

Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Monday, September 27, 1982

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

2:17 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Approval of the minutes of the meeting of August 23. Any takers?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, does the motion in connection with the guidelines for promotional materials allowance say what everybody thinks it should say? I know what was meant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you said that we weren't going to change the funding during the course of the year.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right, and that it was distributed on . . . The per-member figure is how we multiplied it out. Somebody said, should we take into consideration this difference of the number of people in the constituency on all that? Our opinion was that there's no way we could get into that at this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We decided it was hopeless.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So as long as everybody understands what that per-member figure was. It was a straight 79 into the amount allowed.

MR. GOGO: It wasn't \$1,500, Mr. Clerk?

MR. STEFANIUK: It went up, because we glued together the two figures. That's what you asked us to do. It went up to \$1,850.

MR. GOGO: Per member?

MR. STEFANIUK: Per member.

MR. APPLEBY: That was after your office had deducted their share?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. We just gave everything out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, we have got this on the agenda, just two items down.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I just wanted to make sure, for the purpose of the minutes, that that motion was understood.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I'll move the adoption of the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed? Carried.

Number two: members' charge cards, consideration of draft guidelines. You may remember that this was one of those surprises we pulled on you. You

didn't have a chance to read them before the last meeting, so they're here again in the books.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, my compliments on our books.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I spread that to the right and to the left?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Excellent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Incidentally, I think number five on page 2 is very important. You know that's that old spectre that haunts us: members being taxed on this kind of thing. That's why everything possible should be done to see that payments go directly to suppliers and not by way of refund to members who have already paid suppliers.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Would you interpret that particular clause as preventing us from reimbursing a member who has paid out the funds in cash for the purposes of gasoline for operating a vehicle?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It might be construed that way. I don't know if it should.

MR. GOGO: That's not the intent. The intent was that if a member, for whatever reason, makes a purchase legitimately . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll say: will ordinarily be paid. Is that all right?

MR. GOGO: Well, what does the Clerk say? He's the man who always seems to lower the axe around here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You sound like one who has suffered.

MR. APPLEBY: There are circumstances. Sometimes you get caught where your credit card is not used at a certain gas station, and you use Visa, Chargex, MasterCard, or something like that.

MR. STEFANIUK: This is precisely why I asked the question. If this is to prevent us from reimbursing a member, then let's understand what the intent is or amend the wording to the extent that we will be able to interpret it as intended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, that kind of exception might expose you to being taxed on it. But if we say "ordinarily" and we follow it, it will diminish the tax exposure to the minimum.

MRS. OSTERMAN: After having this brought to my attention, I remember being in the little village of Irricana, going into what was advertised as a Gulf station. None of the signs were taken down, but it was co-operatively run. I had no idea. When I went to pay and handed my Gulf credit card, they said: we don't take Gulf credit cards. I started thinking: this is Thursday, I must be in Irricana, and I'm at a Gulf station. I had the bill sent. You wouldn't remember; you're not dealing in that end. I said: well, there are special arrangements made for paying, and you haven't properly advertised; you may wait a little while. He said: I know who you are, Mrs. Osterman; we trust

you. I said: yes, but you may not get your money for a while. But the bill was sent up here, if I remember correctly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And paid promptly. The Clerk's office is known for a very sudden turnaround.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm sure it was. Anyway, I brought the bill, and it was paid. But that's just an interesting thing.

MR. GOGO: Can that be reworded? Was that your suggestion?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think the chairman has suggested the word "ordinarily" be inserted after "will". I think that leaves the door open.

MR. APPLEBY: So we agree on that, then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless you're going to go and deal with them now -- that was just a passing comment -- I think we should start one by one.

MR. APPLEBY: That's what I was wondering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Number one should probably be updated, because since then we've passed a motion for three kinds of antifreeze.

MR. APPLEBY: We also included car washes in two discussions here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Car washes have always been on there.

MR. GOGO: Oil, gas, and car wash were the originals. And oil was to include oil changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought grease jobs were included.

MRS. OSTERMAN: A change in service, which is the light service, oil change, and grease.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, that was well covered in your memo to the members. I thought it was, anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That just dealt with the three kinds of antifreeze, if you're talking about my memo of September 14.

MR. STEFANIUK: Fuel, oil, grease, antifreeze, and car washes.

MR. APPLEBY: We had it worded in some way like "periodical servicing" or something like that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I guess you have to define it, because some people call servicing anything they use in their car.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some people periodically change their spark plugs.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, and the motor.

MR. GOGO: Well, the Clerk's office is on the ball. I had gassed up and had my tires rotated. It was \$15, and the Clerk's on the ball. I see a statement upstairs today.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Do you do this to test him?

MR. GOGO: No. It was done innocuously, I assure you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You know, when you look at it, that seems to me to be a reasonable charge. I know it doesn't come strictly, because the next thing you buy after that is tires.

MR. APPLEBY: Get a couple of good jacks, and you can do it yourself.

MR. GOGO: I was commending the Clerk on his vigilance. Suddenly it got turned around, and I have to have a jack. I'll pay the bill.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I didn't have my other credit card, so I put my gas in. I thought, I'll save gas for the province, so I put an air cleaner in. They caught that too. I was trying to conserve gas.

MRS. OSTERMAN: You could put a brand new engine in, Fred, and say that this is going to run more efficiently.

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, the Auditor won't buy those explanations.

MRS. OSTERMAN: What's the staff business here?

MR. APPLEBY: Have we finished all these?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought we had approved the minutes. We're on number two, are we not?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Number one.

MR. STEFANIUK: Number one of the guidelines.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I don't understand why we have "or constituency office charge". I thought we were eliminating everybody except the member from using cards.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think what should be noted is that this was drafted in September 1981 and has been waiting all this time to come before the members. For that reason, it may not reflect the latest decisions that have been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you want to cut out "constituency office staff".

MR. APPLEBY: Delete that "or constituency office staff".

MR. STEFANIUK: Cut that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. APPLEBY: Don't you think so, Fred?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, I think so. But how would this relate to our phone credit cards?

MRS. OSTERMAN: It doesn't. This is just a gasoline credit card.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Is it part of the guidelines as far as telephones -- getting away from the topic here. I know my office uses mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're coming to that. We have got an item raised by Alan Hyland, which will come up under other business.

MR. GOGO: A telephone credit card is fine as long as you don't rotate your tires on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, is that all right for number one? Number two.

MR. GOGO: Number two would be amended as well?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, consequential amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a slight semantic problem in the first two lines: purchase of fuel and oil should be . . . Oh, I see. I take it all back.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabor this thing, but the latter part of that: travel within Alberta to carry out constituency responsibilities. Is there a definition of "constituency responsibilities"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gee, that would be a book that thick.

MR. GOGO: I think I'm elected as a member of this Assembly. Business in Lac La Biche is business of mine as well, as long as it's expenditure of government funds. Is that an interpretation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not a constituency responsibility. Somewhere in the text, there's an exclusion for doing it on government business.

MR. APPLEBY: Actually, it's to carry out your responsibilities as a member of the Legislature.

MR. GOGO: That's what I thought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The idea has always been constituency responsibilities. For example, it doesn't cover travelling with your car to Toronto and back on government business.

MR. APPLEBY: No. Within Alberta, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It doesn't cover travelling to Peace River or someplace on government business, on behalf of a minister.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That needs to be paid out of the minister's . . .

MR. GOGO: I'm not arguing that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But if we've got something written somewhere that says this is for the constituency -- I do a number of things somewhere else that very directly affect my constituents, on their behalf, in order to perform my duties. Or we should just say: as a member of the Legislature?

MR. APPLEBY: Travel within the province of Alberta to attend to the duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. GOGO: Many of my constituents feel certain things that go on in Two Hills just can't be true. I've been meaning to go up there and check them out. I'd hate to be narrowed down to where I couldn't go to Two Hills and check some of those rumors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't you think those two statements of guideline in the latter part of two are adequate?

MR. APPLEBY: No, they're restrictive.

MR. GOGO: If I gas up at Two Hills, will you reject it? I guess that's my question.

MRS. OSTERMAN: No, it never has been. That's why I think it should be left broad and not get into . . . We're going to have to enumerate so many specifics, we would be better off to say that the purchase of fuel and oil should be made only where the intended travel is to be undertaken by the member in order to perform his or her duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. Get rid of everything else in there.

MR. STEFANIUK: To be principally for the purpose of . . . Right?

MR. APPLEBY: I don't know why we need "principally".

MR. STEFANIUK: To be for the purpose of attending to their duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly within the province of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can simplify that by just putting "within Alberta" after "travel", and you've got it.

MR. STEFANIUK: Okay. This would now read: The purchase of fuel, oil, grease, antifreeze, and car washes should be made only where the intended travel within Alberta is to be undertaken by the member for the purpose of attending to his duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, the other two items go.

