

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Tuesday, December 2, 1980

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

3:35 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: At the last meeting we didn't approve the minutes of the meeting before. If there is an appropriate motion, we can do that now. The meeting before was November 14; you have the minutes under tab 1 in your books.

MR APPLEBY: I move that November 14 and November 28 be approved.

MR CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Carried.

We have no other visitors, so item 3 is wiped out. Item 4: as you know we circularized the members concerning the possibility of closing that corridor. The first votes that came in were about 20 to 1 in favor of closing it. But then the later votes came in -- and I'm not suggesting they were the more thoughtful members -- and there began to be opposition to it. In fact, two opposition members; one said he didn't care and two others expressed strong opposition to it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, as I said before, our caucus said they didn't want it closed.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think the opposition is such -- it's a pity in a way, because the corridor is used only about three or four months in the year and the Clerk sits in his office for 12.

MR STEFANIUK: We're prepared to live with whatever way.

MR APPLEBY: Can you soundproof the wall?

MR STEFANIUK: We're going to have that done anyway. You see, the problem is that when they soundproof it, we're going to lose more inches.

MR APPLEBY: Take that off from where they walk.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't think you can at this stage.

MR GOGO: If I can get down there, anybody else can.

MR PURDY: There's room behind the door then.

MR STEFANIUK: Pardon?

MR PURDY: If he moved it out, you couldn't hang the door I don't think.

MR APPLEBY: Which door?

MR PURDY: The one at the far end.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want us to look into it?

MRS OSTERMAN: With all due respect, I don't think it's something for this committee do deal with.

MR APPLEBY: It's just out of curiosity that I asked the question.

MRS OSTERMAN: But in terms of structural changes . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: No, but if you interfere with the width of that corridor, I think that's of interest to the members who use it. It would take possibly 5 inches off that corridor. I don't know how thick that wall is going to be in order to -- the Clerk swears out loud, you know.

MRS OSTERMAN: I move that we leave that to the engineers.

MR CHAIRMAN: So you have no objection if we take a slight bulge into that corridor? Is that the consensus?

DR BUCK: As long as it remains open.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, from your great knowledge of parliamentary tradition, the fact that there are independent methods of entrance and exit from the Chamber by opposition and government members, I suppose that has a realm of intrigue in it, doesn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, I don't think it really matters, although the west entrance did become known as a sort of opposition -- especially when there were 26 in the opposition. But in the days prior to '71, when there were only six for a while in the opposition, they were sitting on that side and I think it was a Social Credit extension around the end.

MR APPLEBY: Could we go on to the next item then?

MR CHAIRMAN: So you have no objection if we have to take a slight strip off the edge of that corridor? Okay.

Caucus and independent members' position on dental plan: who is carrying the ball on that?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think John made a statement on that last meeting. We're getting more information. Or, John, have you got more? You were going to put it back on the agenda when you had more information?

MR GOGO: Yes. I raised it with our caucus, Mr. Chairman, and I don't have all the answers yet. They were looking at matters of The Legislative Assembly Act to see if there was a conflict. I mentioned last day that we would caucus again on the 11th and I would have an answer at that time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Of December?

MR GOGO: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll carry it over.

MR GOGO: I would be interested if the Socreds have . . .

DR BUCK: May I ask a question, which will show my ignorance? But I think it is important that I know so I can report back to caucus. What is the present status now? Are members of the Assembly . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Excluded.

DR BUCK: They are excluded.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. As I understand it, ministers are included.

DR BUCK: Ministers and the official leader of the opposition?

MR GOGO: Ministers, executive assistants, students at law . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: And all people working for the provincial government.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Speaker's executive assistant isn't included.

MR GOGO: Executive assistants as a group are included, whatever category they might be in. My thought was that Members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta should be treated equally. Whether they chose to take it or not was their affair. In terms of precedents, I understand that long-term disability was put in place two years ago for members of the Assembly. As I recall, it was only going through for Executive Council, but it was changed and was for all members, the same as group accident insurance.

To summarize, I've gone to my caucus. There's information coming; it should be available after the 11th. Therefore I request it be put on the next agenda.

MR CHAIRMAN: One of the points you want to consider is whether it would disqualify the members.

MR GOGO: I'm looking at that now.

MR CHAIRMAN: Has your caucus looked at that, Walter?

DR BUCK: Into which area, Mr. Chairman?

MR CHAIRMAN: Into whether it would disqualify the members under The Legislative Assembly Act?

DR BUCK: No, we haven't looked at it because we assumed that MLAs were not going to be covered. The only person who was going to be covered, as far as I could understand, was the official leader of the opposition.

MR CHAIRMAN: As John says, it was the intent of this committee to make it available to members if they wanted it.

MR GOGO: The official leader of the opposition is not covered. It's members of Executive Council, not the leader of the opposition.

DR BUCK: Well, he seemed to receive a brochure to that effect.

MR STEFANIUK: For payroll purposes, he is in the category of a minister. Maybe on that basis the communication was addressed to him.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure how soon we're going to meet again. You may not welcome this suggestion at all, but if you thought it was okay, would you like to authorize the Clerk to act on memos from the two caucuses in the event they agree that the plan should be extended?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think if both caucuses concurred, then. But if there are differing feelings, it would have to come back to this table before any further action were taken.

DR BUCK: This is a very important point here. Either all MLAs are covered or no MLAs are covered. I consider members of Executive Council as MLAs.

MR CHAIRMAN: That anomaly crossed my mind. I don't know how they worked that out.

MR GOGO: They do it on the basis of salary. As you know, MLAs receive indemnities and no salaries. Ministers of the Crown receive indemnities plus salaries. I'm not saying that is a good or bad rationale.

MR APPLEBY: The leader of the opposition gets a salary.

MRS OSTERMAN: We have to make a category for ourselves.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you agree, then, that if the two memos are in favor, the Clerk do what is necessary to make the plan available to MLAs?

MRS OSTERMAN: Maybe John should move that.

MR GOGO: I would so move, and I would be responsible for the government memo.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would be understood that if they did not agree, it would come up on the next agenda. All in favor? Carried.

Item 6 -- airport parking. You have the Clerk's memo of October 15. Unless somebody else has heard, it looks to me as if the next move on that is to chase up the hon. Mr. Kroeger.

MR STEFANIUK: No, Mr. Chairman. We have had a reply from the Minister of Transportation, who has indicated to us -- I'm sorry it isn't in here -- that several of the smaller airports will be prepared to provide parking for members at no charge. Those are airports that are under municipal control. Calgary International, as explained in here, would not make a commitment owing to the fact that the company that was handling the parking facility was retendering its bid to continue handling it, and the decision was to be made on December 1, yesterday. I haven't had time to check whether they were successful in that bid. If they were, we can now move ahead and make an arrangement with them. They had indicated to us they would be interested in entering into an arrangement.

As well, I haven't had an opportunity to follow up on Edmonton Municipal. That can be done within the next couple of days. That would mean a charge-back arrangement to the Legislative Assembly.

MR CHAIRMAN: And I suppose some kind of vouchers would be extended to identify MLA cars?

MR STEFANIUK: We would have to provide for the members a form of identification which, I understand, was in existence in this Assembly several years ago.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR STEFANIUK: It could either be a card, or we could provide a sticker for the car, which might be the more convenient thing to do; perhaps not unlike the

kind of sticker that is provided by the National Parks where admission is paid.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Clerk could work that out. Would the meeting accept this as a progress report, and could we agree that there will be follow-up by the Clerk to pursue the matter with the successful bidder in Calgary, with the Minister of Transportation here, and with the Edmonton Municipal, and send a report to members of the committee, say, in the next week or so?

MR GOGO: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I would hope members of the committee wouldn't think that because the House is no longer sitting the sense of urgency is still not there.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR GOGO: Many members are commuting from Calgary. I think we should treat it with the same degree of interest we would if the House were sitting.

The other thing, I would ask the Clerk when he gets it in place -- because there is no doubt Mr. Stefaniuk is going to have it in place -- that we're not faced with the matter a year from today because there is a change in the International Airport at Calgary, that we're going to have to go through the exercise again; in other words, regardless of who the contractor is, we can maybe fine-tune it enough that it will just carry on as normal practice.

MR STEFANIUK: As I have mentioned on an earlier occasion, Mr. Chairman, I would have expected that once the program is in place we would have considerably less difficulty holding it in place than we have in initiating it. We also would like to get the program under way because we would like to test the effectiveness of it at a time when the House is not sitting and the traffic and use of those facilities is somewhat less than it would be at other times.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you agree, then, that if we could work out practical arrangements, we go ahead immediately and not wait for another meeting of this committee?

MR STEFANIUK: Communicate with the members and advise them of -- produce the necessary I.D. cards, stickers, or whatever.

MR APPLEBY: Would that cover the Municipal Airport too?

MR STEFANIUK: That's what we're working on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Other business.

MR STEFANIUK: It has to do with the new provincial coat of arms and its usage. I looked up the Act and saw the restrictions that are placed and consulted with the Law Clerk as to whether we have to have approval from anyone else. The Law Clerk expressed his opinion in his memorandum of November 25. What I was looking for is probably in his P.S., where he says: it is my opinion the Assembly does not need any such permission, partly because of its very nature and partly because it is not a person within the meaning of the Act.

I'm assuming, therefore, that we can go ahead and print whatever stationery is needed with the new coat of arms.

MRS OSTERMAN: Whatever held before should hold now.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't think it is a question of decision at this meeting, but if there are any recommendations for changes in design of letterhead or memorandum paper or any other stationery that is printed, we should have that from the parties concerned as soon as possible, so we can incorporate new design if necessary in reprint orders.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on that subject, I would be interested in knowing how it would affect our budgetary estimates if we went to Legislative Assembly stationery in living color, such as departments of government. In other words, instead of the black and white crest, we could use stationery -- because we're now using a very high quality paper now relative to what we used to use. I would think that the new crest could be in color if possible. I don't know how it would affect our budgetary estimates, but I think it would be an asset to this Assembly for its members if the cost is not prohibitive.

MR STEFANIUK: The cost is obviously higher, Mr. Chairman, if we go for full color, because that is a full-color coat of arms. That means a four-time press run or using a four-color press. So the cost is obviously higher. On a per unit basis, considering the amount of it we use in any given year, the amount would be negligible.

