

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Wednesday, June 3, 1981

Acting Chairman: Mr. Appleby

2:30 p.m.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'd like to nominate Frank for chairman. As Deputy Speaker, I think he is obviously the logical person.

MR APPLEBY: Are you all agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Item 1, approval of the minutes. We don't have them, so what is your wish?

MRS OSTERMAN: That item can be held in abeyance until the next meeting. Those items from the minutes that we can recall, we will deal with.

MR GOGO: We had better state, then, that the minutes from the April 7 meeting be deferred till the next meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe someone would like to move that those be deferred until the next meeting.

MR GOGO: I so move.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then we'll go into the promotional items.

MR PURDY: How about business arising? Is there anything that is pertinent, or do you want to defer everything?

MR CHAIRMAN: There is one item in the minutes that we have a record of, No. 6.

MR GOGO: The Clerk might be aware of what is arising.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not, offhand.

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's go to 2, promotional items. I didn't bring that letter down.

MRS OSTERMAN: I sent a copy of this, and I thought Karen was going to duplicate it for the meeting. That was unfortunate.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, maybe Bill could give the background on that document.

MR PURDY: About three months ago, we established a special caucus committee to look at promotional items. I am the chairman and work with Stu McCrae and

Mary LeMessurier on it. We've come up with a number of suggestions for items that could be made available to members of the Assembly. We got concurrence from our caucus last week and were asked to bring it to Members' Services to get a resolution from Members' Services that we go ahead. The total expenditure comes to about \$117,000, if my memory serves me correctly. We have to go for a special warrant.

It has been in front of priorities committee of cabinet. They have now said that there are a number of items in here that could be better looked after through a minister's office than through our suggestion of maybe the Clerk's office. That would be through the Department of Education, where they now have promotional items available, such as flags, pictures, and a large plaque for the opening of new schools. That would be better handled through Dave King's office, and it should stay that way. The second one was anything through Housing and Public Works, such as provincial buildings, courthouses, senior citizens' homes, would be better handled by the minister's office, and money to be appropriated be taken from his budget. The third was Municipal Affairs for, say, like Vegreville celebrating its 75th birthday this year. They would be better off to come from Marvin Moore's appropriation.

What I suggest today is that we would let those three departments look after those, and then come under the Clerk's office -- the Alberta flags, the Alberta flag poles, coat of arms, spoons, letter openers -- these would be used at 50th wedding anniversaries; if you wanted to maybe present a spoon to a lady and a letter opener to the gentleman -- engraved pen set, promotional pictures, (inaudible), other items that could be used, and a number of other things.

We've also come up with a suggestion that there should be books available for visiting dignitaries to the province. If you had the minister of some government department coming into your constituency, you should have at your disposal a book to present to him or her as a gift.

MRS OSTERMAN: If I could just interject. An example might be the ministers of agriculture. I think all of them are coming to the province in July. They're going to be doing some touring in the province, I understand. If they were to come to one of our constituencies, I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture may present something. But it would be nice for us, if they were down and toured some facility in your constituency, to have something to present from the MLA. I thought that was quite proper. This was raised by some of our members. That's why Bill went to work on it. And others who visit. Sometimes on behalf of the government or the department there is a presentation, but the MLA doesn't often make a presentation of some kind. If they happen to attend a function in the constituency, it would be nice to -- you might have a visiting mayor, somebody of that nature.

MR PURDY: I have the typical example: on July 10, I have the minister of culture coming out to specifically open an art show in the multicultural centre at Stony Plain. I think it's very fitting for me to have something to present to him as a visiting dignitary.

MR CHAIRMAN: Which minister of culture is this?

MR PURDY: From Newfoundland. I don't know what his full title is, but he is to do with culture.

MR GOGO: Fred, you've been at these functions. Mayor Anderson in Lethbridge presents a set of silver cuff links, and they're quite valuable. And the MLA presents an Alberta pin. It's a very disproportionate type of thing. So that's really what's behind it.

MR PURDY: The list on Appendix A, Fred, is -- it's a very discretionary thing upon the member; you know, where you're going to pass these items out at. We looked at Appendix A as for visiting dignitaries, for special occasions such as 50th wedding anniversaries, 100th birthdays, and so on. Then on Appendix B you have all the promotion items under the various flags. Bohdan, I'll get you a copy of this.

MR GOGO: It's on its way now.

MR PURDY: Okay. The Canadian flag: we've said the allocation should be 100 per member; the Alberta flag, 100 per member; the Alberta [inaudible] flag, which is a small, metal one, 300; the Alberta plastic one should be 4,000. We also looked at crests for sports teams and school children who may be going out of province to participate at some sporting event. On their sports sweater they could have a crest of Alberta attached.

Mr. Chairman, we'll just open that for discussion.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'd like to add a couple of things, as a result of discussions with different ministers. It's quite a budget in terms of the kind of figures Bill worked out.

MR CHAIRMAN: Connie, could I interrupt just a second?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would the object of this be to promote the province of Alberta?

MRS OSTERMAN: And they're mementos to leave.

MR CHAIRMAN: But I mean to say, to give people an impression of this province -- PR work?

MR PURDY: This is strictly a PR thing. Many of our members said it looks damn bad when the MP comes walking in with a flag in one arm, a picture under the other arm, and here we may not even have a steel pin to present.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's fine. I just wanted to establish that.

MR PURDY: This is all promotional.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right. In terms of the kind of budget -- I'm sure Bill and his group did as best they could in terms of the accuracy of it. But that is allotted. Thinking about bringing it to Members' Services, it's a lot of money to plug into a budget all in one shot. It seems it would be just as legitimate, as has been suggested, that a number of departments could logically be keeping things on hand, a request made, and the thing delivered, so to speak. So the list was looked at in terms of, you know, under Recreation, there are a lot of areas that Pete Trynchy's grants sort of take

care of; for instance, opening or adding to, doing something with a community hall or some sports facility.

MR CHAIRMAN: A provincial park.

MRS OSTERMAN: A provincial park, and that's where the event was. It may be through Recreation and Parks.