MRS. OSTERMAN: If it's not grammatically correct, we'll trust . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number three: Cards should not be used to charge fuel or oil for travel primarily related to party or government affairs or for private travel. Content?

Number four: It's recognized that a member's travel in any period will have a variety of purposes. Right? You went to Irricana to talk to a constituent,

and while you were there you bought some groceries. So you divide the cost between the value of the constituent and the cost of the groceries.

MR. APPLEBY: And you charge the groceries to your promotional allowance.

MR. GOGO: I would be prepared to investigate any member who went to Irricana to buy groceries in the first place, unless it's the Farmers Market.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you content with four? Five: The charges will ordinarily be paid directly to the supplier by the Legislature . . .

Six: If a member discovers that . . . for a purpose not authorized by these guidelines, the member should advise the . . . directly, who will invoice the member directly for the charge in question.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It's okay. If you can word it so it's not as cumbersome or whatever, fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A member discovering that the card has been used inadvertently for purposes may . . .

MR. APPLEBY: It might not have been used inadvertently. He might have been stuck and had to buy it, then he'd want to pay it back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that was inadvertent because he forgot his card at home.

MR. APPLEBY: No, he had the card with him. He used it because he had no cash. He was going out to a wedding and had to get gas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you take that out, Frank, you're encouraging wholesale use, then wholesale refunding. It's a lot of work.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Okay. Inadvertent is fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seven: Charges should be signed by the member only, and the card should be retained in his or her possession.

MR. GOGO: How do you lose a card? With a lasso?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you take it apart.

A member losing a card should immediately inform the Legislative Assembly Office so as to minimize fraudulent use.

A member may request the Legislative Assembly office to provide -- I changed that to simplify and so on -- credit cards for air travel within Alberta for use according to the following guidelines.

Now, do you want to exchange all that text for the abbreviated version you put in before?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I was just going to suggest that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that's as in two amended.

You know, considering this is a committee effort at drafting, it's going exceptionally well.

Three: Where the most convenient airport for the member to use is located outside the borders of the province, he may travel to and from that airport.

MR. GOGO: That would be Lloydminster or Dawson Creek? That's allowed, is it? And the one at Radium City? No, what's outside Fort Chip? It lands at Fort Chip, I guess. I guess Hay River is just over the border.

MR. APPLEBY: Fort Smith is there, if you want to go to Fort Fitzgerald to look at the rapids.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In other words, you may be going to a point in Alberta, but you have to land just outside in order to reach that point.

MR. STEFANIUK: For example, we know that Grant Notley will find it more convenient to skip over the border to B.C. and grab a flight coming down, rather than fool around in his own area. That has to be reasonable, and we've been honoring that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, suppose we were to say that where that happens, travel to and from that airport is included in the guidelines, and relate it back to two, because this seems to be an extension of two. No, I guess we could leave it here. It says: he may travel to and from that airport. That doesn't mean to say he can charge up expenses for it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think four could be simplified too, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GOGO: Excuse me, Connie. In fairness, Mr. Chairman, say Mr. Notley's car was at Dawson Creek airport, assuming that's acceptable. If he gassed up at Dawson Creek, there's no objection. I think that should be clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, I think it should be included.

Four: Cards should not be used for . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Why can't we use the same as three and your other one: Cards should not be used to charge for travel primarily related to . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: This one has other things, though. It has to do with committee travel and so on, which we control from separate budgets.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But you're talking about a committee of the Legislature. Isn't that then obvious? If they're on a committee, the committee makes those arrangements.

MR. STEFANIUK: But on occasion, members will decide: what the heck, I'll use my card. They shouldn't do that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That makes it awkward, though. You could say we're a committee of the Legislature. If Fred has flown up here for this meeting and used his card, this line here would actually negate that, in terms of being flexible.

MR. STEFANIUK: I really don't think that first item should be there, quite frankly. It does pertain to this committee, and it may be more convenient. We can sort it out after the bills come in, because your expense account for today will say that you have charged up travel you haven't got a bill for and

you want to be reimbursed. I think the first item should be taken out: travel on behalf of a committee of the Assembly, other than to travel to attend a meeting in Edmonton.

I guess this is saying that if we're sending a committee to Europe, we don't want you running off to the airport and buying that ticket with your credit card. We want some control over the type of travel and to be able to take advantage of group discounts we may be able to arrange for committee travel.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But you've already taken care of that when we've said in our broad statement that this travel is going to be used for performing our duties as Members of the Legislative Assembly within the province of Alberta, with the exception of those who must do these other things. I think it's still redundant. I'm not sure I can think of any circumstances for leaving this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The problem here is that we have guidelines in two places. It's a simple drafting matter, that's all.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In other words, what applies to gasoline credit cards applies . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, not exactly. Either that, or we should work some parallel treatment for the gasoline credit cards and the airline credit cards.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it just seems as if we do have a gray area here. Unless we're going to be very specific and go into detail -- for Members' Services something else may be done, et cetera -- I think most people haven't been aware of these guidelines anyway. It's been handled well by committees when there's a special . . . Unless the Clerk can tell us that he has had problems trying to collect people.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In terms of a Pacific Western credit card?

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, you can originate on Pacific Western and go around the globe. As long as you've bought your ticket in Calgary for an international flight that departs from Edmonton, it's the originating company which will ticket.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But we've already got that statement "within the province of Alberta" that applies both to gasoline and air line. So I really think that that particular item is looked after.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think we have a concern with the second part under four.

MR. APPLEBY: You mean the first part isn't a problem, so we can leave that out and include the second part.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm satisfied with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose you leave it with us, and we'll try to work it out. Even under the first part, assume the surface rights committee, for example, travelling around the province, say from Calgary to Ponoka or to Rocky Mountain House, then they couldn't charge it to us, but . . .

MR. APPLEBY: They could charge mileage. They weren't on air travel.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm trying to remember if the surface rights committee did any flying. But this was from different places, and we just used our credit cards to attend certain things. That did not reflect on the committee's expenses. The other thing: supposing you want to make this standard so it's more easily understood as between gasoline and air line credit cards. Well, one time when Bob Clark and I pulled into a service station, I said: Bob, I've got my credit card handy. I used my credit card. So there were some expenses that wouldn't have appeared. In the case of a rented car, there is no mileage. I never did use my own vehicle, and I don't know if anybody else did. So there's this gray area. I think you have to use some common sense. Maybe a few dollars escape one way or the other. And I view air travel in precisely the same manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Travelling within the province from one point to another, such as for the surface rights committee, would be excluded. But suppose the surface rights committee met in Edmonton. Under this, that travel could be charged to us instead of that committee.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Which it does all the time, which is what happens. Our committee met on several occasions, and we popped up here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that cause any problem budgeting?

MR. GOGO: It's a pretty fine line. The heritage fund meeting, for example. I'm an officer of this Assembly, and I want to attend. So I come. I can't charge it to the heritage fund committee; I'm not a member. Yet it's constituency business. That's why I come; I want to know what's going on. So the poor Clerk, if we're going to try to keep separating these things . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think the bulk of them will be separated, if it's a committee travelling together with organized arrangements. But a lot of things happen before you reach the point at which everything's being organized . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should go back for a moment to the reason we are considering these guidelines at all. The reason is that the auditors came to us and said: you have absolutely no guidelines and no authority for the issuance of these cards; now come up with it. So here we are.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, let's see what he says about these after we're done. If they're not definitive enough, we'll have to go back to the drawing board. But let's leave it with as much flexibility as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, so we'll leave the first part of four as it is?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I believe we should just leave it like for our gasoline credit card, that we're talking about travel within the province of Alberta as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. If something else which looks after those expenses clicks into place, it'll have them.

MR. GOGO: I'd be happy if you come back with something.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Then the caveat that was in the other one: cards should not be used for travel primarily related to party or government affairs or for private travel. The same statement applies, so we put that one in also. That's the catchall. It's almost precisely the same, isn't it?

MR. APPLEBY: The rest of it is just the same as the gasoline card, isn't it?

MRS. OSTERMAN: We have precisely the same guidelines for both now, except that for the air line card we have mentioned the fact that a member may have to be outside the province, where it's more convenient to land. That could apply to gasoline credit cards too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is the rest of it all right? Suppose we had a motion which said that the redraft would be submitted to the members, based as nearly as may be on this afternoon's discussion. Is that all right?

MRS. OSTERMAN: And if at that time there is concurrence by the members that the new wording reflects the intention of the meeting, that it does not need to come back to another meeting. In other words, a motion that if there isn't a disagreement by any one member of the committee on any single point, they're accepted and considered approved. That saves us coming back for another meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That wouldn't preclude any member from sending in a comment and our making a change and circulating it to the other members of the group.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Precisely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we have a motion by Mr. Appleby that a redraft be prepared, reflecting this afternoon's discussion. All those in favor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we have a motion by Mrs. Osterman saying that when all the members have approved the draft, it be deemed to be in effect without the requirement of being approved by a further motion of the committee.