MR APPLEBY: Are you speaking of a four-color deal, John, or just a color?

MR CHAIRMAN: Whatever the colors are on the crest.

MR APPLEBY: Previously our stationery had green, or a blue I believe too; I used to see two colors around here.

MR STEFANIUK: We have a green stationery in existence now that's a social stationery.

MR APPLEBY: I haven't seen any for years.

DR BUCK: What John is meaning is just that this little crest be in color.

MR APPLEBY: Yes, I know. But is it going to be in all the colors of the crest, according to the four-run deal that Bo was talking about, or just a color?

MR CHAIRMAN: What did you have in mind, John?

MR GOGO: I think it should be proper; all the colors.

MRS OSTERMAN: Just like our cards.

MR STEFANIUK: Obviously that makes it more expensive to put it on those. But, again, those are printed in limited quantities. As I say, when you take it down to unit cost, it's going to be negligible considering the thousands and thousands that we print.

MRS PRATT: If we have letterhead, we should have envelopes too.

MR STEFANIUK: I question the advisability of using that colored crest on envelopes. The envelope, in so many cases, is that item which is discarded; the letter is kept. I personally feel that printing of envelopes with anything is sometimes a waste of money. Where you're using a postage meter, you can insert a slug with your return address and imprint at the same time as

you're printing postage. If I were on an economy kick, I wouldn't print envelopes at all, at all, at all.

MR GOGO: I'd be happy with the stationery.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. We get comparative costs and send them out to the committee?

MR STEFANIUK: Can we proceed if they appear to be not too far out of line?

MR CHAIRMAN: If it appears to be reasonable, we order it?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right. I think we should use up everything that is available to us now; just not issue anything or say anything about it until

MR STEFANIUK: There is no intention to reprint until current stocks are used up, but we are getting down in stock on certain items.

MRS OSTERMAN: The same with business cards. If new business cards have to be ordered by anybody, hopefully the new coat of arms will be on them.

MR APPLEBY: Could we not leave it in this way: that if the Clerk deems it to be reasonable, he proceeds. If he has doubt about it, he brings it back.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, are we still under "Other business"?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are.

MR GOGO: There are two minor matters I would like to raise, with the permission of the Chair.

MRS OSTERMAN: If I may ask permission to insert one after your first one.

MR GOGO: They're both in the hands of the Clerk and they both have been dealt with. It's just that I haven't heard the report back on one. That concerns the memo in triplicate we dealt with at one time, from my constituency office.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm sorry, it was in this book; it shouldn't have been removed. Perhaps it should have been under "Other business". We had samples for the committee that have been in these books since sometime in October. We did have samples of what was available in the commercial market. Basically they are a triplicate, snap-out memo, with pre-inserted carbons. We could have them over-printed with Legislative Assembly. If members wish those made available for their use, we can incorporate them into our normal stationery usage. I assume that the use of that kind of item will reduce usage of other items, so somewhere along the line it will balance itself off. If you wish us to go ahead, we can put it into use.

MR GOGO: I understood that we had looked at prices at one time and didn't make a decision. I don't know why we didn't make a decision.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want them printed with Legislative Assembly on top?

MR GOGO: I'd be happy with them plain; I don't care. It would save a great deal of time in terms of typing memos and writing memos, because you get rid of that stuff -- enquiries from my constituency office. The girl there now uses scraps of paper and tries to put it in a book, and so on. But with those memos, when I get a copy and bring it to Edmonton with me, there is a copy on the file. I would find it very helpful. I didn't know where it was at.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is an established cost for those things, and I'm sure it's not prohibitive. Why don't we just go ahead and get them?

MR GOGO: That would be my view.

MR STEFANIUK: And make their availability known through the caucus secretaries.

MR GOGO: I'll be using a rubber stamp on mine. The Clerk raised the question: should they be over-printed? I have a stamp made: Constituency Office, Lethbridge West.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose we use them plain and see how heavy the usage is; then over-print them perhaps after. One of the things about not over-printing them is -- I wouldn't want to suggest this, but people might take them out for using in their business.

MR GOGO: I have another point, but I'll defer to the hon. Member for Three Hills.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mine is new.

MR GOGO: The other matter is -- I was going to do this, but it may be appropriate for the Clerk. It concerns constituency signs. As a caucus we had agreed as to the sign. There are a variety of signs. I've had several members come to me saying they are still waiting for their signs. The position with the Clerk is that if they come and ask for the signs they'll get them, but we're not going to print the signs and have them waiting because there is a variety. What I'd like is permission from the committee to instruct the Clerk to give a memo to members of the Assembly re signs.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, definitely.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. The same memo could mention the memo forms.

MR GOGO: I was going to do it, but I'd rather the Clerk do it if it's okay.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS OSTERMAN: It's something I understand this committee dealt with a long time ago, and I thought it would be an opportune time to raise it while we have some time on our hands. When did you have and why did you not come up with pins for Members of the Legislative Assembly? In fact one member had pins made.

MR CHAIRMAN: We ran into problems. We tried to get them done in various places. We went to Birks in Toronto, we tried a supplier in Hong Kong, and somehow or other Tom beat us in finding a good supplier. We also tried suppliers in Alberta.

MR STEFANIUK: There was a question of design as well, Mr. Speaker. Before this committee could agree on a design, Mr. Lysons had his pin produced and distributed it. There then appeared to me no longer any sense in the committee pursuing it because members had a pin with the coat of arms that said MLA underneath it.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think that was very nice that Tom did that, obviously . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. At his own expense too.

MRS OSTERMAN: But we do have a new coat of arms now, and I really think we should look at an official -- you know, there won't be any other pins floating around. We don't have that kind of guarantee now, and I think there should be only one pin to a member, and obviously a limited supply. I think we have to look at having a pin done with our new coat of arms.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we follow that up?

MR STEFANIUK: Can I just get some guidelines, Mr. Chairman? Are members happy with what was produced by Mr. Lysons? Do they simply want the new coat of arms with MLA letters underneath it?

MR CHAIRMAN: One of the things that indicates that you are in a parliament is the Mace. We tried to get the Mace into it when we were discussing design.

MR GOGO: Connie, maybe you're aware that the House of Commons uses -- it's now a security measure in the House of Commons, as a matter of fact. Members wear that pin. It saves fumbling for wallets, and so on. Part of it is a Mace.

What I wanted to speak on was the coat of arms. Because there are a lot of similar looking ones, I don't think that is sufficient. If we want to be distinctive for MLAs, I think there should be something -- I agree with Connie, it should be distinctive for members of the Assembly. I have quite a few of the ones Tom Lysons has, without MLA on them. So you really can't tell the difference. They're purchasable downtown. I'd like to see something uniquely different. I would not want one per member. I would like to see that the Clerk has a supply, in the event of loss and so on.

MR APPLEBY: I'm a little intrigued by your statement that they use this for purposes of identification.

MR GOGO: In the House of Commons they do.

MR APPLEBY: Anybody could whip one off your coat and stick it on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Also, men would probably want several for various jackets; maybe women too.

MR PURDY: Saskatchewan has come up with their own pin for their MLAs. All it is is a sheaf of wheat.

MR APPLEBY: We could discuss the quantities available after we decide on the design.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't know whether there are people who would specialize in a design of this nature. If there are, it would be useful to find out if they would require a sum of money to put forward ideas.

MR STEFANIUK: Birks does design work. But you need to give them some guidelines as to what you want to incorporate. There's little sense in saying, work the coat or arms in, if in fact you want the Mace, or vice-versa.

MR CHAIRMAN: What would you think about a design -- I know committees designed camels, and all that -- that had Alberta on the top, the Mace in the middle, and MLA below.

MRS OSTERMAN: Or just Member.

MR CHAIRMAN: That might sound like Edmonton Club.

MR APPLEBY: I think you have to get the crest on there.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you? You're going to have a big pin, or it's going to be awfully crowded with detail.

MR APPLEBY: That's what I'm worrying about. I'm worrying about the Mace getting in on it.

MR GOGO: In fact the one we have is a super one.

MR CHAIRMAN: I thought so too.

MR GOGO: It's just that it is now pretty common. I have a dozen from Dallas Schmidt that are identical, that he bought somewhere else, except that they don't have MLA on them.

MRS OSTERMAN: If there is a Mace just on top -- because that's a very small pin. It still could be larger without being gross.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want both the Mace and the coat of arms?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: If possible.

MR APPLEBY: If it's not too cumbersome.

MR STEFANIUK: What I would ask the members to keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, is that the coat of arms has become increasingly more complex from what they have had up to now, which is simply a shield, which is one portion of the arms. There is now the Crown and the beaver on top, and the shield, the armour, the beasts, the Alberta rose, and motto. If you attempted to reduce the new coat of arms to the size of the pin that is in existence now, which has just the shield, you're wasting time because you would see absolutely nothing in it. The coat of arms is a much more complicated deal right now.

MRS OSTERMAN: Would it be possible to say ideally what we would like to have, then see drawings the size it would be, so we could have an idea? They might say right off the bat: it's impossible to keep it to any modest size.

MR STEFANIUK: I would suggest to you now, from my having dealt with the subject two years ago, that it would be impossible; that if you considered the entire coat of arms right now, you're talking something at least the size of a nickel, if not a quarter.

MRS OSTERMAN: I have a pin that was given to me by the fellow who was here doing our study, with the federal coat of arms. That is a much larger pin,

but because it's very fine it doesn't look -- it's not the same as a solid, heavy pin. It has a different look to it.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's pretty simple, though; there isn't a lot of detail crowded into it.

MR STEFANIUK: It's all done in copper, which is one of the things that doesn't make it -- you know, it is not enamelled.

MR CHAIRMAN: The House of Commons pin in England is a very simple one, too. It's simply the portcullis, which is the symbol of the House of Commons -- you know, because they meet in a royal palace.

MR GOGO: One of the attractive things about the Tom Lysons' pin now is its perfect size. It's not garish. It's nice and small.

MR CHAIRMAN: And you can read the MLA on it.