In looking at the list, a number of suggestions were made for our consideration in bringing it here, as to really cutting it down significantly -- some of the more expensive items that could be provided by departments, and then leaving other items under Legislative Assembly appropriations. The thing we would hopefully consider today -- I would like us to consider, and I guess Bill is in the same position -- is how we could break that list down in terms of asking departments -- or one of us could, on behalf of all members -- would you look after these certain things. I think we could lean on our guys to do that, and then the remainder of the budget would fall within Legislative Assembly expenses, but it wouldn't be nearly as large.

MR MANDEVILLE: Bill indicated it was going to cost \$117,000 approximately.

MR PURDY: \$111,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: If it were all done in Legislative Assembly, or wherever.

MR MANDEVILLE: There are three departments. The thing I'm concerned about -- we've just adjourned the session, went through estimates, and then we come for something like this.

MRS OSTERMAN: A special warrant, and that's the first thing I thought.

MR MANDEVILLE: I just think we should have more respect for The Legislative Assembly Act. I think it's an excellent idea, Bill, that we do something like this. But my concern would be what portion the departments -- would they have to have a special warrant to cover this?

MRS OSTERMAN: My understanding was that they didn't think -- it would be a small amount for each of them. Education already does it. Then we would involve other departments. It would be a few thousand dollars spread over each one.

MR CHAIRMAN: So what would that leave to come into our budget?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's the thing somebody has to consider.

MR PURDY: That would be about \$71,000 that we'd have to have a special warrant for. We've looked at Housing and Public Works. There are only about five provincial buildings opened a year. That plaque is worth \$260, which comes to \$1,300. Now he's got that in his budget some place, for that type of promotional thing. Dave King already has that in place. And Marvin Moore has that money in place. So we're looking at, Appendix B, about \$71,000.

MR MANDEVILLE: That would be the concern I would have. Like it says in The Legislative Assembly Act, if it's urgent. Yet we should have had the meeting and had it in the budget.

MR GOGO: I'd like to speak to that. As you know, the budget begins next week for Bohdan, and it was put to bed in August 1980. In this respect . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Not put to bed; it was considered.

MR GOGO: Put to bed to Treasury. The cut-off date Treasury impresses is August 31. What I'm getting at is that unless we considered it back in April last year -- we've had input from many, many members for a lot of things. I don't know how else we as a committee can respond unless we say, okay, it's a good thing, but we would not want to do it until the 1982-83 budget. I don't think that's really acceptable. I would use that as the argument before priorities for grounds for a special warrant.

MR CHAIRMAN: What is our situation regarding our budget? Is our budget going to have any leeway in it? This \$71,000 Bill has spoken of would be if everybody used the maximum allowance.

MR PURDY: That's right; the 79 members.

MRS OSTERMAN: You based that on a figure of 79. I was reminded that ministers ordinarily wouldn't call on it, so then you could cut that down by a significant number.

MR CHAIRMAN: By 29.

MR GOGO: It would have to be applicable to every member of the Assembly.

MRS OSTERMAN: Certainly. I don't know what we have in our budget right now for those kinds of items. When you purchase pins and so on, Bo, I don't know what we have. What kind of increase would we be looking at in that category, whatever category it fits, in making a request like this?

MR STEFANIUK: I have a budget of \$10,000 for all promotional items.

MRS OSTERMAN: So much for that.

MR STEFANIUK: That also includes MLA letterheads and business cards. I think I should interject at this point and say this. From an administrative point of view, I cannot accept that ministers will not call on a special allowance, because they called on special allowances in other areas. From my point of view, as administrator of the fund, I have to regard all members, regardless of what status they hold in government or elsewhere, as members.

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR PURDY: I stand to be corrected on the \$71,000. It's \$71,000 plus \$39,000. This \$71,000 just takes in Appendix B.

MR GOGO: \$1,400 per member?

MR PURDY: \$71,000 and \$39,000 is \$100,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: \$110,000.

MR PURDY: Then you divide by 79.

MRS OSTERMAN: It comes out to \$1,400. But the thing is that if a lot of these things were supplied by -- at least we could start there if we had concurrence. If we could talk the departments into getting items in for members, that would be a start. Then we could look at the remaining items we need. Right now we're calling just for pins and flags.

MR PURDY: Stu McCrae indicated to me today in conversation that the items in Appendix A Government Services can stockpile.

MR CHAIRMAN: But do they have a budget to cover it?

MR PURDY: They have to go to a special warrant. Then the special warrant is reflected back to the Legislative Assembly appropriation. They would be the purchasing agent for -- they said they could do that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Myself, just expressing an opinion, I have grave concerns about going to a special warrant.

MR MANDEVILLE: That's the only concern I have. Is it urgent? I think getting this is excellent. I just don't think -- I mean, if we go to an opening of a provincial building, we have nothing to present. But anything we could get through the departments I sure think would be appropriate. But adjourning the session, after the fuss we made about special warrants, and then to get involved one day after the session.

MRS OSTERMAN: Fred's in an awkward position.

MR CHAIRMAN: I sympathize with him, too.

MR GOGO: Fred can vote in favor in principle, and can be a dissenting vote on the final motion.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, that's true.

MR MANDEVILLE: I do think it's something we need, and it's too bad we didn't have it in our last year's budget.

MRS OSTERMAN: John does make the point, Mr. Chairman, that we would have had to have considered this a year ago in order to have had it in this year's budget. That's what makes it really difficult in terms of . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily so. We could have had a supplementary estimate for it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, that's true.

MR GOGO: We get in the budgetary process. We talk about A programs, which are A operating budget, and we try to expand those as we need them. If there are new projects, we apply for B budget items. I think this is uniquely different from anything else that's done by government. We respond to what members request. If we're to make that decision that their request will not be dealt with budgetarily for 18 or 20 months, fine, I guess. But I think there is a

unique difference to what we want to do on behalf of members of the Assembly, not the government. I think that's a unique difference. Let the government pass a special warrant for government. This time we're asking government to pass a special warrant for Legislative Assembly. I think there's a unique difference.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't suppose the committee did any work in trying to come up with any guidelines. Your statement in paragraph two, at the end, is a critical one -- will be necessary to exercise care so the presentation doesn't appear to be a MLA benefit contrary to The Legislative Assembly Act. How the necessary controls are going to be exercised in that is something I really think we have to have consideration for.