MR. APPLEBY: I'm not sure what you mean by when they've all approved it -- that the redrafted guidelines be circulated, and if no comments are received, they be considered as accepted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't like that.

MR. APPLEBY: I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That means if somebody is away or overlooks it or something like that, they may have a serious objection. We haven't approved it, but we haven't heard the objection.

MRS. OSTERMAN: This is a very small committee. If I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, possibly the Clerk could call members a couple of weeks after circulation have elapsed. There being no objections, they could be considered adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we send them out in duplicate, and you can send one back signed?

MR. APPLEBY: Connie's idea is fine too. If you haven't heard within a certain length of time, you can phone him up and say: have you got that letter; would you send it back, then, and give us your approval?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be a whole lot of phone calls. I think it really would be simplest to send two of them. If you like them, send us one back signed. If you don't like them . . .

MR. APPLEBY: So do we wait til Christmas before we cut things off, or what?

MRS. OSTERMAN: What if somebody doesn't send it back? A little jog, in terms of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, we'll chase anybody who doesn't send it back.

MR. GOGO: Just attach it to the pay cheque, and they can be picked up at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about holding the pay cheque and sending it after we get the approval?

Okay, is that enough for that? Can we go to the promotional materials? We have a memo from John Gogo, dated September 9. There are copies here for the members. Are they in your books?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, if we're on that subject, I only want to speak to the retroactivity aspect. I've read and reread the minutes, and although I happen to disagree with how the minutes read relative to my understanding, the memo I sent to the members of the committee is based on the fact that it's retroactive. I had a request for something. I sent forward a request for something, and that was honored. Little did I dream that it would cost me \$880 for a Lions convention. I thought there was some provision whereby if it was a province-wide, Canada-wide, U.S.-wide Lions convention, those pins wouldn't come out of my allowance but that a judgment would be made, and they would either accommodate me or refuse me. They accommodated me, and then I discovered I was charged \$880.

I'm appealing to the committee on the basis of two things. One is common sense. Being a Rotarian, I hardly subscribe to all the principles of Lions International.

MR. PURDY: Hey, watch it.

MR. GOGO: No, I'm coming to two members of this committee whom I look to for some degree of support.

Then the retroactivity aspect. Had I been aware of that, I certainly wouldn't have done that. Here we passed a motion. My memo from the Clerk's office tells me it's retroactive to April, something that was decided by this committee on August 23.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But it's always been in place.

MR. APPLEBY: Myrna Fyfe has run into this same difficulty in a very serious way, because she has been approached by some large groups having meetings in St. Albert because they couldn't get accommodations in Edmonton. She ran out of money a long time ago on this. She's really had a problem.

MRS. OSTERMAN: How was it handled before? Did the Legislative Assembly provide these amounts of . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: No.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In that case, we're obviously getting into heavier use.

MR. APPLEBY: For these kinds of functions, is this ever provided through a minister's department?

MR. STEFANIUK: Where large conventions are concerned, I think if you take into consideration the two largest cities in the province, there is little doubt that those are the ones that host the largest conventions -- perhaps Calgary more so than Edmonton, because they have the convention centre facilities and can take the extremely large groups. No doubt many of those groups approach either members or departments of government for great quantities of lapel pins or other forms of souvenirs. It may be that some government agency has those available in large quantity. The Legislative Assembly never has.

The simple fact is that beginning in April 1982, we had a budgetary appropriation which was divided among the members and provided each member with an equal amount of money for these promotional items. That went into effect with a certain amount being allocated to each member. Following the direction given by the last meeting of this committee, the amount was adjusted. But that is all the funding we have. The large-quantity funding either should be funded separately if we're getting into support of large convention groups, or perhaps there is an agency of government that handles that now.

MR. APPLEBY: It seems to me that the route somebody should go is Public Affairs or something like that, because no individual member can do this sort of thing.

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, the requirement is going to vary so considerably. It's not likely that you're going to have a 2,000-delegate convention in Three Hills, whereas it is likely you're going to have one in Calgary, Edmonton, or, for that matter, Lethbridge.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Actually, I had a very large one. The Mennonite Brethren held a big meeting in the Prairie Bible Institute. But I said, this is not necessarily a direct constituency function; you've got to realize that the kinds of things I believe are supplied with the Legislative Assembly allowance relate to more personal things in the constituency. I said I would ask if it would be something more like Tourism and Small Business. I've sent people different places, in terms of requests -- and some have been successful and some haven't -- as far as promotion of something. But it wasn't a promotion of the Alberta Legislature or something like that, so I didn't see that it fit. If this is getting to be something that different members want to push, it's fairly expensive to hand out pins, a flag pin or whatever, to every visitor in this province who comes for something.

MR. STEFANIUK: \$1.30 per pin.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So I think we ought to be talking more specifically through government auspices, to see if that's a valuable promotion for the province. If it is, maybe a policy could be established. But I don't see it fitting under the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to consider the position of the opposition members. They may just not feel that comfortable about having to go to government instead of to an impartial committee of the Legislative Assembly.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't see that that's a function of the committee, in terms of asking. A good many things are happening around the province that are also happening in opposition constituencies. Through Government Services, dinners are funded for visiting delegations. If it's once every three years, I think there's a policy -- I was just thinking about the Red Poll association that hosted something. It doesn't really matter where it is, because that organization could come forward. If they fit the guidelines, they receive assistance for promotion.

MR. APPLEBY: They make their own requests directly to the government agency responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They could go through a member, I suppose.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Just for direction. I think that's probably the route, because we're looking at a more substantial item. We could look at a lot of things that are hosted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two things about that: one is the discretion as to what is going to be issued or not; the other is the funding. While I'm not power hungry on behalf of the committee or on my own behalf, it can be a service to members. I realize that when you're handing out pins to a Lions International or a Kiwanis International, that goes beyond what a member should ordinarily be concerned about, certainly within his constituency. But the fact that the funding comes through the estimates of a government department isn't going to make it any easier on the public purse. Then the question is, who exercises the discretion as to what the members get? If you put it all into Government Services, say, then the members will have to go to Government Services even for pins to use in their own constituencies.

MR. APPLEBY: No, you still keep your promotional allowance.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm not talking about promotional allowance for members. I'm talking about things that are . . . Well, if you take a look at the guidelines associated with what government assists with in terms of visiting: the hosting of these different events that come to the province -- as I said, there is a guideline that if you haven't received assistance for a luncheon, dinner, or whatever within three years, you're going to fit, as long as that fits in terms of hosting an event that is an all-Alberta event.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're saying to leave the limit in place, and when you get big stuff that is international or something . . .

MR. APPLEBY: You have another route to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, now that just leaves one other difficulty. What happens to those who have been caught by these things during this fiscal year?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I didn't realize there was something special in place before. I don't understand this, I guess.

MR. PURDY: There isn't anything else in place. You either beg, borrow, or steal. I could go visit Horst Schmid if I had some group coming into the constituency of international, national, or even provincial fame, or whatever, and get him in his back office and he'd give me [inaudible].

MR. STEFANIUK: The fact is, John comes to us and says, give me 500 pins. It's not our place to ask why he wants 500 pins or what he's going to do with them. He gets 500 pins, and the cost of 500 pins goes against his allowance. Amen.

MR. PURDY: I had the same thing. I had the old Alberta mental health group that was established in 1904. They were having a reunion in Winterburn, and they wanted 100 of these owl pins. I got them, and it was charged against my promotional allowance at \$1.25 per pin.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I have sent some pins with a delegation that's going to be attending the Canada World Youth convention. I just decided to take that upon myself. I'll fit it in, in terms of what I might use this year.

MR. APPLEBY: We have no mechanism at the present time for reimbursing John or putting that money back into his fund. We just haven't got it.

MR. STEFANIUK: The only thing I can think of is that if those pins used for the particular purposes should have been forthcoming from a government agency which has a supply available for that purpose, perhaps that agency can give John that number of pins back, or they can give them to us, in which case we'll be happy to credit the account. The fact is that we're scrounging to get those pins at the lowest possible value. For example, we just had an opportunity to buy a reasonable stock of Universiade pins, which members find useful, for about 55 cents apiece. We grabbed them, because you'll get two for the price of one, as compared to giving out a flag pin or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else we know of who is in John's situation?

MR. APPLEBY: I know Myrna is.

MR. PURDY: I'm in there for that one particular group.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I just turned my request down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you know whether Mr. Notley has a situation where he's handed out pins at his own cost or out of his allowance, maybe to an international labor group?

MR. MANDELBAUM: To the best of my knowledge, that hasn't come up at all.

MRS. OSTERMAN: John, I think you're going to have to go scrounging for a few extra. If that was a sort of promotion, you should talk to Boomer and Horst and a couple of people. Between them all, you might get a few.

MR. PURDY: Tell you what I'll do, John: for the ones that went from my constituency -- the six clubs represented, about 24 people -- I'll get those pins and refund you.