MR GOGO: Yes. I like the idea of the Mace, but I wouldn't like to see us put the Mace on and not put the diamond on. It's our diamond anniversary and I would hope we would put a diamond in it for the occasion.

MR STEFANIUK: That was 15 years ago.

MR GOGO: I thought the 75th was the diamond.

MR STEFANIUK: That's 60.

DR BUCK: There is some advantage to the Lysons' pin in that you can identify that it is the Alberta flag, the shield.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we be content with the shield if we put the Mace on it?

MR GOGO: I think so.

MRS OSTERMAN: Let's have a look at what it looks like.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we get somebody locally to draw something?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't know.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sure we can.

MR STEFANIUK: We didn't get very much co-operation from the Alberta Mint the last time round; in fact, we got no co-operation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Why don't we get somebody locally to draw some designs, then we'll go after somebody to produce it?

DR BUCK: Bo, there is a fellow at Sherriitt Gordon who does all that Mint work. He's very artistic and comes up with some great designs.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you know his name?

DR BUCK: We could find out. Just phone the Mint at Fort Saskatchewan.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it agreed, then, that we'll get some designs done; we'll send them around by photocopy to the members? If you agree by mail, we'll go ahead with it; if you don't, we can bring it up at the next meeting.

MRS OSTERMAN: I really think we should discuss it at the next meeting.

MR APPLEBY: I think we had better discuss it.

MR CHAIRMAN: We should bell the cat and get it done, because it got pretty tiresome the last time trying to find a supplier and trying to get too much really into it.

MR STEFANIUK: As long as we're waiting for the architect to arrive, there is another basic question which came up in connection with the pin last year. Should it be in a precious metal?

MR CHAIRMAN: That means silver, gold, or platinum.

MR APPLEBY: Maybe if we could get that information on the cost, we could discuss that when we look at the design.

MR STEFANIUK: You see, that says something about who we go to to get it. All kinds of people produce ski pins, particularly. Those are the big sellers in this part of the country. Of course those are not precious metal and very cheap enamel jobs. If you're dealing with a Birks pin, chances are you're dealing with a precious metal and a high quality enamelling, if you're going to do it in color.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think if it's worth doing, it is worth doing in at least semi-precious metal.

MR APPLEBY: They you go to a different type of fastening. Rather than the clip, you 'd go to the screw type or something.

MR CHAIRMAN: One thing is pretty sure: they'll cost less per pin than the gold medallions we handed out. I'm not including our time for delivering them.

MR GOGO: Could we have an update from the Clerk on the statutes? As you recall, we made a decision here as to the binder type or the bound type.

MR CHAIRMAN: Should we dispose of the pin thing first?

MR GOGO: I'm sorry.

MR CHAIRMAN: What's the consensus? We'll go after designs. We'll circulate them among the members, and if you wish we'd be glad to have your comments. In all probability, we'll have it on the agenda for the next meeting.

MRS OSTERMAN: We could also maybe get an estimate in terms of cost of the different metals involved.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR GOGO: We had discussed the statutes some time back. I just wonder about an update from the Clerk.

MR STEFANIUK: The statutes are going to be printed in 1981, the revised statutes of Alberta. They will be printed in both loose-leaf and bound form. The decision, as I understood it at the last meeting, was that members be given an option as to which they wanted and that's what they will be supplied with, but only one set.

MRS OSTERMAN: Will members be notified that they have that option?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Have they be notified?

MR STEFANIUK: No, because the statutes are still quite a ways from being available.

MR CHAIRMAN: Will that affect the quantities that are ordered from the printer?

MR STEFANIUK: No, it won't.

MR GOGO: I think we resolved that well last time, Bohdan, but just the time frame.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm just wondering whether you couldn't put that on that memo that is going out.

MR STEFANIUK: This one requires a firm response. I would respectfully suggest treating it as a separate item, perhaps closer to the date when we know the statute books are going to be ready for delivery. I don't have any indication yet of delivery date.

MR CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't want to pose as an expert, but I did try to get the Queen's Printer to put the statutes on loose-leaf about 25 years ago. The purpose of having them loose-leaf of course is that you can keep them up to date with the amendments. But that is not quite as ideal as it sometimes sounds. Occasionally, you'll want to look at the predecessor section of something that was amended, to see just what the direction was, why it was amended. Also, unless you have a diligent, conscientious staff to put the amendments in, you get to be in a bit of a mess. Occasionally you'll look at your statutes and will think you have an up-to-date version because the amendments have been put in, and they haven't been put in and you could be misled by using an old version.

MR GOGO: Final point, Gerry. With regard to constituency offices, I think it would be a wise move if the staff in those constituency offices were commissioners for oaths.

MR CHAIRMAN: You mean the secretaries?

MR GOGO: The secretaries of the offices.

MR STEFANIUK: You have to handle that through the Attorney General's office.

MR CHAIRMAN: The director of legal offices. I think.

MR PURDY: We've tried it for other things and just couldn't get it.

MR CHAIRMAN: You can get commissioners for oaths.

MR PURDY: No, they're getting tough to get now.

MR GOGO: What I'm raising, Mr. Chairman, is that the Clerk is here. If we could do things -- we have 41 offices. If you could send a memo advising members if they want to have their secretaries commissioners for oaths in their constituencies, which to me is a very good thing, to follow a given procedure.

MR PURDY: I just went through one, John, not for a secretary of an office but an insurance company. They said no, there are already two commissioners for oaths in town; you cannot have it. So we turned around and got it through his mailing office, which is down the road 10 miles.

MR GOGO: We're going to come up with a magnitude of senior citizen programs, like we have, that require a commissioner to sign the name. We are either going to do it as members, or have to arrange for people . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: You know, this is an administrative thing, not a statutory thing, as to how many we hand out. So we should be able to solve it by dealing directly with the Attorney General and, through him, the director of legal offices. If the committee agrees, if you want us to do that, I suggest the Clerk go to the Deputy Attorney General and say that we want special consideration given to staff in members' offices getting commissioner for oaths, then report to the committee on the results.

MR APPLEBY: You mean the constituency offices?

MR CHAIRMAN: The constituency offices, I'm sorry. Secretaries in constituency offices should get special consideration.

MR APPLEBY: The statutes will not come out for a year from now, so we could leave that now.

MR CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to with the statutes, Frank. This is commissioner for oaths, so that in your constituency offices you have a convenient way of having an affidavit completed.

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, for clarification. Are we automatically COs when we're elected?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, MLAs are.

MR PURDY: And notaries.

MR CHAIRMAN: You want somebody when you're not there?

MR GOGO: That's right.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think John can make an enquiry.

MR CHAIRMAN: You don't want us to do it?

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't know.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think the Clerk should go to the Deputy Attorney General.

MR GOGO: I think it should be a legitimate expense of a constituency office to pay the fee for commissioner for oaths for the person working in that office.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, is it the payment you're concerned about or the appointment?

MR APPLEBY: I think we had better bring that back.

MR CHAIRMAN: We haven't got an allocation to cover it, John. But we can look after the appointments. It could be an administrative expense of the constituency office. Is it agreed that the Clerk will enquire of the Deputy Attorney General concerning relaxation of restrictions so that secretaries in members' constituency offices can be appointed commissioners for oaths?

MR GOGO: I would amend that to take out "relaxation of restrictions" and insert "facilitate".

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we go to the Chamber, so to speak?

MR GOGO: Welcome, Mr. Minister.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think you've met everybody.

MR McCRAE: There's Scotty McIntosh.

MR CHAIRMAN: Scotty, this is Dr. Buck. And you know John Gogo, George Wolstenholme, Mrs. Osterman, Bill Purdy, Karen Lynch. Over in the corner there is the recording angel, Gordon Eno. And you know the Clerk.

MR McCRAE: Gerry, thank you for inviting us to come along today. We appreciate the opportunity of showing you some artists' renderings or drawings or perspectives that Scotty has done on the Chamber. Rather than have any formal presentation by me, we'll just throw it right open to you.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are these books the same as the ones that were circulated some time ago?

MR McCRAE: Yes, the same thing, I believe. Scotty has extra copies if some members don't have any. Actually the material in here -- it might be as well if we didn't dwell on this while the presentation by Scotty is going on. He has larger pictorial offerings that perhaps we could go through, then ask questions later.

Just while you're getting your show ready, Scotty, I could say that Scotty is under sub-contract to him on the engineering part of it, Reid Crowther. Acoustically you have Scotty, Cable Brothers, who I gather are some of the foremost acoustic experts in North America. For aesthetics, or whatever, we have Carolyn Tavender, who is a special consultant to Scotty.

So, Scotty, right over to you, if you want to go through what you're recommending for the Assembly. We'll go back to cost. Maybe we'll go through the whole thing, then come back and handle questions members may have, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: Good.

MR McINTOSH: When we were first asked to look at the building, we looked at the building in general, then to concentrate on the Chamber. I did some research as to -- with historical buildings, you always try to go back in time and see what the original designer had in mind and how it was achieved. We went through some documents. In the *Edmonton Bulletin* at that time, December 27, 1907, they made the announcement about the intentions of the people who were going to build the building. In the description they zeroed in on the Chamber and stated that the Chamber itself was a room that was to be 56 by 56 feet wide and go through three storeys in height. Just to quote what they said: In its design, it follows the anaudible] lines of the Ionic order, which is one of the orders of architecture which is pretty well identified by capitals of columns. They mention there being two detached columns on each of the four sides and angle across the corners. What they mean by the detached columns are these columns and the ones in the corner.

MR CHAIRMAN: What did you call those?

MR McINTOSH: It's the Ionic order. Then these columns are brought together by a molded cornice, which is identified by this large cornice; which exists, incidentally. Above the cornice there will be a large barrel vault having panelled beams and ceilings and ornamental [inaudible] skylights. In the north and south ends will be large elliptical lunettes -- that was these areas here -- which will have grand historical pictures painted on them. The sides of the Chamber will have solid partitions, et cetera.

This is what we glean was the intention of the original designs were, to create these areas. So we had our artist in the office just take two historical scenes -- mind you, we're not saying [inaudible] or whatever the case might be. Of course we took a look at the other end and said, well, maybe Crowfoot, and this was the famous painting of the Fort, one an artist had done some years ago.

