

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Wednesday, October 7, 1981

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

4:25 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're ready to come to order at 4:25. Is there a motion concerning the minutes of the previous meeting?

AN HON. MEMBER: I so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: All in favor? . . . Carried.
Should we go right into the estimates?

MR GOGO: Is there any business arising from that?

MR CHAIRMAN: From the minutes? Oh, right.

MR GOGO: We would have reached it if we reached number five, but there was some discussion in the minutes regarding parking, but if we're going to come to it in five, that's fine; if we can't, just leave it.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm just wondering. I suppose it's six of one and half a dozen of the other before Connie arrives. So would you rather deal with business arising?

AN HON. MEMBER: That's fine.

MR GOGO: I can wait. I just think that if it's of that importance and if there's anything we can do . . . due to the fact that we may not have another meeting before the House opens.

MRS OSTERMAN: Good afternoon. My apologies, Mr. Chairman. It was because John Gogo was following me in traffic and I was just trying to [inaudible]. He didn't even realize it.

MR CHAIRMAN: And he took your parking spot.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes. Hi, John.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now what's your wish?

MR MANDEVILLE: Shall we deal with the items you have on the agenda here, Mr. Chairman, and then go as far as we can on the estimates?

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, it's just whatever you prefer. We could go through business arising out of the minutes, and there's only one other item on the agenda apart from estimates and other business that isn't included in business arising or the estimates. So, suppose we go to business arising out of the minutes.

MR PURDY: One item I had, Mr. Chairman, is under number two. I just had a very quick discussion with the Clerk. We had the promotional items here but I don't see anything in the estimates so maybe we want to pass that resolution now that we're going to add \$150,000 to this year's estimates for promotional items for members of the Assembly.

MR STEFANIUK: It might be more appropriate when we come to that in the estimates itself.

MR CHAIRMAN: What's your wish? Do you want to do that now, separate from the estimates, or consider that when we've gotten into the estimates and reached that point?

MR PURDY: I only raised it because it was an item under the last meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think the main thing is that . . .

MR PURDY: I'm just as happy to go with it under the appropriate . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Estimates? Right.

We have another business arising and it's also in the agenda and that's airport parking. The item was agreed to be tabled until recalled. The question is: do you want to discuss it further today, or do you want to give some further directions? Have you thought of some new ideas for grasping this . . . ?

MR GOGO: Well, I know Bo has spent a lot of time at this. However, I keep coming back, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that we're probably not going to be making any amendments to the subsistence allowance of members and hotel rates have escalated, anything we can do to make it easier for members I think we should do.

MR CHAIRMAN: Specifically under airport parking we're caught between two things. One is that we don't want to make direct payment to members to reimburse them for the parking, if we can avoid it, and the other is that we haven't been able to get credit or credit card arrangements.

MR GOGO: I guess I come back to the suggestion I made a long time ago that you, as Speaker, or maybe even Marvin Moore, talk to Mayor Purves. I know Bo has spent a lot of time with the administration and there's no way. I think it just has to go to a higher level on that. I'm thinking particularly of Edmonton Municipal.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting on, June 3, I had reported that a number of stalls were available on a monthly rental basis at Edmonton Municipal. I had advised the members at that time of the rate at which they were available -- I don't recall that, offhand -- and advised as well that a decision would have to be reached quickly because the airport was not going to hold those stalls until we made a decision. Following that, it was agreed that the item be tabled until recalled. So we had nothing further. Subsequent to that, however, Mr. Gogo contacted our director of administration and provided her with a sample of something called an exception ticket which is used in Calgary. Ms. Blaney contacted the administration at Calgary airport and was advised that that exception ticket is used only on occasions

When an original parking ticket is lost or an individual is unable to pay for parking expenses. The airport administration does not have a mechanism other than the Chargex card by which credit can be processed in relation to the parkade.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about the Chargex card?

MR STEFANIUK: We went through that at the last meeting, or a meeting prior to that and, because its use cannot be restricted to an airport parking facility and therefore some control is lost and could result in considerable additional administrative work, the idea of the Chargex card was rejected by the committee.

MR GOGO: Well, the reason I keep bringing it back is that two or three people continue to say, how about doing that.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's a gross inequity. And it's a shame that it's gone on this long.

I don't know, we might be able to work something out at the Edmonton airport here -- get some kind of pass or something -- but the Department of Transport is adamant in Calgary.

MR GOGO: Well, I think we've had the indication, haven't we Bo, that we could not be treated as Members of Parliament in Calgary and Edmonton?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right.

What would you think about a Chargex card that would be accepted at the Calgary airport, which we would obtain in the name of the Legislative Assembly, with an arrangement with Chargex for a limit, if that were necessary, and we marked on the card -- this won't affect its use -- "Calgary Airport Parking" -- if they use it at Edmonton, just "Airport Parking" -- give each member one and, to the extent that the member provides us with vouchers which he gets at the time the Chargex thing is made up, we pay it; to the extent that he doesn't, he pays it.

MR PURDY: Is that possible?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR GOGO: We have the judgment in the minutes about Revenue Canada.

MR CHAIRMAN: They'll take Chargex though, won't they?

MR STEFANIUK: They'll take Chargex. Our difficulty with Chargex was that when the statement arrives it is not substantiated by copies of the individual charge slips, and the responsibility then, and the Treasury will not accept a statement. Treasury will not issue a payment on the basis of a statement, but insists on having individual vouchers. That's the manner in which we handle our gasoline cards and our airline cards. So, if we were to pay the account, the member would then be responsible for retaining and turning copies of the individual charge slips over to the Clerk's office.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I'm hearing correctly, I think that would possibly eliminate the kind of administration hassle that we would normally have where the onus would then be on the member. One of the problems is there's a charge to the Legislative Assembly and it comes to the Assembly. If members don't substantiate it and say, I've lost my slip -- I've this, I've that -- I really have a problem with that. And then, alternatively, I suppose it can't be in the member's name. Member's could easily just take the -- and as you said, Mr. Chairman, the problem is paying a member directly; we have a problem tax-wise. I see a bit of a saw-off in terms of the kind of hassle it causes and the number of people that we're actually going to serve, and I'm one of those people. It would be very nice to have that availability, but . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, don't you think . . . Is it that big a problem? I realize everybody mislays slips, but is it that big a problem to remember to keep Chargex slips at the Calgary airport and once a month send them in here so that when we get the bill from Chargex -- it's going to mean some more work in the Clerk's office -- we pay the ones that are vouchered, or we pay them all.

