you get.

MR STEFANIUK: Rather than provide the members with the formula, maybe what we should do and in fact haven't done is calculate the budget, the dollar volume for each member, and say, you have \$1,736 and you have \$1,934. That's your limit; spend it whatever damn way you like.

MR CHAIRMAN: How soon can you get that out?

MR STEFANIUK: We've got it now.

MR CHAIRMAN: I know, but . . .

MR STEFANIUK: In fact we even have postal codes broken down for every single constituency. So if you come to our office tomorrow and want to know what the postal codes are that affect all your constituency, we can rhyme off the list.

MR PURDY: If you'll be there, I'll be there.

MR STEFANIUK: If you treat me the way the pages did last night, then I might be there. I went to gulp out of my water glass and found out it wasn't water.

MRS OSTERMAN: We all waited for that. As a matter of fact, I felt discriminated against. I asked why I didn't get similar treatment. Anyway, this is applicable to the end of this budget year. Correct?

MR PURDY: That's right.

MRS OSTERMAN: I thought someone was trying to make it cover '81-82.

MR PURDY: No, the other budget takes effect after we pass it in the House, April 1.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can I suggest that the Clerk and the Law Clerk reduce these conclusions to writing and guidelines, which will be submitted to the members for their scrutiny?

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR CHAIRMAN: The members of this committee, that is. That's agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PURDY: Then I can get it out to the members of my caucus.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed any further, could we have some guidelines here as to -- are we just going to proceed on this agenda as far as we can, until a certain time, then leave the rest to Tuesday? What's the plan?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't see how we can do anything else.

MR PURDY: I'd like to get out of here by noon.

MR CHAIRMAN: I should be out of here by 11:30 actually.  
Now, telephoning answering for constituency offices.

MR PURDY: I think the Clerk has some information on that.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, we distributed information on that subject to members on October 15, and it appears in the members' binders under tab number nine. Members will find there a memorandum from me to the committee dated October 15, supported by a memorandum from the administrative officer to me on July 17, having conducted a study of what was available in the market place. As well, the memorandum of July 17 makes a firm recommendation as to the type of equipment, and that is described in the final paragraph on page 2. For the record, my personal recommendation is to provide equipment which the members are able to access from a location other than their constituency office and that allows a message to run as long as the caller speaks. The most economical model which has these two features is the Recordacall 80 at \$599 per model. However, should the Members' Services Committee feel that warranty and maintenance convenience be an essential feature, I would recommend the model Callaphone 333 at \$899 each. This also happens to be the model that Alberta Government Telephones previously carried.

What we have, in conjunction with the latter recommendation for the Callaphone 333, is a situation at the moment where Edmonton Telephones is offering that model at a discount price. The regular price is \$895; they're offering it at a discount price of \$760.75, for a saving of \$134.25 per unit.

MR CHAIRMAN: How long is that open?

MR STEFANIUK: December 6.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's all over the province?

MR STEFANIUK: We can buy them all from Edmonton Tel.

MR PURDY: To get a motion on the discussion, I move that we authorize the Clerk to buy that Callaphone 333 at that saving price.

MR CHAIRMAN: How many, Bill?

MR PURDY: I can't determine that because I don't know how many members want them.

MR APPLEBY: Do you have to buy them on a mass purchase?

MR STEFANIUK: We have to buy by December 6 to get the deal. What we should also realize is that there is no funding for this particular item right now. The committee will recall that we built in funding for this item into the '81-82 budget, and the committee decided that that item should be removed from the '81-82 budget and that a special warrant should be raised instead, in order that this equipment could be put into place during the current fiscal year. It would mean, depending on how many we bought, that that number would multiply \$760.75 and we would need a warrant for that amount.

MRS OSTERMAN: What about members who already have some equipment like this in place? We haven't got an assessment of how many that pertains to, have we?

MR PURDY: How many constituency offices do you have now?

MR STEFANIUK: I believe there are 45 in existence.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Is this only for offices? Is this available for home too?