So that was the original intention for these areas. In the renovation of the whole room, when you get into modern times the building at one time served a purpose. But now that we seem to be more sophisticated and more demanding as far as sound and light are concerned, we took the approach that perhaps it needs more than just an interior facelift, that if we were going to panel the walls we had to give some thought to the panelling of the walls, specifically with regard to the acoustic value of them and to the new design of the ceiling panels. The acoustic engineer told me that one of the worst situations you can have in any room is parallel walls. This is where you run into trouble. In this building, although some attempt was made by putting some form of drapery for the hard plaster wall, I'm told that it's virtually ineffective because of the weight of the drape, et cetera. In order to be effective with drape, I forget what the yardage was, but it would be very heavily draped with a heavy material. So the end effect would be . . .

MR GOGO: Scotty, can I ask you a question? In the history of the Chamber -- since I came we went through the Tannoy system of mics, and now the new PA system. I don't know when the drapes were put in the Chamber. I wonder if you could just briefly describe in terms of the PA system within the Chamber in the last 20 years. What dramatic changes have taken place?

MR McINTOSH: You might have caught me there. We didn't go into the history of the sound system in the Chamber.

MR GOGO: Obviously that is fundamental to whatever we do with the walls.

MR McINTOSH: Yes. Apparently they have looked at both what they call the cluster, and the system you have now, which is fairly accurately timed so you don't confuse the person speaking because of a delay in the voice coming back. Cable Brothers seem to think the system you have now is one of the better ways to approach it. They agree that the cluster is very well done, and while you're listening, it's great. But they say that in some cases, somebody speaking over here, if there is a delay in his voice coming back to him, even a fraction of a second, it confuses the speaker. This was their analysis of it.

So the treatment of the walls as an acoustic element, they suggested that if we went to a panelling, the secret of diverting the sound waves is to go with into deeper [inaudible] and to treat the panelling, besides being a decorative feature, these panels should also react as sound diaphragms and behind the panel we would have an absorbent material. By creating slots, et cetera, in the panelling, that wouldn't be visible from where you're sitting . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Where did you say the absorbent material would be?

MR McINTOSH: In behind these walls. This is a section to it, showing how the deeper [inaudible] and how we've accomplished the system whereby if a sound wave comes in here, bounces in and out of here rather than back out and back across the Chamber. It sort of gets caught in all these different planes and angles and is dissipated in that way. This finer panel here, which would be a fairly thin wood panel, also acts as a diaphragm. This also serves to absorb some sound. Then by creating some slots, some of the sound waves would get back in there and absorb the material in behind. As I say, it isn't just a decorative thing. What we're trying to do is recapture some of the old details of that era, the Grecian details which are somewhat [inaudible] with the moldings we have found. By adapting these and using them as instruments to dissipate sound, we created a [inaudible] panel.

MR CHAIRMAN: How much floor space would we use by using that? You have a floor layout there at the bottom.

MR McINTOSH: This is just the section through the panel. This section, mainly to get as deep as possible, we're about 3-1/2 inches for the overall thickness of the wall. If possible, they've asked us if we could sneak a little more depth into the design of the panel. It would be our wish that we would probably build a couple of mock-up areas to make sure that what we are doing was going to satisfy their request.

MR CHAIRMAN: Have you any concern about the width of the passageway that would be left behind the members on the upper tier?

MR McINTOSH: It's only a 3 inch . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't remember. It seems it's not terribly wide.

MRS OSTERMAN: Oh, it's wide enough to accommodate that. As a matter of fact there is some post sticking out here and there. People even store their garbage cans there now, and we walk by them.

MR GOGO: Scotty and Stu, while we're on that, I'm sure thought has been given to it. We're a 79-member Assembly. What we're doing here is obviously for the next 50 years; it's not just for a few years.

MR McCRAE: Scotty, would you like to go into that?

MR McINTOSH: What we can do is expand the Chamber back, and then these would just become members' lounges in future, if it could ever get to the point that the number in the House . . . I did a small report, which I gave to you. I forget what was projected for the number of people. But it wasn't that significant.

MR STEFANIUK: No, it wasn't. This was one of the questions I raised. One of three questions I raised as soon as I had seen the plans was the capacity of the Chamber. Based on projected population growth from the Bureau of Statistics and the experience in terms of increases as they now take place, every second election of every 10 years, whichever comes sooner -- I think it has happened every second election, which has been about every eight years -- the net growth has been four, for the last consideration. If you take that over a multiple of eight years, the growth appears to be fairly insignificant if that pattern is followed. Of course no one can predict accurately what a boundaries commission, for example, may do in its wisdom or recommend in the future.

MR McINTOSH: But if it were to be enlarged, page 7 indicates how.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'd be making the Chamber wider than it is long, in effect.

MR McINTOSH: That's correct.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'd be taking in space that is now in that committee room, 312; also the space used by the Clerk's office.

MR McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, you can appreciate that on the overall analysis of the building, this isn't the only area that is of concern. The rest of the building and the spaces being used now . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: It's all too small.

MR McINTOSH: It's all too small. Hopefully, some day, maybe the Ag. Building will be utilized for some of the space this building requires.

MR McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, frankly, the key to it -- and you and I have discussed it many times -- is to probably get a hold on the Agriculture Building, either for ministers or for MLAs, or a combination thereof, and be able to move a number of people out of this building over there, in three to four years. At that time the extension -- it would not take place then, but if at some future date, if the proper planning were done, we could look to extending east and west in terms of the Chamber itself, and to find you appropriate new space and everybody else.

MR CHAIRMAN: Assuming an accelerated growth, say that at each eight years instead of adding four members we were to add five. That would mean that in 32 years we would add 20 members. Would that require bulging out like this?

MR McINTOSH: I guess that's correct. The way it's set up now, with the exception of . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Behind the opposition.

MR McINTOSH: There is space. Then if the opposition were larger.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, of course we're hoping to get those TV people out of there when the technology is available.

MR McINTOSH: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: So couldn't we accommodate about 20 more members as it is now, with the walls where they are now?

MR McINTOSH: I would say yes. Or even with the extra thickness of the walls that we would require what we're trying to do.

MR CHAIRMAN: What I'm concerned about is that, obviously, this is going to be costly.

MR McINTOSH: Very much so.

MR CHAIRMAN: As Dr. Buck or John Gogo says, we're looking 50 years away. That could be an increase of maybe 20 or 30 members. If we're giving it that kind of long-range view, should we be looking now at this, or is that something we simply can't do because there isn't enough space in the building?

MR McCRAE: Scotty, I'm not sure you can answer that one. There just isn't any space at all in the building. I had difficulty finding room for Mary Ann. As you know, she's in a temporary location down there.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'd lose 312, and we're critically short of committee space as it is. And we'd have to find another place for the Clerk.

MR APPLEBY: With expansion.

MRS OSTERMAN: For expansion now.

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, if we go to this walled construction now, move these walls out, on the basis that we're doing something that is going to be good for 50 years, obviously it means encroaching on that space, as you mentioned, and reducing those areas to something else, like a lounge room or something.

MR McINTOSH: Yes, the members' lounges on either side. Bohdan Stefaniuk was explaining to me what the ideal situation would be to accommodate the members -- if they could just walk out of the House into a lounge on either side. We tried to project that into that sketch we had done.

But when we were studying how the province is exploding, we felt that maybe at the turn of the century it might compare with Ontario, but the number of seats isn't representative to the population that we do here.

DR BUCK: That's the point I wanted to bring up, Mr. Chairman. Are we over-represented now?

MR CHAIRMAN: Compared to B.C. we are.

DR BUCK: Compared to across the country? Does anybody have that figure?

MR APPLEBY: Not compared to P.E.I.

MR GOGO: Saskatchewan has 55 to a million people. On that basis we're entitled to 110, and so on.

MR STEFANIUK: I believe Ontario has 10 million with a House of 125.

MR CHAIRMAN: Their population isn't 10 million; closer to 8 million.

MR GOGO: One of the matters the boundaries commission has to address is not just numbers, as you know; it's geography. I only raise the point, Stu, in the context that we're going to spend a lot of money in there. Has consideration been given to increasing numbers?

MR McCRAE: John, I think you raise a very valid point. I would suggest to you that I think we're looking at a 10-year situation right now. I don't think we're looking at 50 years. Okay? When people begin to move out of here in four years, if they do, then whoever is here would start looking at the new space allocation for the building. It was mentioned here that we are ridiculously short of committee rooms. You know, Public Accounts meeting in the Chamber I think is inappropriate. In most jurisdictions they have a proper committee room to meet in. I would think we need four, five, six good committee meeting rooms here.

I think, John, that we're looking at a 10-year solution right now; it may go into 15 or 20 years. But there is enough room in the present Assembly for the next 10 years anyway.

DR BUCK: And if all else fails, we can use the British system where there aren't enough seats for all the members.

MR APPLEBY: Just bring in benches.

MRS OSTERMAN: I didn't realize that.

MR GOGO: Stu, I guess the concern I had initially is that historically, the distance between the leader of government and the leader of the opposition is 18 feet, and that has great historical significance -- two sword lengths on horseback. To me that's a very important item. I would hate to see the floor of the Assembly -- we do now. It's that kind of concern I have. I guess I'm assured now that that's not going to happen.

MR CHAIRMAN: That puts it into context, then, Stu. We're looking at what may be obtained for as short a period as 10 years.

MR McCRAE: I would think so, Mr. Chairman. It's really not that expensive. When you come to the number, you'll see that it isn't, in terms of what we're spending elsewhere, a critical number.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: For \$1,500, this is going to be a bargain.

MR McINTOSH: Per square foot.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, if there were an expansion, it doesn't mean that what's there would be lost. I would think that if you just extended the idea, you would be using the panels.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think they'd be re-using those panels.

MR McINTOSH: As far as moving the walls back, yes, we could. We had considered that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Put them on rollers.

MR McINTOSH: So that was the way we approached the wall system. That's why it is the way we have presented it. As for the material, we've pretty well been committed to extensive use of mahogany, and I've used a dark stain. I think it would be impossible to go in there and remove the dark stain, so we've accepted that. In our involvement in the canopy over your Chair, sir, was that when we got working with it, it didn't turn out that bad as far as the color is concerned. So it doesn't disturb us.