MR. GOGO: I don't mind saying no, had I been aware of it. I'll give them the Premier's phone number. I'm not above doing that, except I thought there was some provision whereby this province was sincerely interested in promoting itself in the North American market. Obviously we're not. I'll live with it; I don't care. Thank heaven I didn't ask for it three times in a row. To hell with it. I'll just ignore it. It's been brought to the attention.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think we're all in agreement that we should have something but that maybe there is another way of pursuing it that doesn't lay it on the shoulders of this committee.

MR. GOGO: With respect, I think it's on the shoulders of this committee and not the government.

MR. PURDY: I think it's within our guidelines. We have to put forth some parameters in the guidelines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the whole problem. John or Myrna wouldn't have been caught had they been aware of some guidelines ahead of time.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But I don't understand. They know there's a dollar limit. Everyone knows there's a dollar limit. It doesn't matter what the guidelines say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They did know that?

MR. GOGO: For constituency use. I don't have any trouble with that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Everybody knows that.

MR. GOGO: That wasn't constituency use. That's incidental. It was another constituency.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So you have several people you can talk to.

MR. GOGO: No, I'll look after it. Just leave it with me. I'll write the president and send him a bill, and we'll see the reaction. Believe me, I have no hang-up.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But all this has been handled in a different way before, John, by various members.

MR. GOGO: With respect, I'll tell you how it's handled. There's no shortage in any of these pins in 29 offices in this building. Members don't have the prerogative of buying pins. You heard the hon. Member for Stony Plain. Members do not have that prerogative, because within the budget we've

discussed every member of Executive Council also gets \$1,500. That's all I'm saying. So there's no shortage. It depends on whether you have a budget for your office.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But the ministerial functions are just on a global basis for the whole province, so they're in a different position than we are. We talked about promotional items that dealt with our constituencies. So what I'm saying is that we have another place to raise it.

MR. GOGO: I've said three times that I'm prepared to drop it. I hate to take all this time of the committee.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think it's a good item to raise. I just think it has to be carried somewhere else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. What about the second draft, then?

MR. GOGO: Item three, Mr. Chairman. Is the Clerk sending out a list of those items?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to have to run a catalogue.

MR. PURDY: Do you remember that the first draft had the reference to catalogue in it, and it was deleted?

MR. GOGO: I understand there's a thing such as silver spoons and so on. I stumbled across that, but I'm not aware of it otherwise. I'm just wondering, should members be circulated with the items that are available?

MR. PURDY: I thought it should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose members were circulated with a list of the items available and a brief description. From time to time -- this is going to be some more administrative work for the Clerk's office -- as items run out and aren't obtainable, a memo can go out saying that we no longer have these and, as other items are added, that we now have some of these. Keep the catalogue updated.

MR. PURDY: But, Mr. Chairman, there are other times when a person may want something entirely different and has to get the Clerk to approve it anyway. So I don't think we have to catalogue it. That's my observation after thinking about it.

MR. GOGO: I'm not thinking about the catalogue, Bill, as much as . . .

MR. PURDY: . . . what is available and the cost.

MR. GOGO: I would think our job to represent our colleagues here is to make sure they're aware of what is available.

MR. PURDY: I have no problem with the Clerk sending out the list that he now has in his office and the cost of the items: what the 3 by 6 provincial flag is worth, what the flag pins are worth, the plastic ones, the owl pin, the coat of arms . . .

MR. GOGO: That's not a catalogue; that's simply an information sheet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And a cost list.

MR. PURDY: Yes. I have no problem with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So is there a motion?

MR. GOGO: I so move, then, as applies to number three. Does the Clerk have any hang-up on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the motion is that the Clerk send out a list of available items, showing costs. All those in favor?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm just wondering if I had a different sheet.

MR. STEFANIUK: What about the guidelines?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we're just dealing with part of them.

MRS. OSTERMAN: May I see your page, John? I feel like I have something different. Have you got a second draft? Oh yes, it's just the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, do you want to deal with the guidelines as a whole first, or do you want to deal with this motion concerning the Clerk sending out a list of items and costs?

MR. GOGO: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I shouldn't have made the motion. I'm happy with the guidelines as listed; I should have said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's go to that one. Are you content with the guidelines as shown on the second draft? All those in favor? Carried on the motion of Mr. Gogo.

All right, what about the list? Is there a consensus that you'd like to have the Clerk send out a list of available items, showing costs?

MR. GOGO: I don't think that has to be a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just saying a consensus. That's what you'd like done? Okay.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, some time ago the Clerk gave us examples of lapel pins for members. I forget what conclusion we came to on that.

MR. PURDY: I think that was tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean MLA pins?

MR. STEFANIUK: Scrapped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We dealt with it at several meetings, and then people said to forget it.

MR. PURDY: There was something like a fairly significant cost behind it, wasn't there?

MR. STEFANIUK: The members wanted them quoted in precious metals and, when we got that quotation, we were told to bury the whole thing.

MR. GOGO: It was just that if it was still pending, I wanted to remind the chairman that we have members who will no longer be members. They have indicated they're not running again. If we had proceeded, they should have them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. You know, Tom Lysons had some small ones made up in Hong Kong. I think he gave each member one.

Communications allowance, item four. I think you have in your books the verbatim transcript of the previous discussion on that. If you look under tab A, you'll see the draft guidelines.

MRS. OSTERMAN: We're not dealing with guidelines again, are we, Mr. Chairman? No, I think it was just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't recall that we've ever approved them.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have never approved guidelines for the communication allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And there the Auditor General looms again.

MR. GOGO: I guess I always have some difficulty with that. The Legislative Assembly appropriates money and presumably the Auditor General -- there's no question about the authority for the money -- says: hey, just a minute, are people spending this money within the spirit of the intent? They say: we can't deal with spirits; we have to deal with something. Is that how this came about, Bo?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In effect, he is saying: in order for me to do my job, to see whether this money is spent properly, somebody should spell out the guidelines.

MR. GOGO: With regard to the communication allowance, Mr. Chairman, have we had an occasion of the Clerk rejecting a bill or statement?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've also recovered some costs in one or two cases, where it was inadvertently used for partisan purposes.

MR. GOGO: The Clerk makes that judgment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we discuss it.

MR. GOGO: For example, under two, party materials. Mr. Clerk, party materials relate, for example, to Progressive Conservative or New Democratic Party soliciting memberships, but in no way any colors of material? That wouldn't be construed, would it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean if it happened to be in the party colors and wasn't party material?

MR. STEFANIUK: You mean if you have something printed in blue on orange paper, am I going to reject it?

MR. GOGO: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: Not likely.

MR. GOGO: I'm wondering what the abuses might have been. I understand party means and soliciting membership.

MR. STEFANIUK: If a member buys a newspaper advertisement that says that John Gogo, MLA, and the Progressive Conservative Association of Lethbridge wish you a Merry Christmas, chances are I won't pay for it.

MR. GOGO: You'd pay half, wouldn't you?

MR. STEFANIUK: No. Not likely.

MR. GOGO: I clearly understand that; that's not a problem. I had an article in the press a week ago about Grant's major spokesman in Lethbridge presenting me with a suit for raising money for Big Brothers or whatever. That was fine. The communication allowance published the photo. But on the bottom, for some unknown reason it was inserted by the Committee to Re-elect John Gogo. We questioned that. We said: hey, not only do you upset my friend, who presented me with the suit and is a nationally known leader of the NDP, but clearly it's contravening my communication allowance. The way that problem was resolved, of course, was that there was no statement for it. They simply reprinted it correctly the following week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the bill was for the reprinting and not for the first time, so you're okay.

MR. GOGO: Oh yes. But these things happen somewhat innocuously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Isn't that unfortunate.

MR. GOGO: I wasn't worried about him not paying the bill; I was frightened to death of Grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether it's fair or not. Have you had enough chance to go over these things?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, these have been the kind of things we talked about before. So obviously this is what the Clerk keeps in the back of his mind when he's looking at things now as tentative guidelines. Is the Clerk happy with this, in general terms?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. I don't suggest by any means that any of this is carved in stone. We may have to come back at some date and say: look, here's a loophole that we found and missed; we're having difficulty with it, and the auditors are having difficulty with it; we think we need to plug something up.

For the time being and based on current experience, we're suggesting that this covers the intent of what has been discussed by this committee and the experience we have had.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, then I only have one comment under cost limit: each member will be permitted an annual allowance of 40 cents per household in his constituency. Well, I'd like to speak to the base that we established, and then put in there some sort of formula that spoke to that, as opposed to an amount. Then it doesn't have to be changed every year. Do you know what I'm saying? In other words, when we came up with this, trying to figure out what a reasonable budget for communication allowance should be, we did it knowing we had to grab onto something firm. Something firm was mailing, the idea that every MLA should receive something that would enable them to communicate twice yearly, I think is what we thought, to their constituents. Based on that, can we find a way of writing number four in such a way that we say that notwithstanding the different means of communication, the amount allowed for will be based on whatever.

