

Select Committee on Members' Services

Wednesday, April 30, 1980

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

12:15 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you had a chance to look at the minutes of the last meeting?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I had (inaudible) and I didn't bring them with me. They were all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an item arising out of them that I'll report on. As far as I know, if we don't require seconders in the Assembly, we certainly can't require seconders in the committee of the Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I don't think we'll bother with seconders. Does somebody want to move the adoption of the minutes?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'll so move.

*Motion carried*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have no other business arising out of the minutes.

You may remember a resolution which required me to get in touch with Graham Harle to ask that we either be provided with minutes of the meetings of the security committee or that we be represented on it, and I put both of those proposals to him in a memo but I haven't had an answer yet. It's about two weeks ago since I sent it, so I think in about a week's time I would say that a decent interval has elapsed and I should go after him again. I won't wait until the next meeting to report to you. When I get his answer I'll just send it out to you.

MRS. OSTERMAN: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chamber renovations: since our last meeting and on my way back from Quebec City, I stopped in at Winnipeg and Regina, and I'm more convinced than ever that we should go ahead and get these various proposals for our Chamber, because I think that we're probably in last place in western Canada. We can't help the fact that our building is the smallest of all those in western Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Manitoba one is as big as the Saskatchewan one and ours put together. And Saskatchewan is at least half as big again as ours.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Are you talking about the whole building?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Not the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, the Chamber too. I think the Chambers are a little bigger than ours. In fact someone who visited ours remarked on how small it was. On one of our CPAs, I noticed it in the proceedings.

MR. APPLEBY: Do you want to pass those around?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was going to say, this is the B.C. one, and both of these will be useful in connection with another item that's on our agenda. That's the Saskatchewan one.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It's a lovely one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see how interestingly the walls are done, and so on. There's a sort of warm and impressive . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: That looks smaller than ours. I don't recognize that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't swear to it, Frank.

MR. APPLEBY: I have been in there.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Is this the Manitoba?

MR. APPLEBY: This is B.C., isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's B.C.

I gave the stuff I brought from Manitoba to either Mrs. Spencer or Diane, and I wonder if we could . . . Because there are pictures of their Chamber.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that B.C.?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The sound is excellent.

MR. APPLEBY: And that is marble, then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. There's no faking in it. But what you can't see is just up there -- and I'm not sure whether that's the bottom of it or not -- a big white globe, and the loudspeakers are concealed in that. Their sound reinforcement comes from up there. There are no loudspeakers on the desks.

AN HON. MEMBER: I wonder when that was taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fairly recently, because Harvey Schroeder's in the Chair, and he's been Speaker for less than two years. Incidentally, he was felled by a massive heart attack.

MR. APPLEBY: Recently?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. About three weeks ago. A young . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, I remember.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've seen him. Remember how humorous he was at our dinner last . . . You know, he's a trim-looking guy, United Church minister, clean-living fellow: the last candidate in the world for a heart attack. And they say he'll be *hors de combat* until about two months from now. He's not coming to the Speakers' meeting in Ottawa.

MR. APPLEBY: Fourteen pages.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Clean living doesn't seem to have anything to do with it. I can testify to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't got a large picture of the Manitoba one, but I do have a picture of it, and when Karen finds it . . . When Mrs. Spencer gets back, she knows where it is.

Now this is the booklet on the the Manitoba one, and that isn't the best sort of picture, but it gives you an idea.

MR. APPLEBY: That's set out more on the American style, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, it's two sides.

MR. APPLEBY: But the curves, here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a somewhat round Chamber. But of course the fish-eye lens exaggerates that.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: What is this up here, wood?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: That would be marble, and this is marble down here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I don't know for sure what those panels are.

MR. APPLEBY: The one in Arizona is very much like that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Is this a fabric on the walls here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of them has fabric and one hasn't. The Manitoba one has fabric.

MR. PURDY: Which is the circular Chamber?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Queen's Park is square. Manitoba has a horseshoe which we tried to imitate here. We thought of a horseshoe here, so that regardless of how many government or opposition members there were, you could push the divider, and we found it wasn't feasible. We would have lost the use of the main door.

Anyhow, I would suggest that we should definitely go ahead and get these four architects to give us proposals. I would propose making those pictures available to them -- I could perhaps get a better one from Manitoba -- and also a master's thesis that was done on the buildings of the four western provinces just recently, and get a variety of advice that we can look at before we get into actual concepts.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I've thought about this for a long time now. I don't agree with you. Maybe I'm somewhat hesitant and, as I have expressed before, I would like to have a meeting with the architect who is presently employed and I'd like to talk about what kinds of concepts, if any, he's been looking at in conjunction with the whole sort of theme right through the Legislature, because we obviously have to do some new renovations and maybe that won't happen until we get some more space for members, (inaudible) eventually happen. It's pretty obvious that we are -- with the dining facilities needed and so on, that there's going to have to be some movement and maybe another building is going to end up having to be freed up and renovated for somebody, and I don't know who that will be. When I look at that ag. building across the way, I guess if it has a new front and whatnot it could be made -- that compatible with the area that it's close to.