MRS OSTERMAN: We have to pay them all.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we pay them all, and we say to the member, you owe us this much because you had so many unvouchered ones and they come to this.

MR GOGO: That's fair enough.

MR CHAIRMAN: We take a permanent marker and mark on the card: Airport Parking. That's a reminder to the member when he gets it out that he mustn't buy his wife a dress with it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Well, I see some problems for the administration of this in terms of some amount of hassles that those people who will have to bill for bills that aren't covered by vouchers but, on the other hand, with the very strong onus on MLAs, all of us duly report to our caucuses that there will be absolutely no exceptions.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Because otherwise it creates a hassle.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right. And I think it can be handled very simply. The Clerk gets a supply of cards. We prepare a memorandum for a member to sign wherein he acknowledges receipt of the card and agrees that for any expenditures charged against that card for which a voucher acceptable to audit is not received, the member will reimburse the Legislative Assembly. And he signs it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Further to that, Mr. Chairman, it's duly noted that the card is only for airport parking.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, we'll put it right on the card before it leaves the Clerk's office. Of course that won't show when the card's being used on a little roller because it doesn't have bumps in it.

MR GOGO: Why don't we try it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like the Clerk to reflect before we . . . It seems like a good idea, but I'm not in administration and I'm wondering -- because, after all, we are spending the people's money -- if it's going to cost us more to administer this than we're actually going to help members with.

MR CHAIRMAN: If it isn't a mixed metaphor, would you like to father a motion that unless the Clerk encounters unexpected and apparently unacceptable difficulties, that this plan be put into effect? And if he does, of course he will report back to us.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

MR GOGO: I second.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need a seconder here. If the House doesn't, it seems the committee . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Is that motion descriptive enough?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, it isn't.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm going to make a motion, and the motion will start out as you have stated, but I would alter it to this degree. I would say that before this is put into effect that at the next meeting I would like a report from the Clerk as to how it's going to be put into effect.

MR CHAIRMAN: That changes the motion completely. Then what you want is an enquiry.

MRS OSTERMAN: No, it's not an enquiry. It's a direction to carry this out and describe to us at the next meeting how it's going to be handled administratively before it is put into effect.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. So what you want is the Clerk should now start to do the preliminaries necessary to put it into effect, report on those at the next meeting and, if his report is concurred in, or whatever, we can say, go ahead.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right.

MRS OSTERMAN: Add to the motion that through the Legislative Assembly office we would issue to all members . . . Is it Chargex?

MR GOGO: Visa's the name on here.

MR CHAIRMAN: Visa's the name.

MRS OSTERMAN: . . . that would be used for airport parking only.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. So the motion then would be that the Clerk undertake the preliminaries to establish a method of charging airport parking for members to the Legislative Assembly by means of Visa cards, and that the procedure by which he proposes to do that be reported to the next meeting before the plan is put into effect. Okay?

Do you want to read it back?

SECRETARY: The Clerk undertake the preliminaries to establish a method of charging airport parking for Members to the Legislative Assembly by means of Visa cards, and that the procedure by which he proposes to do that be reported to the next meeting before the plan is put into effect.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other business arising out of the minutes?

MR GOGO: There was, I think, the matter of the pins, Bo.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes, sir.

MR GOGO: Maybe that can be dealt with. I don't want to impinge on . . . I'll stay as long as is necessary, but obviously the budget is the item.

MR CHAIRMAN: I have a meeting at 7:30 at the other end of town.

MR STEFANIUK: I was directed, Mr. Chairman, to produce designs for the Mace with the letters "MLA" through it, and I have three submissions of a design here and information relevant to the cost of the metal which may be employed in the theme.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could I make a suggestion? Are we possibly going to have a fairly lengthy discussion about this, and would it be better to have this material reproduced and given to the members and dealt with at an early next meeting?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that all right?

So it's agreed that the information which the Clerk is providing with regard to members' pins be circulated to the members of the committee for consideration and be included in the agenda of the next meeting. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Anything else arising out of the minutes?

MR GOGO: Just the identification cards. I hate to keep raising these issues, but we dealt with them in the previous minutes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR STEFANIUK: We have that as well. We have the art work completed, Mr. Chairman, and the text corrected. I can pass that around as well, if members wish, and we can proceed with the card.

MR CHAIRMAN: That doesn't lend itself to copying as well, I guess.

MR STEFANIUK: No it doesn't.

MR CHAIRMAN: So the next item is members' identification cards. What's your wish?

MR GOGO: My wish is to proceed.

MR CHAIRMAN: With this version?

MR GOGO: With that version.

MR CHAIRMAN: Will there be a photograph on the back?

MR STEFANIUK: No.

MR CHAIRMAN: No photograph at all?

MR STEFANIUK: There's no provision for that in that format, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: We would have to supplant the coat of arms.

MR STEFANIUK: If a photograph is used it could be redesigned, still incorporating the coat of arms, I think. It would be a matter of spacing.

MR CHAIRMAN: What do you think? In some security situations you just about have to have a photograph. In some you don't. I'd hate to forego the coat of arms. I suppose you can help yourself out with your driver's licence if you have one.

MR GOGO: I would almost think a photo's essential.

MR STEFANIUK: Do you wish the design altered in that case to incorporate the photo?

MR CHAIRMAN: What do you think?

MRS OSTERMAN: Can I see what it [inaudible]?

MR CHAIRMAN: There's what was given us the first time, but of course a thug could easily deal with that by scraping off the little photo and putting another one on.

MR PURDY: You could go and get them superimanted like you do with a driver's licence now.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's different. But of course there's not much room there for a coat of arms.

MR GOGO: Well, I would almost think that the photo would be on the left hand side; the lapel pin we've been talking about could be on the other side.