MR PURDY: That comes back to our committee. Once we get concurrence, we're going to have to come up with some guidelines. If the Clerk of the Assembly is going to be responsible for divvying it out, he's going to have to have a set of guidelines to know what is and what isn't.

MR GOGO: How do we do it now? I send a note saying that this, this, or this is occurring and I would like a flag. I don't have a supply of flags. I assume the Clerk, formerly the Minister of Government Services, would look at my request for that ball team or whatever, and say yes or no, and send me a flag. That's the type of criteria I think you need. We don't want to give members a hundred flags to store.

MR PURDY: But you don't want to have the guidelines that the member gives a flag to his next door neighbor because he wants to fly a provincial flag.

MR GOGO: Connie, you brought up the old sock that ministers probably wouldn't be totally involved in this.

MRS OSTERMAN: As much. They seem to have their own supply.

MR CHAIRMAN: I just wonder if some work could be done on this to try to find out how we could work it in, what could be done to work it in without having to go to a special warrant.

MR MANDEVILLE: Could Government Services, Stu McCrae -- they involve a number of these items in his department without a special warrant.

MRS OSTERMAN: There's a thought to handle it in the interim.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then introduce it as a total budgetary item for the next budget. Probably the demand would be -- you know, if you limit each MLA to a certain amount. I know very well the whole total amount would not be taken up, because a number of MLAs will make very modest demands on it.

MR GOGO: Like the communication allowance.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about transfer of funds, Bo? We have the communication allowance. We have money in there for constituency offices and so on that is not all being picked up, although I think we're getting pretty high in the number of constituency offices now.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't think we could transfer funds, especially at this time of year. Transfers are effected toward the end of a year if we see surpluses in one area and shortages in another, with a view to avoiding requests for special funding, supplementary funding. Of course there are rules that pertain to transfer of funds. In some cases it's possible to transfer; in other cases it's not possible to transfer. I would be reluctant, when we're into our third month in a new budget year, to suggest any area whatsoever which might have surpluses, because we do not forecast them at this time of year. Our forecasts would be, I suggest, somewhat inaccurate. We may not have call, for example, on communications allowances for a while yet.

But you will recall that the general guidelines, which received some sort of tentative approval by this committee, indicated that a member might spread the expenditure of his communications allowance over a period of time or could utilize it on a one-shot deal. If I recommend to the Speaker who, for the purposes of The Financial Administration Act, has responsibilities of a minister in the case of the Legislative Assembly, that funds be transferred from the communications allowance, what do I do with the member who has waited until March 29 to provide me with invoices for a communication allowance he is entitled to? I can't do that.

MRS OSTERMAN: The guidelines in terms of paying for office expenses are just so firm that there is no way of handling it through that either. Some of us, I'm sure, wouldn't mind donating part of that.

MR STEFANIUK: We have a piece of legislation which spells out just what the constituency office allowance may be used for. I can't see how we can transfer funds which have been provided as a result of a statutory provision to something else. That would be the same as taking funds which have been budgeted for MLA indemnities on the presumption that somebody might die during the year and we'll have that extra number of dollars, and transferring it out. I can't do it because that's budgeted according to statutory provision.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we possibly look at this thing in a modified sense for the first year and not go for the . . .

MR PURDY: The only way you could do that is go back to Stu McCrae and see if he has any dollars in his department.

MR MANDEVILLE: Or the Department of Municipal Affairs, if they have some in there.

MR CHAIRMAN: What could be covered out of this list?

MR PURDY: From Appendix A or B? Nothing.

MR CHAIRMAN: So item 2, then, you'd be looking at thirty nine five.

MR PURDY: That's on Appendix A.

MR CHAIRMAN: In number one, where you say the plaques cost \$260 each and Housing and Public Works has estimated five new buildings. That's for the total province?

MR PURDY: That's for the total province.



MR CHAIRMAN: So that's only \$1,300 for the province. As you suggested, the schools, senior citizen lodges, and so on, come through the other departments.

MR PURDY: Correct.

MR CHAIRMAN: So your items under 2 . . .

MR PURDY: That's under Appendix A. It says that each member should be allowed \$500 for the various things, which would look after openings of other, smaller buildings such as a new community hall or somebody visiting the constituency from outside the province; we would give them the books.

MR CHAIRMAN: What are our allocations of the pins at the present time?

MR PURDY: Hit and miss.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't think that's an entirely fair statement because this committee did draw up some general guidelines respecting pins. While I don't think it defined limitations on quantities, it did define limitations on pin use. For example, looking at Appendix B attached here, I see an allocation of 100 Canadian flag pins per member. I believe the previous guideline established by this committee required that the Canadian flag pin be used for presentations outside the country. That was to be used in travelling abroad and not to be used within Canada. The Alberta flag pin, with the signature, was to be used in conjunction with travel to other Canadian jurisdictions as well as for presentation on anniversaries by members. The metal signature, I can't recall what the deal there was. The plastic one was supposed to be restricted to mass distribution among school children, if I remember.

MR CHAIRMAN: You may remember the guidelines for that, Marg.

MRS OSTERMAN: And that should still hold true.

MR STEFANIUK: The only thing I look at here is that you have an allocation of 100 Canadian flag pins per member. Does the other guideline still hold true? If he's not travelling abroad, does he get use of those? Is that allocation transferable to another type of pin? What goes on?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think this should apply in terms of maximum amounts for the kind of usage that was dictated.

MR CHAIRMAN: I have quite a concern with, say, the allocation of 100 Alberta flag pins. Normally we give these out to 50th or 60th wedding anniversaries or to people who have had an 80th birthday, or whatever. If there is no guideline as to what they can be used for and you have 100 pins . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Those guidelines could be republished. This is for the purpose of trying to figure out a budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then again, somebody may need more than 100 just to fulfil those requirements.

MR PURDY: However, if a person is travelling abroad, usually you get that out of the minister's office anyway, don't you?

MR STEFANIUK: To the best of my knowledge, members come to us and ask for that allocation.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're going on an assignment for a minister, do they do that?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't question why they're going.

