

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Wednesday, October 15, 1980

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

6:45 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we come to order? The minutes of the last meeting are under the first tab in the book. Are there any comments?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Page 4, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the Law Clerk. Could I ask for clarification? A motion was passed rescinding an earlier motion. Is that correct?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's correct. We're as we were on this.
Is there a motion? Connie?

MRS OSTERMAN: I'll so move.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'll second.

MR CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Now, you're a visitor, Rolland, and in a way Mr. Puxley is. Any special concerns you would like us to deal with, assuming they're not on the agenda?

MR COOK: A question from Dennis Anderson. He would like to have some indication of when dictaphone equipment in members' offices in constituencies might be made available.

MRS OSTERMAN: You mean he doesn't have one in the office here?

MR COOK: He has a small dictaphone, but he'd like some playback.

MRS OSTERMAN: In his constituency office, not in his office up here?

MR COOK: Not in his office here.

MR STEFANIUK: There is a memorandum covering that item, under Other Business, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. Have you any special concerns that are not on the agenda?

MR PUXLEY: No. I'm just here to answer questions, if necessary, on our budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. If you want to raise some concerns as well . . .

MR PUXLEY: They'll come under that heading.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Then, Business Arising Out of the Minutes: we had a request to get representation on the security committee. That request has been taken under consideration by the Chairman of the committee. We'll get an answer after the committee holds its next meeting. Is that all right?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Chamber renovations: there was a request made last meeting that we should have a special meeting of the architect concerning the Chamber renovations. Having regard to the goings on during summer, especially September, the Anniversary happenings, and so on, I would suggest that the committee choose a time, now, at which we could spend some time on that, and have the architect here. I think that was your intent, wasn't it? To have the architect here? Or were you going just to discuss the plans?

MR GOGO: I thought we were talking about photographs first.

MRS OSTERMAN: And photographs also. I think that was part of the whole thing, Mr. Chairman. Photographs of other Assembly chambers.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Clerk has a collection of those.

MRS OSTERMAN Oh, good.

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, while Mr. Stefaniuk is looking for that, when Mr. Mandeville asked me to sit in for him this evening, he had one concern about architects. He wasn't concerned about an architect, but that there should be architects. He really felt that with just one person, we should have more than one opinion. He felt quite strongly about that. So he would like that brought under consideration by the members of the committee.

MR CHAIRMAN: That fits under Chamber Renovations. What is the wish of the committee? Do you wish to have the meeting with the architect who prepared the tentative plans that we have? Or do you want to get some suggestions from other architects, and then consider them all at once?

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we've dealt with this matter before, and I think we agreed that we were going to consult with the architect that has the plan right now, look at other chambers, then after that time, after that conversation, we would come to a conclusion as to whether we felt we wanted other people brought into it or not. We haven't had an opportunity for that discussion.

DR BUCK: Is this architect with DPW?

MR CHAIRMAN: He's on contract to the government, to the Minister of Government Services, I think.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, in view of the nature of the Chamber renovation, I feel we should call a special meeting dealing with that specifically. Maybe we could set that time now. At that time we could have the people assembled we think we need. In the meantime members can look at the photographs. We could devote that meeting just to Chamber renovations, if that's in order.

MR CHAIRMAN: We haven't got enough copies of these pictures of other chambers to give a set to each member of the committee. In the interval, could we arrange some kind of rotation, so members could pass these on so they'll all

have a chance to look at them before we meet. John, following on from that, what kind of suggestion would you like to make as to a date for another meeting?

MR GOGO: I think it should be as quickly as possible; maybe the second week into the session. The first week is going to be very intense. That would allow members, in the meantime, to look at the pictures, and that allows the Clerk time to contact people we want to have at the meeting. I think because of the nature of it, we should devote a meeting of this committee just to Chamber renovations.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. You say the first week is kind of crowded, which is next week. So that brings us to the week of the 27th. What kind of dates would you like to suggest?

MR PURDY: Could I suggest October 28 at 9 in the morning?

SOME HON MEMBERS: That's cabinet day.

MR PURDY: Wednesday is Public Accounts; Thursday is caucus; Friday the House sits in the morning and in the afternoon members want to get away.

MR APPLEBY: The 29th is that University of Alberta . . .

MR PURDY: That's right.

MR PURDY: I guess I'm asking the Whip: would a Wednesday at 5:30, until 7:30 -- that would give us two hours.

MRS OSTERMAN: We don't have that luxury, because there are commitments -- at least that second week, there is a commitment, a dinner.

MR PURDY: There are commitments right through now until November 19, every night.

MRS OSTERMAN: There are.

MR CHAIRMAN: For Wednesday?

MR PURDY: Yes. I just confirmed that today. Invitations for MLAs.

MRS OSTERMAN: If it were very early Monday morning, I guess . . .

MR PURDY: We could have a separate meeting at 5:30 on Tuesday.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fit it in between an afternoon and an evening sitting of the House?

MR PURDY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: The 28th -- I don't know how many people are involved, but that's the night the Byzantine Choir from Utrecht is here; they're here on Tuesday and Thursday. It's a Ukrainian, Byzantine Choir. That's been scheduled for a long, long time.

MR PURDY: How about Monday, the 27th then; the same type of thing, at 5:30?

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm not here; I'm in Calgary.

MR CHAIRMAN: At 5:30 the economic affairs committee.

MRS OSTERMAN: It may be that I'm the major problem here in terms of setting a date, because of cabinet and . . .

MR PURDY: Okay. Let's go into the third week.

MR CHAIRMAN: That brings us into November.

MRS OSTERMAN: The Monday night supper meeting might be all right. What date is that?

MR PURDY: November 3.

MRS OSTERMAN: I believe that's clear; I don't have my calendar here. Heaven forbid that we should have an extra two hours that we don't know what to do with. How does it look for you, Gerry?

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm okay that evening.

MR APPLEBY: What date is that?

MR CHAIRMAN: Monday, the 23rd.

MISS BALLARD: No, Monday, November 3.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, you're in November; sorry.

MR COOK: Could we do something over Monday lunch, for example?

MRS OSTERMAN: Not enough time.

MR APPLEBY: Lunch is terrible for me.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, I guess I'm booked for Monday, November 3.

MRS OSTERMAN: Tuesday, the 4th?

MR CHAIRMAN: Between afternoon and evening sittings.

MRS OSTERMAN: Walter is looking at his calendar for Fred.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay, is that a deal?

MR APPLEBY: Okay, November 4 at 5:30.

MR CHAIRMAN: November 4, Tuesday evening, 5:30. Do you want to have a bite?

MR PURDY: We should. We'll be sitting that night.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you go out to eat, you're going to lose a lot of time.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right. I think we should eat over meeting, looking at things, or whatever.

MR CHAIRMAN: It could be a little difficult, but we could perhaps agree to have a very expeditious supper.

MRS OSTERMAN: And breath deeply.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's 5:30, Tuesday, November 4. This is a meeting which will be devoted entirely to plans in the Chamber.

