

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Tuesday, November 24, 1981

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

6:20 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for a motion concerning the minutes of the meeting of October 19? We have some business arising from the minutes. It has been moved by Mr. Gogo that the minutes of the meeting of October 19, 1981, be adopted as circulated. All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think we should consider what we are going to try to deal with at this meeting, since our time is limited. I'd suggest that the two most urgent items are funding of members' offices and the continuation or completion of the discussion of the estimates, rather than going, for the time being, to business arising from the minutes of the last meeting. Is there general agreement?

MR APPLEBY: Just for information: Connie, you had Item 3 you were going to provide some information on. It's in the minutes. The alternative office space.

MRS OSTERMAN: Oh yes. Marg was going to bring some information down for us.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to deal with that first?

MRS OSTERMAN: No, just to circulate it for information. We'll get to it eventually. We may not finish it tonight.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, if I could speak to the suggestion for the agenda, you mentioned funding of constituency offices. In discussions I've had with members, I think No. 4 would be more important. Or does that fall in the same ballpark? Extra funding for constituency offices.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's what I'm talking about.

MR APPLEBY: What's the difference between that and the last one, Item 2?

MR CHAIRMAN: Really nothing except that Item 4 is more specific. There were two problems there: one was interpretation in regard to supplies. The problem I'm proposing for discussion is additional funding for members' offices for the current year.

As members know, the amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act, which was approved this spring, gives the committee plus the Speaker the jurisdiction to increase that funding. I think we should consider this. If we increase the funding from now on, money which would otherwise have gone for supplies will be available for salary and rent. We would have to get additional funding right from the present forward. If, and I'm not sure whether we can, we

approve it retroactively, then funding which has already been earmarked for supplies would be freed. Those deductions from the \$10,000 allotment would be removed and that would restore certain additional funding, which could be used for rent and salaries. On the other hand, you may decide you don't want the additional funding to take effect until some date in the future.

We have tried to collect information, and we had difficulty getting it. All kinds of statistics are available regarding salaries and rents in Edmonton and Calgary, especially downtown, but there are no constituency offices there. We have attempted to get information concerning the places where there are members' offices. Miss Yuzyk is now circulating a summary of the representations we got from various constituencies with regard to both salaries, or secretarial work, and rents.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, is the topic open for discussion?

MR CHAIRMAN: I thought it was. I assumed we had agreed -- am I wrong? -- that we deal with those two topics first.

MR GOGO: I had wanted to speak to the procedure. As I understand it now -- I forget the Bill number before the House now; Do may know. Bill 99, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, deals with the question of supplies and services. I understand that's one matter. The other matter is the extra funding for constituency offices. That is part and parcel. As I see it, and correct me if I'm wrong, of the \$10,000 appropriated last year, some members committed themselves for \$5,000 rent and \$5,000 wages. They then found out, for a variety of reasons, that there is a substantial number -- maybe it's to do with interpretation -- of other things added in in the form of supplies and services that have, in effect, put them in a position that because the rent is committed, they would have to make changes to their office in terms of changing hours of closing. If Bill 99 is dealt with, some compensation is arranged for there. I don't know whether or not it's retroactive, but that would look after part of that.

The second issue is those members who are on a month to month tenancy in rent and have faced dramatic increases in rent, or those who had a contract for wages not for a year but for three or six months, and the wages have gone up.

I understand we're going to discuss here both items: Bill 99, when it passes, supply and services are resolved, and perhaps extra funding for such things as rent and wages. Is that accurate?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is two different and, as you said, related matters. The Bill, unless it's amended in committee, provides that it take effect on Royal Assent.

MR GOGO: Not retroactive, in other words?

MR CHAIRMAN: No. So it would alleviate the shortage from now until the end of March. I think there is a way we could possibly eliminate the cost of the supplies that have been charged to members heretofore, and that is by simply giving additional funding amounting to that members have had taken out of their \$10,000 money for supplies. If we were to include that in any increase we might approve now, that would relieve the financial pressure.

Incidentally, I assume everyone here knows everyone else. This is Mr. Mark Byington, the Pooh-Bah for the Social Credit office. And Margaret Pratt; she

has a similar position in the government members' office. Charlene Blaney has a somewhat similar position in the Clerk's administration. Do you know everyone else around the table? Do you know Vera Yuzyk? She is one of the people who helps to keep me out of trouble. Perhaps you'd like to tell people who you are.

MS RATTAN: I'm Susan Rattan from the Calgary Herald.

MR THORNE: I'm Duncan Thorne of the Journal.

MR MANDELBAUM: I'm Henry Mandelbaum from Grant Notley's office.

MR CHAIRMAN: Good. To come back to John's point, you're government members. Do you expect this Bill to go through?

MR PURDY: The Bill will go through at the pleasure of the House.

MR APPLEBY: It may not go through until sometime in April, or whenever.

MR CHAIRMAN: I guess we're in difficulty if we increase the funding disregarding the Bill, or are we really? The Bill is going to remove an interpretational difficulty with the text; that's all. It's going to make it clear that supplies don't come out of the \$10,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the Bill were amended in committee to change the time it takes effect; in other words, to go back to rectify what had inadvertently happened, that would look after it.

MR CHAIRMAN: That would mean that each member's \$10,000 would be replenished by the amount that was taken out of it for supplies.

MR GOGO: It would not account for increased [inaudible].

MRS OSTERMAN: Right.

MR CHAIRMAN: One of the reasons for the inadequacy of the \$10,000 is that supplies were taken out, and that wasn't anticipated.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the Bill is not amended to take care of that, can we somehow make a recommendation that you consider providing the funding just as you have indicated? Hopefully, within a short while the Bill under discussion will be through, and you'll know the status of it and could act accordingly.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose this committee makes a recommendation to increase the funding by a certain amount. Subsequently, the Bill is passed. How will that affect the increase in funding?

MR APPLEBY: We don't want to do both.