MR CHAIRMAN: When I went out of the country for a minister, I just tried to scrounge it from ministers' offices. I didn't know there was a possibility of getting it from the Clerk's office. Of course that's when Bill MacDonald was here.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I've had several members say to me that the reason they feel that way about pins is they're restricted and they don't have them except for 50th anniversaries, for example. Yet many departmental people, at ADM level and so on, show up in constituencies with a pocketful of pins. They have people say they want a pin and they say I can't get one. Yet other people have a great supply of pins. For that reason I think our members should certainly have pins. Frankly I have never had any difficulty getting pins to give somebody. I've had to ask three or four people, three or four ministers. If I didn't get it from them, I'd ask Tom Lysons. But I think there should be a simpler way. Frankly I've asked -- Charlene Blaney has just been super anytime I have asked for anything. I don't think I'm unique; I'm one of 79.

MR PURDY: She's good that way.

MR CHAIRMAN: As long as she has guidelines.

MR PURDY: Maybe she's going by those guidelines I wasn't aware of.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. And she also has to maintain records, because the Auditor General walks in at least once a year and says, Blaney, prove to me that you didn't take 3,000 pins and hand them out to all your buddies.

MRS OSTERMAN: Right. I have a suggestion, Mr. Chairman. I think we're in a little bit of a grey area here in terms of the budget implications for the Legislative Assembly. Would it be possible, Bill, since I guess you have most knowledge of this and have been fairly instrumental in drawing it up, to look hard at the items that are possible for government departments or ministers to be responsible for, that all members can call on, and possibly split the list a little more definitively? Maybe, Fred, your people might want to add to the list in terms of ideas for presentation. This isn't an exhaustive list. It was just some ideas that you guys got together on. Right, Bill?

MR PURDY: That's right.

MRS OSTERMAN: There may be other things that could be added. Then we could canvas ministers for possible approval of having some of these items brought in under their allocation immediately, and then looking at the remainder and seeing what the budget implications are at our very next meeting, and making a decision. Possibly we might have some bright ideas in the meantime. Regardless of whether we can do this immediately, this year -- and I for one would certainly like to -- or whether it's going to have to be deferred, it

still is a budgetary item that's better got into the budget. We'd better know how much of an item it is.

MR PURDY: If that's the suggestion or resolution from this committee, I can go back and rehash this with the various ministers, see what items are available, and bring it back to the next meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we put it this way? If everybody agrees that Bill would go back and work it over and see how much of it could be financed within the framework of present budgets in various ways, in departments and whatever. Some of it will be financed with our \$10,000 to a certain extent.

MR STEFANIUK: What we finance at the moment with the budgetary figure we have, which has now been approved, is flags and pins, based on the guidelines that have been previously established by this committee. Do you wish us now to take notice of this and to begin to develop a budget for this for 1982-83?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think I would prefer a report to come back via Bill to this committee, as quickly as possible, that gives more firm figures. I wouldn't want you people to be doing work that is going to have to be redone as a result of our finding out what can be handled by others.

MR STEFANIUK: There is another consideration in terms of my budget, and that is if I'm going to start running a general store, with all due respect, I need people to run the store. I don't have them right now. In the Clerk's office we are presently at the saturation point.

MR GOGO: I think you're past that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Not only the amount of work you can handle but the place to put them too. Is that not . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Well, we have to consider storage space, maintenance of inventories, promotion of these items to the members. That may be something else that's desirable. For example, I know that in the province of Ontario, the Ontario Legislature had, at one stage -- I don't know if they still do -- published a colored catalogue for the members' use, so they could know what's available and at what price. Of course when the member ordered, he would order on a prescribed form and would get a bill, which was either payable by the member personally or out of an allocation. I don't know what the funding arrangement was in Ontario. Presumably if a member is ordering, a member should know how much he's going to be charged for these items, regardless of where the funding is coming from, and know that if funding is provided through the budget, if that's exhausted the member is going to have to be personally responsible.

MR GOGO: That's in Mr. Purdy's figures now in terms of allocation.

MR CHAIRMAN: But the administration of it is another thing that has to be considered.

MR PURDY: That's the question I was going to ask anyway today, if this would have been accepted: what was the projection then for additional people in the Clerk's office to run the grocery store?

MR STEFANIUK: Half a man-year.

MR CHAIRMAN: And what about space?

MR GOGO: We had better get on to other items.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, we will. We're just about to wind this one up.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm not sure. I can't define space until we know what we're talking about.

MRS OSTERMAN: . . . what items you're handling, because I think they are all very small.

MR CHAIRMAN: Connie's suggestion that Bill work this over and do some more work on it -- perhaps it might be useful at the same time if Bo had some input there as to what it would involve as far as your office is concerned. Could we include that, so we would have something to work on?

MRS OSTERMAN: I think if Bill comes up with a suggestion and brings it to the Clerk ahead of time so that that sort of information also comes to us.

MR CHAIRMAN: Because that would be in the budget too. Are we agreed on that then?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS OSTERMAN: With the possibility, if I can just remind, that the opposition might have some additional items they would like to give consideration to.

MR MANDEVILLE: I'll discuss it with our caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is under consideration, Fred. I think you have to look at it from that viewpoint. How it's going to be developed and finalized are matters that have to be decided at some future date.

Can we go to No. 3, John? Can you update us on airport parking?

MR GOGO: I was hoping Bo would advise us.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting we were instructed to look at the possibility of renting parking stalls at Edmonton Municipal and Calgary International on a long-term basis. Edmonton Municipal replied to us that they had 10 stalls available in the open compound by the control tower, at a rate of \$30 per stall per month. That provides a plug-in facility but no security. The terminal building itself is filled on a long-term rental basis. We updated that as of yesterday, and there are now only seven stalls available. They will not hold them for us; if we want them we have to reserve them. Calgary International will not provide any monthly rentals stalls.

MR CHAIRMAN: Comments?

MR GOGO: I guess we go back to the option we looked at before with regard to the principle that we can not indemnify a member for an expense incurred while a sitting is on, and that is primarily the time we need it. The alternative

was that the Assembly would pay the bill direct, which brought us to the Visa card or some type of plastic money. Although I thought it was fraught with difficulties, I recall Mr. Speaker saying if that's necessary, so be it. I think that's where it was at, unless you can add to that, Bo.