MR. STEFANIUK: Postage-plus on the cost of two first-class mailings, plus a percentage thereof to represent the contents? Is that what you're after?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes. That way we're not going to get into the business of having to change it. You'll see that in terms of what I asked the Clerk for, to try to find out where we should be for this year's budget, his suggestion now is that to accomplish the original intent of the communication allowance, at least costwise, it will now take 70 cents per household.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes. When we established the 40 cents, first-class mail postage was 17 cents per envelope, I believe. We set 34 cents for postage and 6 cents for contents. That was based on running something off on an offset press, 8.5 by 11 in size. If we were going to do the same thing, considering when that figure was established, with the inflationary costs involved we're now into 60 cents for postage and from 6 to 10 cents for the contents, which seemed reasonable. So I rounded it out to 70 cents in giving Connie an estimate of what it would cost to enhance the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two things that cause no problem. One is the postage: whatever it is, that's what it is. The other one is using the latest enumeration as a basis on which to establish the number of households. But suppose you tie the third factor, which is the cost of the envelope and contents, to the postage one. It's going to be rather arbitrary, and it might be a little incongruous, if there's a huge increase in postage and not a comparable increase in printing costs. It seems to me that could get you into a somewhat grotesque situation.

MR. GOGO: Manitoba provides for two first-class mailings a year. I don't know what the other provinces do. I don't know how theirs is worded, but that's what I was told: two first-class mailings a year.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's easy to do if it's controlled out of a central point, John. You'll recall that when the discussion first arose about this, we had the impression that in fact members wanted to come to us and say: print two pages of something for us; you look after the printing and getting it into an envelope, we will supply you with addressed envelopes, and you put the postage

on it; and you can charge that against my allowance. That was easy. Subsequent to that, though, the members of this committee said: no, we don't want to be limited to a piece of paper printed on an off-set press, put in an envelope, and mailed; if we want to buy space in a newspaper or other periodical or, for that matter, if we want to buy radio or television time, or if we decide we're going to set up a booth at the country fair or enter a float in the parade, then we feel we ought to be entitled to do that, and let us use our own ingenuity.

MR. GOGO: That's how we ended up with the dollar amount. I'm perfectly happy with that. I'd like to transfer it to my promotional allowance, but I won't speak up.

MRS. OSTERMAN: No, there's something else. I asked that question before. We'll get into it again, in terms of combining the two.

But that is a problem, Mr. Chairman, talking about how we put into a formula what the contents might cost. Just so we don't lose track of how this was developed and so we get a good part of it firm, could we not say that the cost limit will be based on just precisely what the Clerk said -- two first-class mailings a year and the number of constituency households, and that from year to year the Members' Services Committee will consider the consideration of the cost of contents. In other words, I think we should have that base written here.

MR. STEFANIUK: Is that something we should be considering at the time the budget is prepared?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That other factor.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That way it stays constant.

MR. STEFANIUK: So if postage drops down to 20 cents, it will be reduced.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Exactly.

MR. GOGO: But the bottom line of that would then be multiplied by the number of households, a dollar amount. But that would not restrict such as the Clerk said: those who would want to use that for radio advertising instead of postage.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Precisely. In other words, notwithstanding this, you say that this is how the base for the cost was . . .

MR. STEFANIUK: In other words, when we draw up a budget we look at the last available enumeration. That is the basis on which we establish the budget for each and every individual member.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Precisely. So all we have to do is consider what we should allow for contents. We get into the next thing here, in terms of suggesting 70 cents for this year. That was something the committee left open, because we didn't have postal costs last year. We knew it was going to go up, so we left that open.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with how we arrived at the number of households through enumeration. Enumeration is going on right now, and it could very well be the last enumeration for another three years.

MRS. OSTERMAN: No, it won't.

MR. PURDY: Oh yes.

MR. GOGO: The year of the election and the year following.

MR. PURDY: Two years following.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, one year following.

MR. PURDY: Are you sure? I think it's two years.

MR. STEFANIUK: It's the year of an election and the year following. Ken Wark was just speaking about that on the radio this morning, as a matter of fact.

MR. PURDY: I thought that if an election was held in March of '83 . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: We had an enumeration last year. Mind you, we had a new Act.

MR. PURDY: As I understand it, unless the Act was changed and I missed something, if an election is held in March of '83, say, there won't be enumeration until September of '85.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. PURDY: Okay. That's two years after the election.

MR. STEFANIUK: If an election is held in '83, then the following year you wouldn't have one, so you wouldn't have one until 1985.

MR. GOGO: That's the year of the election and the year following.

MR. PURDY: Okay. That's what I proposed in the amendments to the Act five or six years ago. So I'm saying that in Connie's area of Airdrie or Bill Purdy's area of Spruce Grove-Stony Plain, we could very well end up with a fast growth again. That 70 cents would not reflect the number of households to what I had a year prior.

MR. STEFANIUK: You see, 70 cents is applied to the number of households as established by enumeration. If you employed that formula, you would have to live . . . Let's say there was an election in 1983. You would then have to live with 1982 enumeration figures and the consequential number of households, until 1986, as a matter of fact. You would get '85 figures in the fall. We would build them into the '86-87 budget, and that's where you would realize the benefits.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to delete the rest of the paragraph. I thought that was after that.

MR. PURDY: No, I didn't mean that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Okay, fine. I didn't mean to delete that. I'm only looking for the household count and the postage as the base for the communication allowance, and I thought the rest of the paragraph looked after your [inaudible].

MR. PURDY: We have to have some mechanism in there that will look after you, Mr. Speaker. If your area is going to grow fast . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: What are we missing, Bill?

MR. PURDY: The enumeration part of it. The number of households.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It goes on. Read the rest of the paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number four. There's another statement.

MR. PURDY: It says that if a member submits a written statement addressed to the Clerk of the House from the post office, indicating a greater number of households in his constituency than the most recent . . . Okay.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That takes care of that. I've got a statement from Airdrie that shows that I have over 4,000 households.

MR. PURDY: I didn't read further. I should have.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mind you, what members should realize is that that statement plays hell with the budget. I don't have that information when the budget is being drafted, so the consequence of that statement could mean significant shortages in budgets, depending on the growth of the province.

MR. PURDY: It might be imperative for the member to be supplying that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that leads me to the point I wanted to make about this year's communication allowance and how we handle putting in place what we said we'd do last fall, when we found out exactly what postage was, and looking after that consideration. I don't think it's at all improper for the committee to be suggesting to our chairman that, on the advice of the Clerk, he be looking to a special warrant that deals with communications, in instances where the budget has to increase because there are more people in the province. I don't think you can forecast precisely what the growth is in any one constituency. I remember seeing last time that Ray Speaker's constituency has fewer numbers in it. Some of us have 12,000 new people in three and a half years. That's a lot of people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, so we're dealing with the guidelines. We're content with one, two, and three. What about four?

MR. PURDY: I'm content with that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I just don't think we should have the 40 cents in there. That's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So would your motion be that four be amended by saying that each member will be . . . The thing is that regardless of what you put in here,

you can't scramble the discretion of the committee in establishing a budget. So suppose you said that the committee adopts as a guideline a cost limit based on two first-class mailings . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Times the number of households.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not yet. You have to finish up with the cost first, then multiply. All right. Based on the number of households and the cost of two first-class mailings, together with such reasonable amount as the committee may establish from time to time to provide the mailed items themselves.

MRS. OSTERMAN: To provide the contents. To provide the printed material.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Even the envelope. Is that the substance of the motion?

MRS. OSTERMAN: That reflects it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed? I'm sure Mrs. Allen and I will be able to extract that from her notes and from the transcript. Agreed? All right. That relates to paragraph four.

Are you content with paragraph five? Six? Seven? Eight? Nine?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman -- the member should select the printer and distribution agency he wishes to carry out the service and sign the invoice for the materials or services supplied, to indicate his approval, before transmitting . . . Oh, I see. In other words, where I have chosen a printer, you may receive an invoice for some printing along with a sample of the brochure, but I will not have signed.

MR. STEFANIUK: We're going to ask you to approve it, because in effect you're saying: yes, this was delivered; go ahead and pay for it. For all I know, your printer lacks integrity and sends me a bill for producing 20,000 of something, when in fact he produced only 10,000. I don't know that unless you tell me.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are we all right on eight? Then that's it.

So subject to being amended in the manner indicated by Mrs. Osterman's motion, are the guidelines approved? Do you want to move that, Fred?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: We now do not have an amount defined in this guideline. That is determined from time to time by this committee.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, at budget time. Pardon me, the only thing is that we don't want to get into setting down precisely at budget time. I'm not sure.

Bill, you're the one who raised this. Is it not our responsibility to canvass members to ask them for a statement of the number of their households, so we can in fact set a budget? Anyone coming forward after that time with an explanation of a sudden 1,000 increase by half-way through the budget year -- they say: look, we've had this incredible increase and here are the figures, substantiated by the post office. But as close as possible, we should reflect the precise amount at budget time, unless we're in a position like we were last year. We can set a budgeted amount. The post office can declare an increase three months from that time, and we're in a position like that again.