MRS OSTERMAN: I think there are two things here. One is the problem with members who, through their own budgeting process, didn't expect to be short that amount, by paying for materials and supplies they didn't know they were

going to have to pay for. The other item is the major increases in terms of salaries, space, and so on. To me, that is a separate issue for discussion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we deal with it this way? Could we consider a recommendation to increase the allowance for salaries and rents, leaving the question of supplies aside altogether?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, I think that would be a good idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: If that's what we're going to do, I wonder if you've had a chance to look at the representations we've had from members with regard to the inadequacy of the . . . As you may recall, this resulted from a memo I circulated to all members, asking them to state their views about this funding and to give particulars concerning any shortages they might think there were. It seems that city members are having more distress than country members, but I don't know of any way we can differentiate.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I could just give you my own personal experience. I haven't opened an office in Airdrie, which I had full intention of doing, because \$10,000 can't begin . . . I don't have a choice of opening an office with another member, as some city members have done. It may be that other communities that are almost in the lap of a large metropolitan area suffer the same sort of fate; I'm not sure.

In terms of handling this, do we get to the point where we should start looking at what's a reasonable office and so on? How are we going to decide what the norm should be? Eventually, we have to tackle that problem in terms of saying -- it may not be hard and fast, but it may be that the committee would like to recommend some guidelines to be looked at.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's going to be difficult to do because if you apply guidelines equally to rural and city offices -- Miss Blaney has been to all the offices.

MISS BLANEY: With the exception of three.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Charlene to make some comments about the offices? I think we'd all be much enlightened.

MISS BLANEY: They're all very different. A lot of them reflect members' personalities. We have store front offices. We have little cubbyholes. We have one in Calgary that is a business office, where we have the three ministers combined. No two offices are the same. The difficulty I see for us is that if we have to -- and we will have to put together some guidelines: what's good for Pincher Creek is not good for Fort McMurray. And the members, you'll notice, there have been some decreases in the rent. They've been negotiating with their landlords. Maybe they've decided they would take over the cleaning to get a rent decrease. So they have a little extra money saved, and they want a photocopier or something. So they've been managing them very well, saving on rent so they could have an extra service they need. But the member in one office may need a photocopier, where another one wouldn't. We

would be saying to all of them: no, you can't have it. It's really hard to make the guidelines.

MR GOGO: On that point, you've addressed the extraverts and the introverts -- the store fronts and second storey rear, and I appreciate your comment because that's where I am. I would find it very difficult for this committee to try to say we should have X square feet. We have members who entertain, in terms of their, job groups of 50 or 60 people. We have others who work on a one to one basis for interviews. I would feel somewhat reluctant for us to drop those parameters. But this is an urgent matter, in my view and of members I've spoken to.

I'd like to put on the table for discussion an increase from the \$10,000 of \$2,500 for the fiscal year we're dealing with, addressing the extra amount of money.

MR CHAIRMAN: For the fiscal year or the remainder of the fiscal year?

MR GOGO: I don't see any difference, but maybe the Clerk could tell me.

MR STEFANIUK: Oh yes, there is.

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure. If it's for the fiscal year, part of it has gone and part of the \$2,500 has gone. But if it's from now until March 31 . . .

MR GOGO: For the balance of the year then. I thought if we went from \$10,000 to \$12,500 for the fiscal year . . .

MR STEFANIUK: If it's for the fiscal year, we would have to consider what is remaining in the fiscal year, and we would be able to provide only that. If one-third of the year is remaining, it would be one-third of \$2,500.

MR GOGO: An additional \$2,500.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion of the motion?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Just so I'm clear, if it's \$2,500 for the remainder of the year, that's \$2,500. It isn't a third.

MR STEFANIUK: \$2,500.

MR CHAIRMAN: From here on in, to March 31.

MR APPLEBY: So that puts it up \$7,500 for the year.

MR CHAIRMAN: Presumably, we'd be taking another look at it.

MR GOGO: I think that would deal with this year only.

MISS BLANEY: It should. The people who are in trouble, whom we've attempted to notify to this point, are running approximately \$800 overspent in the estimate for the year thus far. We've tried to do forecasts for the members on our own where practical.

MRS OSTERMAN: Could we look at the information that has been provided us here?

MR CHAIRMAN: If you look at the foolscap sheet, that lists everyone who answered the memo. As you can see, three-quarters of those said it was inadequate. Three, by coincidence or design, said it should go up to \$18,200. One said it should be doubled.

MR APPLEBY: The average lease increase, from what we have here of the ones who have given us the figures, is 25 per cent.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, if I might ask Bo a question, or Charlene. Supposing it is \$2,500 for the balance of the year, those who are now overspent and are in debt -- as you said, about \$800 -- would they be able to get that back, or are they just out of luck on that and from now on . . .

MR STEFANIUK: They're overspent, but they haven't been hit with their own money yet.

MISS BLANEY: They're overspent for this portion of the fiscal year. We've determined that it's over half way through. If you were over the \$5,000, which is over the half way mark, we have started alerting the people.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: It's not out of their pocket yet.

MISS BLANEY: It's not out of their pocket.

MR STEFANIUK: They're overspent in proportion to the portion of the year that has gone by. We monitor on a monthly basis.

MR CHAIRMAN: Real overspending can't be established until the fiscal year is over.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right. If I can recall the comment of a few members, Mr. Chairman, they said that at a certain point in time, about three-quarters of the way through the year, their office would have to be closed because at that time they would be out of funds.

MR APPLEBY: That is also based on the fact that they have been paying for their supplies.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right. The supplies have been coming out of the \$10,000.

MR APPLEBY: Of course, when Bill 99 is passed -- so far we have no idea when it will come into effect.

MR CHAIRMAN: It says, upon Royal Assent. The thing is, if we're going to postpone this until Bill 99 is passed, it's going to aggravate the situation considerably.

MR PURDY: I don't think it's necessary. I think we can go ahead and make a decision now.

MR CHAIRMAN: And deal only with rent and salaries.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, John had a suggestion of the amount. I wonder if we could do a quick look at what members have put forward here and see if

that's going to be the kind of average help that will be enough. Obviously, it's not going to be enough for some people, but I suppose it may be some kind of average. Has anyone looked at this?

MR CHAIRMAN: It's pretty hard to arrive at an average.

