

THESE TRANSCRIPTS HAVE NOT BEEN THOROUGHLY EXAMINED FOR ACCURACY AND ARE,  
THEREFORE, UNOFFICIAL.

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Tuesday, February 3, 1931

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

8:05 a.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion for approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 2?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'll move.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'll second.

MR CHAIRMAN: Carried. Just before we go on with the agenda, have those standardized forms been made available?

MR STEFANIUK: I have the samples here.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose we look at the samples then.

MR STEFANIUK: Members will recall that originally there was a proposal from Mr. Notley to design a special form. We were subsequently asked to determine what there was in the way of a stock form; that is, the form that is stocked by central supply, within the Department of Government Services, and is readily available. If that is found satisfactory, we can immediately put it into stock.

MR PURDY: What would be the extra cost, Mr. Chairman, of having Legislative Assembly placed on top of it?

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think that question was asked at the last meeting, if I recall. I believe the consensus was not to worry about personalization for the moment, to use the form for a while. Later, if it were deemed necessary, we could look at personalization.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would there be any substantial leakage of these forms out into private use? There is nothing on them that identifies them as Legislative Assembly; maybe that wouldn't stop it.

MR STEFANIUK: No more than perhaps any other stationery item we use.

MR CHAIRMAN: We get these letters from pressure groups and they're all metered. You know darn well they have no meter at home. That kind of thing goes on all the time.

MRS OSTERMAN: This is the kind of thing that is hard for me to imagine -- maybe it's because I'm not involved in anything else -- where else it would be used.

MR CHAIRMAN: You could send notes to your husband.

MRS OSTERMAN: He would appreciate that, especially in triplicate -- he could read it three times.

Mr. Chairman, if some members feel they might be useful -- I know there are times when you want to copy something down and rather than having it redone or waiting for your secretary to write out a message that you have written down, you can just rip off a sheet.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we all content? Okay. So we can say it was agreed that the snappy memo form in stock by Government Services will be acceptable as a standard memo form for those memos who want to use it.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: What does this PPY mean?

MRS OSTERMAN: Just stylistic, I think.

MR CHAIRMAN: That could be the initials of the company that puts it out. I think that is everything that isn't on the agenda. We have no "other visitors". With regard to the provincial coat of arms, the Clerk has a presentation board that you might like to see.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, there was a discussion about letterhead design. Perhaps it would be easier to pass these around. There was a recommendation at the last meeting about printing the coat of arms in full color. I have that sample in the building; it wasn't on my desk this morning owing to the hour. I have asked that it be brought in. There is some question on the part of the designers about the validity of use of full color in light of the amount of color and the size of the coat of arms. I simply bring that comment to members' attention in the event they wish to reconsider the use of full color, although we do have a sample of it. My personal opinion is that it is attractive.

MRS OSTERMAN: I've seen a paper up in the office with the coat of arms on it. Is that what it would look like?

MR STEFANIUK: We felt that needed further redesign, that the lettering was perhaps too small and the coat of arms was too small. Both needed to be enlarged. In effect what we are hoping for is that we can standardize a single letterhead design for use by the entire Legislative Assembly, and overprint individual identifications for whichever office as required or for individual members as required. We have the previous approval of this committee to proceed with personalized letterhead for each and every member, but I refer to the offices as well: the office of the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the Speaker, the Clerks, the Law Clerk, and so on. So in effect we will be using a single design, which will bring about certain economies if we simply overprint the local identification. If you have seen the one that has the full-color coat of arms with the single line identification -- Legislative Assembly of Alberta -- I would personally recommend that members consider that particular one, slightly modified by enlargement of the coat of arms and the identification of the Legislative Assembly. Then we proceed with identification on the right-hand side of the letterhead.

MRS OSTERMAN: The one that Gerry has right now -- that's a little larger than what I saw, isn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's a nice size, I think.

MR STEFANIUK: This one is in fact two. This one is slightly larger than what you saw. There is one question, and that has to do with perhaps a more modern concept -- the printing of an address across the bottom. If I can have some guidance on that item, I could then proceed. Do you like this modernized concept of the address at the bottom? Or would you prefer to have the total identity at the top?

MRS OSTERMAN: I like the total identity at the top. With the coat of arms there, it's quite elegant looking. I think it detracts if you start printing . . .

MR STEFANIUK: If that's a consensus, Mr. Chairman, then I could take it from there.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is just one little slip here. I think we should watch and not say Legislature Assembly.

MR STEFANIUK: These are mock-ups, and the text is not finalized of course. Even the words, Legislative Assembly Alberta, I would consider improper; it should be Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think if you have Legislative Assembly Alberta in that fashion, you're okay. Or this way; this is certainly okay.

MR STEFANIUK: We're talking about one straight line, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're putting it on the envelope, the words Legislative Assembly should be put a little closer together and the Alberta a little farther . . .

MR APPLEBY: But if you're putting it on one straight line, you should have the "of" in it.

MR CHAIRMAN: I suppose, although there is certainly a lot more snap to Legislative Assembly Alberta.

MRS OSTERMAN: With a comma?

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, I don't know. Or you could have Alberta, then Legislative Assembly. There is no accounting for taste, as they said thousands of years ago.

MR STEFANIUK: There is also a format here for a business card that I hope members noticed. I wonder if that would be satisfactory, again going to full color. So we would standardize the design of the business card from here on in.

MR CHAIRMAN: On this larger coat of arms, you can actually make out the motto.

MR MANDEVILLE: I think the larger coat of arms is nicer.

MR CHAIRMAN: I agree. What do you think about the lettering, though? Do you think it's a bit light? Does it look a little anemic?

MR STEFANIUK: We have just said, Mr. Chairman, that we would look for larger lettering, more of a bold face, to identify the Assembly more clearly.

MR CHAIRMAN: How much more cost are we looking at if we go for color?

MR STEFANIUK: We're definitely talking about more costs, but as much as engraving would cost -- which is what we have here in gold. So we can go to four-color offset for the cost of single-color engraving. Again, I believe we discussed at the last meeting the consideration of vast quantities if we standardize the letterhead form, thereby bringing the cost down considerably on a per-unit basis.

MR CHAIRMAN: Have we any idea what quantities are on hand now?

MR STEFANIUK: These are merely mock-ups; these are not orders.

MR CHAIRMAN: I realize that. But if we just had a new run of this kind of thing, and we start putting these in, the old stuff won't be used up.

MR STEFANIUK: Our old stock is almost completely depleted. We're desperate for stock. We've had to put in interim stock, so we're ready to go. We've held off with the old stock. The new stock wouldn't be distributed until the old stock was completely depleted. In any event we're probably talking about initial runs in the vicinity of a quarter of a million.

MR PURDY: That also includes ministers' offices?

MR STEFANIUK: No, the government will look after ministers' offices, and they have decided on a design that is different. They've decided on the gold embossing as opposed to a colored coat of arms. And of course the Alberta signature is employed in ministerial areas which is a government logo and would be inappropriate for the Legislative Assembly.

MRS OSTERMAN: I was going to ask about that stylized A. I wondered where the difference was in terms of usage.

MR STEFANIUK: That is a government logo and, therefore, would be confined to useage within ministerial agencies or those identified with government. It would be inappropriate for the Assembly.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any motions or suggestions?

MR APPLEBY: You mentioned the flip card for the business card. I wouldn't like to see that. I think the business card like we have it now -- if you get a flip card, you're getting a little cumbersome.

MR PURDY: I carry quite a few of them and they get bulky, twice as much.

MR STEFANIUK: Marg tells me that some members wish as many as three addresses and we run out of space.

MR APPLEBY: Could it be optional which kind of card you get?

MRS OSTERMAN: What do you mean by a flip card?

MR STEFANIUK: It's a folded card, and you can have printing on the outside and the inside. In effect it is printed on two sides, but it is a little folder as opposed to just being a single flat card.

So if members are agreeable to use of the full-color logo, we will enlarge the type face and proceed immediately.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'd be inclined to suggest that we see one before it goes ahead.

MR STEFANIUK: Some members have seen one, Mr. Chairman, and we will have a sample brought up here as soon as staff is into some of the offices.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does it say, Legislative Assembly?

MR STEFANIUK: It says Legislative Assembly of Alberta, a single line under the colored logo.

MR PURDY: I would second Mr. Wolstenholme's motion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Where does it say that?

MR STEFANIUK: Right across the centre. Marg is just going to get us one. For the interest of members, I should perhaps mention that we have determined that there is available a reproduction of the large new coat of arms, in bronze. We thought of it as a possibility for constituency offices. We have rejected the first model on the basis that the cost is ridiculous because it is cast in bronze. The price is \$225 per copy. We do know that there is being reproduced a new coat of arms in poster form. We will determine whether that might be suitable for framing, whereupon we will bring the sample to this committee for consideration.

MR PURDY: I hope it's quicker that the Alberta Bill of Rights, which we were supposed to get in '72, which I still haven't received.

MR CHAIRMAN: What Bill of Rights is that?

MR PURDY: We were all supposed to get a copy of the Alberta Bill of Rights.

MR CHAIRMAN: Who was doing it?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That was done a long time ago.

MR PURDY: In '72.

MR CHAIRMAN: But who was doing it?

MR PURDY: I forget now. But I remember that through our caucus or someplace it was stated that members would all receive a copy of the Alberta Bill of

Rights in the engrossed form. I never did receive one, and I don't think anybody else has.

MRS OSTERMAN: There is a 10 by 12 coat of arms in a very light frame.

MR STEFANIUK: That was the one that was distributed on September 1. That has gone into reprint because the original printing was not considered to be of good quality. Individuals have had that one framed.

MRS OSTERMAN: But I'm talking about one -- maybe it was the Department of Culture that did it.

MR STEFANIUK: Is this the full-color one?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, that's the one. I've seen it in one or two ministerial areas. That was the same one that was done for September 1 and distributed to the masses on the grounds. The one being done now is somewhat larger. I'm told it is poster form, but I have nothing more on it. The one I have received in bronze is about 14 by 14 inches. That is the coat of arms itself; it has no backing of any kind. It is intended simply to be fixed to the wall as a permanent thing. But I think the cost is prohibitive for members' offices. I simply am assuming that members would be interested in having the coat of arms, in their constituency offices at least. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR MANDEVILLE: Yes, I would think so.