MR GOGO: Chamber renovations.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think we have a minute in our book from our last meeting which describes our desire to have a special meeting: It outlines it there.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we'll ask the architect to come to that meeting?

MRS OSTERMAN: At least him.

MR CHAIRMAN: Who else?

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, is there such a thing as an engineer being needed or anything?

MR CHAIRMAN: No. He has referred to the engineer in his plans, but that looks after pipes and wires. We're more concerned with the functioning inside the Chamber.

MRS OSTERMAN: Good.

MR PURDY: I don't think we have to get into the technical end of it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Just how it looks.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does that look after item 3.b), Chamber Renovations? Item 3.c), Food Services.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I had that item aside, because I'm afraid I don't have an update. I haven't been able to arrange a meeting with either the minister or the deputy minister to date.

MR APPLEBY: I have a memo which just came in today from Mr. McCrae:

Cafeteria, Legislature Building
Possible Extended Service - Fall Legislative Session.

Further to earlier discussion with yourself and other members of the Members Services Committee, please be advised that CaterPlan, the current contractor operating the Legislature Building cafeteria, are prepared to extend the service hours during the Fall Session as follows:

7 a.m. to 7 p.m. - Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday [that's when night sittings could be held]

7 a.m. to 4 p.m., Wednesday and Friday.

The Contractor will provide its normal service at no extra cost, provided the increased business will cover the overhead. If a loss

results, the Contractor will require a 6% profit margin based on gross sales plus costs, which Government Services is prepared to subsidize during a trial period.

You might wish to review this with . . . the Members Services Committee, with a view to proceeding on an experimental basis during the Fall Session.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any comments?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I think it's well worth a trial.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would seem so. It doesn't commit us for too long a time. Are you ready for a vote on it? All those in favor of the motion made by Mr. Appleby that we accept this proposal? Opposed? Carried. Frank, could you give a copy of it for the minutes. Okay, is that enough on food services?

AN HON MEMBER: Are we doing anything to review the quality?

MRS OSTERMAN: It has been mentioned. It is a matter of -- I think if we start talking about either all the members being willing to pay more, or even accept that there should be a subsidy, because apparently we don't have the numbers to warrant a very major change. This seems to be the difficulty, or it is what I continually hear.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to cloud the issue, but the Clerk has been very busy obtaining information. But I'd like to request him to obtain the information from the Manitoba Legislature, the Ontario Legislature, and the House of Commons, with regard to the price of meals.

MR CHAIRMAN: How about B.C.?

MR GOGO: Wherever. I don't accept for one minute that the members should have to tolerate the quality of the food that's in this building after a long day. I think it's a break, too, that we've got them to extend the hours. I don't accept the argument that affordability is the key. I think if we look at other jurisdictions, it would give us some guidance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that at the same time the Clerk might enquire as to the quality of the product?

AN HON MEMBER: That's a matter of opinion, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: I know it is.

MR GOGO: Well, the Clerk has some excellent ideas that I've heard before, and alternatives. I don't think these should be discussed now, but if he could come back with the prices and the subsidy question -- it's too late; we can maybe consider it for the spring.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does everybody agree with Mr. Gogo's motion that the Clerk enquire of other legislative assemblies, including the four mentioned, concerning meal prices?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR COOK: Could I just add one item? I spoke to Dave Russell, minister of health, appropriately enough. He suggested that it might be useful for

Alberta's Legislature to set an example by having a healthy menu instead of greasy, tasteless food; and have something like a salad bar, which would not require a great deal of administration, and just have it as a self-service section, where you pay a set fee and go and help yourself. It would not be labor-intensive; materials could be kept for several days, and it would be healthy.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would the committee agree with the suggestion that the Clerk enquire of the Minister of Government Services or of CaterPlan, as to the possibility of providing a salad bar?

MR GOGO: I think we're going to cover health care insurance later on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe we won't need to, John.

MR APPLEBY: Is this going to be just a salad bar, or is there any alternative?

MR COOK: It would be both.

MR CHAIRMAN: In addition to what's there now.

MR PURDY: We have to look at the alternatives that may be available to us.

MR COOK: As an experiment this fall, would it be unrealistic to ask CaterPlan to try for a week or two to provide . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: They probably would expect Government Services to pick up the deficit.

MR PURDY: I think what we're going to see, Mr. Chairman, with CaterPlan -- the stuff that they bring in here is institutionalized cooking. It comes in in great big pots; it's stuck in the stove and warmed up.

MRS OSTERMAN: At 9 o'clock in the morning.

MR PURDY: That's right. Unless they go to an additional expense, they're not going to be able to provide that salad bar and other things that are wanted. I don't know where they get it from, but they bring that stuff -- you know, the spinach is all in one big can, and it's heated up; the whatever else is available that day is heated up.

MRS OSTERMAN: The vitamins are long since gone.

MR APPLEBY: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this suggestion could go in with John's suggestion, for later discussion, looking into what could be done.

MR CHAIRMAN: What I'm asking is whether the committee would like the Clerk to enquire as to the possibility of adding a salad bar to what's there now.

MR APPLEBY: I don't think you could have it in effect for this session.

MR CHAIRMAN: But he could enquire.

MR APPLEBY: Oh, yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: And let's bring it up at the next general meeting, the one when we don't deal with the interior of the Chamber. Does everyone agree with that?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that enough for food services?

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, it's always difficult to come in and pinch hit, but surely there must be some happy medium between what we've got here and the Quebec situation.

MRS OSTERMAN: Wine, women, and song down there. He's willing to leave out the song.

DR BUCK: I don't think we need the red and white wine, but surely there must be a happy medium someplace, John, between this despicable situation and Quebec.

MR GOGO: Make sure that's on tape.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may interject at this point, is it the Canadian National Institute for the Blind who is responsible for downstairs? I don't know -- I guess I have to say I'd like to be shown the figures as to what it costs them to operate and what they're providing in relationship to others. I mean, we have the operation down there, and I don't know why we have it -- whether it was a decision because those people needed to earn some money, or whether it was a decision based on their offering the best price. Maybe that has to be reviewed. If we determine a policy on food and set a minimum standard and anybody can't meet it, I think it then has to go to tender, done in a very democratic, businesslike way. If somebody needs the money, and if this group does, I think we have to find another way to subsidize them, as opposed to us eating food that everybody is obviously very unhappy about, especially when we're stuck here from early morning right through til late at night.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think our visitors are very happy either.

DR BUCK: It should be not so much ourselves we are worried about, but I have never seen the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, or any members bring any delegation down there for noon lunches.

MR CHAIRMAN: Speak for yourself.

DR BUCK: Really?

MR CHAIRMAN: My delegations aren't as posh as yours.

MRS OSTERMAN: He hasn't told you that they've never come back.