MR STEFANIUK: We're dealing here with constituency offices, as I understand it.

MR APPLEBY: It wouldn't be for other people who don't have a constituency office?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't know. This committee decides.

MR GOGO: If you read the memo from the Clerk on the 15th, he refers to constituencies and not offices. My feeling is that it is more important to those people who do not have offices.

MR CHAIRMAN: To have them in their homes.

MR GOGO: It is more important to have this equipment for those who do not have offices. Looking at the memo of October 15, it refers to constituencies, not constituency offices. My feeling is -- I draw your attention to the motion that was passed by this committee. In speaking to that, I've had representation from members who would like that. How they use it is their business. Obviously they want to use it in their home, because they don't have an office. I would think that that's a service we should be making available to them.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would have to be understood that if they have it in their constituency office, they don't get another one in their home.

MRS OSTERMAN: Only one.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'd simply say the constituency office is in his home and it's not costing the Clerk any rent.

MR PURDY: In my case, I have a constituency office that is not being funded by the province. The only thing being funded is the telephone that's in there now. The phone is manned from 8:30 in the morning till 5 o'clock at night, with no cost to anybody. So I would accept what John has said, that I should have one in my home.

MR GOGO: If I could still continue, Mr. Chairman, the bigger item, the major item, is that we now have arrangements whereby constituency office telephone bills are paid by the department, on direct billing from the Clerk. Members who have telephones in their homes, and they'll obviously be using this equipment for that, are paying those telephone bills themselves. I'm talking now of the rental of the number per month. So those who don't have a constituency office, if you follow me, are paying for their own telephone bills. Somehow I would like to see included that a member have a telephone number -- I suppose the caveat I would attach to it would be that "MLA" would have to be inserted in the directory beside his name -- that the Clerk would pay.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we getting outside the scope of authorizing . . .

MR APPLEBY: I think so.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I think so.

MR CHAIRMAN: Aren't we going to have to say somehow that the member has the constituency office in his or her home? Otherwise, have we any authority for spending this money to provide the service?

MR APPLEBY: I think the original notion covered the situation, did it not? By members in their constituencies.

MR CHAIRMAN: Here's another thing. It seems to me that if Edmonton Telephones is anxious to sell a bunch of these, they're not going to impose too short an artificial deadline on the Clerk if they know that he is hanging fire on an order for two or three dozen of them. We might even negotiate a discount price lower. I don't know whether there's a possibility of going to tender on these things or not. They're not going to sell them at a loss. Rather than to just strike out blindly and order a bunch of them that we might or might not need, it seems to be that we should try to negotiate and get the deadline extended, also consider whether someone else has these and get tenders. I don't know.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, in the memo of July 17, we have provided a complete list pursuant to our survey of equipment that is available, the supplier is identified in each case, and the cost is identified in each case. We have simply made a recommendation for the committee's recommendation that is based on the needs which certain members have described to our administrative organization.

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, these are not available except through -- well, it's Cardinal Communications?

MR STEFANIUK: Which?



MR CHAIRMAN: The one you're recommending.

MR STEFANIUK: The one we're recommending is on sale by the Phone Exchange of Edmonton Telephones, the 333. The price is uniform on these things.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's a factory sale.

MR STEFANIUK: The full price is that thing we normally refer to in the consumer world as the suggested retail price. Somebody may choose to give us a deal on a quantity, or they may not. I felt it was my responsibility to show the committee that at the moment somebody is offering them at a sale price. I have also worked out the figure if every member were to be supplied with one of these units, and it is \$60,099.25 for 79 members.

MR APPLEBY: Will it not be necessary to survey the members, with a cut-off date as to response, and follow up, say, a week before that cut-off date, having the secretarial staff try to get them by telephone if they haven't responded; find out how many we actually going to need?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: The cut-off date is a week from today, isn't it?