MR CHAIRMAN: I should say to the committee that it was Scotty's intervention that probably saved us some trouble there, and certainly enhanced the result.

MRS OSTERMAN: I like the -- I was just looking at one of the enlarged blow-ups you had, a sort of desk or portion back in front of the Speaker. Is that something you're proposing? I rather liked that. Mr. Speaker may feel differently about it, but I felt that something has been lost in that the whole canopy and so on is so large and elegant that it's almost too much without something else with it.

MR GOGO: I thought that was under construction now.

MR CHAIRMAN: The wall panelling, I think, will help it.

MR McINTOSH: It will tie in with this.

MR GOGO: I thought they were building another one.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, I wasn't going to build it without looking at alternatives and discussing it with this committee. One of my concerns about putting it back there is that it hides the lower part of the canopy.

MR PURDY: It does now anyway with the two desks you've got at the side.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, they're so unobtrusive.

MR PURDY: But they take away from it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we didn't think they did much. We didn't have them built; we took what was available. We didn't want to incur any expense until some decisions had been made.

MR GOGO: It's Gerry's socks that take away from it.

MR CHAIRMAN: What color are they?

MRS OSTERMAN: You'll have to start wearing mahogany socks.

DR BUCK: Let's keep going, guys.

MR McCRAE: Certainly if we had a woman Speaker, we'd want a skirt, or whatever it is called.

MRS OSTERMAN: We normally wear one.

MR CHAIRMAN: Pants we could put there.

MRS OSTERMAN: We wear those too.

MR CHAIRMAN: Back to business.

MR McINTOSH: The other area that was of concern within the Chamber besides sound is sight. With the introduction of television and the requirement of the higher lighting levels, we then zeroed in on the existing lighting system and ceiling system, and hoped that we could design a ceiling that would become one large light fixture, and act as another ways and means of treating the acoustics of the building. The way we approached that is to look at several different ways. Once again, these will all come out in the final analysis of what it should be, but this is an artist's idea of taking some of the details of the past of how they treated ceilings.

But what we wanted to do is that we would then, looking at the ceiling, which is a vault, we can re-do the ceiling in two ways. We can do it with pre-cast plaster panels, or we can go into fibreglass. They're using a great deal of fibreglass now in restoration because you can get an exact duplicate of all these details of the past and recreate them, especially in the event of a ceiling that is a very light material. Due to its lightness, once again we can use this panel as a diaphragm, because it will have just enough to be a little resilient, and we can also, by designing it with the different details, conceal the lighting so that when you look up to it you don't see any bare light bulbs and all the light will be concealed in the valance around the exterior and up into these areas we can conceal lighting and back in here. What the engineer wants to do is put them on a dimming system so that during the television broadcasting they can increase the intensity of the lighting, so you can eliminate this business of spots when they come in with the cameras.

Right now when they want to change light bulbs once a year, they have to move in with this large scaffolding. Then they have to take the light bulbs down and change them all. What we can do, you can get up on catwalks up in there and they'll be able to just go back up in there and do any changing of the fixtures, light bulbs, what have you, from above rather than having to go through this exercise once a year of changing a bulb whether it needs it or not.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would they be concealed bulbs or tubes?

MR McINTOSH: I think in most cases, it's easier -- we would probably be going into the high-pressure sodium lighting. So it would be in bulbs, not tubes. It's a lot easier to use dimming systems with those rather than with tubes. That's very, very expensive, and not that successful. The way they are working now, with a mixture of the different sodium lighting fixtures, you can almost get perfect reproduction on television screens, et cetera.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would the color of the light be changed noticeably?

MR McINTOSH: Not noticeably, no. If anything, it would get a little warmer than it is now. You've got incandescent lighting in there, so no, there wouldn't be that much of a change.

MR PURDY: That's the next question I was going to ask. With the incandescent lighting we have, and you go to the sodium type bulb, will there be any difference in heat generation?

MR McINTOSH: No, because the incandescent bulb is about the worst there is.

MR PURDY: But you're talking about more numbers, aren't you?

MR McINTOSH: Yes, there would be. But then in that Chamber the heat would be taken upwards and we could pull it off.

MR PURDY: Most of that heat is about 5-1/2 feet high.

MRS OSTERMAN: Speak for yourself.

MR PURDY: I'm 6 feet 2. I was leaving myself out.

MR McINTOSH: So that was the approach we took to the ceiling system. Then, once again, going to these end areas, as I say, we would hope that perhaps an artist could be commissioned. His work would be done on canvas and these canvasses mounted up there. Once again, we would get by with putting some sort of absorbent material behind the canvass. This would also help to dissipate sound. So what you see there is not just an artist's sketch. It has a little more depth to it.

MR GOGO: It would still only be one end area, though. You said end areas. MR McINTOSH: At both ends.

MR GOGO: The Speaker's end?

MR. McINTOSH: Yes. This is what was originally intended. It is not my decision, but someone else's.

MR CHAIRMAN: We should put a picture up there of the signing of the agreement giving Alberta ownership of its natural resources.

DR BUCK: Better yet, the coming of the Ukrainians to the province.

MR GOGO: Better yet, the going of the Ukrainians from the province.

MRS OSTERMAN: Frame the picture in black.

MR CHAIRMAN: Have we gotten you off your intended sequence?

MR McINTOSH: No. I was going from the walls to the ceiling, then to the final decoration of the Chamber. Once we went through that phase, we'd go into more or less some more interior decoration where these colors, et cetera, as well as the different -- gold leaf is too expensive now, but they do have something called aluminium leaf, which is [inaudible] from a distance, how it would be applied, where, what detail. All these studies would have to take place for the end result. Then in some cases, we would be using fabrics to finish and we would have to do a study here of where the press is, because apparently it is quite an unsightly area now.

MR GOGO: Just when it's occupied.

MR McINTOSH: In the final analysis, there was some suggestion that perhaps the red wasn't an appropriate color for the Chamber, and some other color would be selected.

MR CHAIRMAN: Red is an Upper House color, green is a Lower House color. We're neither really.

MR PURDY: You can't see the blood with red carpet.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Socreds had green. We changed it in 1971. We put the red in. We went from the Lower House to the Upper House. But if we were to use a color like the one you have on the picture there . . .

MR GOGO: That's green and red combined, I take it.

MR CHAIRMAN: . . . it would not have the significance of either. That, I think, is appropriate because we are a unicameral parliament.

DR BUCK: I didn't even know that about the colors.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Senate Chamber is red; I think the House of Lords is red. The House of Commons in Ottawa and Westminster are green.

MR GOGO: It's the only place that can originate in spending money. I think that's why it's green.

MR McCRAE: Scotty, do you want to touch on timing, or would you be interested in that, Gerry?

MR CHAIRMAN: Definitely. I think we should find out everything we can right now.

MR McINTOSH: In the thinking we've had is that we couldn't I think accomplish this in this recess at this time. So we would go ahead into the planning of the lower area and set it up so that between the next recess between the next sittings would be an appropriate time to try to achieve the panelling.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would it be your intention that the panelling would be built in situ or would you have it built in units and moved in?

MR McINTOSH: It would be more practical to build it in units and move it in. This is where we need the lead time, because we'd like to do a few mock-ups, et cetera, and a lot of planning that has to go into just the individual design of the panel.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't want to monopolize the time, and I know that you have consultants for these things, but I have three concerns. Perhaps I could raise them now.

MR McINTOSH: Certainly.

MR CHAIRMAN: One of them of course is the sound system, and I note what you say about the cluster, possibly involving a noticeable delay between hearing the speech directly and getting the reproduction from the cluster. My scepticism about that is that in both the B.C. House and the Lower House in West Germany they have the cluster system. I think our ceiling is a little higher than the West German House, but I don't think it's any higher than the B.C. House. That was put in by a Vancouver firm, Baron and Brown, or something like that, and it works beautifully. And so does the West German one. I've sat in both and listened to debates, and so on.

The reason I have a sort of one-track mind about it is that I would like to get those little boxes off the members' desks. Those desks are so damn small already. If we could get those little boxes off and have the sound reinforcement come from above into all corners of the room -- the place the Clerk and I have looked at a number of times, and no doubt you have, is the sort of opening there with some, for want of a better word, gingerbread work

in the plaster. It would seem to me that possibly that could be adapted. Some baffle cloth could be put behind it and directional loudspeakers aimed at the various parts of the room. I'm just wondering why, since -- of course the speed of sound isn't as great as light. There would be no delay in the wiring that you'd notice.

MR McINTOSH: No.

MR CHAIRMAN: But in the sound, I suppose, if it were too high up, there would be a noticeable delay.

But that is one thing that, you know, for years I've wanted. The boxes, I admit, are smaller than what they used to be when we had the Tannoy system in there, which was the original sound system. But I really would like to get them off the members' desks. I think it would improve the appearance of the room as well.

My second concern is with regard to television. We now have two television cameras concealed in the ventilators at each end. Can you eliminate those ventilators?

MR McINTOSH: We can conceal the cameras by going into a remote control system. It was my understanding when we were first looking into the television system that the way it is now, it is all run by private enterprise. If you went into a remote control system to conceal the cameras and do away with . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The present tentative idea would be to go to tender, maybe, once every two or three years, depending on what kind of contract you would get; that one private enterprise outfit would take all the footage. The Clerk has discussed this with some of the people. Some of them want to take it to higher management. But it does seem, from present information, that it's feasible to have one private enterprise outfit, like the one that has the two places now that are there all the time, to take all the footage and to share it with the others, on an acceptable commercial basis. If it got to be oppressive or something, of course we'd interfere. But that would have to be in our contract with the main recording outfit. We would not want to go to Quebec where they have about 30 employees and I don't know how many hundreds of thousands a year to run it, and Ottawa is worse. But we could do it that way and stay with private enterprise, and get the cameras out of the House if the television is . . . And all we'd need to do, Stu, is find a room somewhere where we could have the terminals coming in and the screens for the remote control operator. Then, as I say, we could get all the cameras out of the House, because it bothers me. It looks like a darn television studio at times.

AN HON MEMBER: They are concealed very well, I thought.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, gee, no.