DR BUCK: If we want delegations and people to be proud of the Legislature, and feel this is where the business of the province is done, then I think we have to provide some facilities for those people to come. I guess I'm proud of the fact that I was the one who got the membership down at the Royal Glenora, and I think the Royal Glenora is probably making more money off the members than anyone because that's the only place we can take them.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, you're absolutely right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. How do we bell the cat. What should be the outcome of this, so there's some follow-up.

MR PURDY: I think Bohdan's got it.

MR STEFANIUK: I'll bid for the catering contract.

MR CHAIRMAN: So what's Bohdan going to do?

MRS OSTERMAN: Bring us information, hopefully, on the price of meals.

MR CHAIRMAN: He's looking at the price of meals in other places. He will probably check on the menu and quality. Is that enough, or do you want him to scout out the possibilities downstairs as well?

MR PURDY: That's what I was going to say, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to beat the drum I beat here six months ago. The members should have a place that's private to them. If I want to bring a delegation in, I should be able to bring them in without any worry about confidentiality.

MR CHAIRMAN: May I suggest, though, that that's a slightly different topic.

MR PURDY: Well, it all involves the same thing.

MR CHAIRMAN: I realize, but I was going to say, suppose we finish dealing with the menu, then we deal with the place.

MR PURDY: I think we have get the place before we get the menu.

MR GOGO: I think we dealt with respect to the place with the Minister of Government Services, and I think he has responded to us about what he's looking at.

MRS OSTERMAN: There are possibilities in terms of the renovations, and we have to keep on top of that. But now, it's an interim measure.

MR PURDY: Okay, I respect that.

MR CHAIRMAN: All I would like to know is, do you want the Clerk to enquire of the present incumbents downstairs concerning the feasibility of a salad bar or any other extension or variation of the menu?

MR COOK: That's short term. Could we even ask the Clerk if it's possible to have consultants come in and see if there are ways . . .

MR STEFANIUK: You need a budget for outside consultants, Mr. Chairman.

MR GOGO: I would be happy if the Clerk would come back with what other legislatures do in terms of pricing and quality of food, and the service, and then plan on that basis. I would be happy with that -- without touching the present food.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Taking that as a motion by Mr. Gogo . . .

DR BUCK: I think Mr. Stefaniuk has a comment he wants to make before we vote, Mr. Chairman.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting we considered a memorandum from the Minister of Government Services, and it read in part: our staff had given consideration to a separate table service facility across the hall from the present cafeteria which would utilize a common kitchen, and we have also considered the feasibility of longer hours and extended fare in the existing cafeteria. It goes on to say: these facilities will probably be available by mid-1982 -- he's referring to other facilities -- and might well accommodate the members' wishes for extended and improved facilities. He mentions in the letter: the request or direction for any changes should come from the Members' Services Committee.

So the minister has made it quite clear, I would think, that if there is any request or direction for changes in the existing facilities or additional facilities, it should be forthcoming from this committee. Perhaps that will be forthcoming, based on further research which I have been directed to conduct. But in any event, there it is.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we vote on John's motion, that the Clerk make these enquiries?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried. Now, regarding the place. Can we take it that we have a motion by Bill Purdy that we go on record as favoring some private facilities or some other facilities to which members can bring guests?

MR APPLEBY: For the use of members and their guests.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS OSTERMAN: I believe that would be covered in the minister's letter. He has said there is a possibility of an area being available in 1982, and with a view to maybe mentioning that letter, that we would like to be on record so that when that space is being considered, possibly a plan be drawn and we would be most interested in addressing ourselves to it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we take it, then, that we have a motion by Bill Purdy that we inform the minister that this committee favors facilities of the kind that are referred to in his memo of whatever date . . .

MR STEFANIUK: July 18.

MR CHAIRMAN: . . . July 18, 1980, and that the committee would like to see preliminary plans. Is that all right?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Could we use a little stronger word than "like"?

MR CHAIRMAN: The committee expects?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Expects, that's a better word.

MR CHAIRMAN: The committee expects to see preliminary plans. Is that all right?

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm not sure whether that's diplomatic enough. When they're available, please forward.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, George wants to make it unmistakable.

MR APPLEBY: You know how you'd react if somebody wrote you a letter like that.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: If I were in the position that I think we are, I would expect to get a letter like that.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that the Members' Services Committee in the last Legislature was in fact shown plans, which included a private dining facility for members. So those plans have already been seen. Perhaps it's a question of determining whether or not those plans are still in effect or whether they require alteration.

MR CHAIRMAN: Or still under consideration.

MR COOK: Could I just ask a question? Why is the minister waiting until mid-1982?

MR STEFANIUK: I have no idea.

MRS OSTERMAN: It's the space.

MR PURDY: Moving across the road.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's the whole business. It isn't one isolated effort. All in favor of the motion? Carried. Is that all right for food services? We've covered the food and the place.

What about 3.d), then, Classification of Legislative Assembly Officers.

MR PURDY: I think that should be held in view of the time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Over to the next meeting?

MR PURDY: There is no real urgency, is there?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think we should carry it over too much longer.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to that item, may I suggest that that type of item is usually handled in camera; in fact, without the presence of any staff members, for consideration only by the elected members of the Assembly.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Then, what about this? Can we tack it onto the meeting that deals with the plans for inside the Chamber?

MR STEFANIUK: Or you could postpone it to the conclusion of this meeting, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: What is your preference?

MR STEFANIUK: The staff could absent themselves for the discussion of this item.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I would suggest that at the close of this meeting, the staff could absent themselves.

MRS OSTERMAN: If time permits.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next is the 1981-82 budget estimates.

MRS OSTERMAN: Agreed.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I think No. 4 will be prolonged. Would we not be wise to deal with business arising -- don't we have a couple of other items from business arising that we should probably deal with?

MR CHAIRMAN: We have some items concerning which we got memos just a short while ago.

MR GOGO: One I wanted to report on was airport parking. I see the Clerk has done something, and I've done something. I wanted to report on it.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Do you want to deal with Spouse Allowances at the same time?

MR APPLEBY: Not at the same time, but sequentially.

MR CHAIRMAN: Bill, do you want to kick off on that?

MR PURDY: On that item, I feel very strongly that if a member is going to visit another Legislature or jurisdiction on CPA business, if the spouse is going to attend, the air fare and expenses be paid by this jurisdiction.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is where the spouse performs some function, such as helping to host and so on?

MR PURDY: Not necessarily so; even her company.

MR APPLEBY: Actually we're getting into an area -- you're thinking of CPA, are you? Would this not have to go to a CPA meeting?

MR CHAIRMAN: It deals with funding. We've never really dealt with the budget in a CPA meeting. If it's confined to CPA events, I suppose we should bring it up at a CPA meeting. But then we get to the point where it has to come back to this committee for funding.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, you're responsible for our participation in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

MR CHAIRMAN: Sort of.

MRS OSTERMAN: You're chairman of our branch. So we all have a duty in that regard, all being members, in terms of trying to take our turns in whatever events are going on. It would seem to me that it's not necessary to raise it at another meeting. It's a matter of policy.