MR APPLEBY: Are there any detailed descriptions or explanations of the components of the coat of arms?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, that folder that was done for September 1, Frank, has all the detailed explanations with it.

MR APPLEBY: Not as complete as I would like to have it. Frequently we get asked why the changes were made, and so on -- that sort of thing.

MR STEFANIUK: Well, what we had was simply a shield, and this is what is referred to as the augmented arms of Alberta. It has all the heraldic symbolism attached to it.

MR APPLEBY: Where does the lion come in? That isn't explained. It mentions it being there but it doesn't say why.

MR STEFANIUK: If you really like, I will see if I can get some sort of text that would explain it.

MR APPLEBY: Yes, that is what I would really like.

MR STEFANIUK: All right.

MR CHAIRMAN: We had a motion on the question of the letterhead. I think we should be very clear about it. I don't want to scratch my noggin afterwards

and try to find out what we decided. We had three items under consideration. One was the envelopes; one was letterhead; and another was the business card. What does the motion deal with?

SECRETARY: It deals with the letterhead, the colored coat of arms on top of the letterhead.

MR CHAIRMAN: So, so far we've decided that we're going to go into color for the coat of arms.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Right.

MR MANDEVILLE: The large coat of arms or the smaller coat of arms?

MR CHAIRMAN: The larger one. What is this going to do to the legibility of the motto? I like the motto, and of course it's unique to Alberta. In the black and white it is fairly legible. What will the color do to the legibility?

MR STEFANIUK: If you look at the colored sample, Mr. Chairman.

MRS OSTERMAN: This one isn't too bad. If it's larger, I think it might be . .

MR STEFANIUK: . . . even more legible.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: I really think that before we go into a quarter of a million copies, we should see proofs.

MR APPLEBY: Actually, the color is more legible than the black and white, isn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: Not the big black and white. So the intention is . . .

MR STEFANIUK: The intention is to double the size of the colored coat of arms.

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, the colored coat of arms is going to be the same size as the black and white one that we have in the samples. Is that the idea?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: Why is there some with it in the corner and others . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Those are just design ideas, Connie. That's not produced letterhead.

MRS OSTERMAN: Right. Are they going to be done both ways?

MR STEFANIUK: No. As I understand what was decided here, we will take this design; we will simply be doubling the size of this and doubling, approximately, the size of the identification Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

And we will be printing the local identification in this side, saying Connie Osterman, MLA, et cetera.

MRS OSTERMAN: Just looking at the two things here, I think I have to say -- and I don't know what the propriety is, but I like the Legislative Assembly, Alberta underneath, better than it stretched across, Legislative Assembly of Alberta. I like it in two lines rather than stretched across.

MR CHAIRMAN: Think of letterhead you've seen coming out of embassies and the Senate or some of the secretaries of state offices. Those people are aware of international usage and international good taste. Certainly we're going to have a majority decision on this and we're going to do what the majority says; there is no question about that. In the first place, I have real misgivings about the use of color. It's a bit flamboyant. It almost looks like Alberta showing off its wealth. Believe me, that's a sensitive point in other parts of Canada. I'm getting my nose rubbed in it fairly often. Apart from that, as Connie was just saying, I think that having Legislative Assembly, and then Alberta below that, has far more class to it than Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

MR APPLEBY: If you're not having it in one straight line, I think it would be appropriate. But if you're going to have it in one straight line, you should have "of" in it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Another thing. If we're going to put some identification of addresses, we should consider whether we want phone numbers. We have to give some thought to the use this is going to be put to. If you're writing to constituents and you don't object to their telephoning you, then it's a real convenience to them to have the phone number. Every business letterhead practically has a telephone number, and some have the area code as well. Then of course you know there are some businesses that have a telex number or cable address. So it's a question of whether you want class or utility or a compromise of both. If you're going to put this additional information on, there is a consideration as to whether you're going to balance it. Are you going to put something on this side and Edmonton, Alberta on that side? Or are you just going to have it on this side? Some people are keen about balance on letterheads.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'm not so much hung up on that as I would be about -- that whatever, phone numbers or whatever, went over here on this side, wouldn't that be up to the individual preference?

MR CHAIRMAN: You can make that decision. All we'd need to do then is decide the basics, and the overprinting is up to the person who gets the overprinting done. That could include the phone number, as you say, George. I think some of us have sometimes as many as three phone numbers on our card; others don't.

MRS OSTERMAN: Do you have a sample of what is being produced for the ministers' offices?

MR STEFANIUK: It's entirely different from this. They have gone very modernistic. It's being done in blue and gold. There is the logo in the corner, the Alberta signature beside it; then, under the line, the

identification of the particular minister. The coat of arms is in gold in the corner.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would be extremely unhappy if we went to a quarter of a million copies and then had second thoughts about whether we had done the right thing. I realize that we shouldn't stall around and agonize and bite our nails over this for the next two hours, but . . .

MR APPLEBY: Can't we get a basic letterhead, and the overprinting, if we're going to have it individualized, the individual person would have the choice?

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure. I don't know what your colleagues are going to decide, but if you think that some people are going to be interested in balancing it, then we'd have to decide whether we'd want this in the middle or over here. If you put it over here and you put other information over there, this looks too far up in the corner. It doesn't look right. If you're going to put it here, then people who are going to strive for a balance of appearance will want to put something here and something there. For example, you could have Legislative Assembly Alberta, or whatever you decide to do with the "of", then over here you could have William (Bill) Purdy, MLA, then perhaps the constituency. Then over here you could have the office address and the phone number. That would give you a balance. But if you're going to put this over in the corner, then probably all that other information would go over here to more or less offset it, although this likely would be higher up. I'm not an expert on letterhead, but I guess I've ordered millions of them up till now.

MR PURDY: What's the extra cost of the overlay?

MR STEFANIUK: The overlay is minimal. The intention would be that if members decide finally on the colored coat of arms -- and I assume that decision was made at the last meeting -- then we would like to print the full stock once with the color, and emboss Legislative Assembly of Alberta. Then we would simply overprint in black, which is a very minimal cost, local identification, regardless of who it might be for. The big cost is in the embossing and in the color work. That is what we would want to standardize in a single location throughout.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sure you wouldn't find the letterhead of the House of Commons in Westminster or the House of Lords with a colored coat of arms on it. In fact I doubt whether you'd see a colored coat of arms at all, because the coat of arms is royal and it's not parliament. It's more appropriate on the ministers' letterhead than it is on ours.

MR APPLEBY: Actually it's not appropriate there either, if you're going along that line of reasoning. It would be appropriate on the Lieutenant-Governor's.

MR CHAIRMAN: They are ministers of the Crown, and the Premier is the Queen's first minister of Alberta.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Then do the ministers of the Crown have it in the House of Commons at Westminster?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know. It would be interesting to find out. You know, if the heat's on and we've got to crack into something, of course that's another

thing. But if it's not, then I think it might be prudent for us to look at some other letterheads, not necessarily the smallest jurisdictions. But I do think that we shouldn't be too flamboyant, coming from Alberta. I could sooner see a pink polar bear on the Northwest Territories than a color on ours.

MR APPLEBY: I fail to see how the coat of arms we have in the color here could be construed as flamboyant. Really, that's stretching it a bit, I think.

MR CHAIRMAN: As I said, there's no accounting for taste. Mine is no better than anyone else's.

MR APPLEBY: When somebody opens up a letter and sees a bit of color, that gets them in the right mood right there.

MR CHAIRMAN: As long as they don't see purple after they've read it. Okay. What is your wish? We have a long agenda; I think we have to get cracking.

MR PURDY: We have a motion on this.

MR CHAIRMAN: We have a motion to have the coat of arms in color. But as you can see, there is some more detail.

MR APPLEBY: Well, we have to come up with the printing as far as the identification is concerned regarding the Assembly; then the personalized heading -- whatever anybody wants -- would be another matter, wouldn't it?

MRS OSTERMAN: Is it a lot of trouble to get a mock-up of the coat of arms blown up to the black and white one we have here? Can we have that? Stick it on a piece of paper, then put different lettering underneath to see what it looks like?

MR STEFANIUK: We can. The only thing I would bring to members' attention is that that delays the whole process.

MR CHAIRMAN: By how much?

MR STEFANIUK: Until the members come to another meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Unless we circulate it and take a poll on it.

MR PURDY: I am of the opinion we should go with what we've got, the enlargement, and let the individual members pick the overlay they want.

MRS OSTERMAN: It's not the overlay I'm concerned about, because that's going to be very personal and everyone can do what they want. My concern is what the lettering will look like underneath. On the basis of what I see here, will the lettering be the size that's underneath the mock-up one?

MR STEFANIUK: It will be twice the size it is on this color, the identification. That's the intention right now. That's what we have asked them to come up with.

MR APPLEBY: Actually, comparing it to the old letterhead we have, which is on the agenda this morning -- Legislative Assembly on either side and Alberta underneath -- I certainly like the new one with the whole thing underneath. It allows the coat of arms to stand out much more distinctly than having it surrounded by words.

MR MANDEVILLE: If you took the Legislative Assembly and took the "of" out and put Alberta underneath . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: I rather like that, but I wonder if the letters would be about that size.

MR STEFANIUK: They would be larger.

MR CHAIRMAN: For example, overprinting -- if you wanted it like this, you could put Member for Athabasca.

MR APPLEBY: Yes. I like that arrangement better, with Alberta underneath and not using "of".

MR MANDEVILLE: Because it's the Legislative Assembly and it's Alberta.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure but I think you see this on the letterhead used by Senators. I got a letter from a Senator yesterday, but I left it at home. That is, the word Alberta above the letterhead, then Legislative Assembly below. I think they have Canada, then I think the coat of arms or below that, The Senate. That's got snap and class to it. They don't say The Senate of Canada, for example.

MR APPLEBY: It doesn't look flambovant?

MR CHAIRMAN: It's not colored; it's one color. I don't know of any parliament, of the larger ones, that uses colored letterhead.

MR APPLEBY: There have been colored ones around here for years.

MR CHAIRMAN: The ones we inherited were just plain green.