MR. GOGO: Only 6 per cent for two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You wouldn't want to go a little further with a nasty thought that from time to time the Clerk should inquire of the post office, and that the amounts would go up where warranted and down where warranted?

MRS. OSTERMAN: No.

MR. STEFANIUK: In so many instances, our difficulty is that we have to define physical boundaries for the post office. If we go to them with 79 such definitions, which is the Legislative Assembly Act . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: They might tell you where to go.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MRS. OSTERMAN: The only way you can do it is take from individual members a list of their mailing points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Should we go to item five?

MR. STEFANIUK: What about four (b)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry. Mrs. Osterman's item.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just thought it was an appropriate time for us to be dealing with the situation we had. We didn't have information last year; we now have information. One, we had an enumeration last September. A number of people may still come forward showing a dramatic growth, but to the best of our ability we still should be striking an amount to set for members, so they know what they're working with in this particular fiscal year. I would like us to reflect that, in terms of a budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in effect we would now be approving part of our estimates.

MRS. OSTERMAN: From last year.

MR. STEFANIUK: Are you talking about amending the current year's situation?

MRS. OSTERMAN: No. I'm saying that I think for the purposes of letting members know what their budget would be -- I mean, we now have a lesser amount -- we should look at what the amount would have been, had we had all this information last year when we were budgeting, and divide it up appropriately among members, according to their households. They should have a new

statement of what their approximate communication allowance will be, so they can work with that amount.

I realize that if every member expended it, we would be far over budget. But into the year, the Clerk could look at how the expenditures are coming and advise you accordingly that we will have to go for a special warrant. That's the other thing. I believe the committee should be saying to you, whether or not you need that support, that we would like you to be looking at asking for a special warrant to reflect that increase. But if members don't know they're going to have it to spend, they're not going to spend it. If they don't know that, your surplus is going to be dramatically cut back this year because of the cost of the postage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So would you like to make a motion?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'd like to make a motion that on the advice of the Clerk, the Speaker be looking at the timing of a special warrant to reflect the increased costs in the communication allowance. We all know what those increased costs are. I don't think we need to define it here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean the increase in the communication allowance, based on increased voting population and postage?

MR. STEFANIUK: In effect, you're saying to make a change in the current fiscal year, Connie.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I am. I want the change this year.

MR. STEFANIUK: You want it to come into effect during the 1982-83 fiscal year. In other words, you want the policy guideline, which has just been approved, reflected immediately.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think that's in place, simply because our discussions reflected this last fall when we discussed budget. We said that we were going to have to increase it, but we didn't know how much. So I'm now trying to put in place the . . .

MR. APPLEBY: Actually, we should have sufficient funding to carry us for several months yet, shouldn't we?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I'm sure we do.

MR. STEFANIUK: I've done a calculation based on two first-class mailings, based on current rates of 30 cents plus a dime for content, and considering the 1981 enumeration figures. If every member uses the maximum, I will have a budgetary deficiency of \$190,659.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we can't go for a special warrant until we're actually sure.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Right. I just think that if we don't let members know . . . Members have been coming forward and saying, what's our funding going to be this year? Last year, almost everybody was told that their funding would be whatever was allowed under the increased costs that are going to be shown. So now they're wondering what those dollars will be. Somebody like Bill Purdy, say, goes to the Clerk and says, what's my funding going to be? Based on last

year's enumeration or what he can provide right now, if he has a household count for his constituency -- and according to our formula, whichever is the greater -- this will be the number of dollars you will have to spend, Mr. Purdy. But we all know that all those dollars aren't there right now, because we couldn't put them in last fall. So when we start to run short, we're going to have to go for a special warrant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then suppose we wait until into October, when we have the result of the current enumeration, and calculate on that basis.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But, Mr. Chairman, this is last year's budget.

MR. APPLEBY: No, it's this year's budget.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, it's '82-83. It's a bit of both, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I was saying.

MR. GOGO: He's just saying that within X days from today, we'll have the household count for the province.

MRS. OSTERMAN: At least we'll have the numbers. We just divide it by two, is what you're saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All we need is those numbers, divide by two, and multiply by 40 cents. We can then tell the members, on the basis of . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Seventy cents, because we have to reflect the new cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, all we need to do is agree that we're going to do this. Then when the time comes that we have to get some more money, we have to apply for the warrant. Isn't that it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Connie is concerned that the members should be informed, in case they don't understand the situation.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's right. That's all. So it has to be decided here that we will in fact go for a special warrant when that occurs.

MR. APPLEBY: If necessary. Some may not use it.

MR. GOGO: That raises the question: when is "occurs"? Having decided that there's an aggregate of \$1 appropriated for that purpose, the minute one man or woman runs out of money, the demand is there.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But funds can be found from another place in the Legislative Assembly budget to carry us while a special warrant is prepared and acted upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we can't be sure we're going to get the special warrant.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, we can be pretty sure. When I raised this with the Provincial Treasurer last year, he said by all means. The Legislative Assembly budget is not going to reflect it.

MR. APPLEBY: There are two parts to this, Mr. Chairman. One is that we have agreed that we're going to update to 70 cents and update to the most recent enumeration. We agree on that. Everybody is going to get that money, and that's how much they're going to get. Now, if we don't run out of money for some time because some are not using this, then we don't have to go for a special warrant for some time. But they're still going to get up to that limit if they want to.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I guess the whole question is, when do you apply for it? Do you apply for it when you see that you're almost out of funds? I guess this is what you're asking.

MR. STEFANIUK: Funds have to be expended before a warrant can be granted. So it's a question of cash flow. We have to determine what other cash we have at a particular time to carry us. We can run into a problem. Let's assume that the House is in session in February and March and we get the real crunch coming on the funding, a really heavy demand for the funding. We cannot make a warrant application at that particular time, because the House is sitting. However, I suppose we could consider supplementary estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd have to, or go for a bank loan.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I know it will be approved. It's just a matter of how we do it.

MR. GOGO: I'm not concerned with whether or not it's approved. I'm concerned that Mr. Purdy comes to you and says: I've run out of money; Members' Services Committee approved the update of the number -- and that's now official, because the Chief Electoral Officer certified that; and secondly, it's 70 cents, a 90 per cent increase; therefore, Mr. Clerk, I want another \$3,700. Are you telling me he has it? That's critically important to me.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'd go out and get a mortgage on the Legislature Building at 12.5 per cent.

MR. APPLEBY: That is in there. We agreed to that. It's just a matter of when you have to go for extra funding.

MR. PURDY: John, right now there's a budget of \$271,950 for the communication allowance. Once that has depleted, that's the predicament the Clerk is in. That's when he is supposed to go for the special warrant.

MR. GOGO: He'll never run out of money. We know that.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm just saving it everywhere else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mandelbaum has a question.

MR. MANDELBAUM: I have a question on that. As I understand it, when there's a current enumeration, that will be used as a basis. Otherwise, the post office will be used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We use the latest enumeration, but if between enumerations a member perceives there to have been a significant increase, he may then use updated post office figures as a basis for requesting an increase in his authorization.

MR. MANDELBAUM: The difficulty I have -- and I'm just asking this to clarify it in my mind -- is that when you have enumeration, that's for every person. It doesn't have any information as to households. On the other hand, the post office has information on households, but there's no indication on the number of persons per household.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but there's a direct relationship. In order to establish a member's entitlement, we take the last enumeration, divide it by two, and arbitrarily assume that's how many households there are, even though it doesn't fit in Bill Purdy's constituency. Now, if the post office figure indicates a substantial increase in the number of households, then we add that. The problem we haven't addressed ourselves to is what happens when the post office and our dividing by two disagree in the first place.

MRS. OSTERMAN: We've chosen to say it will be the greater.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have we?

MRS. OSTERMAN: In terms of the guidelines here, it says: The number of households in a constituency will be determined by the most recent enumeration. It will be deemed to be half the number of the voters enumerated. If the member submits a written statement addressed to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, from the post office, indicating a greater number of households in the constituency, then the most recent enumeration [inaudible] then the allowance will be based on the greater number.

MR. GOGO: I'm sorry. I agree with you. I thought you were mixing people with houses again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. GOGO: No argument at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we take it a step further, then? If the entitlement is established by the number of households as shown by the post office, since it's significantly greater than the number of the voters divided by two, may that also be used subsequently for changes in entitlement? In other words, as I take it now -- and we have problems with timing and so on; the more you think about this thing, the more you think -- suppose we get this new enumeration which is now under way. Let's say it's available sometime in October. Bill comes along and says: according to that enumeration, I've got so many households, but t'ain't so; according to the post office figures, I've got so many more. Then as I understand it under the formula, that entitles Bill to have his entitlement calculated on a higher number.