MR. MANDEVILLE: We're talking about the Chamber?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're just talking about the Chamber; not about the ag. building or the rest of this building, but the Chamber itself. As far as I know, there is no plan to have the Assembly in the foreseeable future meet other than in this Chamber. As I say, looking at these other Chambers, and I've now seen all four of them in western Canada, and our buildings are somewhat contemporary and they all follow more or less the style that was current at that time both here and the States, I'm more convinced than ever that we should not be limited to the ideas of one architect; certainly not a preliminary way.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I'd have to agree with that too. I think it's something that's historic. If we're going to do some changing, I think that we should make certain that we have the best design that we can.

You had some costs floating around . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten thousand dollars.

We're not committing ourselves to anything. All that we're really committing ourselves to is the \$10,000, which is certainly not a negligible amount, but we're not committing ourselves to doing anything in particular with the Chamber, be it in harmony with outside buildings, the grounds, the rest of this building, or whatever. That would come later. And I presume that on that score we would have some suggestions from these four architects on that very subject.

MR. MANDEVILLE: The thing is, would we need four architects? Would we need to go that far?

MR. SPEAKER: It's an arbitrary number, Fred. (Inaudible) too expensive.

MR. APPLEBY: Before we went that route, I certainly would very much like to see what the architects normally employed by the government to do renovations and changes in this building present what they thought would be something suitable and give us an opportunity to examine it, and then if we were felt that we were not completely satisfied, we could probably give some consideration to going to this other one. But I'd like to see us make use of what we have available here before we went this route.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the thing is that we limit ourselves to one man's ideas if we do that, and I really think the thing is too important for that. I also think that this committee should not be limiting itself to dealing with the government appointed architect.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Is he on staff?

AN HON. MEMBER: No. These other architects would be the same thing. As far as I understand it, it's an outside architect who is employed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I agree, but we have a preliminary suggestion from this man already that we should consider wood panelling before we do something with the soundproofing. Now that is one of the concepts that I would propose to mention to these four architects, and get their ideas. They might develop it further.

MR. PURDY: I'm sorry I missed the last meeting when the preliminary discussion was held in this regard. I'm of the personal view myself that we should look further, but I also ask the time line, because we have the 75th Anniversary here September 1, and it sure would be nice to have the interior of that Assembly completed by then, because it is drab-looking compared to British Columbia or Manitoba, that I've just recently visited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the problem there, Bill, is that we probably don't have the time.

MR. PURDY: We wouldn't have the time, even with Scotty McIntosh?

MR. SPEAKER: I wouldn't think so, unless you're going to commit yourself to adopting what he comes up with. And even then, the advice that I got was that if we had gone ahead with it possibly at the beginning of this month, there might have been a chance to get the concepts back, have them reviewed, and get somebody to do it. And that was tight; that was doubtful.

MR. PURDY: You're looking at an early 1981 project, then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I was hoping we might do, if the thing works out, is have it ready for the 1981 opening. And of course that will mean that the work will have to be fitted in with the fall sittings.

MR. APPLEBY: Well then, if we're going to go that route, and we're not going to be working on a deadline right now, there would really be no reason why we couldn't have the government appointed architect look at it, come up with a proposal to us, and if it's not something that we feel is in harmony with our ideas, then we could go this other route.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I say again, Frank, it limits us to one architect.

MR. PURDY: And it also delays the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would not want it . . . What we're doing here is of immense importance, as far as I'm concerned, because it's going to have significance for many years to come for those who come after us. There's no way, whether it was a government architect, whether on staff or on contract, or whatever -- and even if he had no connection with the government -- that I would want to make a decision on a thing like that without having a lot of alternatives. A reasonable number of alternatives.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Has this present chap just come up with one idea?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He hasn't fully developed a concept, but he made the suggestion. He considered the Chamber as whole, partly arising out of the canopy that the

city of Edmonton wants to donate, and he suggested that because of that we should perhaps consider wood on the walls, somewhat as they have in Saskatchewan. He didn't mention Saskatchewan, but I would think that would be something of what he might have in mind.

I would be afraid to go ahead with that proposal and say, okay, we're going to get this man to design us some wood covering for the walls, without getting other opinions as to what we might do. The soundproofing is now a minor part of it, although it's a large area and it's important for what effect it will have on the appearance of the Chamber.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Do we have a picture, or how are we deciding what the chair and canopy they're donating are going to look like?

MR. SPEAKER: We've got plans.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Who did that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Someone chosen by the city. The government architect has reviewed those. They've been fitted in there. They are feasible. You see, they were going to donate a chair in the first place. It has happened, and I mentioned this to them -- and I hasten to say that I have no designs on the chair; this one or any other -- but it has happened a number of times, not just in Alberta but also in the Northwest Territories and other provinces, that the chair has been given away to a Speaker on his retirement. When they heard that, they decided they didn't want to give a chair because they wanted to give something that would stay there.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So you're talking about a canopy now; just a canopy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not the kind of thing that has four posts and a canvas on top.