MR APPLEBY: There were some blue ones.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have some of those too. So we've decided that we're going to have the coat of arms in color. Does that stand?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we going to have it on the side or in the middle?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Middle.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. And what is the juxtaposition of the text going to be?

MR APPLEBY: Legislative Assembly on one line and Alberta underneath.

MR CHAIRMAN: And you don't want Alberta above the coat of arms?

MRS OSTERMAN: I haven't seen it, so I can't comment. But I like the way that looks; it's compact.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it is moved by Mr. Wolstenholme that letterhead be provided with the Alberta coat of arms in color, the same size as the attached sample -- that's the easiest way to describe that -- with the words Legislative Assembly on the line immediately below, followed by the word Alberta on the next line below, and centred. Is that agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, the pins for the members. Do you want to report on that?

MR STEFANIUK: I have no report because we have not been successful in finding a design facility in Alberta. There are people here who manufacture pins, providing we provide the design. But they do not have the creative services available. I have been able to determine that Birks in Toronto has the design facility, and another manufacturing firm in Montreal. I have some travel scheduled to the east within the next two weeks, to central Canada, and I had intended to approach the two sources in Montreal and Toronto for creative design.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question that immediately arises is how did Tom Lysons beat us to the draw? As I understand it Tom got somebody to do a design here in Alberta and sent it over to Taiwan and they produced it.

MR PURDY: Anything I have had to do with our Lions Club, we've had to design our own and send it to Taiwan.

MRS OSTERMAN: Towns and villages do this all the time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure, it shouldn't be any great hassle. I have a notion that we could possibly find somebody here who would draw us one in town. I really don't think . . .

MR APPLEBY: And Henry Woo will get them for us very quickly in his import agency.

MR CHAIRMAN: There's an idea. Is that all right for the pins? Now, the Commissioner for Oaths thing. Do you want to report on that, Bohdan?

MR STEFANIUK: A report is contained in the members' books, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: Under item 3(c).

MRS OSTERMAN: My reading is that it's fine to do that as long as it is for business, and that will have to be stipulated.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. In other words, there will be no fee attached to the licence, if you like, providing their work is restricted to work on behalf of the MLA in the MLA's function as such, and that no fee will at any time be charged to anyone for exercise of that power. The forms are on their way here; I still don't have them. We would propose to distribute them to all

members, with an appropriate covering memorandum asking them to complete them with their constituency secretaries, if they desire that kind of service.

MR CHAIRMAN: Should there be a memo go out to all members?

MR APPLEBY: Probably, when you get ready to put it into action -- when you get the forms and so on.

MR CHAIRMAN: We could attach a form, I suppose.

MR STEFANIUK: This is what I just said.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Chamber renovations: that also refers to item 11. The problem that we ran into there was that we had been told that a special warrant would be available for getting these concepts that we want to study in the committee and the members, and there has been some expression of interest that other members would want to see those as well. When that application for a special warrant was made, it was turned down. I then wrote to Mr. Hyndman and pointed out that this was not the way we had expected things to go. He agreed then that in March 1980 he said he anticipated no difficulty in getting the warrant through. I explained the circumstances to him. I have his preliminary answer here, dated yesterday, which I have permission to share with the committee, if you would each like to take a copy of it. And Lou is going to follow it up.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't know about the other members of the committee, but Stu had the designs he has in hand brought to caucus. We didn't have an opportunity to discuss them. I had promised that members would have that opportunity on the 12th. They have seen the designs and there shouldn't be any problem in getting a decision very quickly.

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, the choice is going to be made in the government caucus as to what we're going to do in the Chamber?

MRS OSTERMAN: It will be, as far as direction for our colleagues.

MR APPLEBY: Our views would have to be reflected here in the Members' Services meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, I've gone as far as I can go with it. I can't move without the money.

MRS OSTERMAN: My suggestion would be that there would be either another meeting called immediately after the 12th, or else we let the Chairman know what the majority of the members would like to do.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think if the government caucus is going to make the decision, we should just take it away from this committee altogether. We've been hassling over this since March 1980.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess I feel some responsibility to reflect the views of my colleagues, and I haven't. I will accept responsibility for not having canvassed them properly. We just haven't ever had the opportunity to discuss it as fully as we should have. That's so important, and they all feel part of [inaudible] it's quite proper to discuss it with all the members.

MR APPLEBY: I wasn't at the last caucus because I was sick. But they were on display then?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR APPLEBY: You didn't have an opportunity to get a reading after the display?

MRS OSTERMAN: No.

MR CHAIRMAN: So the situation is that the committee has decided to get concepts of four other architects and in the meantime the one we have already is being put up for study, choice, or decision.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't know what kind of views will come forward.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we know where it's at anyway. Anybody want to say anything more about that?

SECRETARY: You're leaving it with the government caucus?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, that certainly isn't my idea.

MRS OSTERMAN: No, we'll be back. They may just leave it up to us.

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's summarize it this way. The government members of the committee wish to have the question of the special warrant and the renovation of the Chamber placed in abeyance for consideration by the government caucus.

MRS OSTERMAN: Not the special warrant; just a reflection of their views on the Chamber renovations. The special warrant has nothing to do with it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

SECRETARY: Placed in abeyance?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, for decision by the -- or for consideration by the government caucus? Or decision by the government caucus?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: No, not decision.

MRS OSTERMAN: Not decision. We don't know what they will do. Consideration.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. The dental plan. We were going to get some reports from the caucuses. We did get some replies from three members. What is the decision of the caucuses with regard to the dental plan?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think John was keeping track of that.

MR APPLEBY: Maybe we could hold that until John gets here. He was on the airport parking too, wasn't he?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, the Clerk has had that in hand.

MRS OSTERMAN: I gather the report is negative on that.

MR STEFANIUK: Well, there are two reports, one dealing with Edmonton Municipal and one dealing with Calgary International.

MR CHAIRMAN: Apparently we're not getting anywhere at either place, but we can cover it by giving members a special credit card, or a credit card in the name of the Legislative Assembly. I suggested to the Clerk yesterday that we should consider putting the word "parking" on that card.

MR PURDY: If you're going to be talking about a special credit card for Legislative Assembly, I would suggest that we could use it for gas purposes and everything, instead of going to Esso or one from Pacific Petroleums, and all this. The same as the federal government does. The typical example is the RCMP. They have one card, and they can go to any gas station and get gasoline for their car. The same with AGT; I think they have a special card, and they can go in and buy their gas wherever they need it. But with the situation right now, I have a Gulf credit card. I have to go looking for a Gulf service station.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm in the same boat.

MR PURDY: If we're going to go to a credit card system that's going to be usable and standard, we should look at it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, whose credit card is it? Is it a Chargex or what? Who administers it?

MR PURDY: It's a special AGT credit card, and it's acceptable at all the service stations.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it should be a Legislative Assembly credit card, and it could be used for gasoline and whatever specified. Gee, if I had thought of that, we could have had George's parking covered a year ago.

MRS OSTERMAN: But it has to be accepted by the parking people. They have to accept it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, you have the indication that they would accept a credit card.

MR STEFANIUK: They will accept a bank credit card. That's covered in my memorandum. They accept bank credit cards as a matter of course now. Their suggestion was that we simply equip our members with a bank credit card.

MR PURDY: How would that work then in my concern about gasoline purchases and so on? Could we extend it that far?

MR STEFANIUK: I frankly don't see any significant difference from using a bank card to an individual company's gasoline credit card at the moment.

MR PURDY: Because most gasoline companies do honor MasterCard and ChargeX.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not sure what the implications are. With a bank card, the actual charge slips are not returned. I believe there is just a statement listing all the charges. The difficulty we have there, unlike a gasoline credit card which returns the actual charge slip, is the statement which we require for audit purposes to ensure that it's only gasoline and those other authorized services that are charged. I don't have that with a bank card. That is the difficulty I foresee.

MR CHAIRMAN: If an RCMP officer has to park at an airport, does he use a bank card or an RCMP card?

MR PURDY: I don't know about that. I think maybe we should investigate what AGT has.

MR CHAIRMAN: If the parking outfit will accept an AGT or an RCMP credit card . . .

MR STEFANIUK: They will not. They have made that clear to us, Mr. Chairman. The RCMP is a federal force and there are special arrangements at all federally-owned airports -- for federal Members of Parliament, for Senators, and presumably for federal public servants, which the RCMP is. The province has no status at those airports. We've been through that.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Here's Gogo John.

MR CHAIRMAN: Hi, John.

MR GOGO: Good morning.

MR PURDY: Can we go the other route then? Those who leave their vehicles at the airport will use their bank charge card, then turn the bills in to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly for payment.

MR CHAIRMAN: We don't want to get caught in the position where we're making a refund to a member. That's the whole thing. So it should be a Legislative Assembly credit card, whether it's on a bank or whatever, rather than in the name of a member. Otherwise, he has to pay it and we have to reimburse him. That's what we have to avoid.

Well, let's check to see what AGT does. If they have a better way, we can go into it. If not, why don't we go ahead and get bank credit cards?

MR APPLEBY: I just wonder how restrictive they would be.

MR CHAIRMAN: We now have credit cards out which members are using to buy gas and oil. Can we just see whether we can't get an extension of that so one credit card will look after gas, oil, and parking.

MR PURDY: That's what I'm talking about.

MRS OSTERMAN: But it has to be a bank one.

MR STEFANIUK: The airport parking facility will accept a bank card. I pointed out a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, why the bank card could not be used for purchases of gas and oil -- because the formal statement will not comply with our audit requirements.

MR PURDY: Unless the individual member submits each month his copy.

MR STEFANIUK: Look, it's all fine. We can do anything that the committee directs, except that if we get into use of a bank card for other purposes, the committee must appreciate that the accounting process will significantly increase.

MR PURDY: What I'm saying is that a card will be issued to Gerry Amerongen, Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, for those specific purposes.

MR APPLEBY: But they won't accept it at federal airports.

MR PURDY: They would if they were MasterCharge or Chargex. A lot of the mayors of our towns and villages -- you know, the village has a card, a Chargex or a Visa card, for that particular . . .