MR CHAIRMAN: The provincial crest appears on this one -- here and here. If we had a small version of the coat of arms, a fairly tiny one, which might not be identifiable if it were that small, we could just leave it with the crest and forego the coat of arms.

MRS OSTERMAN: Without a picture, Mr. Chairman, what could possibly happen? A card is lost; somebody picks it up and comes to the Legislative Assembly?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, not here; they wouldn't get away with it. They have photographs of all the members at the front office, haven't they, so that new staff can . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: So what are we saying? That it's necessary when we visit other jurisdictions?

MR CHAIRMAN: Is this identification intended only to get into this building?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't think that was the purpose, Mr. Chairman. There is no problem with members getting into this building.

MR CHAIRMAN: No.

MR STEFANIUK: It was a question of their being able to identify themselves in other jurisdictions and, having identified themselves, being accorded the appropriate courtesies.

MR CHAIRMAN: So a bomb is dropped from the Speaker's gallery of the New Zealand House of Representatives, and security says, gee, the guy had an identification card; he is a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. But there wasn't any photograph on it.

MR GOGO: You've got that a little different from the way I assumed when you opened the discussion. I would have thought that when they gathered the remains, in the pocket of the remains they found this picture of the Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta and would know where to ship the body.

MR PURDY: I think it should have a picture on it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay? So the minutes can record that the Clerk circulated a proposed design for an identification card, and was asked to revise it to provide for a photograph of the member to appear on the card.

MR PURDY: On that item, if we go ahead with it, maybe the Clerk could also investigate having someone from Alberta Transportation or the Solicitor General's Department that issues driver licences come over here and do it in one fell swoop, sort of thing.

MR CHAIRMAN: That would be the production once we get going.

MR PURDY: The production of it once we get going on it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want the Clerk to enquire as to means of producing the cards?

MR PURDY: Sure.

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, you don't want the design to come back for approval. You want the photograph added and carry on. Is that your wish?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it's agreed that when the card has been redesigned to provide for a photograph, the Clerk is to proceed to have the cards produced.

Are we ready to go on to the estimates, or is there still other business?

MRS OSTERMAN: Since the estimates will probably take the rest of our time, Mr. Chairman, I wonder about item 3, members' alternate office space.

MR CHAIRMAN: That has to do with the proposal being mooted about of members moving into the Agriculture Building. The question simply is: does this committee wish to be involved in that in any way or does it not? If it does, we should do something about it.

MRS OSTERMAN: At least for the committee's information, Mr. Chairman, I can report that as a result of a number of our caucus having regard to, number one, the little cubicles we're working out of, which are very small and not enough space for support staff, had made a request that we at least look at whether there is any other space available. Obviously, in our building there is not. So as Whip of our caucus, I've done some investigation and discovered that some of the agricultural staff will have to move out. That's the proposal right now. Then in fact some of our members may be so accommodated. That was something I took upon and thought was my responsibility, and can just say that's where we are right now.

MR CHAIRMAN: So there's no need for this committee to deal with it.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't believe so, with the exception of the fact that when this happens there will probably be built into our budget an accommodation for some additional support staff, which has budget implications.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think Treasury would approve an addition right now on the basis of expectation. I think we would have to perhaps go for a special warrant once we had some solid information about it.

MRS OSTERMAN: It's solid in that you can't always predict time frames, but I think we're hoping this can be accommodated by January-February.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we able to say that a certain number of members will be going over and that a certain number of support staff would be required?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes. Hopefully Marg has that built into the budget. I haven't looked at it.

DR COOK: I can point out right now that that hasn't been provided for in the budget.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I suggest there are implications for the operation of the Clerk's office as the Clerk's staff provided certain direct services to members. That staffing is currently based on services being provided in this building. If there is need for messenger service, for greater mobility, for travel to remote locations -- locations remote from this building -- I suggest there are certain implications for the Clerk's budget as well, in terms of staffing. While I respect the opinion of the hon. member as to this kind of move becoming the responsibility of a given caucus if only that caucus is concerned, I do suggest that others need to be somewhat concerned with the matter.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Government Whip and I discussed this some weeks ago, and it appeared to me that the Government Whip had it in hand. I was asked whether I would be perhaps representing the opposition in this regard in case some of them wanted to move over. I think that under the circumstances I can't do that. I can foresee that -- I'm not suggesting there are going to be any gross disparities, inequities, or anything like that, but I think I have to have regard for my position. I can see that if I am less successful in getting preferred space for opposition members than the Government Whip is in getting preferred space for government members, that could give rise to an unacceptable anomaly. So the position I took at the time was that if the Government Whip is going to handle this, the Government Whip should also deal directly with the opposition. I realize that that is an abdication of the usual function of the Speaker in relation to space for members, and I am reconsidering what I said there. But at the moment I'm not able to say anything further about it.

MRS OSTERMAN: Two things have been raised by the Clerk. I guess I spoke to the ministers of Government Services and of Public Works, which does some work, and I may be mistaken -- we understood them to be looking after putting things into place. Other than additional staff -- and if we're looking at equipment that has to be over there. That's why I must sit down then with Marg, because I thought that might have been taken into consideration because it's additional staff. The operation wouldn't involve -- there's a tunnel between us which is not much different from the floors which go up and down. We looked at that in terms of time and so on, and there may certainly be some things that I believe to be a government service for anybody's offices, in terms of putting things in place.

MR STEFANIUK: In terms of staff or the ability of our staff to move, I suggest that moving up and down floors on elevators is certainly a whole lot faster than compared to a trek on foot through a tunnel if that tunnel is of any consequence at all, and I suspect it will be. But I suggest there are other implications that must be considered as well. A couple come to mind immediately. What happens during session insofar as signalling members who may be located in a remote location through sessional bells that the sitting is to commence in five minutes. Do we need to consider that five minutes may not be sufficient time any longer and alter the rules or the practices of this House in order to provide longer notice. What happens, as the Speaker has just mentioned, in the case of a division? Do we still adhere to the three minute bells or provide for a longer period of time? There are ways in which a remote location directly affects, I suggest, the operations of the Assembly.