MR STEFANIUK: I think we had a difficulty with the kind of card. There was at one point a direction given that we look into making available to each member a bank credit card. While a bank credit card could be made available, it was identified with certain problems since its use could not be restricted. A member might, inadvertently or otherwise, use the card for other purposes, which would then present additional administrative problems. The statement resulting from a bank card was not acceptable to the Auditor General, who required a copy of a signed receipt for each transaction. Members would then be required to retain all the receipts and turn them in at a given time, or be responsible for the costs themselves. Those were the difficulties encountered there.

The other alternative that is open is of course for members to submit expenses, on a prescribed expense account form, for parking charges, which the Assembly, given the proper direction, could pay. But members would have to recognize that they may be subjected to paying of taxes on moneys received for that purpose, that possibility being that those payments could be regarded as taxable benefits by the Department of National Revenue.

MR CHAIRMAN: To go back to this renting a number of stalls, has anybody any idea how many people use parking at the airport on a regular basis?

MR MANDEVILLE: In Edmonton, because that's the only place they would have any stalls.

MR PURDY: More in Calgary -- well, you can't get any in Calgary. I think very few in Edmonton.

MR CHAIRMAN: There would be Gogo, Fjordbotten, Zaozirny -- these are people who have cars now that I know -- Fred Bradley. You, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: I leave mine in Calgary.

MR GOGO: My initial reaction is that we should grab the seven.

MR PURDY: That's a lot of money.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're looking at \$2,100.

MR GOGO: I was hoping Mr. Wolstenholme would be here. He wanted to report on this because he talked to the airport manager in Calgary, who was on the trip to England, and had a discussion with him. So I thought George could give us an update. What's wrong with the other option, with the receipt and people take their chances?

MR CHAIRMAN: On finding stalls?

MR GOGO: No. They park in the parkade, pay it, then turn the receipt in to the Clerk and we reimburse him. The Clerk has said he faces the problem of being challenged for income tax.

MR STEFANIUK: The member does.

MR CHAIRMAN: Just like your subsistence allowance.

MR GOGO: Is that a problem?

MR PURDY: You also better amend the Act.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Clerk could comment on that.

MR PURDY: We just amended the Act to look after the dental part of things for members. You have to be very specific about Section 56 of that Act. It outlines exactly what you're eligible for as a member. It says you're eligible for X number of dollars per day.

MR STEFANIUK: By paying you, this is the difficulty we have. It's assumed generally that we don't have a difficulty with paying for your gasoline credit card charges, yet we have no real provision for that. I think the only way the member is indemnified is that the member is not the recipient. That's why I have suggested to members of this committee on previous occasions that they avoid filing gasoline expenses under an expense account form.

MRS OSTERMAN: As John says, I suppose if we went into parking, they'd just have to take notice that it is quite possible, because there's no provision, that they would be paying income tax on that.

MR STEFANIUK: Income tax as well as, what Bill has mentioned, possibly disqualifying yourself for having received funds that are not authorized.

MR CHAIRMAN: To take those seven stalls would cost us \$2,500 for the year. How would we get the money to pay for it?

MR STEFANIUK: We may be able to squeeze them in under our rental budgets at the moment if we do some shuffling.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would the seven take care of the situation?

MR GOGO: With respect, I've been addressing it from the point of view of a \$15 charge every weekend -- Friday, Saturday, and Sunday -- sometimes \$20 for the members who leave their car there and go to their constituencies. Almost by implication, they would be vacant during the week. However, during the season when the House isn't sitting, there is always someone here. I think it would be a scramble to see who got in there.

MR CHAIRMAN: You think there would be more than seven?

MRS OSTERMAN: At times.

MR GOGO: I'm not alone here. I see lots of people when I'm here.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think we have a problem, Mr. Chairman, in an unequal distribution in terms of what we have possibly available to us right now. I don't see how we could proceed without there being a hassle between members. I think it would pose too many difficulties. If somebody can bring some

additional information, ideas on this item, and if George arrives and has something, that would be really useful to us. Then we could give it consideration again.

MR CHAIRMAN: So what do you want to do with the item?

MR GOGO: I don't want to see it disappear. I'd rather defer it than have it disappear.

MR CHAIRMAN: Tabled until recalled?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: John, do you want to comment on the dining facilities?

MR GOGO: I think Connie does.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm using some information I think John had requested at one time to be collected. I thought this was an opportune time to raise it because certainly many of our members had shown concern over dining facilities, in particular a members' dining area that would be private, without press and so on. The information was collected for us before that there are six provinces that do in fact have these facilities. I think it's an excellent time for us to give it consideration again. Certainly the members of the government caucus are quite supportive of a facility like this. It isn't anything that could be done right now, but with the renovations going on and the possible area that will open up when those renovations and access tunnels and so on are complete . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: You mean outside the building?

MRS OSTERMAN: Maybe even outside the building. I can't say where it would be, but there is a possibility. What I would like to do -- I don't know whether I could do it by way of motion, but I would like the record to show that this committee is supportive of suggesting to the Minister of Government Services that he take the members' desires into consideration as those plans are being involved, with a view to looking at a members' dining room. I can't speak to the feasibility of it, but I certainly would like the minister to take that under consideration. I would say the majority of members have expressed a desire to have a dining facility.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MR GOGO: Speaking to that, Mr. Chairman, two jurisdictions seem to go 10 months a year. I look at Alberta and the way it's growing, and I think we should be planning now for our successors. I can't help but think, the way Alberta is growing, that we'll be into six and eight months a year of sittings. I think it would certainly be a wise decision for us to have that type of facility in place, because it's becoming more and more awkward, assuming the hours of the House don't change, to get away and eat or suitably entertain people, constituents, here. I won't take issue with the cafeteria, but there's no privacy. If I want to have a private meeting, I have to find a private corner and hope no one comes within earshot.

