

Special Select Standing Committee on Members' Services

Monday, December 7, 1981

Chairman: Mr. Amerongen

6:25 p.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: Has anyone had a chance to look at the minutes of the last meeting, the November 24 meeting?

MR PURDY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are there any errors, omissions, or corrections?

MR APPLEBY: I don't think so. I'll move they be adopted.

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: The minutes of the meeting of November 24 are adopted as circulated.

I wonder whether we should go at the business arising. Evidently we're in the same bind we've been in in the last few meetings, and we won't have enough time. Should we go right into the estimates?

MR APPLEBY: We should really clear up some of these other housekeeping things.

MR CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR APPLEBY: I see you have business arising from October 19.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, there were a couple of items.

MR APPLEBY: I was wondering what they were. I haven't got those minutes with me.

MR CHAIRMAN: Airport parking, lapel pins, name tags, and identification cards are the items left from the October 19 meeting.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, as I explained to you earlier, I have an emergent meeting I must attend. I can take 10 minutes, though. I wonder if we could put some of these items to bed on the agenda and perhaps leave the estimates for a full meeting. I apologize.

MRS PRATT: I have revisions to distribute to government members. They're accounting changes.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, good. I wonder if we could circulate those now, and maybe you could give a copy to Connie directly. Could we come back to John's concern about putting something to bed here?

MR PURDY: I think it's a good idea that if we have outstanding items, clear those off.

MR CHAIRMAN: Lapel pins and name tags are pretty short, aren't they?

MR STEFANIUK: On the lapel pins, members of the committee took it back so they could decide what they wanted after we gave the prices. That information has been circulated to all members.

MR CHAIRMAN: So it's in your court. We can put that over to the next meeting.

MR STEFANIUK: There was no decision on name tags. That was taken back to caucus as well.

MR CHAIRMAN: What about the samples you were going to bring?

MR STEFANIUK: I haven't got them.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, that's where the name tags are sticking. We're waiting for samples. The identification cards?

MR STEFANIUK: The i.d. cards are printed, ready, and we're just waiting for delivery of the members' thumb print photos and to have them laminated.

MR CHAIRMAN: Has a request gone out to members?

MR STEFANIUK: We've arranged that. There are photographs of all members on file. They don't have to pose again.

MR PURDY: Some of those are outdated too.

MISS BLANEY: We'll scan them before we put them on the cards.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're not good looking enough on it, they'll get you another one.

MR PURDY: I looked so old in that last photograph I had.

MR GOGO: I think that's super, Bo, if you've done that. It's just a matter of Public Affairs getting in touch with you.

MISS BLANEY: Once they supply the prints, we'll have the members sign the cards. Then we'll laminate them.

MR CHAIRMAN: That covers those three items from the October 19 meeting. Is airport parking in such a situation that we can put it to bed in a short discussion, or should that be tabled?

MR GOGO: I don't know. I think it's still in Mr. Clerk's court.

MR STEFANIUK: I haven't got the time right now to get into it, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry.

MR GOGO: We were going to provide the VISA card, annotated for parking only.

MR STEFANIUK: We've been through some preliminary work there. We have some problems with it.

MR GOGO: In fairness, hopefully the sitting is about over. It's not of urgent concern until then.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we go to the November 24 meeting? Three items were left over. One was Code 600, materials and supplies. The Clerk was going to report back. Of course, we now have that amendment given Royal Assent, so there is a considerable amount of arithmetic having to be done in the Clerk's office, because we have to credit back the deductions we've made in the past.

MR STEFANIUK: We have that, Mr. Chairman.

MISS BLANEY: That has all been done now.

MR CHAIRMAN: Great. That's terrific.

MR STEFANIUK: We have estimates ready to recommend. Having considered the entire matter now that the legislation has been given assent, with the amendment that was brought in in committee, we would recommend that rather than grouping all the relevant constituency office expenses under supplies, we should identify those individual areas we need to increase in order to accommodate constituency offices. They're under Code 350 for rental of property and equipment, Code 400 for telephones, Code 410 for repairs and maintenance, and Code 600 for supplies and services. We have this printed, if you want us to circulate it.

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's do that.

MR STEFANIUK: Charlene prepared it all. We ran through it today and made a final decision on it. What members should note is that we have not, in these estimates, provided for the full 79 offices. We have, where it appears to be necessary, increased by a maximum of 10, with the view that that's probably the more realistic figure. In effect, what we need in addition under general administration is \$55,140, to cover the cost of telephones, rental of equipment, repairs and maintenance, and supplies.

MR CHAIRMAN: This is what you're recommending for '82-83?