MR APPLEBY: You can't very well take care of certain situations. That's a member's prerogative. For instances, if they're paying over \$900 a month for salary, that's over \$10,000 right there.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Charlene a question. I'm looking at these percentages. Are they the projected increase that members are looking at? In other words, I would think that when members set up offices, they had a budget based on certain hard facts they had at their disposal. Those amounts have now changed. Talking about Barrhead: 47.7 per cent. So you can't say that a member hasn't budgeted properly. They've just been hit with those kinds of increases.

MISS BLANEY: They have been hit. The statistics you've been provided with are from those constituencies that have had to negotiate new contracts on their offices. A number of the offices were for three years. These are the ones that have come up to date for renegotiation.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I didn't make a motion. I simply put \$2,500 on the table. My view is that I plan to discuss it when we get into -- I hope we haven't passed constituency office funding for next year. What I'm trying to do now is assist my colleagues in having enough funds to see out their year.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to 1982-83, I should say we've already gone through the general administration budget, and the committee has given approval to the budget which is based on current appropriations, i.e. \$10,000 per office.

MRS OSTERMAN: We may have to review that then, Mr. Chairman.

MR STEFANIUK: Yes. I suggest we'll have to go back to that item.

MR GOGO: I just didn't want us addressing that now, Connie.

MRS OSTERMAN: Right. Right now we're looking at only the rest of this year.

MR GOGO: So when I put \$2,500 on the table, members may want to change that. I think we should resolve it fairly quickly.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on the \$2,500?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Is that a motion or just a suggestion?

MR GOGO: A suggestion.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's not a motion?

MR GOGO: No. I want to get a feeling, and then I'm prepared to put a motion.

MR APPLEBY: I certainly have reservations about it.

MR CHAIRMAN: In which direction, Frank?

MR APPLEBY: That we should be pretty cautious about bringing in this sort of thing. It's going to cost almost \$200,000. What I'm thinking about is that these people have been alerted to the fact that there is an overrun on their costs. I don't know what type of operation they've been running, but for the balance of the year probably they can run in a different manner, cut back, if they know that the following year they'll get an increase. Also the matter of supplies will be taken care of out of Bill 99. My feeling is we shouldn't do anything about it.

MR CHAIRMAN: The fact that you provide the increase doesn't necessarily mean it's going to be spent. Some members are doing reasonably well. Presumably, they won't touch the increase.

MR APPLEBY: I know. I'm doing well myself. I haven't spent anything.

MR CHAIRMAN: I haven't either.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if we come up with an increase to finish out this year, because a number of us haven't had an office, I expect there will be an amount unexpended in that vote. Because it's just a global amount, could it be used for other offices?

MR STEFANIUK: No, because the ceiling is applicable to each member.

MRS OSTERMAN: But if we decided that each member's ceiling were to be raised, are the funds there or are we talking about a special warrant?

MR STEFANIUK: No, the funds are not here. We budgeted on the basis of \$10,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: That isn't what I meant.

MR APPLEBY: You budget for a lump sum to cover that \$10,000. Supposing it went up to \$12,500, there still would be enough money in that appropriation to cover that if a lot of them didn't pick up their funding.

MR STEFANIUK: There would be some money left because we budgeted for 79 offices and there are 53 in existence. So money is left in the appropriation.

MR APPLEBY: As long as we didn't have to get extra money for it, I would see it in a different light.

MR STEFANIUK: Twenty-six at \$10,000. There is \$260,000 in there.

MRS OSTERMAN: There may be the odd office open between now and the end of the year. But supposing there were about \$200,000 available.

MR APPLEBY: Is there an overrun on all of them, Charlene?

MISS BLANEY: No. There is only an overrun on roughly 14 to date.

MR STEFANIUK: That's an overrun at this time of year.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: That could be more at the end of the year.

MISS BLANEY: I suspect there will be.

MR APPLEBY: I'm not sure of the technicalities of this, but I think Connie is on to something. If we could agree to increase it without having to go to special warrant or something like that, it would be a different matter.

MRS OSTERMAN: It would sound as if the kind of figure John has put forward is fairly reasonable. It won't look after some of the projections I see here, but it will certainly be a great help to a few people.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fred, how are your fellows making out?

MR MANDEVILLE: I haven't heard any complaints.

MR CHAIRMAN: We got an answer from you. Bob Clark answered and said it was inadequate. We haven't got one from Walter Buck, and Ray Speaker didn't say anything.

MR MANDEVILLE: Bob Clark of course will terminate.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but he said it was inadequate.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I move we increase funding to constituency offices by \$2,500 for the balance of the fiscal year.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion of the motion?

MR GOGO: Is there a seconder?

MR CHAIRMAN: We don't need one. The House doesn't have them; we're a committee of the House. Is there any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those agreed? Opposed? Carried. Now, that will go in the form of a recommendation to the Speaker, and the Speaker, I think I can forecast, will go along with the recommendation.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we're on the topic, could we take a look at the . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Go back to that estimate?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's do that.

MR STEFANIUK: The estimates for 1982-83?

MR APPLEBY: Yes, the next budget year.

MR STEFANIUK: It's under general administration, Code 430, under professional, technical, and labor; page 8a, supporting documentation: \$790,000.

Obviously, that has to be reconsidered depending on what decision is made relative to the maximum allowance for 1982-83 and in light of the possible effects of Bill 99.

MR CHAIRMAN: Increases that take place after the budget is passed can again be taken into account through this committee.

MRS OSTERMAN: Except, Mr. Chairman, we would then be in a position where if all offices were functioning, we'd be going to special warrant. So I suppose we should do the best possible job of guesstimating this. If I could open the discussion again, looking at the next year we have some amount of time to consider this. I'm still troubled that we have -- I see the thing growing like topsy in terms of addressing the question of offices and so on. Somehow I would like us to have a really good -- obviously, I'm pleased we've increased in the amount we just have because people got into a budget problem through no fault of their own, in my estimation, because they had budgeted originally on the basis of \$10,000. But looking to the future, if we don't have some sort of feel for how we're going to pick the amount out and why -- everybody has gone off, and maybe this committee agrees that it should be just a completely individual operation, that we acknowledge that and take some sort of middle course in terms of picking out an amount. I have a feeling that will come back to haunt the committee at a later date, and somehow we should try to wrestle with it just a little, at least a discussion about how all of us feel about no guidelines in terms of trying to get a proper amount.