MR PURDY: I've heard the comment many times by other members who would like to have taken their spouses with them to other jurisdictions where there may be a CPA convention or other functions being carried out by CPA, and they just can't afford the \$500 or \$600 air fare, and the additional moneys for hotel rooms and other expenses that are incurred.

MR CHAIRMAN: Have you compared our practice with that of other branches in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association?

MR PURDY: I think they're all about the same. I think maybe we could be a leader in this.

MR APPLEBY: Quebec pays it.

DR BUCK: In Quebec at least, they provide you with a consort.

MRS OSTERMAN: You're kidding. Don't let the word out. Guys will never take their wives.

MR CHAIRMAN: Speak for yourself, Walter.

MR COOK: I raised this actually, in the last CPA meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe Walter and I have different . . .

MR APPLEBY: We're getting a transcript, are we Donna?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. Walter and I perhaps have different understandings of the meaning of the word "consort".

MRS OSTERMAN: As in consorting?

DR BUCK: At the dinner the province put on in Quebec, it said: the member and his wife or consort are invited to the dinner. If your wife is not there, one of the staff members accompanies the member for the dinner. What they do afterward, they're on their own. But for the dinner -- that's right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Rollie, did you have something in a more serious vein?

MR COOK: I was going to speak to the earlier question about whether this meeting was the proper forum to discuss this question.

MR CHAIRMAN: The propriety?

MR COOK: Yes. I raised it at the CPA meeting we had last year, and it was decided it was a topic that shouldn't really be discussed there and that it should be dealt with in another place, this being the only other place. The specific reference was to Andy Little's problem, where the New Zealand group was going to bill Mrs. Little for registration and functions, as well as she being responsible for her hotel and air fare.

MR STEFANIUK: And they did.

MRS OSTERMAN: You mean they didn't host her?

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR COOK: So this is part and parcel of the question.

MR STEFANIUK: As Gordon Stromberg did this year, and every other member has in every other year.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I've done it.

MR PURDY: I think it's about time we made a change.

MR COOK: It's clearly something the CPA group is reluctant to discuss in the Chamber. I think this group, as Bill has pointed out, should take the initiative.

DR BUCK: I agree a hundred per cent with Bill. If it's going to make the other assemblies wake up to the fact that it can be a real problem, as in the case of Andy Little going way down under. In many instances it means that the spouse will not be able to go with her husband.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I should point that from my knowledge of certain other assemblies, they do cover the expenses of wives or spouses travelling with their member spouses to CPA functions, to both international and in-Canada CPA functions.

MR CHAIRMAN: Because of the relative infrequency of CPA functions, this is not going to be a large -- it isn't going to be as if we're going to go off on a trip every month, or anything like that. It might happen only once every two or three or four years.

MR COOK: I'm not married, so I'm not speaking from a position . . .

MR APPLEBY: You have more problems than we have.

MRS OSTERMAN: It probably would cost you more.

MR APPLEBY: You would have added expenses.

MR COOK: But my point is that politics puts a real strain on family life. Here is an opportunity to try to bring families together instead of splitting them apart for a week or so.

MRS OSTERMAN: As a matter of fact, because I haven't done any of this and haven't given it a lot of thought, I guess I would have to say that, at first blush, in principle -- not in terms of the actual dollars, because as the Chairman said, it doesn't happen often. I guess I'm a little concerned about the principle, also recognizing that there are people who won't participate because they are not going to travel without their spouses because they are already gone so darned much. It can be fairly expensive for one particular person. I guess you've got a point. I really hadn't spent a lot of time thinking about this.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would certainly be a very, very modest thing compared with what, for example, the federal Parliament has for the spouses of federal members. They get -- what is it? Six trips a year to Ottawa. We have nothing like that here.

MR APPLEBY: I think the problem we have -- I think we have a consensus that we agree with the idea -- is the financing of it, how to put that in budget and so on.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would say that if you pass a motion in favor of pursuing this further, perhaps the Clerk and his assistant who is doing budget calculations might come up with a round, sort of ballpark figure, having regard to the frequency of these occurrences in the past, and give us some idea as to a reasonably adequate figure that we could put in the estimates.

MR PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I look at the budget we have in front of us right now. For the Newfoundland CPA conference, coming up in August 1981, \$4,445 for air fare. So you double that. If we come up with the figure of \$15,000, it would cover what we're looking at, other than maybe the delegate who goes to the international conference.

MR CHAIRMAN: If I might suggest, the motion should be fairly carefully worded, because the text will go into the estimates and the Auditor General will then make sure that the expenditures conform with what that text says. So I think it's important that the text be reasonably specific.

MR PURDY: I would move, then, that we give the Clerk the mandate to come back to this meeting -- have we enough time for even a B budget item?

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think this could be an A budget item, with appropriate explanations, if it is the recommendation of this committee -- extension of the CPA budget. We have an estimate calculated for attendance by Alberta delegates at the CPA Canadian regional conference. I believe we also have an estimate for the next international conference, to the extent that that can be appropriately increased.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then there would be only one other thing, the parliamentary seminar.

MR APPLEBY: The motion would be that the appropriation would be increased to include the spouses of members of the Alberta delegation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right. And the purpose of the appropriation be extended.

MRS OSTERMAN: And that the -- I'm just trying to think in terms of being more precise about the expenses. I suppose it would be fair to say that the rationale for expenses for members and spouses would be exactly the same. Is that what we're saying? Is there a problem with that? Or before making it final, should we be consulting with the Auditor General as to what, if anything, there would be a problem.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose we get the principle of the motion from what Bill has said. We put an amount on it, if you wish. We can put it in the estimates, and then, when the Assembly passes it with that description, that would be in order. Before we put the description in, we'll check it with the Auditor General.

MR PURDY: I would leave my motion to allow the Clerk to come up with that respective figure. I'm not one to say at this meeting tonight that it's \$15,000, \$20,000, or whatever the case may be. He has put the estimates in now, under A, for the various functions that are going to be carried on. He is going to have to determine what the extras are for hotel rooms, and so on.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be in order to briefly explain what we have budgeted for and what would remain to be budgeted.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR STEFANIUK: The Canadian regional conference is budgeted on the basis of members' expenses only being covered. All additional expenses incurred by members in connection with having their spouses accompany them are not provided for whatsoever. Representation at the Commonwealth conference, the international Commonwealth conference, is not budgeted for at all, because our membership in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the global Commonwealth body, entitles us to receive appropriate expenses for sending one delegate each year to that particular conference. Therefore, we do not incur any expense, other than perhaps the presentation of small token gifts; that is all. So we have no budget provision for that whatsoever.

The Speaker of the Assembly, by virtue of having the status of minister according to The Financial Administration Act, can authorize for certain other expenses to be paid, to the extent that when the Alberta branch has hosted a conference or a gathering under the auspices of CPA, and spouses have accompanied members for the purpose of acting as hosts or hostesses, expenses incurred by them may be authorized by the minister, and that has been so done in Alberta in the past.