MR PURDY: They're pretty scruffy.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're used to it. I don't want to put Scotty on the spot and ask him to be on my side, but I think somebody who comes in there a little oftener . . .

MR McINTOSH: We've looked at different ways. Also we felt that we could conceal cameras within the panelling.

MR CHAIRMAN: That would be the thing.

MR PURDY: Which cameras are you talking about?

MR McINTOSH: The ones that are on the platform.

MR McCRAE: Where the half dozen people sit, Bill.

MR PURDY: You were talking about the ventilators.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, no. Those are no problem; they're concealed. What I'm trying to say is why can't we do that for all of them.

MR PURDY: Like Quebec.

MR CHAIRMAN: Their's aren't well concealed.

MR PURDY: They're still not out on the floor.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR McINTOSH: We could get cameras that could be concealed in the panelling, but the cost of this would run high. Then I ran into whether it would be public or whether the government would provide the cameras. So as an alternate we said, well, if all else fails you can sort of build a fence around the existing cameras for the time being.

MR CHAIRMAN: As far as we can see, there is really not likely to be any serious problem in getting it done throughout by non-government, non-Legislative Assembly people.

MR McINTOSH: It was just the cost of the cameras; they are very costly.

MR CHAIRMAN: That would save us a lot of cost if you didn't have to build that staff sort of thing there.

MR CHAIRMAN: And the third thing is the question of that desk in front of the Speaker's position and which used to be used also by the two Clerks. We have no intention of leaving it permanently the way it is. We had to do something quickly after the canopy went in and be ready for the fall sittings. Those tables aren't even the same size. I'm wondering, from an aesthetic point of view, and there is also the practical question, about putting something there -- you've shown it there in your large . . . Isn't it there behind? Yes, right. As I say, I have a concern -- it doesn't keep me awake nights -- about hiding the bottom part of the canopy. What do you think about that idea?

DR BUCK: The skirt with the . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR BUCK: I personally like that better than the open. It softens that big throne.

MR CHAIRMAN: There are several things there. There is a space problem, because the canopy sticks out farther than the pillars used to. In addition, when you come in on the Speaker's parade, and the members seemed to favor that when we did it on a trial basis last year, you have to go and circumnavigate the ends of that desk. You do have to keep the middle removable for the Lieut-Gov coming in on the Speech from the Throne.

MR McINTOSH: We did give a suggestion as to how it could be done.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I saw it in the book.

MR McINTOSH: That was on page 11.

MR CHAIRMAN: What would your offhand recommendation be from the point of view of decor as to whether or not that should go back? There are Houses, like the House of Commons, where the Speaker sits out in the open and you can see the color of his socks and all that. It's not an historical rarity at all to have the Speaker sit in this fashion. In fact when we put that desk in, that was quite a departure from tradition. We copied from one of the Australian Houses. They do have one in Saskatchewan, and one or two of the maritime ones have it -- no use conducting a census of it here in the meeting, but there are some others.

MR STEFANIUK: The Saskatchewan desk is different in that it accommodates only the Speaker, and the Clerks still sit at the table.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, and I think one of the maritime ones is the same. It's not traditional at all for the Clerk and Clerk Assistant to sit beside the Speaker. But it's darn nice when you first get into the Chair and you can say, what the hell do I do now?

MR PURDY: It happened to me. I was doing okay but couldn't find the names of the Bills. Finally I found your book there.

DR BUCK: At that 75th Anniversary celebration in Regina, the Lieutenant-Governor said, I'd now like to present you -- where is that thing? It wasn't there.

MR CHAIRMAN: To come back to it after all that digression, how does that appeal to your sense of . . .

MR McINTOSH: If all it had to be was a screen, it would be quite an easy thing to accomplish. But as to your preference as to whether the Clerk is beside you . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: But apart from those things, looking at it from your point of view as an architect and a judge of aesthetics.

MR McINTOSH: I was looking at it in a different way. We were trying to, when we were looking at it from a straight architectural and functional point of view, have the -- if this is required. This is news to me that it really isn't required.

MR CHAIRMAN: You know, it's open.

MR McINTOSH: It's open. I would say it's six of one and half a dozen of the other.

MR CHAIRMAN: From an aesthetic point of view?

MR McINTOSH: From an aesthetic point of view. If you were self-conscious, then I would say by all means take it away.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, I always wear long skirts.

MR McINTOSH: I think you would find that the whole thing would function much better -- when this came in, we were always concerned how tight that area was becoming.

MR CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, if you restore that you're going to have to jut over the top of the thing and come down on the second-last step.

MR McINTOSH: Yes, that's very awkward. But I sort of assumed that this was one of your requirements, and I didn't question it.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, I'm pretty flexible. I'm sorry, Stu. You said something about timing. Did you want to say anything more about timing?

MR McCRAE: Your initial phase is . . .

MR McINTOSH: Oh, all right. Now, then this could be accomplished by panelling and then, once again, we would then relax on the construction and the House would sit again. During the next recess, we feel we would be fully prepared to take on the ceiling system.

MR CHAIRMAN: Two stages?

MR McINTOSH: Two stages. In the meantime, all this would be pre-fabbed elsewhere and it would just be a matter of installing it. But where we would like the time is that there is a lot of design work to be done and a lot of thought.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is just one other thing. The Clerk would like to make some observations too, but before that, may I ask you whether the type of panelling you have in mind would have any direct relationship to the color of carpet that is put in there?

MR McINTOSH: This is where it would go to the design team and, hopefully, you would participate.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's where you would bring in Carol Tavender.

MR McINTOSH: That's where we would bring in all -- and then consultation with the users on the final color schemes, with certain suggestions of what we feel should be.

MR McCRAE: Scotty, you're looking at the summer recess for the floor panelling area, and next winter recess for the ceiling area and carpeting.

MR McINTOSH: Painting, decorating, et cetera.

MR CHAIRMAN: You have no intention of -- oh, no. That's gone, that coat of arms; it's now in the panel. And the brass railing would stay?

MR McINTOSH: At this time. If we can think of an alternate. The brass railing has been there since the beginning of time. There are certain sentimental, and you have to respect that.

MR STEFANIUK: I have a concern, Mr. Chairman, with the timing. If it's proposed that the panelling be installed before the ceiling is taken care of, I have a concern that with the present lighting levels having to last through even a single session or sitting of the House would create considerable

disadvantages, because the panelling would obviously darken the Chamber. This may be a very naive suggestion, but I would think that, ideally, the lighting levels up above would be improved before the panelling went in.

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, you would see an opposite sequence?

MR STEFANIUK: I would see an opposite sequence. You put in the panelling and we go in, and you have the existing lighting levels. In the meantime, the panelling itself has darkened the Chamber. So you have the members and the media people working under somewhat adverse conditions.

MR McINTOSH: The way that is set up now I think you'll admit that isn't the greatest lighting system.

MR STEFANIUK: Oh, I agree.

MR McINTOSH: The way it is set up, I don't think the change in this wall will affect the lighting at the desk tops. It's a direct lighting system; it isn't dependent upon reflecting off the walls.

MR STEFANIUK: What about TV cameras, Scotty?

MR McINTOSH: I think with your TV, they have to supplement it, don't they?

MR STEFANIUK: We don't allow them to on a daily basis. We only allow them to supplement when live TV is being broadcast from the House by the network stations -- that's for the throne speech and the budget speech. We allow supplemental lighting on those days, but on normal sitting days we don't allow them any supplementary lighting.

MR McINTOSH: As far as the human being is concerned, I don't think it's going to affect his eyes. If he wants to zero in on the walls, yes, I think he'll have trouble getting detail on the walls. I don't think that's what they're really after.

MR McCRAE: I really wonder if it wouldn't be possible, if we began our planning soon, to do the whole thing next summer. Say we adjourn by May 24, which we traditionally do, and we have until October 15, subject to some very untoward event happening. If we did the planning right now, would it not be possible to do the two -- I know we've always talked in two phases, but with four or five months lead time, I wonder.

MR McINTOSH: Well . . .

MR McCRAE: It's sort of like buying a suit in two phases. You get the trousers in the summer and the jacket in the winter. You'd like to see the whole thing as a finished product.

MR McINTOSH: Our problem is delivery of materials. With that lighting system, there are deliveries of six months for fixtures, and what have you. And this is what I sort of thought was practical to go into this area because we can use the local tradesmen.

DR BUCK: That gives them a year for the other.

MR McINTOSH: That's right, and it's delivery of material. If you wanted to wait, then I would say wait through two sessions if you'd rather not do it in stages.

MR STEFANIUK: There are two more points, Mr. Chairman. One is perhaps a subtle, ornamental thing. Members should perhaps focus attention on the fact that it is intended that the royal portraits become part of the wall system, and that's illustrated of course.

The other point I wish to raise, and the minister can perhaps deal with this matter. Even though we have a sound system that is reasonably satisfactory in place now, it seems to me that in addressing ourselves on previous occasions to the problems with the existing sound system, the advice we received from sound consultants was that the microphones should be placed much closer to the source of the sound, and therefore should be projected a whole lot farther than they are now if we were going to have ideal sound reinforcement in the Chamber. We did look at, perhaps as far back as two years ago, replacement of the present microphones with a considerably smaller microphone. In fact there is one in the Chamber now, the one beside the Speaker's throne. A long black tube with a very small microphone. It had been recommended that attachment of that type of microphone to each member's desk would result, one, in the source of the sound being much closer to the microphone and, two, would also prevent the occasional problem that we've run into; that is, placement of papers and rattling of them between the microphone and the source of the sound. I'm wondering whether there is another consideration that should be made in conjunction with these renovations.

MR CHAIRMAN: That would be pretty much for your consultant.

MR McINTOSH: Yes. You really don't have a sound problem in there, do you?

MR STEFANIUK: We still kept getting notes this fall.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh no, we only got one note, I think. We get notes from the far corners.

MR McINTOSH: I noticed during the rehearsal for the unveiling of this, when the Speaker was even walking away from the mic and talking in just a natural voice, I was sitting over here and that was picking it up just tremendous. From that standpoint, but when you get the sound people and they start talking about lapses of time and what have you, they're looking at it with a keener ear.