MR GOGO: Speaking to that in principle, Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with the Member for Three Hills. I've always had a great concern that any attempt be made here -- and I hope that is not the inference by Connie -- to differentiate between members. We allocate a specific amount, and you cut your cloth accordingly. That responsibility has to be on the member. I don't think Connie inferred that we should look at city members versus rural members. I strongly believe we should appropriate money to a member of the Assembly. If we want to put in guidelines later as to how that's used, i.e. the store front neon sign, that's a matter I think we should discuss. But in terms of allocating per member, I think we should end up with a dollar figure that we can guesstimate which would be adequate for '82-83, and then consider that the following year.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I see the amount being equal. Nobody can quarrel with it. But it creates inequality, because I can have an office in every one of my villages and towns for \$10,000 and have people who will be there, but I can't put one in the major centre of Airdrie, 9,000 people. Obviously, that happens to city members. I guess what I'm thinking is that in the application of it, maybe it's the application that has to be somewhat equal. I don't know. I suppose you can say that a city member, or somebody with a large urban centre in their rural constituency, should have only one office and that the rural member, whose costs aren't as high, can afford more than one office, can afford many offices, and needs that kind of operation to do the best job for their constituency. That may well be. Then there are those people whose ground is covered by both seas. The amount may be equal, but the application of funding then becomes inequitable.

MR CHAIRMAN: But aren't you in the same situation if you pay the same salary to a man with seven children and to another who hasn't any?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the federal government, and some of the other provinces which provide constituency offices -- there is no means of equalizing. I'm sure Marcel Lambert with his office in west Edmonton gets the same amount as someone in Toronto.

MRS OSTERMAN: I was going to be facetious and say that maybe the man with seven children had a choice.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: The expenses for the MLAs are all the same regardless of whether it is somebody way up north who can't fly home and has to drive all the way or someone who lives right here in Edmonton, or Calgary, or someone who has to drive way down to Medicine Hat. They have to do with -- so I think about the only thing we can do until different localities are addressed is make it a certain amount and leave it at that.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would say that when we started on this funding of members' constituency offices on the basis of the Miller report -- he, of course, wasn't specific about it. But not having had any experience in it in Alberta conditions, it would have been impossible to draw guidelines. I think it may be a little soon now to prepare guidelines. But if you wish, suppose that in the administration of the Assembly, we do the best we can. We will make comparisons with other jurisdictions and try to come up with a proposal to this committee for some kind of guideline. The only thing is that I don't know whether we have that much time to approve our estimates.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: I wouldn't want to see that pinned down as a definite instruction to the Clerk's office.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm suggesting that if you wish, you can say to us that you would like us to make some attempt to prepare some reasonably adequate guidelines for the committee's consideration.

MR GOGO: I'm uncomfortable with that, to be very frank, Mr. Chairman. I don't differ with you very often, and I do differ very carefully. I think we're seeing a burgeoning system in this Assembly. On the one hand, the dollars are going straight up, but I don't see us getting through additional changes for staff in this Assembly to administer it. I think we should look to the responsibility of the member and set a dollar limit on the office, and let him be accountable. He's accountable in instituting a contract between the Clerk of this Assembly and his landlord and/or employee.

MR CHAIRMAN: Of course, the Clerk approves all the leases. It's difficult to do that with staff that are engaged, because they have different qualifications, and so on. We'd have to have an enormous staff here to administer that.

MR GOGO: That's why I object to the guidelines.

MRS OSTERMAN: I have a question to Charlene, Mr. Chairman. Are you ever involved in the choosing of constituency offices? Do those who have offices just come in and say, this is what I have?

MISS BLANEY: No. I have been involved in going out and speaking with real estate people, finding the space, assisting in the selection, doing the negotiating.

MR STEFANIUK: I hasten to point out that that it is above and beyond the call of duty. If guidelines were drawn up, I suggest someone on behalf of the Clerk -- who is the lessee, if the you like, because he actually enters into the lease agreement -- would have to inspect the premises in advance of any agreement being entered into, to ensure that the guidelines were being met. For example, if a member decided this week or next week that he or she had found a location and wanted us to go out and inspect it because he wanted the lease agreement entered into by December 1, I would be a little hardpressed to release anyone for sufficient time to go out and inspect those premises.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is it the consensus, then, that we drop the idea of the administration of the Assembly attempting to prepare guidelines?

MRS OSTERMAN: Agreed.

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, the intent of the \$10,000 per member was to provide an extra service in the constituency. If we make any changes here, we're getting away from what the money was intended for. The resolution we've just passed gave us an increase of 25 per cent. So in Code 430, I think we have to look at a percentage increase for '82-83.

MR APPLEBY: If you're following that criteria, you're going to increase it by 75 per cent for the year. You'll go up to \$17,500 on that basis.

MR GOGO: I need straightening out, Mr. Chairman. The motion passed was an additional \$2,500, which has nothing to do with the '82-83 year.

MR CHAIRMAN: No, but Fred is going from that to what we're going to do for the funding for '82-83.

MR GOGO: I think that's what we should be discussing in reviewing this. I don't see now it is implicit that because we do that \$2,500, we're looking at a 75 per cent increase. That's all I'm saying.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would agree. Really, this should probably have been done some time ago. Now we're running into these things, and it hadn't been examined in terms of last year. So we can sort of put that aside in looking at the coming budget year.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's a new thing, and we have to learn by our experience.

MR APPLEBY: The same increase of \$2,500 could come into effect April 1, as far as that goes. Then it would have been a 25 per cent increase.

MR MANDEVILLE: So next year, we're dealing with \$12,500 per member. What increase do we want on that? Ten per cent, 13 per cent? What are our guidelines?