So what we are really talking about is an extension of the expenses incurred in the Canadian regional conferences, the international Commonwealth conferences, and perhaps the annual meeting of the Canadian Regional Council, which occurs once a year, in the spring, and is usually attended by the Speaker and the Clerk, as well as the seminar, which occurs in the fall, to which I believe we send three or four delegates.

MR CHAIRMAN: Three.

MR COOK: If we were to phrase it in this sense, Bohdan, where members are travelling on CPA business and would like their spouses to accompany them, then the CPA should assume the costs of their travel, accommodation . . .

MR STEFANIUK: The Alberta branch of the CPA.

MR COOK: . . . the Alberta branch should assume their costs of travel to that meeting, their accommodation, and registration.

MRS OSTERMAN: Should assume the same costs as is assumed for members.

MR COOK: Exactly. When they're travelling on CPA business, whatever it be, the spouses should be treated as members are.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does that put appropriate words in your mouth, Bill?

MR PURDY: Too many right now.

MR STEFANIUK: I think we know the intent.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does that express the intent of your motion?

MR PURDY: Yes, very well.

MR APPLEBY: Maybe we could approve that, and the wording could be developed, as you suggest, with consultation with the Auditor General.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR GOGO: Does that deal with Frank's?

MR APPLEBY: No, I was going to bring that up now. That was the question I brought up, Mr. Chairman, last meeting I think, about the fact that members are issued passes on the Greyhound and the airlines. Quite frequently your wife wants to come to the capital for some function, or something like that. She has to pay her own way. I would think we should be considering something like they have in the House of Commons, where your spouse is allowed so many trips to the capital a year, on one of these types of transportation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you have any particular number in mind?

MR APPLEBY: Well, I think the House of Commons is six, isn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: The House of Commons is six. Ontario, I believe, is four. I think we should clarify for the record, however, Mr. Chairman, that passes, in the true sense of the word, are offered to members only by Greyhound, on buses. We advise members about the restrictions with the use of that pass, in that the carrier assumes absolutely no liability in respect of personal injury or baggage damage. All other transportation is in fact paid for by the Legislative Assembly.

MR APPLEBY: That's the same sort of thing the MLA has actually on the Greyhound.

MR CHAIRMAN: So your suggestion is that we pay the return travel expenses for the spouses of out of Edmonton members, for how many occasions in a year?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Or Edmonton members if the function happened to be in Calgary.

MR CHAIRMAN: That comes under Bill's motion. We've got that covered, haven't we?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Not unless it's CPA.

MR COOK: Unless you're planning to move the capital of the province to Calgary.

MR CHAIRMAN: We have a difficulty in drafting then.

MR APPLEBY: I think it has to be journeys to the capital.

DR BUCK: Yes, I think that would be acceptable to the members and to the public.

MR APPLEBY: I would think so.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. How many times a year would you suggest in your motion?

MR APPLEBY: I would suggest four times at the present. If we found later that maybe we should extend that, we could.

MRS OSTERMAN: What events do we have?

MR CHAIRMAN: We have the spring opening and the fall opening. That would give you those two, and two others.

MR COOK: The Throne speech and the budget speech.

MR APPLEBY: MLAs are quite often invited, especially during a session, on a Wednesday night to some function where your spouse could attend too if she were here.

DR BUCK: Like the ATA dinner.

MR APPLEBY: Yes, things like that.

MR CHAIRMAN: It really puts an unfair inequality between city members and rural members.

MR APPLEBY: John, you might give us the example you had today, that you gave us when you and I were talking about it, about the cost there would have been for Joyce.

MR GOGO: The air fare is \$150 return, you know, to be invited by the Speaker's wife to participate in pouring tea the day of an opening. I think it works a hardship. A spouse of a member is really representing the Assembly. The only caveat I would have on it would be I think it should be in the capital city. It should be in Edmonton. I think it should be six a year, not four.

DR BUCK: Let's say, a maximum of six a year, because there are times some people may visit only once a year.

MR APPLEBY: That's right.

DR BUCK: I would certainly go along with the people who are involved and who know how many times they could use it. That way we do set a maximum, not a minimum. If it has to be used that many times, so be it. I support that very strongly.

MR APPLEBY: Yes. I would imagine not too many would use the maximum, but it would be available.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you want to change your motion from four to six?

MR APPLEBY: Yes. Make it a maximum of six.

MR CHAIRMAN: The motion, then, is that we include in the estimates an allowance which may be reasonably expected to be adequate to cover the travel expenses of spouses of members coming to Edmonton up to six times per fiscal year.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, for clarification. Are we talking about four occasions?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: We're not just talking about a trip; we're talking about occasions.

MR CHAIRMAN: Six trips.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, but those trips are made for a specific occasion.

DR BUCK: They always are, Connie.

MR COOK: For example, someone might want to go to the Lieutenant Governor's dinner or an ATA dinner.

MRS OSTERMAN: What if they just come to Edmonton, and they decided, well, I haven't made all my trips this year, because I've had only three occasions to go to, so I'm going to make three more trips.

DR BUCK: So be it.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's what I'm asking. How far do you want to go?

MR CHAIRMAN: The only alternative to that is for the Clerk to get himself a few enforcement officers and follow the gals around and see what they do when they get to Edmonton.

MR APPLEBY: Actually it's a matter of being with your spouse, being able to come up here six times a year and participate.

DR BUCK: I bet it won't happen three times.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think I should point out one possible difficulty with passing this motion within the committee. The transportation for members between their residences and the capital is provided for in the Legislative Assembly Act. If there were to be an extension of that particular travel provision, I wonder if an amendment to the Act would be required, as opposed to a decision by this committee. I don't pretend to have legal knowledge, but I feel it is incumbent upon me to bring this to the committee's attention.

MR CHAIRMAN: Just off the top of my head, I would be inclined to think that we wouldn't need an amendment to the Act, because it's not a benefit to members. It is not being paid to them.

MR STEFANIUK: Then does it become a taxable benefit to the spouse? Will we be required to issue supplementary T-4s in the name of the spouse who has benefited from this?

MR CHAIRMAN: I would suggest you write a letter to your counterpart in Ottawa.

MRS OSTERMAN: I was just going to say that in Ontario and Ottawa, let's find out how they handle it. Maybe they've been through this.

MR STEFANIUK: The difference being that in Ontario and in Ottawa, there is provision for a maximum number of trips between the residence and the constituency by the member, of which four or six may be taken by the spouse of the member. We don't have that type of provision here. We virtually don't have a limit set on the number of trips to be taken by the member. We know fully well that certain members utilize their credit cards, with the expense being paid by the Legislative Assembly, to commute between their residences and the capital more frequently than once per week.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think that's going to affect the . . .

MR APPLEBY: Could we pass the motion and sort out the legal implications and have it brought back if there's a problem.