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Their auditing doesn't have the requirements that Bo is talking about. The statement you get from Chargex or MasterCharge just lists on them. You don't get anything back to prove what it is. I've run up against this on the Social Care Facilities Review Committee. They want the statement not from my Chargex slip but the receipt from the hotel.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think for the amount of money we're talking about, frankly if we're going to add a tremendous amount of administration, I feel very guilty about doing something like that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then the simple way to do it is to simply have another credit card and have it used for parking, as far as accounting is concerned. It may be a nuisance to the members to fish out one card for gasoline and another one for parking.

MR PURDY: Well, let's look at AGT and see what they do.

MR STEFANIUK: We can look at what they do for gas, Bill, but that will not be acceptable for parking.

MR PURDY: Let's find out when a guy from AGT goes down and parks at the Municipal Airport, has to go to Calgary, and takes the airbus.

MR STEFANIUK: He pays cash and submits his receipt as part of his expenses.

MRS OSTERMAN: Because he's allowed to do that. But we're not allowed.

MR GOGO: I'm a little confused. How can Dick Johnston, as Minister of Municipal Affairs, park at Edmonton Municipal Airport with a sticker on his windshield, year in and year out. Surely the city of Edmonton has provision for those types of things, unless the building of the parkade or stockade did

away with that. I don't see why it would, because they always used . . . I should have raised that with you some time ago, when we were checking into it. I wonder if it wouldn't be advisable, if possible, if such stickers exist, to have each member issued with one. Then there are no such things as receipts to worry about.

MR CHAIRMAN: But it wouldn't cover you at Calgary International.

MR GOGO: I was just dealing with Edmonton.

MR STEFANIUK: I gave you a very brief report on Edmonton Municipal, which reflects entirely the information I was given at Edmonton Municipal, which amounted to: go to hell; we're not interested.

MR CHAIRMAN: We could certainly go over his head and directly to the city, I suppose. But it won't help us in Calgary.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: It would appear that Bo has something under way in Calgary, but this one for Edmonton is pretty dogmatic, isn't it? I wonder what Purves would think if he knew that that's the way they were talking to us.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's all it would take -- to call one of the alderman about it.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: This letter of Bo's here sure looks as if they're not interested. It's interesting to hear about what John said about Dick Johnston.

MR CHAIRMAN: Supposing we do this. We look into AGT. We investigate Dick Johnston.

MR GOGO: That didn't come out quite right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Sorry about that. And if we can go that way and cover both Edmonton and Calgary, we'll work something out and just do it. If we can't, we get a bank card and hope to use it at both airports. We'll simply have to use an extra credit card.

MR APPLEBY: Before that, you'll talk to Cec Purves.

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure, this guy maybe needs his nose rubbed, but the thing is that it doesn't cover us in Calgary. That's where people like George are affected.

MRS OSTERMAN: As long as we're not going to burden ourselves with a tremendous amount of administration, considering the number of dollars that are actually involved.

MR CHAIRMAN: According to Bohdan, if we have a separate card for it that simplifies the accounting.

MR STEFANIUK: Regardless, Mr. Chairman, if we have another card, it's another monthly account to process on behalf of a potential 79 members. Our accounting facility is presently so overburdened that we can no longer manually handle the accounting facility. I am forced this week to meet with Data Centre personnel, with a view to mechanization of our accounting.

facility. We now have constituency offices which have been laid upon us -- entirely new, but we have to keep an entirely separate record for each and every constituency office. We have to issue a rent cheque, a salary cheque to the secretary in that constituency office -- in one instance, at least as many as five because there is one member who has five, and there are other members who have multiple facilities. So we're into a whole new ball game in that particular area. And there have been one or two other things.

Please don't misunderstand me. We will do whatever the members wish. The members have to realize that every new program creates greater administrative responsibility.

MR GOGO: But you've had an increase in staff of two people in the last nine years.

MR STEFANIUK: And if we put one more in, we'll have to suspend them from the ceiling.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're putting a mezzanine in. The burgeoning bureaucracy. Anyway, as I understand it, we can't use a MasterCharge or a Chargex for both gasoline and parking.

MR STEFANIUK: A bank credit card is not acceptable for gasoline purchases.

MR CHAIRMAN: The oil companies won't take them.

MR STEFANIUK: The oil companies will. They're not acceptable for internal audit.

MRS OSTERMAN: Because it doesn't detail what the purchases were.

MR STEFANIUK: You see, we get bills in from members, and they have bought tires and other things that are not provided for. So we have to prepare an invoice and invoice the member back. But unless we have the details that are provided on a charge slip, we do not know whether the purchase was an allowed or a disallowed purchase. And the Auditor General is sure not going to like it if I tell him all I'm going by is a statement.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is this the consensus: we'll enquire as to what AGT and the ministers are doing, and if that doesn't indicate a practical alternative we'll get MasterCharge or Chargex cards?

MR APPLEBY: Well no, because we still run into this problem.

MRS OSTERMAN: Not if it's just used for parking. It would be just a parking card.

MR APPLEBY: We still won't get an invoice back, though.

MR STEFANIUK: No, but I can identify parking charges because they'll simply identify the source, which is an airport.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we enquire as to what the ministers and AGT are doing. If that doesn't indicate a practical alternative, we will then get MasterCharge

or Chargex cards for the members which may be used for parking at airports. If possible, we'll get the word "parking" put on them.

MR GOGO: Could I just add, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the Clerk should talk to the Chief Commissioner of the city of Edmonton. It's probably the level you should be talking to.

MR CHAIRMAN: The only thing is that apart from teaching this guy some manners, even if we solved it at the Municipal Airport, it doesn't help us in Calgary. What I'm suggesting will deal with both places. Isn't that right?

MR GOGO: Even if we couldn't solve the other one, we'd have one.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Just one other thing. While we're at it, should we consider whether there would be other kinds of parking that you would want to cover?

MRS OSTERMAN: No.

MR APPLEBY: I don't think so. Let's not get complicated.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that all right then for the parking?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The next item is item 4 on a taxi stand.

MR PURDY: Can we go back to the dental plan, Mr. Chairman?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right. You've arrived, John. That's item 3(e).

MRS OSTERMAN: While John is getting his papers out, the taxi business is being looked into and is under way, right?

MR CHAIRMAN: You can see the thing under tab 4.

MR APPLEBY: Actually, it's supposed to be run past caucus, isn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: What it boils down to, Mr. Chairman, is that the Assembly does not have jurisdiction over the grounds; that jurisdiction rests with Executive Council. The matter has been investigated, turned over to Executive Council, and my memorandum of January 30 indicates that it has been favorably received and that the intention of the minister and a representative of Executive Council is to take it to caucus. Thereafter, I assume, a stand would simply be established.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is just one thing. We're confining it to Yellow Cab. They're the biggest in town. We haven't gone out to tender or for proposals with specifications as to what kind of service is going to be provided. They can't do anything on the rates because they're set by by-law. I understand that Yellow is already being used by a lot of people in the building, some of

them having accounts there. If we get somebody else in, it just may make it that much less attractive because they wouldn't have this other business to make it worth while to have a stand here.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is it proper to give one company preference?

MR CHAIRMAN: It goes against my grain, especially when it's the biggest one.

MR APPLEBY: It does mine too. I have some difficulty in how it could be put out to tender, though.

MR CHAIRMAN: The only way I could see it going out for tender would be by having a contract whereby they would undertake to have cars available from a certain time to a certain time, and possibly guarantee on the average a maximum waiting time, or something like that.

MRS OSTERMAN: And maybe only one company, being large, would be able to guarantee that. But that's something that obviously we could leave to Government Services.

MR CHAIRMAN: Because you can't get it on the rates.

MR APPLEBY: I think this question will arise, and I don't think we have any solution to offer. No doubt that question will be asked in caucus.

MRS OSTERMAN: They will know what is proper. Government Services has to provide the space and look after it.

MR APPLEBY: It's definitely against the policy of the government. It always has been, for decades. This kind of thing goes to tender.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do we leave it to Government Services?

MR APPLEBY: I guess so.

MR CHAIRMAN: And we can just accept the report. All right.

Now, item number 5. The reply from Mr. Sindlinger is that he just simply hasn't got enough money. We have approved \$17,000 and he says he needs \$25,000.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That's for research?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, a decision has been made on this, and it was based on the salaries that are being paid. I don't feel that we should change that decision.

MR CHAIRMAN: He wants to appear before the committee.

MR APPLEBY: He did appear before the committee.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is December 15; we had our last meeting on December 2. I didn't invite him; I want your wishes on it.

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, is this the special warrant that he is concerned about?

MR CHAIRMAN: The special warrant has already gone through. We'd have to ask for a supplementary one.

MRS OSTERMAN: This was the amount budgeted for the next fiscal year.

MR GOGO: Speaking to procedural matters, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned that the Member for Calgary Buffalo wants to appear before the committee. As a member of the Assembly . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: We should hear him.

MR GOGO: . . . he can certainly attend the committee. The procedure question I have is, if he is wise he would prepare everything in detail and we would have it before us some time -- if he's wise -- before he would show up. I strongly feel that this committee should never deal with any matter that has financial obligations of any magnitude or any change in principle without the equivalent of a notice of motion. I don't know that I would be prepared to sit down and reverse -- because essentially we'd be reversing a decision we've already made. I understand the special warrant has now gone through. I'm not saying that sober, second thought is not a good thing. If we think he needs more, that's another matter. I guess it's really procedure that I was referring to.

MR CHAIRMAN: I agree with you, John, but we have a notice there in that letter of December 15. He says, I can't get a researcher for that amount of money.

MR GOGO: What was the date of the special warrant? It seems to me it was January 12.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think it went through a couple of weeks ago. That's this year.

MR PURDY: You mean up to March 31?

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR MANDEVILLE: Did we not approve \$40-some thousand?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't have those figures in front of me. I think what he is in fact asking for is a reconsideration of the amount that was provided for research facilities.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Wasn't our information that that's what basically we're paying researchers?

MR APPLEBY: Is this increase he is asking for specified just to pay the researcher? I noticed yesterday he had quite a comprehensive advertisement in the *Edmonton Journal*, asking for representations to be made to him by the public in his capacity on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I wonder if this is what he is calling research.

MR CHAIRMAN: We've really never gone into the government or the opposition and enquired what they're doing with researchers.