MRS OSTERMAN: We did have regard for that, and we felt there was going to have to be a trial period so those kinds of things would be established because we just weren't sure what the effect of operating that way would be.

MR CHAIRMAN: If, say, 15 members were to move over to the Ag. Building, and we increased the time on division bells, it would mean that the other 64 members are going to have to twiddle that much longer to give fair opportunity for members who may be in their offices in the Ag. Building to come back for a recorded vote. We could consider possibly having a brief adjournment every time a division is called. Divisions certainly intrude far more into the proceedings of other Houses than they do into ours. I mean, the very word itself comes from Westminster, where the members trot out into the division lobbies and then file past counters, the yeas on one side and the nays on the other. There's a real division, and that's where it comes from. They say the House divided. In Ottawa, I've forgotten how long they ring the division bells there, but in Ontario, God bless us.

MR STEFANIUK: In Ottawa they ring the division bells until such time as the whips decide they are ready to go. The bells have rung for three or four hours.

MR CHAIRMAN: However, we have had a very efficient way of having recorded votes in this House thus far. I guess it's maybe going to have to lose a little bit of efficiency in the interests of giving better space to the members.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I sure don't want to be remiss in my duty of discussing the implications. It seemed premature, because there are a lot of things we really didn't know in terms of the impact on the Legislative Assembly. But in terms of the budget, that's very important.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, if we had a notion of how many members are going over, how much additional staff there would be, I would assume that by the time we have our next meeting the Clerk could come back with probable figures.

MRS OSTERMAN: I will talk to Marg about that and get some things down, because we did have some ideas as to the additional staff.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that with regard to extra funding which may be necessary as a result of some members moving to the Agriculture Building, the Government Whip will be providing the Clerk with information especially concerning extra staffing, and the Clerk would thereupon provide supplementary estimates in that regard for consideration at the next meeting. Is that agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that enough for the Ag. Building?

DR COOK: Just one further thing on that. One of the reasons it was proving somewhat problematic to include that in budget was that it was not clear as to the numbers that were involved in the sense of ratios members to secretaries, and whether it would be consistent in what will be later known as the Legislature Annex and this building. So any inclusion of some sort of

provision in the budget without clarification on that would have been purely arbitrary.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the purpose of the consensus we've just recorded is to get that.

DR COOK: Yes, I agree. I was just trying to clarify why it was not in.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are we ready to start on the estimates or is there any other business? I don't know whether there is any purpose in bringing it up here or not. I do have a space concern, though, in regard to the government interns. Two of them came to see me today and said they were having difficulty working there because the ventilation isn't adequate and they develop headaches. They're down in a subterranean cavern on the first floor, just about underneath the front steps.

MR PURDY: The same one as last year.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's where they were last year. They were slightly unhappy last year. Maybe these two who came to see me today are more sensitive to the lack of fresh air. I'm told nobody is smoking.

MR GOGO: Well the fifth floor storeroom -- we discussed this once before -- is virtually empty; a tremendous amount of space there.

MR STEFANIUK: Again, windowless.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm going to look into it. If we could get additional ventilation down there, that would help. The scenery is going to have to be photographs on the walls. Is that enough for that?

I don't know to what extent members have had an opportunity to take a look at this. I reviewed the definitions and had a little difficulty with one of them. If you'll look at page IV, at the beginning, the definition about the middle there of 1981-82 forecast. That will make sense if you strike out the word "new" in both lines. If you put "new" it refers to '82-83, and that's not intended. Members may have noticed that the result of the compilation of these new estimates is an overall increase of 3 per cent. That may be worth knowing if occasionally you see a fairly large decrease or if you see a fairly large increase in the individual items.

Are we ready to go to -- you probably want to leave the summary to the end and go to General Administration. There may be some concern that in the odd place a number or letter may not be clearly legible, but we did the best we could. The only alternative would be just about an unacceptable amount of typing. Are there any questions or observations about General Administration? You'll notice the working papers follow. On the working papers, you may want to write the word "over" at the bottom of some of those that have information on the other side as well.

MR PURDY: I see there is a 730 per cent decrease in purchase of fixed assets.

MR STEFANIUK: The comparable figure from the estimate input column is to the forecast input. You see where we had an amount of \$29,450. We budgeted in that in the previous year -- the original budget was for only \$10,300. We had to get into equipment for constituency offices. You'll recall that we

received special warrants to fund telephone answering equipment and a certain number of typewriters that we had to buy. That is reduced very considerably because we do not anticipate having to replace that equipment this year.

MR PURDY: There's no projection then of any of the other members coming in and opening up new constituency offices. There are 47 now?

MR STEFANIUK: I believe it's 47. We have some equipment in inventory. Those are best guess figures, based on information we have as to new openings. The budget, I hasten to mention, is a zero-base budget to the extent that is possible. So we do not allow figures from a previous year to influence, unless it is absolutely impossible to do otherwise, the input figure for the following year.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think that's a fairly important point to record, that in preparing the estimates the administration followed the principle of zero-base budgeting.

MRS OSTERMAN: Did you take a 'guesstimate' about new office openings that might come up?

MR STEFANIUK: We based that on discussion with members. Our contact with members is frequent enough that we feel we have some indication as to attitudes about opening new offices or rejecting the idea entirely. So that is taken into consideration.

MRS OSTERMAN: Some of us may be thinking about it and not make a decision until the spring of '82.

MR STEFANIUK: You appreciate we're dealing with a certain number of uncertainties. I also wish to draw attention to another item which is very uncertain at the moment. That is the item dealing with freight and postage, under code number 290. Freight and postage is based on current experience, with slight additional escalation. We do not have a formal announcement from the federal government or from the new Crown corporation relative to an increase in postage rates. We simply know that a very substantial increase is being rumored. We're concerned about our input figures in that regard. We have discussed with Treasury the possible establishment of a universal, if you like, contingency fund. Treasury informs us it does not have any intention of establishing that kind of fund. If postage goes up to 30 cents for a first class letter, an almost 100 per cent increase, everyone in the government and the Legislative Assembly is obviously going to be confronted with the same problem. The result may well be that we are seeking substantial amounts by way of special warrant to counter the effects of a substantial postal rate increase. I suggest that is not confined only to this area of General Administration, but has some very significant effects on that budget item where we cover the communication allowance for members, since to a very large extent members using that allowance may rely on postage. That may be an item this committee wishes to discuss and come to some conclusions on.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to get into the specific categories?