MR CHAIRMAN: All those in favor? Carried.

MRS OSTERMAN: There's a financial benefit to getting married, Rollie.

MR COOK: A microwave oven doesn't cost as much. I'm going to have to excuse myself.

MR CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Rollie. Airport Parking -- John?

MR COOK: Thank you very much.

MR GOGO: I see a memo from the Clerk, Mr. Chairman. After last meeting, I had agreed to look into it. The Clerk also may want to speak to it. Have you heard from the airport manager in Calgary?

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR GOGO: Well let me just share -- you all have the memo. I spoke to the airport manager at Calgary. He said he could really see no problem with members parking in Calgary airport if it were operated on the same basis as Members of Parliament. What that would involve would be, because they contract the parking out to an outside firm, and they collect and remit that money to Transport Canada, the way it's done with the MPs is they have a list of all the Members of Parliament in the parkade. A man comes in, he parks, he goes out; he surrenders his ticket. They stamp it with a special stamp they have, called Exceptions. It then goes into the airport manager and forwarded to Transport Canada.

MR CHAIRMAN: And they pay.

MR GOGO: Yes, and they pay. The way he explained it to me was that if we had a list of our members at the Calgary parkade, and our members had a means of identification, like their I card, the same thing would apply and they would bill the Assembly once a month.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make a motion for the Clerk to make that kind of arrangement?

MR GOGO: The Clerk may want to speak to it.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I have stated in the memo that I have now consulted with our own Minister of Transportation, who has agreed to look into the possibility of obtaining free parking for our members. As I understand it, federal members simply have all charges waived and no one is responsible for those charges. It is simply a write-off at a federal airport. When I learned this from the management firm, I thought I had better go after getting the same kind of privilege for the members of the Alberta Legislature, at Calgary International Airport. The minister has promised that he will see what he can do to place our members on the same footing as federal members, so that in fact there won't be a bill to pay at the end of the month. It will simply be a write-off by the feds.

MRS OSTERMAN: What about Edmonton, Mr. Chairman?

MR STEFANIUK: We haven't tried at Edmonton Municipal, but we can do a similar thing there. If the minister is going to look into it, he can look into it on the basis of federally controlled airports.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would make that request, because many of us -- I'm affected by both.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm not suggesting that the Minister of Transportation isn't willing to get the thing moving, but I think it might go a little more quickly if the Clerk did it.

MR STEFANIUK: I'd have to go to MoT.

MR APPLEBY: I would be doubtful very much if provincial members would get free parking at a federal airport.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would too. Or even at a municipal one. If there were provincial ones, that would be different.

MR APPLEBY: Especially when a private contractor has the concession. Somebody would have to pay for it.

MR STEFANIUK: The contractor has indicated to me that, providing -- and I've explained in the memorandum that his contract terminates in November, and he is among those who have bid for the contract -- he is successful, he has indicated to me that he would be willing to enter into an arrangement whereby we would be billed on a monthly basis. But that's contingent on his being successful with his bid. He's not interested in entering into an agreement now, in light of the fact that his contract terminates.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, if I might speak to it again. I sense that because the sitting starts next week, there's a sense of urgency; not just in Calgary. I'd be happy if the Clerk would pursue what we've done, to get the thing in place. I don't really care who pays.

MR CHAIRMAN: How do you mean "pursue what we've done", John?

MR GOGO: I think we've got enough information on Calgary at this point to proceed. Edmonton Municipal, which is just as important to many people -- I frankly don't think there is any way we are not going to pay parking charges as MLAs. I think the Legislature is going to pick up the tab.

MR CHAIRMAN: It should have done long ago.

MR STEFANIUK: They tell me they will accept bank cards. Of course if we pay on the basis of bank card receipts, we have to remit to the member, unless we get into the position where we're going to issue bank cards.

MR APPLEBY: You were talking about a list, John, were you not, and identification as you go through and a check off on a list and a charge against the name?

MR GOGO: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: When was the Minister of Transportation consulted, and what did he agree to do?

MR STEFANIUK: He agreed to determine from the federal minister whether or not provincial members might be treated on the same basis as federal members.

MRS OSTERMAN: When did you speak to him?

MR STEFANIUK: That was recently.

MR CHAIRMAN: Knowing the way things move through federal departments, I wouldn't expect any sudden and dramatic developments out of that.

MR APPLEBY: Especially for Alberta.

MRS OSTERMAN: Especially for Alberta is right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Whatever you think, but my inclination would be to have us take the bull by the horns and go ahead and work out an arrangement to have these parking things charged to the Legislative Assembly by the firm that has the Calgary concession, or that gets it in December, and similarly with the authority that runs the Edmonton Municipal Airport.

DR BUCK: The cards that are used for the air fare -- that's the way we handle it, and that's exactly the way it should be handled.

MR STEFANIUK: What I asked him whether we could do was whether we could use PWA credit cards to charge the parking against, because I thought that would simplify it.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would complicate it for them, though.

MR APPLEBY: And if you travel on Time Air too?

DR BUCK: So you use your Master Charge or your Chargex, and if the member doesn't want to collect that back, that's fine. Otherwise he has that as his receipt. We put that through our office for some of the things we do in the opposition's office.

MR CHAIRMAN: And you should pay it direct, not to the member. We don't want to raise any taxation question on this.

MR STEFANIUK: You see, if we reimburse the member, that would be considered a taxable benefit in all likelihood.

MR CHAIRMAN: It could be.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, we could have a list at the two airports of the members of this Assembly, and make arrangements with their accounting people that when the tickets were turned, identification produced, it would go on a list and that bill would be submitted monthly to the Assembly. If that's agreed to, that's the motion I would make.

MR CHAIRMAN: Just one thing, John. I know there's a limit to how far you can go. Should the Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, and Grande Prairie airports be included? I don't know what kind of parking facilities they have.

MRS OSTERMAN: Do they have a charge?

MR GOGO: Not at the moment, but I think that would be a good idea: Alberta airports.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Puxley, where does Grant leave his car when he comes to Edmonton, or does he drive all the way?

MR PUXLEY: No. He usually goes out of Peace River or Grande Prairie. I've never heard him complain about parking charges.

MR GOGO: It's not five bucks a day.

MR APPLEBY: I doubt very much if they have them.

MR STEFANIUK: I thought at one stage that Mr. Notley was flying into B.C. and then driving home. I think he indicated to me that that was closest for him.

MR CHAIRMAN: Dawson Creek.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think it's a good motion if we -- I don't know whether that causes a problem for Grant, though, if we say Alberta airports.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, let's go ahead with Calgary and Edmonton, and if something is raised concerning the others, we can deal with it when it's raised.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would also say that I think the Minister of Transportation, having an inquiry under way -- and I think Henry would have done that when he was asked to -- that he should continue to pursue it, and he should be told what we're doing on an interim basis.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, do we know where we're at? This is a motion by Mr. Gogo, that the Clerk make arrangements with the parking operators at the Calgary and Edmonton airports to have them charge the Clerk for the cost of parking by members, on the basis of a list of members to be supplied to both airports.