MRS OSTERMAN: Eleven per cent. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the principle we're looking at, and Fred has properly stated that we're looking at -- it was

provided for an additional service, an extension of the offices here in the Assembly. When members went out and established these offices with the amount that was available, if their amounts have all very legitimately increased a certain amount, then if we pick an arbitrary percentage -- I guess we're saying you will work within that amount. If it means getting rid of that particular office, that's what we're going to require them to do. I ask that question, because we could be in that position. We could have members with offices established, constituents expecting to find them there and, because of increases in costs, that member having to leave that office. I think we ought to look at what we will attempt to do in setting an amount for the coming year.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, on these two sheets of paper which show changes from '80 to '81 for rents and salaries, the variation is very, very considerable. On rents, we go from a low of 11.1 per cent to a high of 47.7 per cent. On salaries, we go from a low of 12 per cent to a high of 260 per cent.

MR APPLEBY: Don't you go from a low of the greatest decrease?

MR PURDY: 32.5.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right, there is a decrease. I look at some of the figures -- I'm sure members have done things in their wisdom. But I look at the first one on salaries, and it has gone from \$8 an hour to \$15 an hour.

MR CHAIRMAN: With regard to that decrease, Frank, that has to be a freak situation. We know that rents have gone up.

MISS BLANEY: They've agreed to do the cleaning.

MR APPLEBY: I don't know if these give us a true reflection, because somebody perhaps has gone from \$8 an hour to probably a more highly qualified person at \$15, but maybe they're not hiring them for as many hours -- getting twice the amount of work done in half the time.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the most relevant figure is the one in terms of leases, if we're talking about the same space. Maybe Charlene can enlighten us on that. Has anybody changed accommodation, or is planning to, that accounts for some of these large increases?

MISS BLANEY: Mr. Cook is the only member who comes immediately to mind who has seriously had to look at finding a new location because he is running out of money. Mrs. Fyfe changed. She managed to stay on the same floor but have a little more space. But no, no one has been forced to move.

MR GOGO: I increased my staff's wages 20 per cent last year, and I guess [inaudible] probably 17 or 18 per cent. Again, my suggestion is I would like to see it increased another \$2,500, which would be 20 per cent for the year '82-83, bringing it to \$15,000. I offer that as a suggestion.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. In the absence of a motion, suppose we discuss the suggestion.

MRS OSTERMAN: It's interesting that Barrhead and Edson -- I didn't think there would be a much competition for space, for instance. Mr. Chairman, I don't see that trend in terms of percentage in other rural areas. Barrhead and Edson are interesting, that the increase is that high. Is there any explanation there? Or is there competition for rental space?

MISS BLANEY: From what I remember from when I was in Barrhead, Mr. Kowalski was very fortunate to find the space he did. I would say there is a great deal of competition. This goes back to Mr. Gogo's remark about guidelines, why it is so difficult, from what I've seen to date about establishing guidelines, is what is available to members.

MRS OSTERMAN: Rurally, you don't have much choice, often. In all cases, you don't.

MISS BLANEY: I think some members have delayed establishing an office because they couldn't find one at a reasonable cost. We know of a number of members who are still interested in establishing an office, but that has been the problem to date. Also, when I've been looking in their constituency, they've requested that I keep my eye open in one of the other towns they may consider. So the availability is very difficult.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for a motion? Frank?

MR APPLEBY: Okay. I'll move it be increased the 11 per cent. That's based on \$12,500.

MR STEFANIUK: That would make it \$14,000.

MR GOGO: I suggested we increase it an additional \$2,500, which is 20 per cent.

MR APPLEBY: Was that a motion?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, John said his was a suggestion. I'd like to suggest, if you're going to frame a motion, that we should deal with amounts rather than percentages. Otherwise we run into the problem of what the percentage applies to.

MR STEFANIUK: \$13,750, based on 11 per cent.

MR APPLEBY: That's what I moved.

MR CHAIRMAN: We have a motion that the allowance for 1982-83 be \$13,750.

MR GOGO: Could I move an amendment or should we vote on the motion first?

MR CHAIRMAN: You can't amend it after it has been adopted.

MR GOGO: We can speak to the motion now?

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR GOGO: With respect, I understand the guidelines. I think, though, that we're dealing with something substantially different from the guidelines. We're dealing with a member being able to extend his Legislative Assembly office. From the evidence I see, I'm inclined to think -- and I really don't want to talk about percentages -- we're dealing with substantially over 20 per cent. So I would speak in favor of raising it another \$2,500, making it an even \$15,000 for the year '82-83.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to withdraw your motion, Frank, or have it amended?

MR APPLEBY: An amendment, or try to.

MR CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that we go straight to \$15,000 instead of to \$13,750. Is there any further discussion on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment? Opposed? The amendment is lost. Are you ready for the question on the motion? All those in favor of the motion? Opposed? Carried. This is an implicit -- I hope that is as far as we need to go -- rescission of what we did before.

MRS OSTERMAN: So the amount allowed for offices for '82-83 is?

MR CHAIRMAN: \$13,750.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, in light of the effects of Bill 99, may I ask that we now look at Code 600, for which the explanatory material is on page 9a, because that will no longer be included in the global amount budgeted for office accommodation and wages, and that we provide a sum under Code 600 to reflect the cost of supplies and equipment, and that that be done on a per office basis as well in order that all members might be treated fairly. While our budget item under Code 600 will reflect a global amount, we calculate it on the basis of per member expenses. I understand that the expenses per office work out to \$778, based on current experience.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is for supplies, electricity, and all that sort of thing?

MISS BLANEY: Rental of the telephone equipment, utilities where applicable, and there are other items that are involved: business taxes, business licences.

MR GOGO: Typewriters?

MISS BLANEY: No. The equipment we've provided has all been on special warrant.

MR GOGO: Pardon me, the maintenance of the equipment.

MISS BLANEY: Yes, it includes maintenance of the typewriter and the answering device.

MR STEFANIUK: In the case of furnishings, we are now paying for the transfer costs, are we not?

MISS BLANEY: No, we negotiated that out.

MR STEFANIUK: I'm sorry I'm into a bit of an internal discussion here. What happens if we set up a new office and the member needs a typewriter, a photocopying machine, and a telephone answering machine, and all that is going to cost \$3,000. We only have \$778 in his equipment and supply budget.

MISS BLANEY: When we purchased the typewriters and the telephone answering devices, there was a statement that whenever we needed to provide additional than the ones we ordered in the first place, we would have to come back to the committee, and not include it in our estimates.

MR STEFANIUK: And ask for additional funds.