MRS OSTERMAN: If I could add one more thing, Mr. Chairman. I think that's explicit in this, as with other jurisdictions, in order to have full food service, I notice a good many of these are done by a catering service. We would probably be looking at a subsidized service, because there aren't enough members. It isn't as if we're a public meeting area and it could actually be self-supporting. Certainly reasonable costs would have to be paid by members, but because of the numbers I think that's implicit in that sort of suggestion, that we realize there would have to be subsidization of that service, as with other jurisdictions.

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I took it up with our caucus as well. I guess I'd have to say that it did meet with approval with our caucus. I also discussed it with Grant Notley, and he was in favor of it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then we would have agreement that this committee supports the idea of an MLA dining room?

MRS OSTERMAN: I would make that a motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fine.

MR GOGO: A members' dining lounge? What's the appropriate term?

MR STEFANIUK: It depends on what you want. There are dining rooms and dining lounges, and each suggests a different thing.

MRS OSTERMAN: Dining facility. Leave it rather open. I notice that some -- basically a good percentage of the ones that are here have alcoholic beverages available, but not all. That's certainly a detail that could be addressed.

MR CHAIRMAN: That would have to be given consideration. Dining facility I think is a good thought, Connie. Do you want to include in that some idea, as part of the renovations?

MRS OSTERMAN: No. In terms of our support, that this information go forward to the Minister of Government Services for consideration in terms of the renovations.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're supporting that, and this will be sent to him. All agreed on that?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The matter of the name tags is what I have here. Henry Woo came along with this several months ago and asked me if I would bring it to a Members' Services Committee. The idea is that this is a clip-on name tag, which you don't paste or stick on. That's just a sample. The designation on it can be varied in whatever manner a person deems suitable. Henry suggested that the people he has contact with have them available in the silver, as that is, or a gold background or a white plastic background. I think the most attractive feature of his proposition is that they would be quite willing to come up with two samples for each member at the present time, to see if we want to make use of them in any way in the future. We would have to develop how we would want it laid out.



MR GOGO: That would solve my security problem.

MR PURDY: You can take it out of your communication allowance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Take it all out of Bill's. Anyway, that's what Henry has been after me quite often, to say: when you're going to have a meeting, would you take this under consideration. This is the first opportunity I've had.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on two things. First the idea, which I think is an excellent one. I had saved my 75th because so often we have a tape, and if you're wearing a leather suit or something, I found out that's really dynamite. Secondly, I have had a firm approach me with this sort of photography on metal, I think, something like that. I would only be concerned in terms of what the propriety is of only one firm coming forward. Once having made a decision -- looking at something like that is a good idea. I wouldn't want a firm -- and I'm sure Bo would be able to speak to this -- to think they were going to get the contract for it, because I don't think that's the way we could handle it.

MR GOGO: Unless it's free.

MR CHAIRMAN: It is free for those first two. But that could be construed in various manners too. My position today would be that I have brought that for information. We'd better give it some consideration and see what we think about it, and think of the implications.

MR PURDY: What is the cost of that?

MR CHAIRMAN: For other extras and so on.

MR PURDY: What do you need extras for? You put that in your pocket after you're through with the function and use it next time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Or if you're going to have a special meeting place on a regular basis, you could keep a supply of them there I suppose. There are more considerations, but he wanted that to come before the committee. I think it will have to come back after we've had a chance to think about it. Agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Connie, could you take us into No. 6?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes. Last time, after our discussion with the Speaker on Chamber renovations and he indicated that he has complete authority within the Chamber and really doesn't look to us to have a motion giving him explicit instructions in any way, which we certainly all concurred in. I felt that under the circumstances it would be proper for the committee to rescind the previous motion that was made on Chamber renovations, because we made it under the assumption that this committee was given the authority to direct the Speaker in that area. That, we have now come to understand, is not so. So I indicated last time that I was going to have this motion to rescind that previous motion so we would be out of the Chamber renovation discussion completely, other than on an informal basis, giving over to the Speaker suggestions being made by members, as I did last time in saying that members

were hoping that some renovations would be done soon because the stuff on the walls is getting pretty tacky. So I would just say that that motion stands. I think it's very explicit. It relates to a motion that was made last -- I'm sure that can be looked up in terms of the exact date, that dealt with that motion.

MR GOGO: Was that the amount of \$10,000 for the architects?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR GOGO: What's been done on it? Have architects been hired? We should find out before we rescind it.

MRS OSTERMAN: No, because we have no authority. Rescinding it doesn't take away anything that has been done in the meantime, because the Speaker has complete authority in that area. It wouldn't be taking anything away from him at all. It would only be clearing the record.

MR MANDEVILLE: Is there a reason for clearing the record? It's on the record. I can recall making the motion that we go ahead with the \$10,000 and get the architects. As the Speaker has indicated, the Chamber is under his jurisdiction. Is the motion hurting anything on the books? If it's under the jurisdiction of the Speaker, I can't see that the motion is any problem. What's the reason for rescinding it, Connie?

MRS OSTERMAN: To me, and to some of our members, the motion seems improper because we weren't in a position to be giving direction to the Speaker. The Speaker wanted, and obviously had a very personal interest in going that route if that was the route he desired to go. It was made feeling -- the reason our members voted for it was because they felt that was the only way the Speaker was going to be able to move and he had the personal desire to move in that direction. Now that we realize that wasn't necessary, I believe members here would indicate the feelings of caucus, and that is they did like the design they looked at and wouldn't ordinarily have gone that route, except for the very strong desire of the Speaker. He isn't in need of that motion.

MR CHAIRMAN: To add to that Connie, you brought that point out of the caucus feeling at the meeting here of Members' Services. At that time it was indicated to you by the Speaker that actually it wasn't necessary to have the committee approve such a plan.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR PURDY: On that point then, Mr. Chairman. Bo might have some information, but where are we at with renovations? Because that special warrant never did go through, did it, for the \$10,000 for the other four architects?

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, I'm sure it will, because the Speaker will see to that himself. It's not necessary for him to have the Members' Services Committee. As he said, it is not necessary for him to have the concurrence of this committee.