MR PURDY: Last year we went through the summaries, didn't we?

MR STEFANIUK: We went through the summaries and referred to the explanations whenever an item was questioned or it seemed advisable to look at the detailed explanations for each item.

MR GOGO: The point you raise, Bo, is really uncontrollable because it's not fact yet.

MR STEFANIUK: No, it is not.

MR GOGO: You cannot budget for inflation -- or it used to be; I see some comments here about that. I don't see how we can budget other than using our judgment.

MR STEFANIUK: I feel the member should be aware of what the potential is in the eventuality that the Canada Post Office does in fact introduce a substantially higher rate for postal delivery.

MR CHAIRMAN: What is your wish? Do you want to carry on with the summary, or do you want to go into the individual categories?

MR PURDY: I think that as the Clerk said, last year we just looked at the summary and then, if questions arose from the summary, we could go to individual categories. I don't think it's necessary to go through each one step by step, if there are no further questions.

MR STEFANIUK: In some areas we have substantial increases and substantial decreases, again warranted by zero-base budgeting and, in some cases, shifting around of figures under other headings. For example, you've asked the question relevant to the purchase of fixed assets. We have reduced the grants control group substantially, the reason there being that we made a special donation to the working capital fund of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which was a one-time expense. That's the only thing that would account for it, because the item was that substantial. So we have a decrease of 173 per cent. Under hospitality we have an increase of 312 per cent, simply because this year we are building in, under hospitality, provision for hosting in Alberta of the annual conference of Clerks at the Table in Canada; it's our turn, once in 12 years. And so this escalates by so much in this one year. It drops right down again next year, so that next year you can anticipate a very substantial percentage decrease, but we don't want to go the route of special warrants to host that event. I feel it should be approved by the House.

Under data processing services we have substantial increases and they are accounted for by the new rates as described for us by Alberta Government Services for use of Data Centre facilities and, again, based on our needs in that particular regard.

MRS OSTERMAN: A question, Mr. Chairman. Don't you normally have a dinner in the fall?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: And this year?

MR CHAIRMAN: It still is uncertain.

MRS OSTERMAN: Because we have visitors quite often.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right. The CPA advisory committee -- if you would like to digress into this topic for a minute -- had recommended that we invite the Atlantic provinces, which was done. I gave them a preliminary indication in the spring, of course not knowing at all then when the fall sittings would open. When I got confirmation or advice from the Executive Council and sent out the notices I then discovered that we had problems with getting the Atlantic provinces, so we tried to move the date to November 4. We ran into further conflicts and it now appears that our choices are either November 2 -- that is still not certain -- or not at all, and next spring on the Friday after the opening. There's more to the subject than that, but I don't know whether you want to digress into it.

MR STEFANIUK: The short answer is probably that there will not be a dinner on October 16.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, you mean the short answer is that there certainly will not. There's a possibility, and it's a bare possibility, of November 2, which is a Monday.

MR PURDY: I would think that's a lot more convenient than the Friday night after the opening of the spring session, because if we leave here on Friday even at 11:45 or 12 o'clock, a lot of members want to get back to the constituencies.

MR CHAIRMAN: There's no question there'll be a substantial leverage, but if we had it on the night of the opening the members have their guests from out of town and there's no way we can accommodate them. We have a fixed limit in that rotunda, and we have to live with it, or go elsewhere and add an enormous increase in expense. We were going to have some increase, anyway, because NAIT can't cater; they have had a delay in the reconstruction of their kitchen.

MR GOGO: What was the average percentage increase overall in General Administration?

MR CHAIRMAN: Minus seven.

MR GOGO: I couldn't believe it when I looked at it.

MR CHAIRMAN: In the absence of some direction from the committee as to how you want to go about this, unless you agree with Bill's idea that we're just going to follow the summary, we'll be doing it at random.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think I'd like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that for our information, the Clerk highlight any areas where there are significant changes one way or the other.

MR STEFANIUK: I have done that with certain items and, I think, provided explanations. I'd be happy to go into more detail if any more were required.

There's a major item under rental of property, equipment, and goods: a reduction of 92 per cent from a very substantial estimated input of \$407,000. The reason for that is because under that item we have previously included the

rental of constituency offices. That has been removed from that area and now, in light of the fact that the legislation has been amended, we have no restriction as to the amount that may be spent on rentals or secretarial or manpower services.

MR CHAIRMAN: In a way, no restriction.

MR STEFANIUK: Well, up to \$10,000. But it is not necessarily confined to rental, and so we now have a separate item which provides for our constituency offices.

MR GOGO: How do you want to deal with this, with general administration or . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I've asked several times, and Bill Purdy has suggested that we just go over the summary and, if there's anything special, go to the particulars.

MR GOGO: I'm happy with that. I'm wondering what's coming next.

MR STEFANIUK: We should probably record approval, Mr. Chairman, of this particular section or department, which is General Administration, before we go on to the next one.

MR CHAIRMAN: That sounds okay.

MR PURDY: Before we do that, where is that proposal of mine? Does that come under General Administration or does it come under members [inaudible] the general administration Act.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes it would, because it affects all caucuses.

MR PURDY: That's right, and that's the proposal of \$150,000 for promotional items for all members of the House.

MR STEFANIUK: This would be the time to adjust that.

MR PURDY: This is a figure we arrived at in 1980-81 dollars. I don't know if members of this committee accept it, if they want to adjust that \$150,000 figure for the 1982-83 budget, or leave it as it is.

MR CHAIRMAN: What's your wish?

MR GOGO: What's your recommendation, Bill?

MR PURDY: My recommendation is that we go with the \$150,000 for promotional items for Members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR CHAIRMAN: Just interjecting, can we think of a better name? It seems like giving popcorn away, with prizes in the boxes. The word "communications" came to mind, but it's not apt either.