MISS BLANEY: Right. Photocopy equipment is an interesting point because here we have a bit of juggling of the communications allowance. At the moment, we aren't approving them to be purchased out of a constituency office fund. But the communications allowance guideline is open enough that they can purchase them on their communications allowance. So it's whichever way you can skirt the issue.

MR APPLEBY: Couldn't the typewriter come out of that too?

MISS BLANEY: No, we've managed to handle typewriters.

MR GOGO: So I'm clear. Duplicating equipment, xerox machine, if a member chooses to use it . . .

MR STEFANIUK: Comes out of communications allowance.

MR GOGO: Fine. The other question. Does Code 600 deal on the basis of 79 offices or existing offices?

MISS BLANEY: 79.

MRS OSTERMAN: So you took an average, you multiplied it by 79 in order to try to come up with it. I'm sorry, I missed part of your conversation initially. When a member sets up a new office, where did you say the bulk of the stuff came from?

MR STEFANIUK: We currently have stock now which will enable us to carry for a short while. Then we were instructed to come back to the committee when we ran out.

MRS OSTERMAN: For instance, only one telephone answering device is allowed per member -- that sort of thing?

MISS BLANEY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: In order words, he can't set up five offices with five devices.

MR STEFANIUK: The average per office cost of stationery, extra telephone equipment, rental, utilities where applicable, janitorial services, window cleaning I understand is something we're up against, signage, that sort of thing, has worked out to an average of \$778 in the current fiscal year.

MRS OSTERMAN: After the office has been established.

MR STEFANIUK: Right. What we need is a figure per office, I have suggested, multiplied by 79.

MRS OSTERMAN: So to this point in time, there hasn't been a ceiling on the members' offices?

MR STEFANIUK: On supplies?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR STEFANIUK: No, because the ceiling has been worked in the \$10,000.

MRS OSTERMAN: But prior to that, before that.

MR STEFANIUK: Prior to that, supplies, to a limited extent, were considered an extension of services provided in this building.

MR CHAIRMAN: There's really no magic whether a member uses letterhead upstairs or in his constituency office. It's going to cost us one way or the other, and it won't cost us any more or any less.

MR STEFANIUK: The thing is that we need the money in the budget, because globally it's a fairly significant amount.

MISS BLANEY: Approximately \$60,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: So what are you proposing, Mr. Clerk, about Code 600?

MR STEFANIUK: The current experience is for \$778 per office, a global amount of \$60,000. I suggest that, considering increasing costs of everything being affected by inflation, we need to go somewhat higher than that, perhaps to \$850 or \$900, and multiply that by 79.

MR CHAIRMAN: What does that do to Code 600 as we have it here on the explanation sheets?

MR STEFANIUK: At \$800 times 79, it would be \$65,000 additional.

MR CHAIRMAN: And that's to be added to Code 600?

MR GOGO: Could I ask the Clerk, Mr. Chairman? I assume stationery is a major component. Newsprint has gone through the roof. Out of curiosity, do you buy a two-year supply?

MR STEFANIUK: We buy very significant supplies, all we can possibly store or arrange to store with the supplier.

MISS BLANEY: May I add something? The area where we have the significant expenditure in the supply area is actually for the rental of the telephone equipment. The supplies for most office are roughly \$10 a month. Somewhere it gets as high as \$60, but the telephone rental is the area we really have the substantial expense. For example, the system in Barrhead, which is two

black desk sets with two lines on rotary system, costs \$72 a month. That's the area I feel is the major reason for the expense.

MR GOGO: Once this is passed, we can do what we've done previously? That equipment would be covered, and it wouldn't come under the expense of the constituency office.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion then?

MR GOGO: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

MR MANDEVILLE: I was just going to say that under Bill 99, what is that going to involve if I want to put a photostat machine -- \$800 is a pretty small amount.

MR GOGO: It will come out of your communication allowance.

MR STEFANIUK: You have the choice of taking it out of that.

MR MANDEVILLE: Is there any limit on supplies? How do you determine what equipment you have in an office?

MR STEFANIUK: Well, \$800 is going to buy nothing in this day and age. What is the cost of an IBM Selectric now?

MISS BLANEY: We get a tendered price at \$991.

MR STEFANIUK: But that we can supply you with in the set-up charges. A piece of photocopying equipment: you can use your communications allowance to pay for that.

MR CHAIRMAN: But of course, it becomes public property.

MR APPLEBY: That \$800, or whatever we decide on, what will that actually be used for?

MR STEFANIUK: Telephone equipment -- for example, the rental of your telephone service in the office -- your utilities, stationery, signs, typewriter maintenance, telephone answering device maintenance, taxes where applicable, business licences where applicable.

MR GOGO: This is budgeted on \$800, as I so moved, and the member is not restricted to that. This is the budget total. So a member could go to \$1,300 and the Clerk would be embarrassed, not the member.

MR STEFANIUK: No. What I suggested at the outset was that a ceiling be set per office.

MR GOGO: Oh.

MR STEFANIUK: Otherwise, we have an unfair situation. A few members decide they're going to have a terribly elaborate telephone system in the office, we exhaust the fund, and the poor guy at the end has no funds to draw on. So I suggest that to make everything equitable, we set a ceiling on each office.

MR GOGO: I apologize if you said that, because I didn't catch that.

MRS OSTERMAN: I didn't either. I thought what was said was that we need to figure out a amount for the purpose of putting a global amount in. So that leads to an interesting question. Somebody like Mr. Kowalski, with an office in Barrhead, with a bill of \$72 a month will almost exhaust his allowance . .

MR STEFANIUK: Will more than exhaust it if it's \$800.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: Why is it that much?

MR STEFANIUK: Because he has two lines on a rotor system, and that's the kind of telephone system he decided he wanted.

MISS BLANEY: Actually, that is more or less a standard we have for most of the offices. It's just the charges that AGT assesses against us for the equipment. The same type of system in the southern part of the province charges \$50 a month.

MR GOGO: They talk less then.

MISS BLANEY: That's just rent, no calls. But unofficially, we try to establish some guidelines in the administrative office, what they could have.