MR. APPLEBY: It apparently was designed, as I understand it, by the city people and they collaborated with the government architect.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right. He went over the plans, both the floor plan and the front elevation, and the color and did an illustration of it. As a result of his suggestions they made some changes and then he came up with this idea, as I say, of wooden treatment on the walls.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well if that's the case, because we already somehow strike an additional theme or whatever by introducing something else -- and people have already been working on it -- I want to see somebody like that at our meeting to discuss this. If we're going to put in a real historical sort of context then we should be advertising it all over, because any architect who is really interested wouldn't need to have a sort of a come-on to do a job. I think they would be interested in submitting a proposal. I think it would be a real plus to be able to say that if we're looking at a major redesign.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we could go that route. I checked that with the incoming president of the Alberta Institute of Architects, and his prediction was that because of the amount of business there is in the province, the architects are so busy he didn't think we'd get much worth-while response by just going out on a general invitation such as you might do on a larger project where you might get more response, although he was sceptical even about that, because of the fellows being so busy. So he suggested that some reasonable amount should be offered as an inducement, and that in order to keep the costs down and yet get a reasonable amount of choice, he suggested four. That's the basis on

which I made the suggestion, and cleared with government the obtaining of a special warrant to cover the cost. That is available, subject to the approval of this committee.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Did you refer to him as Salmon, or what was his name?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The architect?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sandy McIntosh.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Is that the fellow who brought those plans in for us that were going to have all (inaudible) and so on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the same fellow.

MR. APPLEBY: That's not quite right, I don't think, Gerry, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes. Sure.

MR. APPLEBY: Because I don't recollect him being there at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sandy McIntosh was there. I have the presentation in my drawer, and he was the one who prepared the plans for the fifth floor. Is that what you're talking about?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Yes. They brought and made the presentation. That's the fellow I've certainly (inaudible)

MR. APPLEBY: (Inaudible) no input from this committee or anybody to them before they went ahead and did something.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that's true. I think we should cut loose from government staff or government appointees in dealing with a matter which is . . . Mind you, the fact that he's a government (inaudible) ought to -- and I was going to suggest this to him and to you . . . I think he's prepared to elaborate on his proposal, and if he does, and Government Services wants to cover it, I think that's dandy. That gives us five choices instead of four, at no extra expense to us. But he has at least pointed us in the direction of getting these proposals by making a suggestion concerning the wood treatment of the walls.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Well, I suppose I shouldn't make a judgment on one proposal, but I'm less impressed when I heard you say the name. I thought, golly, that sounds like the same fellow, and I sure wasn't impressed with him then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know if that's fair to him, George. We don't know what constraints he was under as to funding and so on. He might have had to fit that proposal into pre-arranged guidelines you know.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, he had to have some direction from people who were going to be involved in the utilization of the facility and this just wasn't made available to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well that wasn't his fault either, you know.

MR. APPLEBY: I know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You remember we had the meeting with him? We discussed his presentation, expressed some interest, made some suggestions as to possible improvements, and he agreed that he would come back and consult with us again. My suspicion, in fairness to him -- and I hope I'm not being unfair to somebody else -- is that he was told to go ahead. I've nothing against Sandy McIntosh. I'm not suggesting you're being deliberately unfair to him, but I really don't think that in relation to what we have in mind in the Chamber we should consider that to be an obstacle.

MR. APPLEBY: But it was never done, anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I say, I wouldn't blame Sandy for the (inaudible).

MR. APPLEBY: Anyway, the plan was not put into effect.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It's obvious I think that we have to be more involved, but I'd like somebody like that to come to our next meeting and sit down and have a discussion so I have a lot better understanding of what's involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I say . . . There's no use repeating myself. There isn't time.

There is a basic question of principle here, and it's whether we're going to deal with a variety of concepts or whether we're going to take a series of architects in turn and have one say something, then go to another one, then still another, and so on, and obviously . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think there's also a basic principle in that some of us need a lot better foundation from which to operate, and right now I want to know about the plans for the buildings, the number of members we're going to have down the road in terms of our population growth projections, and a whole bunch of other things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are things which I would expect these four architects to take into account. That would be part of their work.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But I believe it has to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: They would be doing research. As I say, I propose to make available to them a master's thesis that was done by a recent postgraduate person on the buildings of the four western provinces, and I am sure they would take that into account in coming up with proposals. There would be an estimate. There's an established pattern of the increase in the membership of this House. Alberta is better represented, with smaller constituencies and so on, than B.C., for example. I would fully expect that this would be taken into account in a far more expert way than I would feel qualified to do in relating it to a room.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Okay. But that room might even have to be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough.

MRS. OSTERMAN: The whole building has to be taken into consideration is what I'm saying, and I'm just not comfortable with making a decision about should we either advertise all over the country, all over the province, or wherever, or just go to four, without knowing the kinds of constraints we're operating under. Is it possible that the Chamber can be even changed in size? I want

to sit down with somebody who knows and is operating with the building right now to explain some of that background.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose you get one man's opinion as to whether the Chamber can be changed in size. I, for one, wouldn't want to accept that opinion without having several, because I do think when you're thinking about this building, the very centre of the whole thing and the main reason why the building is here, is that Chamber. I surely wouldn't want to go on one man's opinion either in a preliminary way or subsequently, until . . .