MR APPLEBY: Yes, I know. But you could probably get that extended a few days.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's an Edmonton Telephones sale; in other words, they are not listed here as a possible supplier. So we have two possible suppliers.

MR PURDY: Does the \$60,000 reflect the sale price or the suggested retail price?

MR STEFANIUK: The sale price.

MR PURDY: So if you went the other way, at \$900 apiece . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Multiply \$134.25 by 79, and you have the difference.

MR CHAIRMAN: Should Cardinal not be given an opportunity to match that?

MR STEFANIUK: It's not a question right now, Mr. Chairman, of who we're buying from.

MR APPLEBY: It's whether we buy.

MR STEFANIUK: Obviously it's incumbent upon the Clerk to find the best deal possible. That's a normal, routine procedure: to shop around and get the best possible deal. The question is: we have responded to a directive of this committee, on January 22, and we bring it back to the committee in report form.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the members are all going to have to be contacted and asked the question so we can ascertain how many are needed; maybe just add a few to that. If we know that we can get this by way of special warrant, attempt to do it.

MR STEFANIUK: I think there are a couple of questions to be considered. One, who needs it and who wants it? Number two, will the approving authority for special warrants entertain a special warrant application in the amount that is required?

MR CHAIRMAN: I think they likely would if this committee recommended it.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not in a position to make that assumption; perhaps the committee members are.

MR GOGO: I thought we had dealt with that in the motion. What I'd like to do -- and I come here for guidance -- is to advise my colleagues in our caucus: those who want to have electronic secretaries, put your order in.

MR APPLEBY: But have we decided that this is in your constituency rather than in your constituency office?

MR STEFANIUK: The motion reads constituency.

MR APPLEBY: Okay. I want to be sure we're clear on that, because that's going to make a difference in the decision of individual members.

MR STEFANIUK: The motion is quoted in my memo of October 15.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think they are going to have to be contacted by telephone, because members will be out; they won't be back up here for a while.

MR CHAIRMAN: Supposing we start off with a memo, and the telephone messages can be based on the memo. Supposing we start off with a memo to all members, then follow-up on the telephone.

MR STEFANIUK: Originating from whom?

MR CHAIRMAN: You.

MR STEFANIUK: From the caucuses to their respective members or from the Clerk's office?

MR APPLEBY: From the Clerk's office. Does this memo not have to be based on an assumption? If such a service is available, would you be interested in having it installed?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR STEFANIUK: Obviously, because we're not in the position to firmly offer it.

MR APPLEBY: Yes. I think this is the survey. Then after we get the response, we have to find out if we can get them.

MRS OSTERMAN: You'd have to state: if we were able to secure a special warrant for these devices, would you want one placed anywhere in your constituency, in the place of your choice? If those memos were sent out and all the secretaries were instructed to phone their members, that would certainly cut down on the amount of work. It wouldn't take that long to ascertain.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR PURDY: I withdraw the other motion I made previously, and move that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Clerk's memo to survey all MLAs as to whether wanted, if available.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: And they must reply by . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, they'll get called.

MR APPLEBY: I think the memo should give a deadline, then the secretary would follow up.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. What sort of deadline?

MR APPLEBY: By December 10. I think we can get an extension on this timing.

MR STEFANIUK: My own attitude is that whenever you go in and make a bulk purchase, you are in a good negotiating position.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: No one is on holidays yet. The secretaries should be able to get word back by next week, shouldn't they?

MR APPLEBY: They have to give time for that memo to get to them, before they follow it up.

MR CHAIRMAN: The 10th is a Wednesday.

MRS OSTERMAN: If the memo were out by late Tuesday, the secretaries would have Wednesday and Thursday to do their phoning.

MR APPLEBY: You mean, Connie, that they would phone and say, this memo has come in and they want an answer?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: And we'll mark it "urgent"?

MR APPLEBY: What deadline are you putting on it?

MR CHAIRMAN: How about the 10th? It's tight.