MR GOGO: In fairness, Mr. Clerk, if we know one of our members -- what I hear Charlene saying is that that is either the recommended, or the standard, or enough people have the system Mr. Kowalski has, and his cost for those services alone -- and there are six others you've mentioned -- exceeds that budget. Should we not address the question of increasing the per member amount?

MR APPLEBY: But not to the extent that it covers that sort of frill.

MRS OSTERMAN: Is it a frill?

MR APPLEBY: Darn right.

MR GOGO: I understood from Charlene that it wasn't a frill, that it was becoming standard for a member's office to have that. Am I inaccurate?

MISS BLANEY: To defend the system, he has an office for himself and an outer office for his secretary. I felt they both needed a telephone set. When they're both in, and he attempts to be in at least one day a week, there may be occasions when there would be calls on both lines. The rotary system is easier and a more businesslike system, whereby callers have one number. They just call that one number and it automatically goes to either line.

MR GOGO: Is it recommended?

MISS BLANEY: Yes, I recommended it to all offices.

MR GOGO: My point is, Mr. Clerk, if that's what Charlene is recommending and that alone, in certain parts of Alberta, exceeds the total amount we're

talking about, I suggest to the committee we reconsider the total amount per member, or make provision that they can utilize other funds that are within the total budget.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would you want to be specific as to how much?

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we're now starting to get into a certain amount of standardization. I think that's the kind of thing I was talking about. What does a standard, average, businesslike operation require in an office? Could we decide whether we only want to say that it involves the kind of telephone system Charlene is talking about, or are there a number of other items? If you had a one- or several-item list, and you were to find out that because of geographic location in this province, there is a great deal of difference in cost, I would say there should be, without discrimination so to speak, that amount provided. Then you would get into differentiation between members, if you like. But you're not differing in terms of the service they're providing and how they're providing it, but you are differing in terms of the cost of it being different. Government operations all over this province -- you can buy something in High Level and it costs you a hell of a lot different in terms of price than buying it in Carstairs.

MISS BLANEY: That was the position we were in prior to the amendment to include supplies and services.

MR GOGO: We addressed and passed a motion by Mr. Appleby about rents in offices. We know if Bill 92 goes through, it is going to drop electrical rates in the north by 40 per cent. They're now built into the rental rates they pay. These things are going to happen. So I think we have to accept the advice of Charlene that a member's office should consist of two numbers on the rotary system. If that cost is approximately \$800 a year, then I'm suggesting that in fairness we have to look at what the Clerk is recommending of \$800 per office, and make it \$900 or \$1,000 per office. That's all I'm saying.

MR CHAIRMAN: It would look like \$1,000, because telephone isn't the only thing.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, before we get too far advanced, I wonder if we could come to some agreement when we're going to adjourn tonight.

MR CHAIRMAN: I don't know. We will certainly have to adjourn before 8 o'clock.

MRS OSTERMAN: I have some things to do for session. I would suggest a quarter to.

MR APPLEBY: 7:45?

MR CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to get into this discussion a little further in terms of what the basic provisions are for an office.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're back to guidelines, and the committee . . .

MRS OSTERMAN: No, I don't think so. I don't know whether I'd call them guidelines or not.

MR APPLEBY: As far as the Clerk's office, they would have to be guidelines.

MR STEFANIUK: The guideline we talked about earlier was with regard to rental space. If I read Connie correctly, she is saying every member should be entitled to a two-line rotor system telephone service, 24 pencils, 1,000 sheets of stationery, and 500 envelopes. Is that what you're saying?

MRS OSTERMAN: I might not have gone into quite that kind of detail, but you've described it just right, Bo. I'm feeling once again, on behalf of members who are in places where costs are much higher -- indeed, probably their costs of operation out of their own pocket becomes much higher because of that. If you go by a flat amount, and maybe after discussion we will reach that conclusion, because administratively we find another way just too cumbersome . . . But if you raise the amount, then those of us with fewer costs are able to provide more services to our constituents. So you've come away, I believe, with an inequitable situation, where if you were to state a couple of the main things that are inherent in an office, or one thing -- one thing might only be the telephone. If you set that aside -- regardless of the cost, that is to be provided to an office -- and then took your \$800 per office.

MR CHAIRMAN: You're back at guidelines.

MRS OSTERMAN: I don't believe I am, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're going to say a member can have this and this in his office, and the cost may vary from locality to locality, that's a guideline. That tells him what he can have in his office, and the administration would have to respect it.

MR APPLEBY: Could we have it so much per member, plus whatever we decide is adequate for a telephone system?

MRS OSTERMAN: That's basically what I said.

MR APPLEBY: But the point is that it will vary.

MRS OSTERMAN: It will. If I could try some sort of analogy here and ask Charlene a question. When you're providing typewriters for offices, is it not fair to say that the cost of putting those typewriters into the offices would have been different in different parts of the province?

MISS BLANEY: No. I made an arbitrary decision. One of the instructions when constituency offices were established was that services should be provided to the level they receive in the Legislature Building. We provide to secretaries here correctable typewriters. We provided correctable typewriters to the constituency offices.

MRS OSTERMAN: I didn't mean different typewriters. I meant to say that when you put certain things into offices, the costs are different in different places, through shipping or whatever.

MISS BLANEY: This won't meet your point, but when we did the purchasing IBM delivers.

MRS OSTERMAN: So it didn't matter.

MISS BLANEY: No.

MRS OSTERMAN: Because normally, costs are different depending on where they are. That's the same thing we're getting into in terms of, say, a telephone system.

MR GOGO: We've always adopted the postage stamp principle; that is, there is no cost to members whether he's in Lac La Biche or Edmonton.

MR CHAIRMAN: We're getting close to our deadline, and I think we should try to resolve two things. One is Code 600, and the other is the date of the next meeting.

MR GOGO: I think I heard the Clerk recommend . . .

MR APPLEBY: He asked what figure we wanted. I said \$800.

MR GOGO: Oh. Well, in view of the discussion we've just had, I would like the Clerk's advice if it's reasonable, based on what Miss Blaney has said, if we make it \$1,000.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can make a recommendation. I'm seeing figures in front of me that for the first time trouble me an awful lot. I'm seeing identical telephone service costing \$72.80, \$33.10, \$46.65, \$19.75, \$96.51. It doesn't darn well make sense to me. For that reason, I can't make a recommendation. I need to get back, look at these figures, and find out why the differences are so significant.