However, we're just repeating ourselves.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But structurally . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: George, did you have any comments?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I was like Connie, I'd done quite a bit of thinking about it and I'd thought that -- I guess (inaudible) the dirty thirties -- I hate to see 10,000 bucks go out the window. It seems to me that it's a seller's market if we've got to go out and pay them \$2,500 to submit a plan. They're sure not very hungry. But after hearing all the arguments here pro and con I'm beginning to waver in my original decision.

I'm like Connie, I'd like to hear somebody who should be knowledgeable. Also, before we get too deeply involved here, I'd like to know what Harry Hobbs and his clan have got up their sleeve, because we're liable to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the best we can do there, George, is we have a space committee on which we're represented by the Clerk.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: There's no report back from him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just rumors; moving members over to the ag building.

MR. PURDY: Let's hope they're in the public with the industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What? The rumors?

MR. PURDY: Sure. Within the architect's industry. That's out there in the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is out in the public?

MR. PURDY: That the members are going to move to the agriculture building.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's because some members have suggested that, because of (inaudible) space.

MR. PURDY: No, no, no. That's within the industry itself; within the architectural industry.

AN HON. MEMBER: They've heard these rumors, and that's where it's got to.

MR. PURDY: I had a meeting with a firm the other day, and that's out there, foremost. This is a construction firm that was working on the job out here, that was with Sandy McIntosh. That's where it came from.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we had no definite indication, and you know . . .

MR. PURDY: They've been asked to look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you know what happens in Ottawa. The centre block got to be too small, in spite of moving all the ministers out. They have offices like the members. They just developed the Confederation building, and so now you have some members in the centre block and a large number -- I think Marcel Lambert's one of them -- over in the Confederation building nearby. We may have that same situation here. My guessing is that we may have a tunnel here that might connect this building from the first floor or the sub-basement with the ag building, but that's only my guess and no one's said that.

MR. PURDY: Well, we'd like to see the drawings and see if that's incorporated in the drawings or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless we were going to build a Chamber for the Assembly over in the ag building, I would assume that what goes on -- and in the context of what is going on, \$10,000 is peanuts -- but . . .

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: That's a very good point. I have some difficulty, Mr. Chairman, rationalizing the view that if we put out a request among the architect colony for proposals, that they would not be inclined to present one on the basis of the prestige it might bring to them for hiring their design chosen or anything else, but they're too busy and there is too much business here in Alberta, and so on and so forth, for them to do that sort of thing, but they would if they were paid \$2,500 which, to me, is also peanuts as far as they're concerned. I can't see an architectural firm taking the master's thesis that you have referred to, setting it in depth and doing whatever other studies are necessary, and coming up with a plan or proposal for \$2,500. I can't really understand that that would be sufficient incentive to them beyond just a request to come forth with proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, except for this, Frank: the advice that I got was that the \$2,500 would be an adequate incentive. I was given a list of names. We called those people and asked them if this kind of thing were approved, would they be interested. The names, as I understand it -- I knew one of them, I think, but I don't know any of the others . . .

MR. APPLEBY: Were they all local ones?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One's in Calgary, I think. So I got the Clerk to phone them, because I didn't think there was any purpose in coming to this committee with this proposal and then have to come back and say, sorry, we can't do this because the carrot isn't enough to tempt the donkey. So we got their indication that they were all prepared to do this. In fact some of their expressions of interest were rather enthusiastic.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a motion, if it's in order. I make a motion that we invite -- I don't even know who would know exactly what even some of the tentative plans are, but my initial suggestion is -- the architect who is presently on contract to the government concerning whatever renovations are going on, whatever minister is responsible for whatever renovations, and whatever other ministers may be responsible, or whether it's somebody even from the Premier's office, who knows what the plans for the building are. I think I'd like them to come to our next meeting, and I'd like to have a discussion. Not that we would make a decision in that meeting at all, because I don't want to talk about it. I only want to hear everything, and then when they're gone to be able to discuss it. I don't want to discuss

it in their presence, but I want to find out exactly what's going on and whatever tentative proposals there may be out there. With that in mind, I would like them to be invited to our next meeting for a discussion with us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Specifically whom do you want to have invited, so that I can put the motion?

MRS. OSTERMAN: The architect, and I would like the the Minister of Government Services asked who else is responsible for bringing together suggestions, or has any part in what's happening to the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put the question, of course, but just to make the matter clear: this question of space has been a bit of a no man's land or at least an unsatisfactory area with this committee, and certainly with me, for quite some time. In the course of the sorting out, it was decided by Executive Council that the responsibility for the Chamber is on the Speaker. I have that, incidentally, in black and white, and I should have perhaps circulated it. I meant to do it, as a matter of fact, before this meeting; I overlooked it. I don't know to what extent that decision has the force of law; it certainly has the force of control of the Assembly and funding and so on behind it, but I thought it would be more appropriate if I got the advice of this committee before going ahead with something with as far-reaching consequence. I've done things in the past in the Chamber, possibly without getting sufficient advice, such as the brass railing and mahoganzing of the desks and some of the other things that I reported to you when I sent the memo around.