MR GOGO: Chronologically, because since that time we went through several steps. One of them, since that step, was that the Minister of Government

Services and the architect appeared at this committee to show us various things that at the time of passing that motion we were unaware of.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR GOGO: I thought we had agreed in principle, following that, and saw some pictures and so on, to proceed on that basis. As far as I was concerned, that's where it was at. I thought the \$10,000 motion wasn't even applicable any more. Is that what I hear you saying, that because it's a matter that the Speaker, as ministerial equivalent, could initiate whatever he wants without this committee making such a motion . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR GOGO: For that reason, because it was moved by Mr. Mandeville and agreed to by this committee, it would be your desire we move it from the books?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fred, have you any further comments?

MR MANDEVILLE: The motion on the books doesn't bother me at all. It's insignificant on the books. I just don't feel comfortable, unless we have a full quorum, to rescind the motion really.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think I would speak to the matter of how our members feel, only by way of recommendation afterwards -- at least the government members feel. It sort of falls on what John said, in that I think it's only fair to the Speaker that we bring him information from our various caucuses in terms of how members feel about the Chamber they're sitting in. Our members strongly wish to go ahead. That's additional information that now conflicts with a motion that is on the books. So I feel that, since there has been a change in the desires of at least the members we represent, it is only fair to reflect that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Actually, that feeling was brought before the Members' Services Committee at one time, a reflection of what the caucus -- it was made clear that it wasn't necessary for us to consider the matter. So if it's not necessary to consider it, you're saying we should take it off the books.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right. I think of two of the overriding reasons: number one, information came to us just after that motion was made that we didn't have in our hands when it was made. So I don't believe the motion would have been made in the same way had we had the information. So in all fairness, I believe it should be rescinded, because it doesn't reflect the current situation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Looking at the sequence here then, you did give notice on this, and it's recorded, or it should be -- we haven't got the minutes -- that you were going to bring this motion to rescind it.

MRS OSTERMAN: I have the page here from the minutes, which don't seem to be around -- and I'm not sure why. I had asked for and received a copy, so I assumed they were already available. It comes under item 4 as dealt with in

our previous minutes. It says here: Mrs. Osterman gave notice of a motion to rescind the resolution approving the soliciting of opinions for architects. It was agreed that this item would be discussed at the next meeting. And I went further to add: it was noted that the government members are very supportive of Chamber renovations being done in a manner described by the architect engaged by Mr. McCrae. But I think the overriding thing is . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: But you did give notice it would come to the next meeting, and that is it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now it's here. Fred has some hang-ups about it, but I think we had better deal with it. Fred, if you don't feel you want to support that, we can record that.

MR MANDEVILLE: At this point in time -- it was my view that if we're going to renovate -- and I'm sorry I missed the meeting when we had the presentation of the program by Stu McCrae's office. I missed that. I did see the design but I wasn't here for the presentation. So I would just as soon not vote for rescinding the motion at this point in time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. So are the rest of you agreed?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's fine, Fred. In rescinding it, it in no way takes away the Speaker's ability to go out and proceed in any manner he wishes.

MR CHAIRMAN: So the rest of you are agreed to support the motion? It'll be recorded that Fred had some reservations about it so he didn't support it. That brings us down to item 7. Is there any other business?

MRS OSTERMAN: One other item, just briefly, to alert you of concerns that have been raised, and possibly the opposition might know the same concerns. One of our members has offered to canvass the government members about the costs incurred in constituency offices and the amount they've escalated, and that it's getting very difficult. They're somehow going to have to cut back on staffing or whatever. It's not going to be possible to keep them open. Under the provisions of the amended Legislative Assembly Act from last fall, the Speaker has the ability, I believe on the recommendation of the Members' Services Committee -- I'm not sure exactly how that's done, Bo, you probably know the specifics. But I believe he's in a position to update that amount. I would just say that our members have said this is a major problem, we would like you to consider it, and one of our members offered to canvass the members to find out what kind of escalation in cost there has been. I felt we should bring that to the Speaker's attention and possibly have a more formal discussion at the next meeting, bringing information in that regard for his attention.

MR MANDEVILLE: I can recall the Attorney General made some comment in the House on that, and I just can't remember the specifics on it, that we could or should be looking at an increase -- I don't know the term he used. I recall he did mention in the House one day that it was possible to increase it.

MR GOGO: I have a concern with that, Mr. Chairman. The original legislation was for \$10,000, which was very specific in terms of the split; that was five and five. We then gave recognition to that and said well, really, two things should be done: one, there should be provision for establishing your constituency office in my constituency if you so desire. We accommodate to that. You no longer have to have a constituency office in your constituency, to allow members to band together.

MRS OSTERMAN: Especially in urban areas.

MR GOGO: Secondly, you could change the mix. This is the point I'd like to speak to, Mr. Chairman. The \$10,000 is still there but you can change the mix. I have some hang-up about a member of the Assembly paying \$9,000 rent and leaving \$1,000 for manpower, and then coming back here in some period of time and complaining because he has an office that he can't staff. With respect . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think the thing that was circulated regarded staffing. It regarded . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Overall escalation in costs.

MR GOGO: I don't want to speak against that. I just want to speak to the point that I think the Clerk has indicated to us before that we have had people sign leases, which are binding, and then want to change with three years' liability up there. By the same token, I want to register a concern about people who sign leases for offices for 90 per cent, or something, of the constituency allowance, and come back asking this committee to get the Speaker or someone else to increase the allocation. I think the reason we amended that was to allow some degree of flexibility. I think it's going beyond reasonable bounds to get that degree of flexibility but you have a fancy office in the high-rent district and no dollars to staff it. The intent in establishing those offices was for the member to have a presence in his constituency in an office setting and at least one staff person part-time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you have an office, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: Yes I do.

MR CHAIRMAN: How do you find it?

MR MANDEVILLE: I find it works very successfully so far. I found it has sure been beneficial.

MR CHAIRMAN: How about the costing, I mean?

MR MANDEVILLE: I've been able to operate under the funds we have now at the present time. I have two offices. It's something that -- everything is escalating.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't have an office, Mr. Chairman, so I can't -- and I don't want to make comment that somehow is negative that those who do. But for those people who came in under the \$10,000 initially, and since that time -- think of the length of time -- and supposing they were somewhere near on the

split, with inflation the way it is I can well imagine how even with a fairly even split, they could now be over the \$10,000. Once having put a service in place, how do you then back off on it? Because the \$10,000 was there, and I don't think they thought to themselves I better pay only \$7,000 now because next year I know it would be \$8,000, then \$9,000, then \$10,000 before another election.