MR APPLEBY: No, but I mean to say that if he expects to cover these kinds of expenses, I wonder if this is what he's asking for. We made an allocation and he finds that that is inadequate. It's up to him to decide how he wants to disburse it. He has been given a full-time researcher compared to what I think the -- and I know what the government pays for salary, and I believe it is comparable to what Fred's opposition group pays too. For one person. In government we have seven of them to spread out among 44 members. So I think he's not doing too badly in that respect.

MR CHAIRMAN: As far as bodies are concerned. But of course he alleges that he can't get one body, you see. The memo says: I've been attempting to engage a researcher on a full-time basis; however, I've found the budget allocation for this purpose and for the researcher's travel is inadequate. I respectfully request an opportunity to appear.

MR APPLEBY: I don't know where this travel comes into the picture at all.

MR GOGO: Speaking to the request, Mr. Chairman, I guess that's where I'm confused. He's requesting permission to appear before this committee. I don't know as you need that permission. I'm not against his sitting here making the arguments. I think we're on different wavelengths here. I hear Frank say, why can't he hire for that amount of money, and so on. Here his request is to appear before us, to present a case.

MR MANDEVILLE: We really don't know what the case is or what he's wanting.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you wish, we could certainly ask him to come to the next meeting and to bring figures; for example, such as what amount of travel he intends to provide for. As far as I know, the caucuses don't provide travel for researchers, do they?

MRS OSTERMAN: No.

MR APPLEBY: A very nominal amount.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we could get particulars of what is here.

MR MANDEVILLE: I shouldn't say because I'm not sure, but I know they can't advertise in the paper with that. I think possibly they do have a travel allowance, do they not?

MR STEFANIUK: The caucuses have X number of dollars allocated to them for research. How they spend it is entirely the affair of the given caucus. They may hire staff, they may contract research from the private sector, they may have their research staff travel -- that happens in the Official Opposition caucus -- and the funds for such travel are taken out of the research budget.

MRS OSTERMAN: And there is a travel item listed on budget. I suppose that would be used however the member sees fit to use it for his permanent employees.

MR MANDEVILLE: We did allocate some money in that area.

MR STEFANIUK: There is a travel item called Public Service and Non-Public Service, which covers the member and his or her employees. It's really left up to the member or the caucus discretion.

MR CHAIRMAN: As a member, I suppose he has the right to be heard.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like the member to detail what it is he feels should be looked at by this committee, and I would like to have that information ahead of time. If that information is no different from what we had originally -- if something new is brought to light that we've never considered, that is altogether different. Otherwise I am not prepared to wheel-spin and go over a budget again. That budget is completely in line with the budget of other members of the Assembly -- in fact, much more generous. I can say that I don't have enough to look after my cost of living, but it depends on where and how I live. I suppose you could say that about somebody you want to hire. I know people have crossed our paths that we'd love to have working for us, but we have a budget to keep within.

MR CHAIRMAN: So is it agreed that I'll ask Mr. Sindlinger to provide details and to come, if he wishes, to the next meeting to discuss those details?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: But we want the details in advance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Quite.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The next is contracts used by caucuses. I think I can deal with that fairly briefly. We ran into a problem there. What has been going on is that contracts have been given out. I don't know whether it's confined to opposition members or caucuses, or whether it's being done in the government caucus as well. We tried to get a researcher who had been dismissed by the Social Credit opposition to work for this constitution committee, and we found that he had been paid or awarded three months' pay in lieu of notice, and he refused to work for us unless he got double pay in effect. We checked it with the Auditor General and were told that that couldn't be done because he would be getting two pays from public funds at the same time. So he isn't coming because he can go in the private sector.

MR GOGO: Who advised us of that?

MR CHAIRMAN: The Auditor General. We asked the Auditor General because we really wanted him.

MR GOGO: That's not applicable to Mr. Pitfield, we know that. But it's obviously applicable to other people.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's a point well made, John.

MR CHAIRMAN: We got the opinion of the Auditor General, and he said we could not pay this fellow a salary during those three months for which he got pay in lieu of notice. That raised a question of what kind of contracts are going out from caucuses. Since this money comes out of Legislative Assembly appropriations, it seems to me we have to know what kind of legal obligations are being undertaken in those contracts. Otherwise we could be stuck for money which wasn't budgeted. If a caucus makes a contract and that contract can result in a contractual obligation which costs more than what was budgeted for that particular purpose, we may be legally stuck with having to pay it, but it still may be beyond budget.

So we've asked the Law Clerk to look into a standard form of contract. The services of course won't be standard, because people perform different services. It may be a short-term contract. He is now in the course of drafting a standard form of contract which we are going to ask the caucuses to use, and it will be subject to the approval of the Clerk and the Law Clerk. If a question arises as to whether this contract may involve us in liability beyond what we've budgeted for, then of course we'll discuss it before the contract takes effect.

MR PURDY: I'm surprised we didn't have those controls before.

MR CHAIRMAN: There hasn't been any problem before.

MR STEFANIUK: I think what members should be aware of is that we monitor the expenditures of each caucus on a monthly basis. There had been one instance where a caucus had, in a previous year, overspent its allocation, or had spent its allocation two months before the budget year concluded. As a result of that expenditure we went to that caucus and said, you have no more money; your choice is to deposit adequate moneys from your party in the general account in order that these expenses can be covered, or release certain of your staff for the next two months.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't know how we could get in a position to be over budget, because the caucus would have to take responsibility.

MR CHAIRMAN: You see, what's happening is that these people are being engaged without our scrutiny. We did it directly in the case of the members' offices, both the leases and the terms of engagement of staff are being scrutinized. But research staff was not being scrutinized, and we ran into this problem. Then I thought, damn, you know, there's a contract we never had a look at.

MR APPLEBY: But it has to be dealt with in that manner, does it not? They, whoever it is -- our caucus or any other -- have a budget for research personnel, and you have to fit your people into that budget. If you don't you run into what Bohdan has just said. You get told there's no more money.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's true. But that person being in a sense an employee of the Legislative Assembly, although allocated to a certain caucus and chosen by that caucus, could have a claim. In the case Bohdan explained, for example, if that person whose salary was overdrawing the budget had been summarily dismissed, there could have been an action for wrongful dismissal or pay in lieu in notice, and that would put us over the budget.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR APPLEBY: But the caution has to come before you run over the budget, so he can be dismissed with that time of termination.

MR CHAIRMAN: With respect, I think the caution has to come before that. I think it has to come at the time of engagement.

MR GOGO: So we're awaiting word from the Law Clerk.

MR CHAIRMAN: For a standard form of contract.

MRS OSTERMAN: That will prevent anything like that.

MR CHAIRMAN: That will prevent the problem, and we'll put it on the same footing as we do the services the members get in their offices.

MR MANDEVILLE: We should have a standard contract.

MR CHAIRMAN: So is that agreed, that we'll adopt a standard form of contract for use in engaging research staff under the estimates of the Legislative Assembly?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR APPLEBY: We'll have a chance to look at it before we approve it?

MR CHAIRMAN: If you like, sure. I think it should be circulated to all four caucuses.

Item 7: office space for Independent member. I think that is pretty well in hand. The Clerk has worked out a possible arrangement and if the Independent member accepts that, then for the time being the heat is off, except for one thing.

MR STEFANIUK: There is a memo on my desk this morning accepting it, Mr. Chairman.

MR PURDY: Where is he going to be?

MR STEFANIUK: Subdivide the secretarial area and rent remote space for other staff.

MR CHAIRMAN: His research staff will have to be outside the building. The secretary will be in the building, but separate from his office, which is not the case at the moment.

The picture and the montage for the 19th Assembly: the House is opening on April 2. What is your wish? Do you want to make a further attempt at having a group photo taken on the front steps, or do you want us to go for a montage?

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, when you say the House is opening on April 2, what does that mean for the previous session?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR APPLEBY: I was thinking maybe we could take the picture then.

MR CHAIRMAN: I have an opinion from the Law Clerk which says that the House need not be in session to be prorogued. In other words, the Crown can say to the members: twiddle-dee-dee, don't come back; you're through.

MR APPLEBY: That's fine. I just thought if we were going to have to meet for that purpose, the picture could be taken then.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's up to the government. If they decide the House should be called, I'll send the notices out and we'll be called for meeting before the official opening. Then presumably we'd have a prorogation at that time.

But what is your wish generally?

MRS OSTERMAN: What kind of picture do we normally have?

MR CHAIRMAN: The last two have been montages, the Assembly that started in '71 and '75. Prior to that, most of them, as you can see, have been group photographs. The thing is that the larger an Assembly gets, the more difficult it is to get everybody there.

MR APPLEBY: And to identify them too.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's true too.

MR STEFANIUK: I thought I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be possible now to take the photograph on the front steps because a structure has been moved in in close proximity to the steps and would not allow a photographer to back up sufficiently any longer. If any steps were to be used, it would have to be the steps at the west entrance.

MR CHAIRMAN: What we want to avoid above all is to have this thing delayed. We've had problems in the past trying to get photographs. We had to chase the Chief Justice for I don't know how many months before we got his photograph to put on.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's only one person.

MR CHAIRMAN: I know, but that's all it takes to hold the whole thing up.

MRS OSTERMAN: I know. That's what I mean.

MR CHAIRMAN: And in the first one, we had two deceased members.

MR GOGO: Just make the decision, and that's the day you hand out pay cheques. You're guaranteed everybody is going to be there.

MR CHAIRMAN: So we hold a pay parade and a group photograph at the same time. The wealthy members wouldn't show up.

MR GOGO: Your question really was the opening day.

MR CHAIRMAN: The opening day or the day after, before people start to find other things to do.

MR PURDY: I think it should be the day after.

MR CHAIRMAN: You've heard what the Clerk said. I think the first decision that has to be made is whether you're going to have a group photograph or not. If we are, we're going to have to consider that structure there.

MR PURDY: We can do it at the west end.

MRS OSTERMAN: My opinion is that a photograph of 70-some people ain't all that hot.

MR PURDY: It would be more like 90 people.

MR APPLEBY: Officers of the Assembly.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes. I'd prefer to see . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Another montage?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then I suggest we start now to collect the photographs.

*The recording terminated at 9:35 a.m. and recommenced at 9:50 a.m.*

MRS OSTERMAN: . . . actual salary. It's their actual salary.

MR APPLEBY: It's a substantive increase in salary.