What this really boils down to in a way, I don't think that anybody in this committee really wants to make a decision on the basis of the opinion of an architect, but I think the matter of principle at stake here is whether this committee is going to act independently as a committee of a parliament, or whether we are going to go the government way, because there is no question about it . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . that the Minister of Government Services has a great deal of interest in what goes on inside the Chamber, which interest, I have told him, I don't particularly welcome.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, I wouldn't care what his interest is, but if you can act without the committee, if you want the committee to be of advice to you, I am making a motion in order that I am in a better position to give that advice. That's why the motion. It has nothing to do with them telling us what to do. I want to know what is happening overall, and it's going to give me a much better feel for whatever advice you would like from the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Bill.

MR. PURDY: Before we call the question, I look at it in this perspective. You now have in writing from the Executive Council that the Assembly itself, *per se*, is your domain. Right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. PURDY: And you went to Executive Council and got approval for a special warrant of \$10,000 to engage . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subject to the advice of this committee.

MR. PURDY: That's right; subject to the advice of the committee. Therefore, I think we're wasting time if we put in effect a delay to come in front of Stu McCrae again and the architects and so on. So I would oppose the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to have to bring it to a head, so . . .

MR. MANDEVILLE: I'd just like to make a comment on it, too, Mr. Chairman. I really think too, that if we're going to design this building, we design it around the Chamber. I think the Chamber is number one, and I think it should be designed from there, from around the Chamber, and I don't know if time is a factor here. As a personal member of this committee, I know I'm not going to be able to get any input until I've got some proposals. If I have some proposals put before me, then I'm able to make a decision: should it be changed here, or should it be changed, or my view. But to sit down without any proposal and discuss it with members' services or an architect, it would be hard for me as a member to have any input in the design.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, I have it in writing from John Gogo -- I guess twice -- that he is in favor of going ahead and getting the advice. Of course he's not here and it's (inaudible)

MR. PURDY: No proxy vote in this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right; no arrangements for that, unfortunately.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, I'll close the debate when everybody has had their say.

MR. APPLEBY: I still can't quite get myself straightened out on this. If we get these four architects, or whatever number, we still have to give them direction as to what we're looking for and what we hope to achieve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

MR. APPLEBY: I see that Connie's motion gives us some opportunity to get a better background before we have to make those kinds of recommendations to these architects. I think this is the way to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Frank, the whole purpose of the exercise is to get this committee the best possible basis on which to reach a decision and to give some advice about what should be done in the Chamber. That's the purpose of the exercise, and that's why I felt that the committee should have the input of a number of persons and not just the government-appointed architect.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Your statement that you have from Executive Council that that is your strict domaine kind of, in my mind, puts a little different view on this. I was inclined to agree with Connie that the more input we could get on this, the better we'd be able to make a judgment. But if that's the case, it would appear to me that it's up to us and yourself to make a judgment on what's to be done. I kind of go along with what Freddie says that until we get some proposals we are at a standstill to make a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've given up the notion, and I think it's sound, of getting this thing completed for our birthday. That was pretty 'iffy' when we started. But I'm still concerned about time because, damn, that soundproofing in the Chamber just looks pretty rough. The glue is showing through in places and is bothering me. If we get Scotty McIntosh in here when we have our next meeting, which, hopefully, can be within a couple of weeks, then I don't know

whether he will talk us out of the four architects idea or not. But we certainly aren't going to be able to deal with the thing solely on what he tells us at the next meeting, I would hope. That means that we then have to have another meeting and decide whether we're going to -- well, we could perhaps decide it at the same meeting that Scotty is at. But I see this as delaying the thing by a certain amount of time.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I have one more question. Would these architects, if we brought them in here to present these proposals, be in a position to tell us what all the problems are in here. Or is Scotty pretty well equipped to tell us what all the problems would be about renovating?

MR. CHAIRMAN: They would get floor plans and structural plans of the building, which are available; I've seen them. They would know where all the utilities are, all the bearing walls and pillars and columns. So if Scotty gives it to them, he'll just have to show it to them on the diagrams.

Okay. Do you want to close the debate?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I'll close the debate. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention for any of the members here for having somebody else come in to help us make a decision, or to make a decision on our behalf. That is not my intention. My intention is that I really want to know what other plans are in store for this building. We're going to have two groups of people here. We're going to have us designing something in the Assembly, and we're going to have others looking at space outside the Assembly. Maybe the Assembly should be expanded. Now how can you talk about it, how can we say this is what we're going to do. We're going to bring these architects in and we're going to tell them this is what we want. We have to give them some guidance in light of what other plans are being made. And those other plans that are being made will infringe upon what we would like to do. I would like to be able to tell those people who are operating in that regard: I want that information. I personally wouldn't want to go out to four architects and say, redesign our Assembly, when I don't even know what the overall plans for the building are. Because that Assembly -- and I strongly agree with you, Gerry. Nobody else should be making that decision. It should be under your purview with, hopefully, some advice from people who are a part of it.