MR PURDY: I think you're right. I don't know what terminology we should use.

MR GOGO: "Public relations" sound better?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes it does. It does indeed.

MR PURDY: Public relations items.

MR STEFANIUK: The item in this budget that would be affected, Mr. Chairman, is the item under code number 600 -- materials and supplies.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes. Did you refer to a 92 per cent reduction somewhere?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes I did; under code 350.

MR CHAIRMAN: But that doesn't say 92 per cent.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes it does. That code's 350.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mine says minus 512.

MR STEFANIUK: You're looking under the overall summary for the entire Legislative Assembly, items of general administration. We're dealing with general administration.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right. Okay; I thought we were on the summary.

MR PURDY: I take it we shall come back to the summary at the end, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR STEFANIUK: The summary merely reflects the totals of each of these departments.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, I've got it. I realize that. That's why I asked how we were going to go about it.

MR PURDY: The vote under Code 600, materials and supplies: we have to determine also, for the information of this committee, the amount of money that's now allocated for certain pins that members do pick up -- flags, and so on -- through the Clerk's office.

MR STEFANIUK: If you look under . . .

MR GOGO: It's on there now.

MR STEFANIUK: If you look at the explanatory sheets on a page headed 9a, under General Administration, you see the code 600, materials and supplies, and you have under that . . .

Take the tab for General Administration and under the summary sheet are the detail sheets, and there's one headed 9a.

MRS OSTERMAN: Oh, I see. Medal, signature, plastic, Alberta shield . . .

MR PURDY: How many of these are used by members?

MR STEFANIUK: In effect, they're pretty well all used by members. The only people besides members who would be using any amount of them would be me or the officers of the Assembly, and what we would use would be damned insignificant.

So you see the total amount for pins and flags is \$39,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: In your \$150,000, Bill -- through you, Mr. Chairman -- did you take that into consideration or is that something you would then deduct? Because it was our overall amount that we originally looked at.

MR PURDY: We have said in our summary that what we would make available for members -- allocated to each MLA -- would be 100 of the Canadian flag pin, 100 of the Alberta flag pin, 300 of the Alberta signature pin, 4,000 of the plastic ones, and then 100 of the small crests could be made available for school teams and school children, which come to a total cost of \$111,000. Then there was Appendix A which included the flags, the coat of arms, the spoons, and the various other things that come to \$39,500. So it was approximately \$150,000 of expenditure.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question is: is that inclusive of what we have here, or is it in addition to?

MR PURDY: It's in addition to.

MR GOGO: That's simple: that's \$150,000 plus whatever's there. That's what you're asking.

MR STEFANIUK: So what in fact you're wanting us to do is add \$150,000 to our existing code 600, which will make it about \$277,000.

MR PURDY: That's right. I would so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: On particulars which you propose to supply to the Clerk?

MR PURDY: They're [inaudible]. Don't you have a copy of this?

MR STEFANIUK: I don't have it with me, Bill, but I think I have it.

MR PURDY: If you don't, we'll get you one.

MR GOGO: Public relations material comes under that code.

MR PURDY: I would move that an additional \$150,000 be added to code 600, materials and supplies.

Motion carried

MR STEFANIUK: If there are no other items, perhaps we should have a motion, Mr. Chairman, to approve the General Administration budget with the amendment previously recorded.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: I'll so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: That the proposed General Administration budget, amended as provided in the preceding motion, be approved?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR STEFANIUK: The next item, Mr. Chairman, is members' indemnities. We really have no choice there. That's a statutory item.

MR GOGO: Yes. I so move.

MR CHAIRMAN: Approved on a motion by Mr. Gogo. All agreed?

There aren't very many unions that would sign a four-year contract with a 5 per cent cola clause in it, but you don't read that in the media. Right?

MR GOGO: Well, that won't be reviewed.

MR CHAIRMAN: I know. But it stands as a four-year contract with a 5 per cent cola clause in it.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, members should be aware that we assumed that there will be a further 5 per cent increase in January 1982 and again in January 1983, and we have budgeted on that basis.

You want the vote recorded, then, on that?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, we have that approved, on a motion by Mr. Gogo.
Next?

MR STEFANIUK: Next we have the Speaker's office, serial number 894.

MR PURDY: Freight and postage, I see, is at 300 per cent. Is there a reason for that?

MR GOGO: Gerry's answering his mail now.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sending it all out special delivery.

MR STEFANIUK: In 1980-81 the budget was \$100 and was overspent by \$71.20. The '81-82 budget, with one-third of the year spent, was \$50, and we really feel it was realistic to put that in there considering current practices in the Speaker's office.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR PURDY: [Inaudible] That's insignificant.

MR STEFANIUK: Some of the percentages may seem outlandish, but you may need [inaudible] the dollar value that's opposite them to recognize how significant it is. Even the overall increase of 46 per cent is relatively insignificant when you consider the overall budget.

MRS OSTERMAN: I move that we accept this particular item, which is serial number 894.

MR CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Next, government members.

MR GOGO: Now I know what I perceive to be a decrease in the budget item 895. I think last year it was \$10,000 per member, wasn't it? I'm having some trouble here. And yet I look at the budget and it was about \$8,000. Now it's \$9,000 per member. I guess my information from last year is wrong.

MR PURDY: Your arithmetic, you mean.

MR GOGO: No, I recall last year saying publicly to government members that there was a budget of \$10,000 per member. Obviously that was wrong, because it would have been \$740,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR GOGO: It's \$519,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: I remember being under that impression too, and it appears that instead of the comparison between opposition members and government members being eight to one, it's just three to one.

MRS OSTERMAN: Probably the Clerk will know, Mr. Chairman. Was there built into here the word processing?

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not the one.

MRS OSTERMAN: It should be. I should have talked to Marg about this. I took it for granted that . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Have you got something reasonably definite to go on?

MRS OSTERMAN: Marg has sent the information.

MR STEFANIUK: These budgets for the caucuses, Mr. Chairman, it should be recognized, are prepared by the caucuses and simply summarized by the Clerk's office, but they are not tampered with.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's a bad word. Give them an "amended".