Now suppose there's no further enumeration, as we discussed. Let's say that in December of 1983, Bill gets some further figures from the post office that say it's up again. Does the rule automatically mean that we may take updated post office figures to increase the entitlement?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, it doesn't just set it at the beginning, at the enumeration.

MR. STEFANIUK: What I don't think we have, Mr. Chairman, is a decision that the current allowance for the contents -- if we have amended the formula to reflect the cost of two first-class mailings, then we should have a decision by this committee to make the contents 10 cents.

MRS. OSTERMAN: For this particular year. That's right, because we have now established the 60 cents, because that's the postage, and the number of households, to be determined by the count going on now. Then I suggest that the contents should be 10 cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion?

MR. STEFANIUK: That brings it up to 70 cents, if that's where you want it. But nobody has told me how much the contents . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: You see, a couple of years ago we decided the contents would be 6 cents. I think that in terms of cost . . .

MR. GOGO: When I see some of the material floating around, it's 60 cents.

MR. PURDY: Why are we saying 10 cents? It should be 20 cents for two mailings.

MR. STEFANIUK: We were reflecting 6 cents for two mailings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was 3 cents on 17. Now we're saying 10 cents more would be 5 cents on 30.

MR. GOGO: We're not restricting anybody then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're just restricting what we're going to pay them.

MR. STEFANIUK: We're not saying that you have to have two mailings. We're not saying you have to mail at all.

MRS. OSTERMAN: This is just a basis to provide a budget.

MR. APPLEBY: You can do a house drop.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, or put a big page in the Lethbridge Times.

MR. GOGO: That's the way I do it, as you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Your motion, Connie.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That for the purposes of the '82-83 budget, an amount of 10 cents be allocated.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, I thought that was for right now. We're amending now, not for the '82-83 budget.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Isn't that the year we're in now?

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm sorry, pardon me. It's almost 4 o'clock. I apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the motion is that for the purpose of calculating entitlement for the current fiscal year, the cost of the mailed material be deemed to be 10 cents per household. Agreed? Carried.

Does that allow us to go to item five? Fred has the calculation here, and I think we have copies to pass around to everybody. I took the liberty of putting in an editorial insertion in the minutes of the last meeting, to see whether I had correctly understood the wishes of the committee in regard to the funding for the most recently elected Independent member. You'll find that on page 112-82 of the August 23 minutes.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, if I could just go over this with the committee. It's what has been worked out by our office, what percentage of our budget is directly to the leader and what percentage is attributed to MLAs. If I can just take a few minutes and briefly go over each item. The first item is permanent salaries. But our office felt that with 75 per cent of that was attributed to the leader, we'd have that office at any rate, and 25 per cent to the members of the Legislature. I can take myself, for example. I don't use the office here, or very little. I use my constituency offices to do almost all my work, with the exception of when I'm in session. That's an example of my role taking out of this budget.

MRS. OSTERMAN: You mean this is administrative and secretarial support.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So who are those people paid for with the \$57,792?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Those are the permanent staff who work in the office here. If you'll go down to the next item, there is sessional relief and stenographer. At that point, they broke it down to 50 per cent for the leader and 50 per cent for the members of the Legislature. The next one was the big one, the contract employees. For example, we had two executive assistants, and they were both working for the leader. But then we had two assistants there. We took the two, and we feel 50 per cent of the two are attributed to the leader and 50 per cent to the MLAs. But 100 per cent of the special executive assistants were to the leader. They were the executive assistants who stay right in the office. This employer contributions: they have that 100 per cent to the leader. I really don't see why that should be 100 per cent. I don't know why there shouldn't have been a small portion of that to the [interjection]. Right, it should have been the same there.

MR. APPLEBY: For the employee contributions portion, those percentages that you have for MLAs' responsibilities -- 25 and 50 and so on -- could be

prorated into that support staff, and take a portion of that and fit in there. Would it not be proper?

MR. MANDEVILLE: They didn't have anything in there. I went over it with the secretary who did this. As far as seminars, conferences, or anything in that area -- if I go to a conference, a Public Accounts Committee or whatever, it's paid for out of the Clerk's office, as an MLA. That's 100 per cent attributed to the leader, because we don't use any of that as members of the Legislature, because we can come to the Clerk's office if we're on a committee.

Down to travel expenses, here again it's 90 per cent for the leader and 10 per cent to the MLAs. This was worked out as accurately as possible. This is what we've been spending as MLAs. The advertising: the MLAs themselves do no advertising. I agree that that's really a substantial budget for advertising, but there's no advertising for an individual MLA. The advertising is done out of the office. As far as the postage is concerned, it's 90 per cent and 10 per cent, and that's an accurate figure. I have figures to back it up.

The leader's car is 100 per cent. The office equipment, the Xerox and so on, is 75 to the leader and 25 for the MLAs. The telephone and communication are 100 per cent. At one time, they used the leader's credit card out of the office for all the phone calls. Now they don't do that. That's why we have the budget in there. It's charged to the Official Opposition office. Any of the MLAs use their credit cards all the time as far as telephone calls are concerned. Then there's repair and service: 75:25. Consultant's report, printing, binding, research, leader's stationery, and so on: 90:10. Word processing servicing: 75:25.

With these figures, a total of \$60,642 is attributed to the members of the Legislature. Divided by four, that's \$15,160.50.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Wow. Mr. Chairman, if I could just make a suggestion about this. This information has just come to us. I don't believe we can deal with it today, because there are a number of things here. Certainly in the course of taking this back and looking at it individually, we may want to call Fred about understanding certain items. I'm not sure how you can function without any materials, Fred. However, I'd like a little while to look at this and to know, even philosophically, some of the things that you're attributing to a leader if it isn't really an overall caucus thing. I'm just not sure. But I'd like some time to think about it. So other than for clarification of certain things, I would suggest that possibly we deal with this at our next meeting, when we've had a chance to look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How are we going to be fixed for funding for the Independent member? Will we be running out of money?

MR. STEFANIUK: Well, we're carrying him on the cash flow. The total budget for the Independent member, as indicated by the information in the binder, is \$105,988. I think we're at about 40 per cent of the budget year. From my recollection of the last cash control statement I saw, he is below the 40 per cent. So on a cash flow basis, we're fine for the moment. I don't think there's a problem there. But if this figure is taken, then the amount that reverts from the Official Opposition budget is \$15,160. We would then have a deficiency in the funding of the private Member for Olds-Didsbury of \$90,828, and that amount would have to be sought by special warrant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to apportion the \$15,000.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, that's already apportioned. It's \$60,000. That's already divided by four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you have to apportion it by the fraction of the year. Bob Clark was here until November 30, so presumably he used the MLA portion of his expenses until November 30. The only saving there could be to transfer to Gordon Kesler would be the MLA portion from November 30 to March 23.

MRS. OSTERMAN: For last year, Mr. Chairman, but we're dealing with this year's budget. This year's budget was allocated starting April 1.

MR. STEFANIUK: So this is a full year's budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. We didn't make an adjustment.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification. I want to ask Fred, why do you divide it by four?

MR. MANDEVILLE: We divided by four because you're putting Kesler in there as well, are you not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Whatever way you divide it, there's what we figure to be an MLA's . . .

MR. APPLEBY: You had the leader and three other members.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Two other members.

MR. STEFANIUK: The budget was drawn up on the basis of three other members.

MR. APPLEBY: So that should be divided by three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A curious thing comes to mind. After the 1975 election, the funding per opposition member, there being then six of them, was increased by \$25,000. It was \$150,000 for six opposition members. If these figures are accurate cost accounting, then it would seem there's been a steady erosion of MLA money into spending on behalf of the leader, to the point where not only do we not have the \$25,000 left, but we've gone beyond it.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, there are a number of things on here that raise questions in any person's mind. One would have to be 600, the material supplies for the leader's office, 100 per cent and nothing for the MLAs.

MR. MANDEVILLE: When we're in session, the MLAs can go the Clerk's office and get our steno pads or whatever we want, send a Page up to get them.

MR. APPLEBY: But stationery, envelopes, supplies like that, I mean . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is deferred to the next meeting. That was item five.

Item six: services to members, survey results. I think you have those in your book. I think the outstanding thing discovered there is that once the House is dissolved there are no members, and consequently all sorts of

ordinary funding cease. We want to look at those. I don't know whether you want to deal with them this afternoon.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, may I draw the attention of the committee to two additional pieces of information. One is a memorandum, circulated earlier today, to which were appended the guidelines or policy statement, if you like, relative to the use of constituency offices and other support services. This deals with dissolution. From the manual of administration of the Ontario Legislative Assembly, I also have the verbatim excerpt of the practice in that particular jurisdiction. Members may wish to glance at those as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have they been distributed? You're going to distribute them now. These should go in the books.

MR. STEFANIUK: The guidelines were distributed earlier, but there is an extra copy here in case someone doesn't have one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to leave those for the next meeting as well?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think so.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I thought this item was considered urgent, and in fact that's why it was considered necessary for it to be [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: It should perhaps have been put higher up on the . . .