But I just do not feel comfortable with going ahead and inviting people. It takes it out of our hands completely, because we don't have a basic working knowledge of this building right now and other people's plans for parts of it. You're going to end up putting me in an argumentative position continually. I'm trying to close a motion, and you're not allowing me to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we've never really been that terribly strictly formal in . . . But there's just one thing. We're not leaving that fellow out; we're not leaving Sandy out.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I want him in here ahead of time, before I go anywhere else. I want to be able to discuss . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We know what he has in mind.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wooden walls.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm not interested in his design specifically about the Assembly. I want to take a look at what other concepts are envisioned for the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess we've been over that, because we're dealing with the Chamber.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Who all was your suggestion to invite here?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Whoever is responsible outside the Chamber for any plans and renovations right now.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: You're thinking about the possibility of expanding the Chamber?

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right. In other words, if that would be a reasonable direction for us to go. Whatever happens now, we're going to be tied in for an awfully long time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No question.

MRS. OSTERMAN: If it takes two years, I'd rather see it take two years than do it and say we've got to have another meeting to decide. If we have to have six meetings and we come up with a good decision, that's important if I'm going to be part of it. If there's a hurry to do it, then I won't be able to participate, because to me it's far too major a decision to just sit here and say, well, four architects sounds like a good idea and we'll go out to get them in. It may be that we want to go outside the province. I just don't have a feel for all that. I'm not comfortable with what's being suggested now.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Just so I'm clear on this. Your motion isn't to have them offer us advice on how to finish it, but to find out whether it's a possibility of enlarging it as a suggestion to an architect or four architects, whatever route we take. But we don't want any advice from these people who are coming on how to refinish it, just on the perimeter of the building is the main thing.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right. It is the most important part of the building then we have to have all the leeway to do what we want with it. But that means it then carries over to maybe some other space. I want to know if we can do all that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you give a fairly exact text of the motion to the secretary? What does it say?

SECRETARY: That the committee invite the architect presently under contract concerning renovations, whatever minister is responsible for renovations, and whoever from the Premier's office, to come to the next meeting and participate in the discussion with regard . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: To the overall plans for the building.

MR. APPLEBY: The long-range plans for the building.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Do you want the overall plans, or the plans as regards to the size of the Chamber?

MRS. OSTERMAN: The overall plans would have something to do with it. They have plans for either side of it, what could be moved. Are things going to be moved? Can they provide the place? What have they been looking at? Then we'll know what kind of space we have available. If we don't like what we see, we can also discuss it afterwards and make a presentation to them, as far as that's concerned.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Could I be permitted a question? You've closed debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's not be too . . .

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Are we generally agreed that if possible the Chamber should be enlarged?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a completely new idea that has just come into the situation.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes. I think it's something I want to look at.

MR. PURDY: That Chamber is probably good till 2020.

MR. APPLEBY: That's why I want to see some plans, so I can see what has to happen. Once I see a plan or a proposal, then I'll be able to determine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the architects whose opinions we get would of course deal with that sort of thing, would tell us what we can do with the way it is.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But if you ask them to make a design and we don't give them some guidelines and how much leeway they've got, and how far they can go -- and I don't feel in a position to do that, because I don't have an understanding of what other plans . . . You know, to take one room and say, we're responsible for it, and somebody else is doing the rest of the building.

MR. MANDEVILLE: What they're going to do, though, Connie, they're going to bring us proposals. Then when we get the proposals, that's when we put the input in. We say, listen, we don't want this wall changed here; we don't want this here; this is the type of decor we want.

MRS. OSTERMAN: For inside the room, Fred.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes. I still strongly believe that that Chamber should be designed and then we should build everything around it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That may not be going on, is my point. You can't have two groups working in isolation. One hand isn't going to know what the other hand is doing. I just think . . .

MR. APPLEBY: We still need all the information possible and available before we can give proper direction to the architects even.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. APPLEBY: George isn't.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I can't make up my mind. I came here with a preconceived idea, and now I'm starting to second-guess it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, George, is there such a thing as having too much information?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I think so.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I don't feel that about this. Gerry has convinced me how important it is. So I'm saying I don't feel under the time constraints anymore at all. If necessary we may do a lot of things before we give any kind of guidance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You couldn't say the time constraints are right out the window because we could be running into a situation where we'll even have trouble in getting it down for the 1991 year. Of course the whole basis for this proposal is more information, not limit it to just one architect. That's the whole basis of the idea, to get these four people in and let them deal with all the concepts, how it fits in the building and everything. It seems to me what we're doing if we carry the motion is just to do it in two stages and draw out the process. I think we better vote on the question. Those in favor of the motion? Those opposed?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I'm afraid . . . I feel I'm casting the deciding vote here.

MRS. OSTERMAN: No, George, don't feel that way about it.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I'm not too sure about it.