MR CHAIRMAN: But the memo that was circulated by the member -- I have a lot of concern with that because he indicates a plus or minus increase of \$800 a month, which is another \$10,000. That's a 100 per cent increase.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think he was speaking about another matter, and that is something that is now considered part of the allowance for the offices that hadn't been there before. It was because of an amendment we made to The Legislative Assembly Act which inadvertently caused charges against offices that hadn't formerly been there, I understand. We can't do anything about that right now.

MR PURDY: What are the items that have escalated in these offices?

MRS OSTERMAN: Rent and salaries.

MR PURDY: He's also talking about materials.

MRS OSTERMAN: The materials are something that maybe the Clerk can speak to.

MR PURDY: It's still part of that incorporation, isn't it?

MR STEFANIUK: When the legislation enabling the establishment of constituency offices first came into being, there was no provision for furnishing or equipping those offices with either equipment, stationery, or materials. The view that was taken initially was that stationery, for example, would be provided to the offices on the basis that those offices were an extension of the member's facility here in the Legislature. We overcame the crisis with regard to furniture by going to the Department of Government Services and getting from them used furniture, just prior to it being declared surplus, still in usable condition. Then we sought and obtained approval for purchase, through special warrant, of certain equipment, which included typewriters and, eventually, the telephone answering devices.

When the amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act -- that portion dealing specifically with constituency offices -- came about last fall, I believe, there was removed in the amendment the requirement that the office be located in the member's own constituency, thereby allowing for sharing of an office by two or more members, it being located in a given place, not on a boundary necessarily. There was removed the restriction to using half the prescribed amount for rent and the other half for manpower. There was also then built into that amended Bill the provision that all expenses for equipment, supplies, et cetera, must be charged to the \$10,000 allotment as well.

So we have no choice. Again we're working under a statutory provision which says that if we now ship to your constituency offices 100 sheets of letterhead, we just take out your ledger card and charge those 100 sheets of letterhead to your \$10,000 allowance. If you don't have any left, we send you a personal bill for it and expect you to pay for it.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's Mike Clegg's legal opinion, is it?

MR STEFANIUK: There is no question about the legislation; it's that clear.

MR CHAIRMAN: So this will have to be considered.

MRS OSTERMAN: It will have to be considered in amending the legislation. Unfortunately it wasn't brought to our attention until very late in the session, and it wasn't possible to just put an amendment in because it was a change of principle. It wasn't just an amendment. It was a change in principle.

I have brought it to your attention, and I would only request that if there is a problem and others know of it, that information would be useful in discussing this item at the next meeting. I would ask then that it formally be on the agenda.

MR PURDY: But is that member using \$800 worth of material?

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't know how much it is at all. This isn't what I want to discuss at the next meeting. It's just the inflationary factor in terms of operating offices right now.

MR STEFANIUK: The legislation also provides that the Speaker has authority to increase -- and I'm not sure what the percentage is. But the Speaker has the right, based on his knowledge of inflationary factors, to increase the allowance for constituency offices. With all due respect, I suggest again we have a fiscal problem, because it's on budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR PURDY: How many constituency offices have you got now that are taking the full allocation of \$10,000?

MR STEFANIUK: I can't tell you that offhand.

MR CHAIRMAN: Constituency offices: I think you have in the 60s now, haven't you?

MR STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR PURDY: But I have one, and I take \$300 a year. That's my part of the \$10,000.

MR STEFANIUK: You're a rare breed.

MR PURDY: I've had mine for 10 years, and it's supplied by private enterprise. As far as I'm concerned it will stay that way.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there any other new business?

MR GOGO: I just wondered about the -- we had people looking at the unique lapel pin and were going to get back.

MR STEFANIUK: We have designs. Would you like us to circulate those to you?

MR GOGO: I'd like us to make a decision on it sometime. I'd feel more comfortable, I guess, rather than just getting it at the next meeting, if we could have it in the interim . . .

MR STEFANIUK: We could photocopy the drawings and circulate them to you if you like. We also have the prices.

MR PURDY: Would they look as original or not? Are they colored?

MR STEFANIUK: No, they're not colored. The designs we have call for a non-colored pin. It's a matter of deciding what color of metal will be used, either yellow, i.e. gold; white; i.e. silver; or pink, i.e. copper. Various surfaces can be polished, burnished, and all sorts of things. We are dealing with quotations based on non-precious metals. The other thing you should be aware of is that the minimum order is for 1,000 pins.

MR CHAIRMAN: These are MLA pins? Why would we want 1,000? Oh, for down the road, eh?

MR STEFANIUK: Well, that's what the manufacturer will consider.

MR GOGO: You can get less than 1,000 but you pay the same.

MR PURDY: Is that a Canadian manufacturer?

MR STEFANIUK: It's an Alberta manufacturer.

MR CHAIRMAN: If we could have that circulated, then.

MRS OSTERMAN: It would be useful to have that information.

MR STEFANIUK: We can circulate it, if you like.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, did the committee ever decide about identification cards for wallets? We had one last term, if you recall -- the green one, sort of plasticized. I have found in my travels around the country it would be very helpful if I had a card identifying me as a member of the Assembly, rather than a business card.

MR CHAIRMAN: How did we get those originally? What did that come under? Public Affairs?

MR STEFANIUK: The one with the picture was issued by the Solicitor General, and it followed the very unfortunate incident in Horst Schmid's office, when there was a general tightening up of security. That didn't really say an awful lot, but Bill has one in his wallet which was an old card. I had found some blanks when I first came here. They had apparently been in use and were issued by the Clerk's office some many years ago. Certainly since 1976 that card has not been issued.

MRS OSTERMAN: Could we make an enquiry about getting cards like that again?

MR GOGO: Could I request, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk -- my feeling would be that it would be a little like the social insurance card, some kind of



permanent plastic card, except there should be a photograph on it. If we could agree in principle to having one, if he could produce some samples for one of our future meetings.

MR CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MRS OSTERMAN: I move the meeting be adjourned.

MR CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed. *The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.*