MR GOGO: Well, we do have provision now, as I understand, with those boxes for systems, earplugs.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, you can plug hearing -- yes.

MR GOGO: That's important to retain I think.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh sure.

MR PURDY: You can also lift your individual mics up too, if you want.

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know if you're supposed to.

MR PURDY: Well, how did they get the Premier's up the day he spoke on October 20?

MR STEFANIUK: We do that whenever we put a lectern in front of the Premier, and the Treasurer, for example, when he delivers the budget speech. But that has to be done by a technician; it's not as though it can be simply done by any member.

MR PURDY: It isn't on a telescope then?

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR PURDY: I was under the impression it was.

MR McINTOSH: I guess the day will come when you'll just pin a remote mic on your lapel, and that will be all there is to it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR McINTOSH: They do have the remote mics now, and as time goes on they will develop it to the point where that is all they really do.

DR BUCK: In fairness, I don't think that is really a problem. Once in a while, Clark gets wandering between three chairs, talking to the guy in the back and over there.

MR CHAIRMAN: The sound operator just turns on the neighboring mics.

DR BUCK: Right. I've lived through some pretty bad systems there, 10 or 12 years ago, when you couldn't hear anything except John Landeryou, and you didn't need anything. You could hear him from Lethbridge. It is really pretty darn good now.

MR CHAIRMAN: Bill Dickie used to twist his microphone away and then face the other way to talk.

MR PURDY: Does *Hansard* have any problems?

MR CHAIRMAN: No. We haven't had any.

MR STEFANIUK: Gordon is here; perhaps he can tell us. I think they occasionally do.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry.

MR ENO: Well, okay. Getting back to the two phases, AGT might have some input into that because they run the sound system. With the panelling and with the absorption material behind the panelling, that's going to change the delay system a bit, I think, in some of the EQ. They have four banks of third octave equalizers up there. So if you do the ceiling at one time and the panelling at another time, it might cause some problems with the sound at that time.

MR McINTOSH: It might throw them.

MR ENO: The other problem with the sound is, again, the proximity of the mics to the source. Sometimes the paper rustling gives problems to the transcribers. Some inaudibles happen when that comes about.

And the visual contact -- this is a personal comment. Sometimes I have a problem in seeing certain parts of the floor. It might be a consideration -- I don't know, I may be speaking out of turn here -- to maybe relocate or readjust some of the visual line when these other adjustments are made to the structure.

MR CHAIRMAN: How do you mean, the visual line?

MR ENO: For example, it's absolutely impossible for me to see Mr. Bogle from where I'm sitting. There is a small TV screen that I can see you stand.

MR CHAIRMAN: We used to have a mirror up there, a convex mirror.

MR ENO: Also on the back line.

MR CHAIRMAN: Of course you know we had a little hassling there over the building of that console. We weren't very happy about that. They didn't do it the way we wanted them to.

MR McINTOSH: Well this is all part and parcel of establishing a program to incorporate in the end results.

MR CHAIRMAN: You've got a corner built there somewhere, I think, that interferes with your vision.

MR ENO: There are two. The lamp post on that first pillar, closest to me, on the left-hand side of the Speaker's Chair impairs my vision of Mr. Bogle, Mr. Appleby, and Dr. Carter. Also, down the left-hand side from my line of vision -- where, by the way, that small camera doesn't pick up; that might be looked after with maybe another camera in there.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about the screen you have up there?

MR ENO: Yes. In the back row, I find it difficult to see Mrs. Cripps and Mr. Kushner.

MR GOGO: Maybe the answer is that we'll give you a director's chair with an extended boom.

MR ENO: Since you asked, I thought I would . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure, glad to.

MR STEFANIUK: I think Gordon has raised the concern about the placement of the console, and I think it is a real one and perhaps one which can be addressed in this total renovation process. There has been a variety of suggestions made as to the placement of the console. We've seen it in some other jurisdictions. In British Columbia, where there is a much deeper Speaker's gallery, that has been projected so the operator sits there, but I think still has difficulty seeing people who are almost immediately below. Ideally, that console is somewhere slightly above floor level in a far corner, so the whole House is in the line of vision. Perhaps that is a consideration that can be made in the redesign of the Chamber.

Access is important because it means, without being disrespectful to Gordon, strangers on the floor. So access through other than the normal entrances used by members is a consideration as well. The access isn't perhaps only before the sitting and at the conclusion, because an operator may, for a variety of reasons, have to leave the console and someone else has to replace him. So access is a consideration.

MR CHAIRMAN: We struggled with that location of the sound booth for a long time, and we just decided there was no other place to put it.

MR PURDY: Where was that prior to?

MR CHAIRMAN: I think it was always there. Remember that convex mirror you had there?

MR PURDY: I thought it was.

MR McINTOSH: As I was saying, as far as needing design and lead time, it's through conversations like this that we can put the package together and resolve most of the problems, never all.

MR GOGO: The Queen is on one side of the Chamber in the plan, and is Prince Philip on the other side?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR McCRAE: What was the result of the Bill of Rights, Mr. Speaker? Was it conceded that it should not be in there?

MR CHAIRMAN: I think that -- what is her name? They had to take it out, and they put it in a moisturing atmosphere to get the cracks to close again. But if they put it back in the Chamber, they'll open up again.

MR McCRAE: I thought her ambition was to put it back down there.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think she is putting it in the Jubilee Auditorium. That is where it was made for, originally intended for.

MR STEFANIUK: Was it brought into the Chamber on a trial basis in event?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR PURDY: Who did that? Did Paul do that?

MR CHAIRMAN: A fellow called Marenholtz did it.

MR PURDY: Well, Paul did the . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: He did the coat of arms and the carving of the canopy.

MR McCRAE: In any event, I think there are one or two members who would like to see it back in there, but that's a debate.

MR CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, this is not for publication. Some time or other, I would like to see whether we could find a very, very suitable place for that coat of arms that he carved which is now on the canopy, and replace it with the present Alberta coat of arms. Either that, or the original that was there

before in concrete, but I think more appropriately the present coat of arms. The feds should be interested in the one that is there, because it is really the coat of arms of the Queen in the right of the Dominion of Canada, as far as I know.

MR McINTOSH: You're referring to this?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR McINTOSH: We did a little sketch of the other coat of arms.

MR STEFANIUK: The Order of the Garter.

MR McINTOSH: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: This one has *A mari usque ad mare* and the other one had *Honi soit qui mal y pense*.

MR McCRAE: Translation?

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, *Honi soit qui mal y pense* is the Order of the Garter: Shame on him who thinks evil thereof. *A mari usque ad mare* is how the Dominion of Canada got its name. A passage in the Old Testament says, He shall have dominion from sea unto sea. So in Latin the motto is From sea unto sea, and it was called Dominion of Canada -- Dominion of New Zealand, Dominion of South Africa. But the motto of Canada comes from the Old Testament.

MR McINTOSH: We did a quick cost estimate. Did you want me to . . .

MR McCRAE: I think you should touch on it, Scotty.

MR CHAIRMAN: Please. Anything you have in the way of information. This is a hard arrangement to make, getting everybody together at the same time. I think we should get it.

MR McINTOSH: We did an original one, but as that was some time ago we tried to figure what the escalation is. I tried to escalate it to 1981. What I call the [inaudible], the wood panelling, we have a figure of \$72,000; ceiling \$110,000.

MR PURDY: That's installation and materials?

MR McINTOSH: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Gee, the wood panelling only \$72,000?

AN HON MEMBER: What do you mean, only?

MR CHAIRMAN: That isn't much.

MR McINTOSH: In discussing with tradesmen -- as I say, maybe I should ask for that one we do in mock-up, we can do a better analysis of it. They felt that for that type of work -- that's \$35 or \$40, which is quite expensive.

MR CHAIRMAN: What kind of wood are you having?

MR McINTOSH: It's not the cost of the wood; it's the craftsmanship that's involved. Ceiling, because it involves some superstructure too, was \$110,000. The carpeting, we used a figure of \$72,000. I used the most expensive wool carpet for this estimate. There are many, many carpets on the market. Painting, \$6,000. Wall finishes, \$6,000. We were also looking at the upholstery work throughout the whole Chamber. We maybe had quite a large escalated number; we weren't sure what we were up against there. We have a figure of \$24,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that for the chairs and so on?

MR McINTOSH: The chairs and so on. The refinishing of all the chairs, et cetera. Art work: I have a number of \$36,000. That would be the paintings. Lighting was \$84,000. I have a miscellaneous figure in there of \$42,000.

MR STEFANIUK: What's the bottom line, Scotty?

MR McINTOSH: I have come up with a final figure of \$288,000, plus or minus.

MR CHAIRMAN: It costs that much to run *Hansard* for one year. And believe me, we've tried to look at it to cut corners, more than once. So panelling is \$72,000; ceiling is \$110,000; carpeting is \$72,000; painting is \$6,000; wall finishing is \$6,000; upholstery \$24,000; art work \$36,000 for the two ends; and \$84,000 for lighting; and miscellaneous \$42,000.

MR McINTOSH: I'm sorry. That's \$452,000, plus or minus.

DR BUCK: If you get it done for that, I'll be even more surprised than the minister.

MR McCRAE: I'd better not accept that challenge.

MR CHAIRMAN: For 10 years, it's \$45,000 a year.

MR McINTOSH: That's the first year; the ninth year . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Of course, even if you expanded the walls, there are certain things you would not necessarily have to touch, such as the vaulted ceiling. You couldn't very well touch that, could you?

MR McINTOSH: What do you mean, touch it?

MR STEFANIUK: We're talking about possibly pushing out the walls in 10 years. Your ceiling cost would remain constant as well as your galleries, and so on. What you're really talking about is moving the walls out.

MR McCRAE: Which is \$100,000 right there.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? John? George? Bill?

MR PURDY: I think it was a good presentation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any more concerns about the sound system?

MR ENO: No.

MR McINTOSH: You could ask me embarrassing questions on that.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think we should work on that canopy. Bohdan?

MR STEFANIUK: No, sir.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm sure we're unanimous in our thanks to you and the minister for coming here and giving us this information. It has certainly been useful and well done as far as I'm concerned.

MR McCRAE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen.