MR PURDY: Is it above the eight and a half to eleven?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: I certainly wasn't aware that we were exceeding norms, because I would have had misgivings about it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, we are.

MR APPLEBY: By 33 per cent or something.

MR PURDY: For the interns?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Gee. I wasn't aware of that until this moment. I'm certainly going to look at that again.

MR GOGO: \$7,500 to \$10,000 is 33 1/3 per cent.

MR PURDY: But that was to include one extra person. We went to a special warrant last year to pick up the eighth intern.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm not going to argue that point, Bill. All I'm saying is that Treasury has said that the increase in salary, not in total, is beyond the norm. That's been questioned, and I think rightly so. Again, I don't feel

that this committee is the place to look at the amounts paid, and so on. I think that question can be properly dealt with just like the reclassification.

MR CHAIRMAN: Here are our estimates. We're paying them \$1,100 right now, and this committee agreed to raise it to \$1,200. That's less than 10 per cent.

MR APPLEBY: I wonder if they looked at numbers of personnel there when they questioned that. There is an increase of one.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would suggest that if there is an interpretation to be done, our staff and Treasury can look at that.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is no question of interpretation. It's as plain as it is written.

MRS OSTERMAN: No, they have different figures, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is what we sent them. I don't know where they got their different figures.

MRS OSTERMAN: Then I would suggest it be discussed.

MR GOGO: Well, the total is substantially different because of the increase.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's obviously what it is.

MR APPLEBY: I think it's the extra person.

MR PURDY: They didn't appreciate the special warrant of 1980-81 to compensate for the one.

MRS OSTERMAN: They haven't understood that, because I did say that we do have an extra person. But they obviously haven't taken that into consideration. So I'm sure that an explanation is all that's necessary.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that only covers part of it. First of all there is the question of principle.

MRS OSTERMAN: Which is?

MR CHAIRMAN: Which is whether the estimates as approved by this committee are going to be subject to amendment by government. If this committee wants it that way, then that's fine.

MR APPLEBY: I think it's a matter there of communication. That should be a query on their part.

MR CHAIRMAN: We went through these committees. I wasn't aware of any guidelines. I don't know if any of you were; I don't sit in government caucus.

MR APPLEBY: But you read the newspapers.

MR CHAIRMAN: I admit that sometimes I find things out from the newspapers before I find them out as a MLA, but I can't say it happens often . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Like when the session is going to be called.

MR CHAIRMAN: . . . and I'm not complaining.

MR APPLEBY: No, but there were guidelines.

MR PURDY: But not when we were discussing budget items, Frank. They were announced in December and we were doing this in October or November.

MRS OSTERMAN: There should be some collaboration.

MR APPLEBY: I think it can be explained quite easily.

MR CHAIRMAN: What is your wish? Anybody want to make a motion?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, there has to be consultation in terms of fiscal responsibility ahead of time. I would agree that once we do our estimates they shouldn't be redone by anybody. But when there are some things that are not clear, I think that if we're going to go above other staff -- and obviously there is a misunderstanding there -- and we can't come to an agreement as to the nature of those kinds of increases, I believe we could use Bill Mack's committee in the same manner, and there should be no problem with that. I think we have to have some accountability in that regard. I don't think we have all the expertise on this committee.

MR GOGO: I need some clarification, Mr. Chairman. As I understand the budgetary process, we as a committee submit a proposed budget and, because we're funded from the public purse, observe that budget. They flag what they would deem to be unusual increases, called variances. Then members of this committee or the minister responsible for this committee appear before a priorities committee of cabinet to justify, and there it is thrashed out. What I hear you saying is that that's probably not the right way to go and that any change that's instituted, I suggest, only comes about as a result of a representation by this committee to priorities committee. I have a little difficulty accepting the statement that arbitrarily it has changed. Maybe I'm off base, but that's my experience with a department of government. That's the procedure I follow, and I understood that was standard procedure.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm ready for a motion or whatever you want to do with it.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I don't think it's needed. I can remember sitting on the committee when that was -- I think a motion was made then, that our budget not be interfered with. But I think they should have every right to question something. If this had been as they interpreted it to be, I think that we should be questioned on it.

MR CHAIRMAN: But it isn't only that. There are other items; I don't recall at the moment what they are.

MR STEFANIUK: All items dealing with spouses' travel on CPA functions were deferred, Mr. Chairman.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm sorry, I should clarify that.

AN HON MEMBER: That was a caucus decision.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes. That was raised briefly again, and some members had comments about the number of times, what it involved -- from where to where, and so on. That also has to be discussed.

MR PURDY: Is that CPA or the special six trips?

MRS OSTERMAN: Those are the six trips.

MR STEFANIUK: Well, all spouses' travel, to the best of my knowledge, was deferred, whether it be CPA or the six trips to the capital.

MR APPLEBY: It's nothing to do with CPA as far as I know.

MR GOGO: My understanding is that members of the Assembly travelling with spouses, the Provincial Treasurer would like this committee to come forward with a recommendation as a result of a discussion with our caucus. We'll have that discussion on February 12. And if we get around to setting the next meeting, we'll have that covering those two points: Alberta health care premiums of \$7,000 and spouses' travel allowance of \$26,000.

Mr. Chairman, I know we're dealing with a particular matter. I think the meeting was scheduled 8 to 10. One of our members must go to cabinet. I had wanted to raise, in just 10 seconds, a point.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we dispose of this other thing? Do you want to have a motion rescinding our estimates and approving them in such form as is approved by the priorities committee, and then we're out of it?

MRS OSTERMAN: No. I think we should do our negotiating after we've had our meeting and more input from our members right after February 12.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would suggest a motion, then, that you appoint a member of the committee to do the negotiating.

MR PURDY: Negotiating with whom?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR APPLEBY: Can I just move that the matter be tabled to the next meeting?

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. Are you all agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I've had various representation made to me as a member of this committee with regard to gasoline credit cards. When they were instituted in 1975, automobiles cost about \$7,000; now they're \$12,000 or something. With regard to tires, batteries, that kind of thing, and people are saying it's becoming very expensive. Could we not consider changes in the use of the gasoline credit cards -- and I put it on the table for consideration at the next meeting -- to include such things as flat tires, for

example, which are not covered. I would like to see us look very closely at the costs that the members are incurring, not from the gasoline and oil point of view but from tires, repairs, those kinds of things; and have that discussed at the next meeting, if that's in order.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think it would be an excellent thing to do, but I think we should learn our lesson. Take it to the government caucus, and when you've decided, then you can decide in this committee.

MRS OSTERMAN: We should find out how many members feel that way.

MR GOGO: Well, if this committee doesn't want to discuss it -- I didn't want to raise it with the government caucus.

MR APPLEBY: Let's go the other way around for the change.

MR CHAIRMAN: What would be the good of it, John?

MR GOGO: I'm just saying that if the committee would agree that we should pursue it, then I would automatically, with my colleagues, take it into caucus.

MRS OSTERMAN: I've heard some comments in that regard too, and I think it could be raised. Fred, how do you feel?

MR MANDEVILLE: I would certainly discuss it with our people. I just don't know how you would control it.

MR CHAIRMAN: So can we say it was agreed that the members would review with their caucuses the possibility of extending the gasoline and oil credit card to tire repairs and possible replacement? Is that what you have in mind? Is that agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR PURDY: What about John's dental plan? Do we have any information on that?

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh yes. John, we put that aside because of your not being here.

MR GOGO: I think it has all been concluded, and all members are now automatically included under one part; it's automatic. Part two is the optional program. To my knowledge each member received an indication that if he returns that to the Clerk . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: The way the thing was left, I was told to ask the members. I had discussed it with one of the ministers -- I think it was Greg Stevens. He provided me with copies. I sent the copies out to the members on January 12, asking for comments or replies. But if it's not going to be done on a per-member basis, if it's going to be done on a caucus basis, then of course this should be disregarded.

MR GOGO: My understanding is that it has been done. The fact that you mailed it out -- whether members indicate or not, they are automatically included under the one part. The optional side that requires the premium . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Who mailed anything out?

MR CHAIRMAN: I didn't get anything.

MR STEFANIUK: My office didn't mail anything out.

MR CHAIRMAN: John, I think the answer is here. Greg Stevens called me about this, and he said he had a plan worked out with two options and should I send it to the members or should he? I believe I answered that since it had come up in Members' Services Committee, probably I should send it to the members. So on January 12, I got enough copies from Greg Stevens and sent them out to all members. Then we wanted to know about your choice of options. But I've only got answers from three members.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not sure I even know about that, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure you do either. I went out of town and I left word that when the stuff comes in from Greg Stevens, send it out to the members, and that's the way it went.

MR PURDY: I didn't fill it in because I don't know what to do with it yet. Has it been accepted by our caucus, and has it been accepted through priorities for budgetary item for 1981-82?

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to table it?

MR APPLEBY: It has been accepted by our caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: Agreed that it be tabled?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR PURDY: What do we do with it after the tabling?

MR APPLEBY: We should table it until the next meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, there is the question of exemptions from the bargaining unit for Legislative Assembly staff. That's a fairly sensitive topic. We discussed that once before when we had a visitor here in the person of Grant Notley, and it was his very strongly held view that people should not be exempted without being consulted as to whether or not they want to belong to AUPE. So far, as I understand from the Clerk, the exemptions have been made on an individual basis, to individuals, not on a job basis. That's a bit of a nuisance, apart from anything else. What we're wondering about is getting it done on a job basis so that these positions are . . . Because there is a turnover. That means that every darn time you have a change in position, you have to go back for another exemption.

MR PURDY: In something that sensitive, I would like to see a legal opinion from the Law Clerk and from Greg Stevens.

MR STEFANIUK: We have one from the Law Clerk, Mr. Chairman. The Law Clerk has recommended that it be recommended to the Minister responsible for Personnel

that the Act be amended, in order to reflect an exemption of a position rather than exemption of an incumbent.

MR CHAIRMAN: Because without that, the legal position, as I understand it, is that they are members of the union. So it takes an amendment to the legislation.

MR PURDY: Well, it should be referred to the minister then.

MR APPLEBY: Did the Law Clerk refer this to the minister?