MRS OSTERMAN: I apologize. I took it for granted that that would be in there. I guess we're going to have to go over this particular aspect of it.

DR COOK: There's a very complicated procedure involved, through Government Services, before any figures can even be obtained. One of the things that would be required would be a consultant to come in and assess needs. We aren't even in a position of being able to choose off the spot what we would like, and then find out how much it costs and put it in. Apparently it has to go through procurement services.

MR GOGO: Have we discussed the renting of one on a trial basis?

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought we'd put this thing to rest.

MRS OSTERMAN: I'm sorry. I haven't had this information given to me. I had assumed that it was within our jurisdiction to do that once the need was established by members, and so on. Maybe there's a central buying system or some way of doing this but as with the answering devices, the Clerk, I believe, made all those arrangements, did you not?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MRS OSTERMAN: So I'm going to have to . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Put out a tender on it, actually.

MR STEFANIUK: It all depends on what you think you want within a given caucus in the way of word processing equipment. If it's fairly simple, then we have no difficulty in going out and purchasing it for the caucus with funds which have been voted for that purpose. There are members who have used their communications allowance to purchase word processing equipment -- amen -- and it has not gone through the long complicated process which is advocated by Alberta Government Services. That is a feasibility study which concludes upon the equipment or hardware and software best suited to the particular need. If in this case we are talking about equipment which can produce repetitive letters, if it's as simple an application as that, in my estimation there is little sense in going into a lengthy feasibility study. A decision can be based on experience which has already been gained by a variety of people who occupy space in this building, and who handle the news. I don't think the other route needs to be taken at all, David. It is complicated; it is a lengthy procedure. We waited for a report on a feasibility study we just got today, as a matter of fact, after a terribly long wait. Even then there were seven weeks [inaudible] by the Data Centre, and that in itself perhaps gives some indication of how efficient the services are from that source.

If anything, if a consultant were going to be hired, I would probably be tempted to go the same route as the hon. Premier, and that was to engage a private consultant and rely entirely on his advice, as opposed to relying on the government Data Centre.

MRS OSTERMAN: How is this best handled, Mr. Chairman, now that I don't have any figures, and I . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: From what Dr. Cook says, it would appear to me that we might be a bit previous if we put an amount in now, unless you want to do what the Clerk is suggesting: go to one of the minister's offices where they have this kind of thing and say, what's it costing, and we're going to get the same.

MRS OSTERMAN: We do have some information like that. It's been very thoroughly gone over in terms of people who've worked with that kind equipment.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe you're ready to put an amount in.

MRS OSTERMAN: But I don't have that with me, so I guess . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe we should hang on [inaudible]

MR MANDEVILLE: [Inaudible]

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, sure.

MRS OSTERMAN: Fine, we'll have that for our next meeting.

MR CHAIRMAN: On a motion by Mrs. Osterman -- what code would that come under?

MR GOGO: Eight-fifty.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's serial 895. The estimates for government members are held over.

MR STEFANIUK: That would come under one of two, depending on what you did, John. Either 350 for rental of property, equipment, and goods, or 850 if you bought.

MR CHAIRMAN: Next: opposition. Fred.

MR STEFANIUK: I should point out in regard to these, Mr. Chairman, that under that particular tab which says "Opposition Services", only the summary of all opposition services appears, and perhaps it would be more advisable to look at the individual tabs which follow; in other words, Social Credit Opposition, NDP Opposition, and Independent Member, which would permit, I think, a more accurate assessment.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to do that? All right. So we're over to the Social Credit opposition. There's no serial number there, but I guess that doesn't matter.

MR STEFANIUK: It all falls under serial number 896, and doesn't have the various caucuses divided with their own serial numbers.

MR MANDEVILLE: I see we have the biggest increase of anyone, with [inaudible] per cent.

MR GOGO: Well, you asked for the biggest increase.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to start talking, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: I haven't had the opportunity to look at this at all.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want it held over?

MRS OSTERMAN: What's the overall increase in here, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: It's 18 per cent.

MR STEFANIUK: No, 13 per cent.

MR PURDY: What's the advertising you're proposing, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to see us hold this over so I have a chance to notify caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay, although on the face of it, a 13 per cent increase, giving regard to the rate of inflation, doesn't seem to be that grotesque.

MR PURDY: I'm just questioning your 200 per cent increase in advertising, and what type of advertising is being done.

MR STEFANIUK: We have no details in the explanatory sheets. Again, these are caucus submissions.

MR MANDEVILLE: I'll get some replies back on it for our next meeting.

MRS OSTERMAN: Telephone communications.

MR MANDEVILLE: That's 400.

MR PURDY: It goes from 350 to 5,000.

MR GOGO: Well, there's one that comes to mind, Fred. That is 200 on 3e. I guess the problem I have is in-province travel, \$13,000, and I look at government members and I see \$7,000. It's those kinds of things. We're coming up to a couple of others; one is Grant and the other will be Tom Sindlinger. I went over the book earlier, and I guess I have some difficulty because I've got to report to members of the committee, to colleagues in the House, and say, this is this and this is why. I just can't rationalize it.

I'm not asking you to comment on it now.

MR PURDY: . . . a decrease of 38 per cent over last year's figures.

MR MANDEVILLE: Is that the one you're looking at, 30 per cent?

MR CHAIRMAN: The 200?

MR PURDY: Last year it was \$26,000.

MR GOGO: I guess what I'm getting at is that I have a habit of dividing things by four.

MR PURDY: You see, the actual spent last year was \$12,000.

MR STEFANIUK: Actually, that's '80-81. That's the year before.

MR CHAIRMAN: The whole year. The fiscal year ahead of the one we're in now.

MR PURDY: Is \$12,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR PURDY: And the forecast for this year is \$26,000.

MR STEFANIUK: No. The forecast is \$16,000.

MR PURDY: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR STEFANIUK: The current year expenditure is \$26,000 which is in line with the budget that was approved.

MR PURDY: And then their projection is a decrease of 38 per cent.