MR McINTOSH: Is there anything you would like me to leave?

MR CHAIRMAN: We each have copies of this. If you have no objection, I think it would be nice if members occasionally might want to drop in, we could put them in our vault.

MR McINTOSH: Okay.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that all right?

MR McINTOSH: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'll keep them safe.

MR McINTOSH: That's fine.

MR McCRAE: So we'll await further contact, anything you want acoustically or general directions.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, please. You know, I do have those two -- particularly that one. I would really like to see us go to a cluster. But if it can't be done, it can't be done.

MR McINTOSH: This was one [inaudible] canopy. We looked at several dozen ways of solving the problem, which are actually cribs from different canopies from different places.

MR CHAIRMAN: The one on the lower left is the House of Commons, isn't it?

MR McINTOSH: Yes. I sort of like that one.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, that looks more like the New Brunswick one. They have a sort of round one.

MR STEFANIUK: [Inaudible] some terrible drapery.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, I didn't have to use it this time. I got out of the Chamber before the paper descended.

MR McCRAE: Okay. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MR CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We'll move it into the vault here. Anytime you need it, it's available.

Next meeting -- any ideas?

MR GOGO: Before we leave the Chamber, the concern I've had that we've never resolved has been one of security. I've been concerned for some time about

the commissionaires, not the quality of commissionaires but the only security on those doors is really commissionaires. I've often wondered what would happen if somebody -- for example, that chap two weeks ago. There is probably no reason to believe he couldn't have had something in his possession.

MR CHAIRMAN: Somebody said he could have taken Bob McMillan, the commissionaire, and heaved him over the railing.

MR GOGO: He could have had something in his possession, hand grenade or whatever. That has always concerned me, the security in the Chamber.. I fly on Time Air, and some seem to think it is a Mickey Mouse airline. But god help me if I got a steel plate in my head or a hinge in my hip, because the goddam bells will go crazy. Would there not be some merit in giving that some thought?

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we just discuss that for a minute, John?

MR PURDY: You mean, getting into the galleries?

MR STEFANIUK: A metal detector?

MR GOGO: Something.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's a sensitive place. I don't know whether members would think we were over-reacting if we had somebody outside there with a metal detector. There would be other things that could be smuggled in perhaps to do harm with. One of the things is the kind of personnel we get. We sit only four months in the year, so we really can't make it a career job, a full-time job to be a commissionaire in the building just for that purpose. Consequently we can't hire younger and more athletic people. It was suggested to me that we should not go to a commercial security agency, because you sometimes get some thuggish types apparently.

DR BUCK: There are some bad ones there.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we're in a bit of a dilemma. We seem to be stuck with the old-age pensioners. I don't know just what the answer is. Mind you, if everybody were screened at the front door more strictly, I suppose it would be difficult for somebody to get a weapon into the building, to get past the front door and then pick the weapon up on his way up to the floor there. But if you want to give it some thought, giving the gendarmes up there metal detectors. We'd have to be a little circumspect about it, because the Ambassador from Romania with his entourage might not appreciate that too much, even though they'll have to do it if they go on El Al.

MR GOGO: My d'ruthers would lie in the field of architectural work; in other words, fibreglass panel 8 feet up to prevent anything being thrown over.

MR CHAIRMAN: We discussed that about six or eight years ago and thought it would be too great an intrusion in the decor of the Chamber.

MR PURDY: I think if you go to metal detectors and all this, you're going to give somebody a challenge.

MR CHAIRMAN: We had a rule there for a while -- but we had no proper place to lock it up -- that women couldn't take their big purses and stuff in there.

MR GOGO: Well, I just put it on the table because it's a concern I've had for some time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want it on the next agenda? We're still waiting for an answer from the Solicitor General, who said that when the security committee met again he would let us know about our request to have representation on it.

MR GOGO: Have other jurisdictions done anything about it? Do they have public galleries like ours? I've been in a couple that do.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know of any that are screened off. I've been in B.C., Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba . . .

MR PURDY: They're all open.

MR STEFANIUK: The glass type of partition, I suppose, is a consideration.

MR GOGO: I know if something happened tomorrow, we'd do something the next day probably.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, that happened after the thing in Horst Schmidt's office.

MR PURDY: It never happened in the House of Commons. You know, that guy -- it actually happened in the washroom.

MR CHAIRMAN: Blew himself up. Wasn't there a woman who put a bag of cow blood onto the floor?

MR PURDY: Yes.

DR BUCK: But that guy Chartier, I grew up next door to him. Doc Horner was there that night. He was just 10 seconds away from throwing that into the Chamber.

MR CHAIRMAN: Throwing what in the Chamber?

DR BUCK: That bomb.

MR PURDY: That's what his intention was.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, in the House of Commons?

DR BUCK: Oh yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Gee whiz.

DR BUCK: He was rigging it, and it just went off 10 or 20 seconds too soon. All he had to do was walk from the washroom and throw it in. That's how close it was.

MR CHAIRMAN: It was providential.

MR GOGO: There is one of two ways, Mr. Chairman. One, we do something physical in terms of architectural work. The other is when the House is sitting, we have the calibre of people there who could detect that.

MR CHAIRMAN: John, this is going to sound like empire building, but there is some serious reason why we should consider this. The guide staff is under, I think, Government Services. I think especially since they look after visitors to the Assembly and so on, and this is getting to be more and more known as a parliament building, that it would be appropriate if the guide staff were under the direction of the Clerk. We might, then, have to give up some of the little girls. But if we had a couple of pretty good physical types on the guide staff the year around, whom we could shift to the galleries when the House sits, that would be one partial answer. In the House of Commons, of course, the guide staff is under the jurisdiction of the House -- I mean the security staff. There's no question about it for the whole building.

DR BUCK: I share the concern, and it's clear it has to go further than that, Gerry. It's not if the guy wants to stand up there and make a speech; it's if the guy gets into that Chamber and then lobs something. That's the concern. The guy can make as many speeches as he wants to up there and it isn't going to upset anything. It's if he blows 25 of us to hell, or wherever else we might go.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Speak for yourself.

MR GOGO: If I thought it would help, I'd say put microphones up there.

DR BUCK: As Bill says, it's a very, very touchy area.

MR CHAIRMAN: At one time, we were consulting with the Edmonton chief of police regarding security measures, but I think somebody got to him because he cut us off. If you think it's worth while, we could, I'm sure, easily go to perhaps the RCMP and ask them for their advice, get a report on what we might do to enhance security in the Chamber.

DR BUCK: I think it should be done very unobtrusively, as Bill says.

MR CHAIRMAN: Obviously. One of the first things I did when I was fingered for the job -- I was still Speaker designate, and I visited Ottawa and some other places -- I wrote a long memo to Don Getty, who then had responsibility concerning security in the whole building. It has been a concern ever since, but of course I haven't a great deal of jurisdiction.

Anyhow, would it be your wish -- I don't think we need a formal resolution -- that we just quietly go to, for example, the RCMP and ask them what arrangements we could make to get their recommendations concerning security in the Chamber?

DR BUCK: Right. Let them do a little study on what . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: They could say, we've got some joker sitting in Ottawa who is an expert on this sort of thing, and if you give us so much money we'll phone him up. Do you want us to do that?

DR BUCK: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: We don't need it in the minutes, Bohdan, because they are publicly accessible.

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any other concerns before we break off?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't see the glass wall as being that much of a problem, the shatter-proof glass.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, if we got security advice on it and it looked like the only solution, we could ask the architect about it.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: The only problem would be to fuse the lights some way so there weren't glare.

DR BUCK: But you see, you've got three galleries.

MR STEFANIUK: Four with the press gallery.

MR GOGO: Essentially two, though.

MR CHAIRMAN: The press gallery might be the most difficult to control. The Speaker's gallery doors are always locked, whether the House is sitting or not. They can't get in there unless they overcome a gendarme and take his key away from him.

MR PURDY: Another point, I'd like to ask Gerry where you're at now with the special warrant for the other architectural designs for the Chamber.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's practically ready. I think the Clerk and I discussed it yesterday. The contacts with the four people are re-opened, and we'll get the proposals back to you. What we're looking at is concepts, because I think we have to deal with this architect.

DR BUCK: Can I just ask a question on that? What arrangements have been made with the architects and can we be criticized that the other guys didn't have a chance? How did the architectural concept come up?

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, Stu apparently is under contract to this architect to do the whole building for some reason or other. I wasn't consulted about that, and he has no jurisdiction in the Chamber. That's blessed by directive of the cabinet. But I don't know to what extent we're tied to him, but I think he's competent. He has been doing other things in the building.

But, as we discussed a number of times -- I don't think you were here, Walter; this was on the agenda quite often -- we'd like to get concepts, a number of them, make our decisions here, then discuss those concepts with the government architect. I would hope we'd have those pretty early in the new year.

DR BUCK: I was going to say to the minister when we were talking about giving them lead time, Mr. Chairman, maybe you can -- or Bill to your caucus. Every bloody year that session starts getting later and later and later. We were in government and we heard that same line of -- if you'll pardon the expression -- horse shit from the ministers that they just can't get that legislation in. But when the Premier says, you'll have it in by such and such a day -- they get it in. For the fellows in the rural areas, or anybody -- you know, we only have about three months of summer in this crazy country. Let's try to move that starting date back to the middle of February again.

MR CHAIRMAN: You know, it used to be six weeks from around the middle of February and we were practically always out by Easter.

DR BUCK: Well, we'll never get back to the six weeks, but if we can get that opening date back to the middle of February, that would sure Because we get more work done in those cold, miserable days than we do later on.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether this is the reason, but it may be part of the reason. Draftsmen are awfully hard to get.

DR BUCK: I know. But I've heard that same story for 12 years, Gerry.

MR CHAIRMAN: We lost two top-notchers.

MR GOGO: When the Premier wants something, we get it tomorrow.

DR BUCK: That's right. So I think it would be 90 per cent in favor of that, wouldn't it?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: All our rural members feel that way.

MR STEFANIUK: Can Gordon disappear?

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure, please. I'm sorry.

MR GOGO: Did we deal with the next meeting?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, what about dates now? What are we looking at? Could we do this?

The recording terminated at 5:40 p.m.