MR APPLEBY: Well, that's following it up by phone.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose we make it the 10th, and we follow up a week from today?

MR APPLEBY: There is no problem about putting it the 10th.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: As long as this is still open at that time.

MR GOGO: I think we confuse the issue, frankly, if we even talk about the damn dollars. I think this committee should say, that service is available, Mr. Member; if you want it, advise the Clerk or produce a receipt that you bought one. We keep getting into all the details.

MRS OSTERMAN: We don't know whether we have a special warrant. We still have to say "if available". We know that that information is part and parcel of going for the special warrant.

MR APPLEBY: But we don't have to tie it into a deadline. If we say the 10th, which gives them time.

MRS OSTERMAN: But for the initial special warrant, we have to because we have to go and ask for X number of dollars, based on some information.

MR GOGO: After we have the information, we go and ask for the warrant.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right. We've got till next March to get the warrant.

MRS OSTERMAN: But we want to purchase stuff now.

MR CHAIRMAN: Of course. If we get the Provincial Treasurer's nod that he is prepared to recommend the warrant, then we can rely on that.

So, it will be an urgent memo. When do you want us to follow up? In a week?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's a motion by Bill Purdy, and everybody agrees.

Okay. We just about have to quit. Thank god we didn't leave this all for Tuesday.

MR APPLEBY: I might say we could probably take a moment or two to look at 3. The point is that that is an internal thing. No, I meant 4.

MR PURDY: On 3, where is that at now?

MR APPLEBY: Could I just talk about 4 for a moment? That's an internal thing as far as the government caucus is concerned, and that will be resolved there, Connie, won't it?

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't even know what you're looking at.

MR APPLEBY: More staff for government members.

MR CHAIRMAN: No. 4 on the agenda.

MRS OSTERMAN: Item 4 on the agenda. Where is my new agenda?

MR CHAIRMAN: It's there.

MRS OSTERMAN: No, I haven't got one. It isn't upstairs in my office either.

MR CHAIRMAN: No. 4 says, more staff for government members.

MR PURDY: I have the same concern as John has.

MR CHAIRMAN: That is?

MR PURDY: I sit in my office for a week getting correspondence answered, and it's not the fault of the girl. It's just the lack of staff.

MR APPLEBY: There is another secretary going over there next week.

MR GOGO: I think that is a caucus matter, Frank.

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR PURDY: Well, it's a caucus matter but it's still a matter for this committee. We put a couple more girls in, it comes back to the old question of space; secondly, the dollars to pay for that. We have X number of dollars in the budget and it has to come back to a special warrant then, through the Clerk's office.

MR APPLEBY: If we run into that problem of getting the extra staff . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The per-member staffing in the government caucus is way below anything anybody gets who is independent or in the opposition.

MR APPLEBY: I still think that could be resolved right now; that if we have a problem with financing, that's something we would have to bring back here.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we leave it on this basis? That if the government caucus decides to increase the staffing, the request come back here for recommendation of special warrant. Is that all right?

MR APPLEBY: Yes, if that's necessary. But I think we're in good shape otherwise. That takes care of 4.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we go back to 3? As I understand it, the situation was that by reason of anticipation of a possible amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act, this question was tossed back into the lap of the Speaker at the last meeting. Now that the Legislative Assembly Act amendment does not refer to Assembly staff or officers, the Speaker's lap can be partly unburdened of this thing.

MRS OSTERMAN: By going to that informal concurrence that you asked that special committee.

MR CHAIRMAN: To the Mack committee?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh. You see, I've been getting conflicting signals.

MRS OSTERMAN: But that isn't what our caucus said.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that you make this recommendation and if there is any problem with it, it goes to this committee.

MRS OSTERMAN: Not our committee.

MR APPLEBY: No, no. To Bill Mack.

MR PURDY: That's what the understanding is. If you make the recommendation now on the reclassification, and if you have a problem you refer it to Bill Mack.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right.

*The recording terminated at 11:30 a.m. and the meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.*