MR MANDEVILLE: I would think that that would be. I don't know what portion of our budget is spent so far, and in this area I don't think we've spent our budget that was approved. That's why that reduction is there.

MR CHAIRMAN: On motion by Mr. Mandeville, Social Credit opposition estimates are held over to the next meeting. Right?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The NDP.

DR COOK: Just before that, could I just use the telephone? Is there a taxi number out there, or a telephone guide?

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't think so.

MR STEFANIUK: For Yellow Cab? 426-3456.

DR COOK: Thank you.

MR CHAIRMAN: We didn't invite the two independent members to come here, but it seems that if we're going to do anything significant by way of changing our estimates, then we have to let them know and invite them to the next meeting.

MRS OSTERMAN: Which is what happened before. The independent -- well, no; both were here last year, I think. They ended up requesting to come.

And the overall change in the NDP . . .

MR GOGO: Nineteen per cent.

MR PURDY: The one I want to question is the increase of 27 per cent in relationship to professional, technical, and labor services.

MR CHAIRMAN: One hundred per cent increase in telephone communications, but there's a similarly large one in the Socred office, so there must be some similar reasons behind it.

MR PURDY: There was no background information on that come into the Clerk's office?

MR STEFANIUK: No. It's on those sheets. It's on page 6f following that summary, Bill, and there's nothing there, as you can see.

MR GOGO: Well, I think we'd want an explanation.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR PURDY: If he's kept it constant to around \$19,000 in the last year and the projection for this year's forecast, and now he's jumped it up to \$25,000, so I'd like to know what that increase is for.

MR CHAIRMAN: What's the carry-over from last year?

We're at the NDP one, Fred, and there are some questions about it. Would you like us to make a note of the questions so that when they come back here next time they could be ready to answer them?

MR PURDY: Oh yes, definitely.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. So referring to the NDP question on the budget, what's the first question?

MR PURDY: Vote 430 regarding professional, technical, and labor services, the increase of 27 per cent: why?

MR CHAIRMAN: So the first question is as to why code 430 is going up 27 per cent. Any other questions?

MR PURDY: Another one I have is why the employee contributions have increased so much when the actual other wages and so on haven't.

MR CHAIRMAN: You'll notice that there are 200 per cent reductions; the second and third items.

MR STEFANIUK: The employer contributions: we have a couple of new programs, Mr. Chairman, and we should recognize that those are being reflected in all sections where we deal with employer contributions, one of them being the dental plan. The percentage there would cause it to be fairly significant when we start contributing to the dental plan, for one thing. Then, of course, there is the management pension. You have a breakdown of it on page 2f under code number 4Q.

MR GOGO: I would feel more comfortable, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, if the proponents of the budgets could be invited to the next meeting so they could explain the budget. I don't want to short-change them. My feeling is that if they're not here, they may be short-changed and . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: The payment to contract employees has gone up significantly. And it's more than a normal salary.

MR PURDY: I move that this be held and that the NDP representative be invited to the next meeting.

MR MANDEVILLE: Would you do the same with the independent member?

MR PURDY: We may as well. We have questions on that one too.

That the questions that we've asked tonight be conveyed to Mr. Notley's office so that he may be prepared to answer the questions.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. So we're over to committees.

MR PURDY: Well, there might be some questions on the independent member, too, that . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: I thought your motion said they'd both be held over.

MR PURDY: Yes. They should both be held over, but we should also look at Sindlinger's and look at some of the increases so that either the secretary or the Clerk could go back to them and say, here are some questions being asked, and he'd be prepared to answer them when he comes in front of the committee.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Your motion was to hold over . . . You see, I thought Fred had moved a motion to hold over Social Credit.

MR PURDY: I move NDP.

MR CHAIRMAN: I thought yours was the NDP and the independent member.

MRS OSTERMAN: Make it the independent member then, too. We don't need to ask any questions; they'll be here to answer [inaudible].

MR CHAIRMAN: The motion by Fred Mandeville then is: that the Social Credit caucus budget be held over till the next meeting. Then we have a motion by Mr. Purdy that the estimates of the NDP and the independent member also be held over to that date.

So then we're to committees.

MRS OSTERMAN: And that they are invited to attend.

MR MANDEVILLE: Would you excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I have to catch a plane.

MR CHAIRMAN: We can only go for another 10 minutes, Fred, so I guess maybe . . . Do you want to adjourn now?

MR MANDEVILLE: It would take me 40 minutes.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're the only person, you know, representing the opposition.

MR MANDEVILLE: You still have a quorum, and we've dealt with . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: But we've only got 10 minutes to go. Bill has a place to go and so have I.

MRS OSTERMAN: Which airport are you going to?

MR PURDY: He says it takes 40 minutes to get to the airport because of the traffic tonight.

MR CHAIRMAN: In any case, we've only got 10 minutes to go. So is it worth it?

MR PURDY: No. Let's adjourn then.

MR CHAIRMAN: A motion for adjournment by Mr. Purdy at 5:50 p.m. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, the next meeting. We're not here anymore, but we can still talk about the next meeting.

MR PURDY: Well, my suggestion before we . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: We'll sort it out in the minutes and put the next meeting ahead of the adjournment.

MR PURDY: I suggested before the rest of the committee members got here that there's no time between now and the opening of the House, because there's only Tuesday left of next week, that we look at an evening, supper meeting, starting at 5:30, and if the House sits, so be it; if it doesn't we just continue till we finish the budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that fair?

MRS OSTERMAN: It sounds reasonable.

MR PURDY: I'd suggested the 19th.

MR STEFANIUK: Tuesday, isn't it?

MR PURDY: Monday night. Monday the 19th.

MR CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Purdy that the committee meet on Monday, October 19, following the afternoon adjournment of the Assembly, and be prepared to continue to finish the estimates if the Assembly does not sit that evening.

MR PURDY: And that the Speaker would be looking after dinner.

MR CHAIRMAN: We don't include that. Not expensive asides.

MRS OSTERMAN: We just come looking hungry and hope that he's looked after us.
We can meet up in the suite to have a bite.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're serious? You'd like some food brought in?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: And that supper be provided. Are you agreed? All in favor?

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.