MRS OSTERMAN: What ID do the members have to produce?

MR GOGO: I think identification is all that is required. There is only one John Gogo, only one Connie Osterman. If Joe went out to pick up your car, if you had parked it and flown to Toronto, I would think the identification would be adequate.

MRS OSTERMAN: We don't look at all alike.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, have you something to say under Special Warrants?

MR STEFANIUK: No, I don't. I had one for approval, Mr. Chairman, which I could simply report. That has received the approval of the Speaker and myself, and has been filed through the normal channels, for the 75th Anniversary conference we held. I'm pleased to report that we had budgeted \$46,000 for that conference and came through \$10,000 under budget.

MRS OSTERMAN: Where is it?

MR STEFANIUK: We don't have the money; we have applied for a special warrant for that. We also had no budget for the September 1 ceremonies for unveiling of the canopy. We came through that one for approximately \$3,000. So I'm rather pleased to report that we conducted both functions and came through about \$6,000 under a single budget.

DR BUCK: Bohdan, if the budget is high enough, you'll come in under -- that's great.

MR CHAIRMAN: Other Business -- Frank, did you want to talk about mailings?

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, we made a provision in the last estimates, the '80-81 estimates, for an expenditure of something like \$244,000 for MLAs for mailing services, to communicate with their constituents. I don't think we as a committee have ever addressed what method this should be distributed under. I did a little bit of work on this, and my estimate is that there are approximately 610,000 households in the province. Based on those figures, it would work out to about 40 cents a household allowance that MLAs could expend for mailing purposes. I don't if anybody else has any thoughts about how it should be distributed. Some members have suggested to me that this could be considered a communication allowance and that it could be used for such things perhaps as reprinting speeches from the House to mail out to constituents, newspaper advertising of pre-session meetings. Then of course the clerical costs of maintaining lists and addressing envelopes. I have thought about it and thought that these lists would require a lot of updating at all times, and perhaps that should be something that should be done through constituency offices, at the constituency level at least. Then expense forms, with the receipts attached, could be submitted to the Clerk's office for reimbursement. Those are the thoughts I have; it would amount to 40 cents times half the number of voters registered in the constituency.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is according to a memo of yours, Frank. Do you have that in your books?

MR APPLEBY: No. That just went out to government members. But that was the base of it, that we should have some method of knowing what each member is entitled to spend out of that appropriation, and for what purpose. I don't know, Walter, if your people have used it at all yet.

DR BUCK: No, not that I know of.

MR APPLEBY: We're well along into the year, and nobody has made very much use of it, as far as I know.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's perhaps because there hasn't been a full awareness of it.

MR APPLEBY: But I think members should have some idea of how much they would be permitted to utilize out of that total appropriation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Per member?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: There has to be some direction.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you like to make some proposal as to how it would be calculated? For example, it would seem that the Member for Cypress, for example, the allowance might be smaller than the Member for Sherwood Park.

MR APPLEBY: That's right. You have constituencies -- Walter's would be one -- that have grown tremendously since the last election, so figures are difficult to come up with.

MRS OSTERMAN: It would have to be a 'guesstimate'. Milt Pahl's is something like that.

MR PURDY: I had 13,400 voters in the '79 election, and we now estimate there are 18,500.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm probably in a similar boat.

MR CHAIRMAN: I have a similar growth situation in my constituency.

MR APPLEBY: So this is based, somewhat, on the '79 election, so the figure probably would be less than 40 cents that could be allowable for each household.

MR CHAIRMAN: How would you recommend that we come to grips with this?

MR APPLEBY: I don't really know.

MR CHAIRMAN: We need two things, don't we? We need a text that describes what is to be done, and we need an estimate of what that will cost. Is that right?

AN HON MEMBER: I think you've looked after the estimate. Didn't you say 40 cents?

MR APPLEBY: Yes, I did. That is based on the '79 election. We've had an immigration of 5,000 or 6,000 people a month.

MRS OSTERMAN: How many mailings did we talk about?

MR APPLEBY: You have 40 cents; you mail twice a year or whatever. Some of it will go into clerical work, printing, or whatever.

MRS OSTERMAN: If we're talking about overall mailings and decide how many of those a member should have, if we're not within budget I guess we would have to request more. The budget was based on a consideration of X number of households. Those have grown. In some cases I think there are probably a couple of members where it has almost doubled, and everybody else has had a significant increase. So I think we should continue to go with that, but the budget would have to be enlarged accordingly. We still should have as many mailings.

MR APPLEBY: Do you have any idea, Bohdan, what we based that figure of \$244,000 on?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes. It was based on three mailings a year. The number of households was estimated by taking the enumeration list and dividing it by two, to arrive at something that was felt was a reasonable average. The cost of production was based on one sheet of paper, printed on two sides by the government's quick print centre. We had no funds provided for maintenance of

a mailing list, as the assumption was made at that time that the mailing would be a "To the Householder" type of mailing, rather than individually addressed. We went so far, in the Clerk's office, as to consult with the post office, to determine how distribution of a given member's newsletter of that particular type could be restricted by utilization of postal codes. While that was going to be a very substantial undertaking, we none the less felt that on an experimental basis, we could implement it within existing manpower facilities.

If, on the other hand, we are going to consider mailings addressed personally to a given household, and require the maintenance of a mailing list, I would respectfully suggest that we need to reconsider the entire budget proposal, because the maintenance of the list in itself is going to be more costly than production of any of the newsletters members may wish to distribute.

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, for what it's worth, at least once a year all I do is what they call at the post office the (inaudible). That way you don't have to worry about lists. You do it as cheaply as you possibly can because you do it in bulk.

MR PURDY: It's 35 cents, isn't it?

DR BUCK: It has been climbing all the time; I think it's three or three and a half now, Bill. The same things we do in our election campaigns. So really, you don't have to worry about lists if you do that.

MR STEFANIUK: That's what we had based the original budget proposal on, that type of mailing.

MR CHAIRMAN: Somebody would have to sit down, then, and work out the correlation between the walks and the constituency boundaries.

MR STEFANIUK: As I say, we had consulted with the post office with a view to accomplishing that.

MR APPLEBY: What I was getting at, Mr. Chairman, was that if each member knew what the allocation was going to be for his particular use, the member could utilize it in whatever manner they saw fit to communicate in, up to that maximum.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you consider it appropriate, then, if we might put the onus on each member to inform the Clerk concerning the number of households, with some particulars, and the Clerk, if he thinks that one of them is way out, under or over, can check.

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, let's base it on the last enumeration we had, plus whatever the estimated growth factor is. That's going to hurt some people, sure, but you can't cover everything. Now we're paying it out of our own pocket anyway. The people who have some of those rapid growth areas, that's the way the ball bounces. If you look at the last enumeration, plus the estimated increase, that's about the best you can do.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, we do have a budget figure that was approved. Beyond that figure there really are no more dollars, unless this committee wishes to consider growth and recommend seeking of additional funding by means of special warrant in this fiscal year. Otherwise, we have what was in fact approved by the House last spring.