MR. APPLEBY: Well George, Gogo is missing, and the Chairman can always cast the deciding vote if there's a tie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where does that put us on the thing? Do you want to defer further discussion to the next meeting, or do you want to deal with it further now? We're running out of time. We have a few other items that I really would like to reach.

MR. APPLEBY: We've had all this discussion on it, I think we should bring it to a head now.

MR. PURDY: I think so too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make a motion?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, I'll make a motion. The only concern I have is the four architects. Do we need the four architects? Is there some way we could take a look at this, if it is necessary to have four. That's not the magic number I'm sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It wasn't my number. It was recommended, as I say, by the incoming president of the architectural institute of Alberta. You know, he could have said five; he could have said three. There was some thought about the expense too. So it's really a compromise between expense and getting the maximum. I mean it would be nice to have 10 or 15 proposals. But it's a choice between expense and . . .

MR. MANDEVILLE: I'm certainly not disagreeing that \$10,000 is a large amount of money to spend to get a design that we're going to have to live with for many, many years.

MR. PURDY: That's just the fee to get them out there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could throw the thing out completely. We're not committing ourselves to anything really except the \$10,000.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, I believe we should advertise. I think there may be architects in this country that are even more qualified; maybe not. But I wonder what kind of nibbles we'd get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, as I say, I'm going on advice. I really don't know the habits of architects. That was the advice that was given to me -- not to advertise a contest. That, incidentally, was my first suggestion. I said, what about a contest; can you give me an outline of the rules that are followed in holding these contests. And he said, you're not going to get anywhere with that kind of contest in Alberta, because the guys are too busy.

MR. MANDEVILLE: In appointing these four architects, just using the four, who would be recommending them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have four names. The Clerk has them; he phoned them. If you like, what I can do is -- incidentally, it's a somewhat sensitive thing, in a way, because there may be some people who feel left out. As I understood it, the recommendation was made on the basis of a probable interest of these architects in things historic.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Who made that recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who made it?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kröll. He's the incoming president. Now I want to clear this again. I think I mentioned to you before that he's also the past president of my constituency association. But I went to him because he's the incoming president and I had some dealings with him concerning the architects Act.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, if we're going to consider any other items, I think we should postpone whatever you want to do till the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Okay. Are you content?

The issuance of large blocks of passes. This has happened once, and it happened again but was revoked.

MR. APPLEBY: This is to the members gallery?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. To be specific about it, it was the NDP member who issued a very large number of passes and practically pre-empted the space. On the previous occasion I think it was the Grande Prairie college students' residence. Then I discovered it had happened again when the nurses' strike was on and the galleries -- I think there were about 20 spaces to be taken up before the end of question period. Then all the rest of the public gallery and the members gallery was going to be filled with nurses one afternoon. This is something which is directly within our area of responsibility. Although we can't go into it in depth, what I would like to have your advice about is whether we should develop guidelines of some kind on the issue of

passes. It's unfortunate, because it has never been necessary heretofore. But we have to give the Clerk's office some direction on it.

MR. APPLEBY: Well what is the situation? The public gallery is open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's right.

MR. APPLEBY: People can go in there till it's filled to capacity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure. Don't you give some passes to the public gallery?

SECRETARY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not married to that, Frank.

MR. APPLEBY: No, but I think that's pretty well a tradition in all parliaments, that the public gallery is public as long as there's room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but what we do though -- what we have done and we do on opening day, we only leave 10 seats. What we could do, if you'd like to give this some thought. We could say that a certain part of the public gallery is going to remain open to the public, and the rest of it will require passes like the members gallery. There's nothing wrong with that, absolutely nothing.

MR. APPLEBY: Well I think opening day is a different situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you can see what can happen, Frank. Let's say the nurses' aides are on the rampage because they want to get 75 per cent of what the nurses got, and some member wants to demonstrate solidarity forever with them. So they fill the public gallery. And, unless we adopt some measure or rule ahead of time, there's nothing we can do about it.

MR. APPLEBY: On a normal day, when there's no controversial issue before the House, how many people would be in the public gallery?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know what the capacity is but it depends on the school kids. Sometimes it's so full of school kids that not too many . . .

MR. APPLEBY: But if they come in asking for a pass to the public gallery, they already know how many school kids they've booked in, several weeks ahead of time. Now it would not be asked too much to reserve, say, 10 seats besides the school kids, and the rest be made available to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's certainly an idea. Offhand, my idea . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: On a first come, first served basis. I don't know, if members are allotted so many passes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, they're not. You see, a member can fill the whole members gallery if he gets there first.

MR. APPLEBY: And no decision has been made on that before?

SECRETARY: Well we usually give out members gallery passes from our office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're only giving them to government members.

SECRETARY: And public. The public can ask for them too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. But what I'm thinking of doing is centralizing this whole business, including the school groups, in the Clerk's office. That's where it should be. The Assembly should have jurisdiction over its own visitors. I'd like very much if you would consider this. Centralizing the thing in the Clerk's office, adopting some kind of rule, not too rigid, with regard to the issuance of passes -- because it seems to me . . . The second instance I mentioned was called off, but it had been arranged, according to the report I got, to fill the galleries after the question period when the school kids got out. So the fact that it didn't happen doesn't mean that it isn't going to happen in the future.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Could we think this over till the next meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd be very glad if you would. Incidentally, if you think of some ideas on it, I would be glad if I could even have memos in the meantime. Okay?