MR STEFANIUK: The Law Clerk has recommended it to me, that the minister be approached with a recommendation that he seek amendment of the Act in that respect. What it boils down to very simply, Frank, is that if you have a Clerk III in your office who is acting as a receptionist, every time we bring in someone to fill that position we must go through the exemption procedure on the grounds that that individual is exposed to confidential information. On the other hand, if the position were exempted, then whoever we hire for that at whatever time would automatically be excluded. But the difficulty lies in the existing legislation.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I move that this committee request the minister to look at it.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm just told that in the federal government, it's the positions that are exempted, not the persons. It seems an awkward way of doing it. I don't know how sensitive you think this is. I'm wondering whether you want to make a recommendation that there be an amendment; in that event, we'll pass it on to the minister.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not too sure I follow. You say you think it's awkward to have the position exempted?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, no, no. It is awkward to have the name -- that's what we're trying to get around. I must have said it the wrong way.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I move that this committee recommend that the minister look at the appropriate amendment.

MR CHAIRMAN: Obtain an appropriate amendment to exempt positions rather than persons?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Yes.

MR PURDY: Just the Legislative Assembly staff.

MR CHAIRMAN: Of course.

MR STEFANIUK: It affects us, but it also affects departments of government a great deal. For that reason we tend to think that the minister may be sympathetic. Certain departments of government go through this same hassle.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? Motion by Mr. Wolstenholme.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The telephones.

MR STEFANIUK: I have the results of the survey, Mr. Chairman. That was with the installation of automatic answering equipment. You recall that we brought before this committee information relative to equipment that was available at a discounted price at a certain time, and we were instructed to determine from members whether or not they wished such equipment installed. The circular letter distributed to all members, we have had 66 responses: 50 wish the equipment installed if it becomes available, and 16 do not.

The question now would be whether this committee would in fact consider approval of an application for a special warrant, in order that the equipment could be purchased in the current fiscal year.

MR APPLEBY: What would be the amount?

MR STEFANIUK: We don't know. We have to go back now and renegotiate because the sale has ended. But it was the feeling of this committee at the time when we were directed to conduct the survey that we would be in a favorable position to negotiate a discounted price in light of a quantity purchase. So the results of the survey are now being tabled for the committee's consideration.

MR GOGO: That's about 25 per cent.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: So what you require now is a motion.

MR STEFANIUK: To tell me to negotiate a favorable price for the equipment and, secondly, to proceed with a special warrant application to incur the expenditure in the current fiscal year. You recall it started out being placed in the '81-82 budget, and this committee asked that that item be deleted from the budget and preferred to have it handled within the current fiscal year.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I'll so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: The motion is?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That Bo negotiate a price and request a special warrant.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to negotiate a price, or tenders?

MR APPLEBY: Well, this was a special deal.

MR STEFANIUK: We would be obliged to go for at least a form of tender to satisfy the Auditor General that we had some price comparisons.

MR APPLEBY: Some bids.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR GOGO: Would this be on the basis of 50?

MR STEFANIUK: We require 50 at the moment, it would appear. I would think we would leave our options open to purchase additional units at the same price.

MR PURDY: I'm just trying to recall now, from prior meetings. It would then appear that some of these will be going into private residences instead of constituency offices.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes. The entitlement was to have one within the constituency, without direction as to its placement.

MR CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Carried.

MR STEFANIUK: May I have one further question in this connection clarified, Mr. Chairman. Some members have gone ahead and purchased equipment personally, and they have now enquired as to whether or not they can be reimbursed for the purchase cost of such equipment if this program goes into effect. May I have the guidance of the committee in that regard.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are they included in the 55, or whatever number?

MR STEFANIUK: We don't know.

MR APPLEBY: In effect we would be buying it from them, wouldn't we? I would think they could be reimbursed to the amount we pay for these sets.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but they couldn't still own the equipment.

MR STEFANIUK: The equipment would become the property of the Legislative Assembly and would become a fixed asset of the Assembly, subject to inventory control and so on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you like to approve it subject to coming to terms on prices and so on? If they've got some Cadillac models that are far beyond the quotes that we might be getting from various people . . .

MR GOGO: That's Frank's point -- up to that limit.

MR PURDY: I have some concerns because of The Legislative Assembly Act. I don't know how we could enter into negotiation with a member to purchase something from him as an asset for the government. The second thing is that he is then liable for income tax on that reimbursement.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's a capital item though, isn't it?

MR PURDY: No it's not. Try to argue that with the federal government and see what happens.

MR APPLEBY: The option there would be for him to dispose of that and take this one.

MR PURDY: That's right. I think he has to look at his contractual agreement with AGT or Motorola, or whoever it is, and get out of that by themselves.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I suppose if the members who have purchased them have purchased them very recently on a given assumption, we would look at it differently than a member who purchased it three years ago and would like to now turn it over to the government.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we make an exception in those cases? Instead of buying them all in one month centrally, we tell those members to turn theirs back and we'll buy them from the people they've bought them from.

MR APPLEBY: I think they can dispose of them.

MR CHAIRMAN: They're going to take a beating.

MR PURDY: Some of them may have bought them from Eaton's or something like that. Some may have bought them from Motorola on a contractual basis or a rental/purchase basis, which would be no problem getting out from under. But if they spent \$600 through Eaton's, I think they're stuck with a \$600 item.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want us to discuss it with the Auditor General?

MR APPLEBY: It would be hard to come up with a recommendation at this point as to what can be done. The Legislative Assembly Act -- we're going to have to talk to Mike Clegg on it maybe.

MR GOGO: Perhaps that's the answer then.

MR APPLEBY: Do you have any ideas about that?

MR STEFANIUK: I know that there is perhaps something of a precedent in this area. When constituency offices were established, and prior to an arrangement having been made to furnish those office, one member went out and purchased all his furnishings and in effect asked us to reimburse him. We indicated that we could not because we had a special arrangement which would incur no cost to the Assembly. He then turned to the Department of Government Services and, to the best of my knowledge, the department purchased his furniture from him. Perhaps there is some parallel in that arrangement.

But I would think that we should get a legal opinion and check with the Auditor General as well as to the propriety of such a transaction.

MR CHAIRMAN: And see whether that precedent you mentioned can safely be followed.

MR APPLEBY: Shall we proceed on that basis?

MR STEFANIUK: And report back to this committee?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Where does that leave us with regard to the purchase of the main number?

MR APPLEBY: We have a motion on that.

MR CHAIRMAN: We proceed with that? No change to that.

MR APPLEBY: The amount of the special warrant will be affected by this other.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's the thing.

MR APPLEBY: But they can still negotiate the price.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: There aren't that many anyway, are there?

MR STEFANIUK: Who have purchased? I really don't know. I would suspect it's no more than a half dozen.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That shouldn't appreciably affect the warrant.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would affect the number of machines we buy, George.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: You would want a few extra on hand, wouldn't you? You wouldn't just buy the 50.

MR STEFANIUK: We have to consider what we have in the works in the way of new constituency offices being established, what sort of word we have. Since the legislation was amended, in the fall sittings, we have seen a growth in the numbers of constituency offices.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to leave to the discretion of the Clerk the amount of the special warrant, depending on the number of machines it appears advisable or necessary to buy?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That was kind of my intention in the motion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Health care coverage: is there anything we need to say about that?

MR STEFANIUK: We still have a dispute raging with the Controller in the Treasury Department in that regard.

MR GOGO: The Provincial Treasurer's memo to the Speaker dated February 2 I think is pretty clear, that the \$7,000 for health care premiums for next year's budget will depend on a decision in the government caucus for the government members' side, and that's the 12th.

MR STEFANIUK: That's another deferred item. What we have is a dispute raging with regard to the funds that were budgeted for the current fiscal year. The plan has never been put into effect because, according to Treasury, we placed the estimate in what they consider an inappropriate code. We think that's frankly a pile of hogwash. If you have it in what they consider an inappropriate code, you transfer the funds and carry on with the program. They're refusing to allow us to transfer. In any event, we believe we placed it in the proper code, because it is a taxable benefit to the members, that portion which is contributed out of public funds, and we believe we have it in the proper location for that. The Law Clerk has had this under correspondence

with the Treasury's Controller and has been urging him to provide an answer, which has been overdue for something in extent of a month.

SECRETARY: They lost the attachments we sent in the last month.

MR STEFANIUK: Treasury loses everything.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Common sense sometimes too.

MR STEFANIUK: I signed documents yesterday which had been clearly stamped that Legislative Assembly is exempted from the need for special approval as a result of a Treasury Board minute. They sent them back saying, where is your approval? We had to write back again and say, look at the rubber stamp, Charlie. But it's this kind of idiotic procedure that we put up with on a daily basis.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: My comment still stands.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there anything we need to do about this? Anything we can do?

MR STEFANIUK: We still have the fight under way. Insofar as next year's budget is concerned, that's up for consideration by government caucus. I think that comes in by way of report, and that's all.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other business?

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I detected in the January pay cheque a difference from the December pay cheque, so I assume that . . .

MR STEFANIUK: You got your increase.

MR GOGO: Yes. I don't know what it is, and I anticipate members are going to ask me what it is all about.

MR STEFANIUK: Five per cent. It's in the legislation.

MR GOGO: The point I want to raise is that in situations like that, perhaps a memo to the Members of the Legislative Assembly . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Explaining the difference?

MR APPLEBY: They should be aware of it. They shouldn't have to have it.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's in the law.

MR GOGO: I don't argue with that at all.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: You're lucky you got yours. I haven't got mine yet.

MR GOGO: I just assumed everybody is like me: they don't always read the Act. Is it 5 per cent?

MR STEFANIUK: Five per cent, provided for by statute.

MR GOGO: And the cost of living is 10.

MR STEFANIUK: We have no choice. We're governed by statute, and we have to pay the money. The percentage is clearly specified. As long as the cost of living has gone up by a given percentage, we are obliged to make a 5 per cent adjustment.

MR GOGO: The CPI you mean?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes. It's spelled out in the Act, John.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: You fellows are lucky you've got yours. I haven't got mine yet.

MR STEFANIUK: Your January pay cheque, George?

MR PURDY: I haven't got mine either.

MR STEFANIUK: Payday was January 29, so they would have gone in the mail -- today is February 3. The government of Canada isn't exactly moving things in a real hurry.