MR. APPLEBY: On page 5, other services after dissolution, number twelve, there's (a), (b), and (c), dealing with communication, credit cards, and so on; nothing to do with the promotional allowance.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt, but I'm late for an appointment with a delegation in one of the minister's offices. As I think it's a kind of sensitive thing, I should be there very quickly. So if you would excuse me, I'll check with my colleagues as to how you deal with this, unless you're still here at 5.

MR. APPLEBY: We can't go into it in detail, but I just thought that it should have been included there with (a), (b), and (c), that the promotional allowances would be critical too.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think it probably is one of the most critical.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: You're talking about promotional allowance?

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, when you said "other services after dissolution", on page 5.

MR. STEFANIUK: Are you talking about the communication allowance or the promotional materials allowance?

MR. APPLEBY: Promotional materials as well as those three you have there should be included. I'm surprised that the Parliamentary Counsel has missed

that one. I don't think it's included somewhere else in these recommendations. It might be.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So what is your point (d) then? Is it going to be twelve (d)?

MR. APPLEBY: Something else should be added to say that no further expense should be charged to the member's promotional materials allowance.

MR. MANDELBAUM: I have a question, though. In the opposition, we don't have quite as much information about when an election will be called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may have as much as we have.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Then for any member, what happens in a situation where, under the communication allowance, the member undertakes to come out with a mailout, but prior to that mailing going out, an election is called? Who pays for the mail in that situation? Or who pays for the material?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean it's ordered and not used?

MR. MANDELBAUM: It's ordered and not used.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think anything done prior to an election call must be assumed to be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has to be approved.

MR. STEFANIUK: A member posed that question to me very recently, relative to buying space in a newspaper. I suggested to that member that if he could show me evidence to the effect that the insertion order was dated prior to dissolution of the Legislature, we would honor the commitment which had been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think there'd have to be a rider, though, that the item ordered -- whether it be a mailed-out item, a newspaper ad, or whatever -- would have to be used reasonably promptly after it was ordered. Otherwise you could order something from a newspaper and say: now, when the balloon goes up, I want you to run this ad.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think what we're talking about here is if somebody places an order for some pamphlet to be printed or something like that, and it's in the mail, it's being processed. Then the expenses up to that point in time should be paid. But anything after that, it couldn't go into the mail. That would be something you're incurring after the writ has been issued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Likewise, then, if you ordered a newspaper ad . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Exactly. It would have to be cancelled. You can cancel a newspaper ad. You can't cancel something that has already been produced, and the bill is just in the process of being on its way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So are you suggesting that a statement be added to the guidelines, according to which promotional material ordered prior to the issue

of a writ must be paid for, notwithstanding that they may not be used after they issue the writ?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Promotional or communication material. I guess it's called communication, really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. This is communication, but it could apply to both?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I think it should say something about the Clerk being immediately notified of something in process, and then steps can be taken to assess the costs to that point in time. It shouldn't go on incurring more expense. Supposing you have something in the course of being made up. You've had some photography done and whatever, but it's not printed. Then I think the Clerk should be notified immediately, because it doesn't have to be printed. That material isn't lost. If the member is running again, then it can be utilized a month or so later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe.

MRS. OSTERMAN: If they're elected. Then the process will continue. It's just stopped in the intervening time, for all of us, while the campaign is on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in effect, shall we say there's a motion that the proposed guidelines in relation to the use of constituency offices and other support services after the issue of a writ of election should be amended to add, as clause (d) to paragraph 12, the promotional and communication allowance, and further amended to provide that where orders have been placed for the use of the communication allowance and the material or service has not been used or completed prior to the issue of the writ, payment may be made but the material may not be used. Of course that's legislation, what you can use after the writ goes out.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I just think the Clerk should be notified of anything that's in progress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes. And as soon as the writ is issued, the Clerk be notified forthwith concerning any communication allowance items that are in process or that have been obtained and not yet used.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That way we can keep ourselves clear and not incur anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to father that motion, if I may mix a metaphor?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I'll even mother it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed? Carried.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I suppose you will send out, under your hand, such guidelines to the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. As amended. Content?

Under other business, Henry Woo once proposed that we get a certain kind of name tag that members could carry around and use permanently. I may be misremembering something, but Henry would like to have his samples back. I'm

wondering whether we gave those to a member of the committee for consideration and didn't get them back.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Right, it was John.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're so gleeful about it. He's not here.

MR. APPLEBY: I know I brought them to the meeting, and I don't know where they went from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You brought them to the meeting. You mean you borrowed them and brought them back?

MR. APPLEBY: No, Henry gave them to me and proposed that we get these. I said: well, it will have to go to Members' Services, and I'll take them down there. So I did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And what did you do with them after we gave them back to you to give to Henry?

MR. APPLEBY: You didn't give them back to me. I left them with you, Mr. Speaker. Henry approached me about this a little while ago, and I said: well, you'll have to see Mr. Amerongen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Damn. Any clues?

MR. APPLEBY: So he's going to go back to Hong Kong and get some more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're going to have to do that. I think I'm bound to replace them. I hope we can still do that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I wonder if they're in anybody's hands. Were they going to be passed around? Did anybody look at them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I put it on here just in case some member of the committee had them.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I just don't recall. Fred, you wouldn't have taken them to your caucus?

AN HON. MEMBER: My memory won't go back that far anyway.

MRS. OSTERMAN: It wouldn't hurt to ask. I will ask around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would appreciate it if you would, because I feel bound to replace them.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'll be on my way to Hong Kong on Friday.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I was going to offer to go.

MR. STEFANIUK: You're so busy, Connie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The final item of other business, apart from giving you your expense forms, is a proposal from Alan Hyland. He suggests we could cut down our long-distance costs appreciably if we . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, I remember seeing that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What Alan is saying, in effect, is that you should be able to do 1-plus dialing from an office in your home, your constituency office, and your Legislature Building or Ag. Building office.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I don't quite understand this. Maybe the Clerk will enlighten me as to how these are normally handled. Do we have to hand in telephone bills and circle our 1-plus dialing from our home, mixed in with all our other long-distance telephone calls? Is that what he's thinking?

MR. PURDY: I think the offices upstairs should have 1-plus dialing, but we don't have that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we had it and took it out.

MR. PURDY: No, we didn't have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We never had it?

MRS. PRATT: The reason was that we only had one telephone number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. He said that the circuit was removed.

MRS. PRATT: We could now, if everyone has his own individual number.

MR. APPLEBY: I think we should just take this as notice and see what we can find out about it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes. I think it's a matter of knowing whether it's administratively possible, from the offices anyway.

MR. STEFANIUK: With every member having an individual number, it's just as easy to keep track of calls assigned to that number as it is to keep track of calls charged against a credit card. And the cost is a heck of a lot lower, because you're paying top rates on credit cards. You're paying the same as an operator-handled call, whereas on the direct dial you're really saving money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For example, we have Edmonton to Banff: credit card, \$1.15 and 55 cents per minute; and 65 cents and 55 cents. It's just about half if you dial direct. Edmonton to Lethbridge -- poor John isn't here again -- it's \$1.22 to 72 cents on the initial period. So we might save ourselves many thousands of dollars.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I didn't realize we could do that. If we can and still maintain a switchboard, then fine. I don't know why it wasn't done before.

MR. PURDY: The only time the calls come into the switchboard now is if it rings five times and I'm not in.

MRS. OSTERMAN: But why can't we dial 1? We can't dial 1 out of our switchboard.

MR. PURDY: No, we're all locked out.

MR. APPLEBY: I still think since we've just received this, we should take it as notice and look into it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Okay. I think if people are making calls from their constituency office and using their credit card, that's foolish. I can't imagine that it's happening, but I guess it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Alan's office in the Ag. Building?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes. I'm just saying that out in your constituency office you have a single number assigned to you. Then you dial 1 and you're out.

MR. APPLEBY: All those things can be considered when we discuss it again, can they not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just thinking that if you're in the Ag. Building, you might drop a word to Alan.

MRS. OSTERMAN: We should just send a memo out to people, as far as that goes. That's the only thing we can deal with directly today. For the other one, we have to have more information, as Frank said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you want us to send all the members copies of Alan's memo.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, underlining that personnel in our constituency offices should be instructed that they use the 1-plus dialing. Or just a memo from you, Mr. Chairman, saying that it was brought to our attention that credit cards were being used out of constituency offices. It would be much cheaper, since you're paying the bill anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Were you saying something about the possibility of checking and these charges being no different either way?

MR. STEFANIUK: It's no different if you get charges shown for direct dial on a regular bill, as opposed to getting a credit card account. That shows you when you called and what number you called. We can do an audit and find out whether you were calling Aunt Mary or someone quite legitimate.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Aunt Mary could live in the constituency and require assistance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other business? Adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.