MR APPLEBY: Like I suggested before, could we not have a figure, plus adequate telephone system or whatever?

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: The only thing is, we need a figure to put in the estimates.

MR STEFANIUK: What I have here is, I'm looking at relatively few offices which are paying for utilities.

MR CHAIRMAN: Some are included in the rent. That's another one of those difficulties.

MR STEFANIUK: Here I'm looking at an office that is paying \$14 for utilities, another one is paying \$31, another \$15, \$20, \$24. That guy obviously gets cut down on his other benefits, those which may be considered services to his constituents, if he has to fork out part of that money for utilities. So that

gets into the same category as telephones. Now, stationery: it varies like heck. Somebody is doing a lot of writing, and somebody is not. Here is somebody who is paying \$99 as taxes.

MRS OSTERMAN: Part of the rental agreement was to pay the taxes.

MISS BLANEY: In St. Albert, when they changed offices, we had to pay electrical changes before they would change the telephone system.

MR APPLEBY: Those are things we weren't aware of. I can see your problem there, Bohdan. I think you'll have to digest it a little and see what you can advise.

MR STEFANIUK: I know there have been areas, for example, where we have had to have private line cable installed because there is no private line service. Obviously, a member, in talking to his constituent on the telephone, does not want to be on a party line system. We have paid for the actual laying of cable, charged back to us by AGT so much per mile: a very significant capital expenditure.

MR CHAIRMAN: But that's been going on for at least eight years. It doesn't happen very often, but I can remember the first instance of that: a rural member whose constituents just wouldn't use the party line.

MRS OSTERMAN: That's right.

MR MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could I make a recommendation that the Clerk come back with a figure for us -- it's going to be a figure times 79 -- to put into Code 600?

MR CHAIRMAN: In other words, your motion is that we table our consideration of Code 600 until the next meeting, by which time we would like the Clerk to come back with a recommendation. Is that the motion?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: One question. As long as the House is sitting, have you got time to go into that?

MR STEFANIUK: I won't be going into it personally. I'm going to look at some figures and, hopefully, give some direction as to what I want calculated, and then formulate a recommendation.

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with that information, will there be a breakdown? Like, would utilities include the telephone? How is that broken down?

MR STEFANIUK: It's a separate amount.

MRS OSTERMAN: I would be most interested in the percentage difference between the lowest and the highest for similar systems. That's a significant amount.

MR GOGO: We have to be extremely cautious not to get ourselves boxed in. I hear utilities mentioned. A man could move tomorrow to another office and there is no such thing. There is no question about telephones.

MRS OSTERMAN: Utilities might be in somebody's rent and not in somebody else's.

MR STEFANIUK: They're paying for it one way or the other.

MR GOGO: I'm far wiser now, with this discussion that has gone on. I agree with Fred.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. There is a motion by Mr. Mandeville that consideration of Code 600 be deferred to the next meeting, and that the Clerk be asked to provide a recommendation by that time. All agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. I don't think we have time for anything else but to fix the date of the next meeting.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I just make fast reference to a memorandum I circulated today relative to an estimate on security, and ask that that be considered at the next meeting as well, because it will require an amendment.

MRS OSTERMAN: Could I make one comment about the memo? I know that our Clerk doesn't very often do this, but I wanted to bring your attention to the third paragraph, where it says the need for adequately trained, able-bodied -- men. [laughter].

MR GOGO: I want to amend that to former members of the Assembly.

MR STEFANIUK: "Men" in the sense that all men are created equal. Dr. Spock always referred to the fetus as "he".

MRS OSTERMAN: But normally, you say he or she.

MR APPLEBY: On the question of our next meeting, I wonder if you could give alternative dates.

MR CHAIRMAN: Then how do we choose one of the alternatives?

MR APPLEBY: We would have to look at it and try to co-ordinate their movements to some extent. Bill Purdy says he's going to be gone completely on the 10th, so we'll have to have it before then.

MRS OSTERMAN: If possible.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think we need more time.

MR GOGO: I'm gone completely on the 9th. Some may argue I'm gone completely now.

MR MANDEVILLE: I didn't say it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Fred, are you half gone or . . .

MR MANDEVILLE: Maybe I'll be able to win that filibuster. The way they're talking, I'll be here by myself. I would say just any time.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any times we must avoid?

MR MANDEVILLE: I don't know if we can ever get one, but if we got a Wednesday we could go indefinitely for a few hours.

MRS OSTERMAN: That would be helpful.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about a week from tomorrow, the 2nd.

MR GOGO: I'm in Calgary -- something I can't break -- in the evening.

MR CHAIRMAN: Wednesday morning is out?

MR WOLSTENHOLME: It is for me.

MR GOGO: The 7th or 8th is the date I put on the table.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about the 7th, from noon on?

MR GOGO: A supper meeting on the 8th?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's two weeks from today.

MR APPLEBY: We can try for that.

MRS OSTERMAN: Yes, we can.

MR GOGO: Frank, would you be comfortable if we said noon on the 8th if the House is not sitting, and the evening of the 8th if the House is sitting?

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose we agree on 5:30 on the 8th for supper. If the House folds before that, we'll shift it to 2?

MRS OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll have cabinet if the House is not in, because we go back to full days of cabinet.

MR APPLEBY: What about the 7th?

MR CHAIRMAN: Is everyone content with Monday?

MRS OSTERMAN: We'll try for it.

MR GOGO: If the House is not sitting, at noon; if the House is sitting, in the evening.

MR CHAIRMAN: If we start at 12 o'clock, we could meet for two hours whether or not the House is sitting.

MR GOGO: Is the Clerk comfortable with the time frame for what he has to bring back?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it's agreed that it's the 7th. If the House is sitting, the time will be 5:30 -- not 12 o'clock? You don't want to have two goes at it on that day?

MRS OSTERMAN: We have caucus.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right. So if the House is sitting, it's 5:30, and if the House is not sitting, it's 12 o'clock.

MR GOGO: I move we adjourn.

MR CHAIRMAN: All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.