MR CHAIRMAN: This last item, on health care, has been reported on, and it's in abeyance I take it, subject to a decision by the government caucus, or consideration by the government caucus and the priorities committee. Is that right?

MR GOGO: For '81-82. I couldn't help but think, Mr. Chairman, that the decision of the caucuses would be binding on whoever. So my question to Bo, then, is: with the approval or request by Mr. Hyndman, if it's forthcoming -- and presumably would be made on the 12th -- that would be applicable to the '81-82 budget. Would it also be applicable retroactive to '80-81? We've budgeted the dollars, so clearly it would be applicable for '80-81.

MR CHAIRMAN: So is this the decision? The question of the application of the currently budgeted item, 1980-81, with regard to health care, and the question of the inclusion of such an item in the 1981-82 estimates, are left in abeyance subject to consideration by the government caucus and the priorities committee. Is that it?

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, you gave out a memo from the Provincial Treasurer to you, and I quote from it: [inaudible] the point you properly raise and move these matters along, I will simply include the \$26,000 for trips and \$7,000 for health care premiums, '81-82 budget, on the assumption that Members' Services Committee will persuade the caucus on these points at the February meeting of the government caucus. So I guess the only concern I have would be Mr. Mandeville's caucus in approving this. The Provincial Treasurer says "on the assumption that . . ." and so on. He has already included his figures, and what he is looking for is a ratification by the caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could I then suggest that the matter be left in abeyance until the caucuses communicate with the Provincial Treasurer after reaching their decisions?

MR GOGO: I think the caucuses should work through this committee.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're just a rubber stamp.

MR GOGO: Sometimes they're important.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, would you like to make a motion then?

MR GOGO: I don't know that a motion is even required. It's already in our budget. The Provincial Treasurer has indicated in his letter to you yesterday that he has included it in the estimates, on the assumption that the caucuses will approve it. I don't know that anything else has to be done. The '80-81 is still outstanding, as the Clerk reports, subject to Treasury, budget bureau, or somebody in that system saying you don't really have authority to do it. Surely the Provincial Treasurer, judging by his memo . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Treasury came back to us and said, you don't have the authority to expend moneys for Alberta health care coverage for members and, furthermore, even if you had, you have placed it in the wrong slot. We went back to Treasury and in effect said, what the hell are you talking about; the Legislative Assembly approved this money, and who are you to dispute a decision of the House, and furthermore we don't think the slot is an excuse for not implementing the program because we can transfer the funds, but we believe none the less that we have put it in the right slot.

MR CHAIRMAN: The thing is, we're at an impasse. The money is not being provided; it's not being spent. We're at an impasse. So I'm waiting for a motion.

MR GOGO: Well, I don't know that a motion is in order.

MR APPLEBY: You can't make a motion without direction.

MR GOGO: This committee at one time did pass that motion.

MR APPLEBY: Once again we're into that same predicament of getting a feeling from caucus before we brought it here.

MR GOGO: Frank, my point is that that matter is clarified in the Treasurer's memo to the Speaker, saying that on the assumption that members can persuade their caucus colleagues to approve it, he has included. Until our caucus approves, I think it rests. I don't even know that it necessarily has to be on the next agenda. We as a committee have approved it. The Treasurer said he has included it provided we can convince the caucus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I need guidance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Frankly, even if what you say works, it only covers part of it. It doesn't cover the impasse with regard to the current year.

MR GOGO: I thought I had the opinion that it did.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, they refused to take our opinion, or the opinion of the House is what it amounts to; it's in the estimates approved by the House.

MR APPLEBY: We'd better table that one too till the next meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other business?

MR GOGO: The date of the next meeting, Mr. Chairman. We have two or three major decisions before our caucus affecting this committee and its responsibilities providing services to members. Perhaps we should try to arrange for a meeting as soon as possible.

MR CHAIRMAN: The thing is, it is no use for us to meet unless it's dealt with. There are members on this committee who can remember a time when we had a lot of trouble getting attendance, in fact getting a quorum, because the members decided the committee really wasn't serving much of a useful function. Time and again we had items for referral to caucuses, and we didn't get answers because the caucuses are darn busy -- that's the long and short of it -- and Members' Services items often were not reached.

So my suggestion would be that it would be a practical matter to call the next meeting after we know the caucus decisions have been made on these various outstanding points. Otherwise we just have another exercise in frustration.

MR GOGO: Couldn't we work it the other way: couldn't we set the meeting and cancel it?

MR CHAIRMAN: No.

MR APPLEBY: I think you have to communicate after caucus. Probably Connie has to communicate with the Chairman that we're ready to go on these items. Then they can set a date.

MR CHAIRMAN: I really question how useful it is to have a meeting in those circumstances. We'll have a motion and we're going to say, the government caucus has decided so and so, or the opposition caucus, or both: be it resolved that we pass those decisions onto the Treasury office.

MR APPLEBY: I think all of us as members are at fault here in that we have raised certain things that we think would be beneficial or worth while, but we haven't cleared those with our caucuses before we raised them here, and this is where we've been wrong.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, gee, I can't say that that was that heinous.

MR MANDEVILLE: It seems to me when this topic first came up, that was what we were supposed to do. I know I failed to do it. I was supposed to go back to my caucus and get the approval from the caucus when we first discussed it. That would be four meetings ago; it was in session I think. And I failed to get the approval of my caucus on it until yesterday, verbally.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, to be practical about it, how do we ensure that this doesn't happen in the future? We're all human, and I'd be the last guy who would have any right to point a finger at somebody about forgetting something. Supposing we do this. Supposing when the Clerk and I encounter things that should be considered by this committee, we send a memo out to the members of this committee and say we think the committee should deal with this; do you

wish to consult your caucus about it? If you do, would you do so; if you don't, let us know and we'll put it on the agenda. If you think the caucus should deal with it, we will withhold it from the agenda until you tell us it has been dealt with. Of course, for Fred that means he has to be answerable for his own caucus plus Tom and Grant.

If you want to adopt that practice -- speaking for myself, it's going to avoid a heck of a lot of frustration. Is that the way you'd like to do it? When there are new agenda items, that they be notified to the members of the committee immediately, with a request that they state whether or not they wish to consult with caucuses. If they say no, we'll put them on the agenda; if they say yes, we'll leave them off the agenda until they tells us that they have consulted their caucuses.

MR APPLEBY: I think if a member wishes to raise something or representatives of certain parts of government want to raise something, these should be cleared with their caucuses before they're brought up here and a motion is made.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well of course if you adopt this as a practice and a member says, I want to put airport parking on the agenda, as has happened, we'll say, okay, have you checked it with your caucus? And if he says no, it doesn't go there, unless he says I'm not going to check it with caucus; I want to put it on anyway. Then we're obliged to put it on. Is that all right?

MR APPLEBY: Right.

MR CHAIRMAN: You see, I think what we're getting to, to some extent -- you know, I recognize the validity of caucus consideration fully, a hundred per cent. What I'm concerned about is chairing a committee which runs into this kind of thing. You know, the principle of caucus consultation has been in the committee for a long time; I'm sure it's in most committees in the House. But I would really like to avoid this sort of go-around.

Also what I'm thinking of is this. It seems to me that there are a number of items that could be raised in either caucus, approved by the other caucus and simply notified directly to government. I don't see that this committee would have a function in regard to those items. It would cut down our work and shorten our meetings.

MR APPLEBY: Another factor which George and I were discussing yesterday: we have a section of *Standing Orders* outlining this committee, and we have no guidelines; we never have had.

MR CHAIRMAN: It isn't necessary if we operate like the British constitution, which is unwritten.

MR APPLEBY: Are we happy in operating that way?

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe somebody should draft some guidelines.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I think so. It seems to me we're raising hackles all over the building sometimes. Why butt our heads if we're out of our bailiwick.

MR APPLEBY: I think the function of the committee has to be assessed and is it going to achieve its purpose.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then do you want to have a motion on the agenda according to which the caucuses be consulted for recommendations and for decisions as to the function of this committee?

MR PURDY: We don't need that because it's already in our *Standing Orders* of the Legislative Assembly.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's not. There are no guidelines.

MR PURDY: But in our rules of the Assembly, didn't we make an amendment a long time ago that consideration of select committees of the Assembly go back to caucus for ratification before it was adopted by the committee, or something like that?

MR APPLEBY: I don't recall.

MR GOGO: I think there's a lot of merit, Mr. Chairman, in this table discussing various things and the members saying, well, you know, this looks all right; I want to get confirmation from the caucus. The other way, if you have to wait till you get caucus approval before you can discuss the pros and cons, what would bother me about that is that I learn a lot around this table, and I'm either sold or not sold. Then at my caucus I can address that matter with more knowledge. The difficulty with not addressing it at this table till you get a decision: how in hell are you going to decide something if you can't explain it? My responsibility to my colleagues in caucus is to explain things to them.

The other matter. How often, Frank, has it been raised in caucus: will this contravene The Legislative Assembly Act? If we follow the Speaker's suggestion, then I would suggest Michael Clegg, every time a suggestion comes, there be a special section in that memo saying, either a notwithstanding or something by the Law Clerk of this Assembly that it doesn't contravene something. We haul it off to caucus, we get it postponed twice, we get it back here, and someone says, I want a legal opinion first; then it dies on our agenda and it has to come up on another one.

MR CHAIRMAN: To be fair, you have to admit that most of the things we do won't involve legal opinions.

MR GOGO: It depends what side of the fence you're on. If you're not in favor of something, you demand a legal opinion. [laughter]

MR APPLEBY: Delaying tactics.

MR GOGO: If we hired lawyers on the government side of the House, we wouldn't have a bloody opinion yet.

MR CHAIRMAN: Anyway, what do you want to do about these guidelines? Do you want to do anything about them?

MR APPLEBY: Not right now.

MR GOGO: We're dealing with those matters, Frank, in our caucus.

MR APPLEBY: We're fighting about it anyway.

MR GOGO: Well, we're dealing with them. As I recall, they're on the agenda for the 12th.

MR APPLEBY: I hope so. I haven't seen it.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. So the question of guidelines for the committee is tabled?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other business?

MR GOGO: The next meeting at the call of the Chair?

MR CHAIRMAN: After getting caucus decisions.

MR PURDY: I move we adjourn.

MR CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

*The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.*