Now, constituency office -- oh, the legislative interns.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I've got a meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Where are we?

MR. APPLEBY: I think we should go to 13.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other business. Oh, there's one thing, though, that John Gogo was particularly anxious about. That's the photographs. That's another reason why we have these here. We had a montage of the 17th Legislature. There's one under preparation for the 18th; it's been delayed. The question is what we want to do for the 19th. I think John's idea is that we should definitely go to the front steps again, the way it was done before.

MR. APPLEBY: What do you do in a case like that? Do you notify all the members on such and such a date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, and warn them not to get sick, not to have anybody die in their family, and all that kind of stuff.

MR. PURDY: We might look at the opening day of the fall session to have it done. We'd know that 99 per cent of the members would be here that day.

MR. APPLEBY: What about the other quarter?

MR. PURDY: Well that guy, I don't know about him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you'd like to consider this, John is quite keen about the idea of doing it on the front steps. Another proposal is whether we would have the logo for the 75th birthday, maybe in the background somehow so it would show in the photograph.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, maybe we could have a try this spring.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see, the last time we suggested doing it on the front steps, it went, I think, to the caucuses. I forget what the Social Credit caucus did, but the majority in the government caucus was against it. So we went to

the montage. Of course on the 17th one, we had two deceased members. We had Len Werry and Jack Robinson.

MR. PURDY: I'd better go, Mr. Chairman.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, we've all got to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry that we . . .

MR. PURDY: What is this 13?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a very brief thing. We didn't want to word that too bluntly in a way. What is happening is that people are attending committee meetings . . .

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Select committees?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The committee is providing the meals and members are charging the meals up as part of their per diem expenses for being in Edmonton. We're just concerned that it won't cause trouble with the income tax people.

MR. APPLEBY: Actually what is happening is that they're drawing a per diem allowance, is this not a fact? And if they have a committee meeting, they're charging that meal to the expenses of the committee.

MR. PURDY: When the Legislature is sitting, they cannot charge any expenses for any select legislative committees. If they're doing that, I don't know how it's getting past the Clerk's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. What I understand is that some committees are meeting over the noon hour and, under committee auspices, they're bringing in lunch. Then the members are charging for that meal as if they had paid for it in their apartments or downtown or wherever. Am I right about that?

SECRETARY: I'm involved in that. Like fisheries committee: we met at 7 o'clock this morning. I order breakfast and it's automatically charged to our office. We have been just allocating it to committee expense rather than . . . Then the members just put in their per diem -- there is no claim put in for it. The only thing is, from what Mr. Blain has told me, that the form you fill out at the end of the month, those meals should be deducted from it. The same as today. That meal today should be deducted off each person's allowance at the end of the month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the whole point. I wasn't under the misapprehension that we're charging for committee meetings when the House is in session. No, that's not the point. It's the per diem they charge for living in the city, away from their homes.

MR. PURDY: But your fisheries committee is wrong submitting that bill through your office. Once the Legislature convenes . . . You know, if the Auditor General gets ahold of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll be okay, because you're entitled to that meal.

MR. PURDY: Right, going that route.

MR. APPLEBY: They should say, look, we're meeting for breakfast and each pays for his own breakfast. You're getting your per diem allowance.

MR. PURDY: That's right, Frank.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well what would you do, pass the hat?

MR. PURDY: I don't care how they do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But aren't you having it together?

MR. PURDY: That doesn't matter. Have it Dutch treat.

MR. PURDY: If you have 10 people having breakfast and it comes to \$50, that's \$5 each for your breakfast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd have to collect it then and there.

MR. PURDY: The Chairman would have to. Like the meeting we had today. It's so hard for a member to determine if he's spending the \$50 a day or if he's spending \$48 or \$55. You get cleaning done, you know, you do various things. You go out and buy groceries in Safeway, throw it in your apartment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're saying what we should do -- that the Legislative Assembly should stop funding meals for committees?

MR. PURDY: During session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, all right.

SECRETARY: Does that mean that the meals so far are going to have to be charged back to the members?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which ones are those?

SECRETARY: All the meetings.

MR. APPLEBY: Dinner meetings and breakfast meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You know, it's so simple. Like upstairs, I put that through -- well, I could put it under committee expenses or under the Speaker's entertainment account.

MR. APPLEBY: I had some misgivings about it, even though I enjoyed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But couldn't you do this, though. Couldn't you just, at the end of the month, deduct those meals?

MR. PURDY: I don't even know what the meal was worth. I'd rather give you the two and a half bucks right now, whatever it's worth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to make money out of you, Bill.

MR. PURDY: Okay, I'll give you a dollar and a half then. I got to go; I have to be in caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Listen, would you mind discussing it with some of your colleagues?

MR. PURDY: Yes.

MR. APPLEBY: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we can get a simple, practical way out of it. Thanks very much.

*The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.*