MR PURDY: It appears we have about 40 cents per member per household anyway.

MR. APPLEBY: Based on the '79 list.

MR PURDY: Based on '79. But even with the growth factor -- you know, we'll only have one drop between now and the end of the fiscal year, March 31, anyway. You have quite a variation there to work with, of printed matter and the mailing of that particular item. So I would suggest that the Clerk, because of the time frame we're into, formulate a list of what each constituency is entitled to.

MR STEFANIUK: I hasten to mention, Mr. Chairman, that some of the money has already been spent. Some members, being aware of the estimate having been passed by the House, have in fact already placed orders and have distributed newsletters in their respective constituencies. So the total figure is no longer available; some money has been spent.

MRS OSTERMAN: Just deduct if off the individual's . . .

MR PURDY: That's what I say. We get a list from your office of the entitlement for the 79 constituencies, and extract that . . .

MR APPLEBY: What about the growth factor that Walter mentioned?

MR APPLEBY: We can add that in.

DR BUCK: The next go around, but now all we're budgeted for is what is there.

MR APPLEBY: We're budgeting on the '79 list only?

DR BUCK: That's what the original figure was based on.

MR APPLEBY: The '79 list would be right in the ballpark with that 40 cents per household.

MRS OSTERMAN: May I ask a question? Have any members sent out more than one mailing at this point in time?

MR STEFANIUK: Not to the best of my knowledge.

MRS OSTERMAN: Then there shouldn't be a problem. They couldn't possibly have overspent; they're going to have to hold until we get . . .

MR STEFANIUK: And they have utilized the guidelines which were used in establishing the budget. To that extent they couldn't have overspent their appropriation.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'd like to make a suggestion to assist those with really high growth areas. I know there are other suggestions, but if we had budgeted on the basis of three mailings and part of the year is already gone so most of us won't be able to avail ourselves of that, unless somebody thinks they still can, if we cut back to two mailings, it surely would cover all those people with high growth constituencies in the reallocation.

DR BUCK: Connie, don't do that. Just say that each member is entitled whatever the figure is.

MR APPLEBY: Then you can use whatever . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm concerned about -- if we do it on the basis of a certain census, we're hitting some members pretty hard maybe. As long as we allocate those dollars properly, I'm not concerned then. If some members can get more mailings out, whatever they do, fine.

DR BUCK: If I'm entitled to \$723 and he's entitled to \$623, that's all I spend, under this budgeting system.

MRS OSTERMAN: But how are we looking after those people with high growth areas?

MR PURDY: We're going to have to suffer.

MR APPLEBY: If we had spent the money as soon as it was appropriated, we wouldn't be discussing this now.

MR GOGO: I don't think you can predict the growth; that's for another year.

MR CHAIRMAN: When we deal with the estimates.

DR BUCK: The member is going to decide if he is going to mail three times a year, or put a pretty glossy one out and do it only once. He's just limited in what he can spend.

MR APPLEBY: That's why I think some members may wish to use personalized envelopes, with names and addresses on them, and that would be more costly. That may be only one shot.

What about my suggestion that these should all be done at the constituency level, and invoices delivered back to the Clerk for payment?

MR CHAIRMAN: Couldn't you leave to the member where he's going to have it done?

MR APPLEBY: I'm concerned about our office staff in handling something like this.

MR CHAIRMAN: Isn't that a sort of internal thing for the caucuses to decide?

DR BUCK: I just get my entitlement, and if I want to contract it out or deliver it hand mail, or any way at all.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're going to cause some resentment, aren't we, if this committee says what should happen inside a caucus?

MR APPLEBY: I have to have a concern that any MLAs -- I suppose it could apply to the opposition ones too -- don't expect the services in this building to look after that mailing.

DR BUCK: Run that by again, Frank.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Clerk's office wouldn't do it; it would be caucus staff.

DR BUCK: I don't follow you.

MR APPLEBY: Our secretaries in our offices are not expected to handle this extra load of mailing.

DR BUCK: No. That should be done outside.

MR APPLEBY: That's what I'm getting at.

MR CHAIRMAN: But then you're the doctor, Frank. You decide what kind of load is going to be assigned to your . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: We don't have as many staff in relationship to members as maybe the opposition.

DR BUCK: I just assumed what we were talking about is what I do in my constituency and how I get it out there.

MR APPLEBY: Yes, not in here. That's what I'm worried about.

DR BUCK: Yes, fine. Good point, then.

MR GOGO: Could you excuse me? I have a meeting uptown at 8.

MRS OSTERMAN: Me too.

MR APPLEBY: Should we go for that 40 cents allocation for the balance of this year?

MR CHAIRMAN: Have you heard the motion?

MR APPLEBY: 40 cents allowance for the balance of this year per household.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried. Can we do any other business before people have to go, or do we carry over to the next one?

MR PURDY: Do we have some urgent items on budget, or what?

MR STEFANIUK: It's the total package.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know how long you've had that, and I'm wondering if it wouldn't be appropriate if you took it along. Maybe we need a special meeting dealing with estimates. If we make the meetings too long, we just get inefficient, either by rushing or . . . So do you want to give some thought to a date for a special meeting dealing with the estimates?

DR BUCK: At the call of the Chair, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: What I'll propose to do is I'll consult with Connie, Fred, and Grant, on a date for dealing with estimates. The sooner the better, eh? Okay. So, Connie, this is my notice that I expect you to be able to give me a date.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right. And it will be almost any day -- just get up in the morning when I do. I'm willing to meet with you tomorrow morning at 6 o'clock.

DR BUCK: That's the first woman I've ever heard say she was ready, willing, and able, in the morning. That is a physiological . . . Unbelievable.

MRS OSTERMAN: If we can't get another time, I was going to suggest early in the morning, a breakfast meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: A breakfast meeting to deal with the budget?

MR APPLEBY: That's awkward, too, in some ways -- for Marg, I mean.

MR CHAIRMAN: 7:30?

MRS OSTERMAN: I just don't know when we're going to find a date. Evening is awkward.

MR APPLEBY: We won't have that much problem.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, especially if we take them along and go over them. I think we can zero in, because a lot of the stuff is fairly routine.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe, from some of the decisions made tonight, that there should be changes effected in this budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then why don't we send the members supplementary sheets? When you say a breakfast meeting, do you mean that? Or should we get the breakfast out of the way and get down to the damn budget when we meet?

MR PURDY: I think we should say 8 o'clock, and let ourselves be responsible for our own breakfast.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we'll arrange a meeting for 8 o'clock. I'll be after you and you and you for a date. I'll ask you on Friday what decision you've made about a date.

That you very much. We'll assume that the two departing members have moved and seconded adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 8 p.m.