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. In some instances, we have had to pay out separate amounts for things like office cleaning, business tax, window washing, insurance, and things similar. It seems to us unfair to place that in separate accounts for some members, whereas most members are negotiating that as part of their lease. So we recommend that that should come out of the \$12,500, or next year out of the \$13,375, to place all members on a more than equal footing, and that just these items be shown as additional items.

MR CHAIRMAN: So this is in addition to control group 002, general administration?

MR STEFANIUK: Right.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Clerk: a set of statutes per member, what category does that fall under?

MR STEFANIUK: We pay for all the printing of the statutes, under Code 430. They come out of that.

MR GOGO: The reason I raised it, Mr. Chairman, is that Thursday last, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised the question of having an additional set in each constituency office. I personally think the constituency office is an extension of this office, not a duplication of this office. I'm not in favor of it. The question I want to ask the Clerk is that if people felt that was justified, what would it do to our budgeting? Seventy-nine copies are pretty substantial.

MR STEFANIUK: We have had an instance, Mr. Chairman, where a member has wanted an additional set of statutes, and he has paid for them out of his communications allowance.

MR APPLEBY: We have a set in the government members' office. That is not allocated to one particular member.

MR PURDY: I asked for a set up there.

MR APPLEBY: We've had them.

MR CHAIRMAN: I haven't got a constituency office. Maybe some of the members who have would be able to say how important it would be, once you had the statutes, to have the regulations.

MR PURDY: I don't know what the problem is, Mr. Chairman, because I had my statutes that I got in 1971 or '72 in my office at home, in my own residence. We have the ability to use the ones that are in the building right now if anything comes up. So I don't see the need for an additional set of statutes for constituency offices.

MR APPLEBY: Not for each member.

MR PURDY: As the Clerk said, if a member feels strongly on it, then he can take it out of his communication allowance.

MR CHAIRMAN: Or maybe if he thought he had sufficient access to the library copies here, he could take it out of his office here and put it in his constituency office.

MR APPLEBY: I think most MLAs keep them back home.

MR MANDEVILLE: I think that's the place for them. I don't expect to hire a secretary to be able to read the statutes to my constituents. I have an obligation somewhere.

MR CHAIRMAN: You'd be impressed, Fred.

MR GOGO: I find the statutes aren't really of much value to me without the regulations, but that's because I'm not a lawyer, I guess. My point was to

clear with the Clerk, in view of the fact Mr. Notley raised it, what the impact would be if we consider that; not that I am in favor of considering it.

MR STEFANIUK: We would have to put an additional budget item in 430 in order to do that. So it's 79 times \$250.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's only what we're charging for them. I don't know if that's what they cost.

MR STEFANIUK: If others are subsidized, those perhaps ought to be as well.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to have a motion on the question of statutes for constituency offices, or are you content with just having had a discussion on it?

MR APPLEBY: How are you going to handle it, Mr. Chairman?

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, you can say you're going to do it or you're not going to do it.

MR APPLEBY: Something has to be on record for your benefit, doesn't it?

MR GOGO: Being as I raised it, I'd just as soon there not be a motion. I wanted to pose the question if it would adversely affect any other part of the Members' Services budget. I don't think it will, is the answer I got.

MR STEFANIUK: You would have to put in an additional figure.

MR CHAIRMAN: The question having been answered, does that suffice?

MR GOGO: It does me.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you want to get back to this recommendation for an increase in control group 002?

MR PURDY: I have a question on that, Mr. Chairman. Under expense code 600, Charlene has down here for 10 new offices, and she only figures it out at \$13,011 per office. That then doesn't show up in the general administration total increase. You have \$55,000, and it should be showing up \$130,000. Or am I missing something?

MISS BLANEY: Right across from the expense code 600, extended to the right, should be the total for that control group. The \$13,011 represents just the stationery aspect of that. The \$10,000 for the current year plus the \$12,000 for the new offices, an estimated increase of 11 per cent.

MR PURDY: Oh, okay. Where do you show the 10 additional offices?

MISS BLANEY: Just in the little explanation underneath there, Mr. Purdy.

MR PURDY: But 10 new offices, with the new amount, is equivalent to something in excess of \$100,000.

MR STEFANIUK: We've broken out telephones and all the other things.

MR PURDY: What code are we then showing constituency offices *per se*, the rental of that office?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's different.

MISS BLANEY: We're showing it under 430.

MR PURDY: How many do you show there?

MR STEFANIUK: We show there 79, and that's a statutory figure now. So it's 79 times \$13,375.

MR PURDY: Okay.

MR APPLEBY: There was some discussion about these signs once. Did we come to any conclusions about them?

MR CHAIRMAN: We got one approved and started supplying them, didn't we?

MISS BLANEY: Yes.

MR MANDEVILLE: Are there two different types of signs?

MISS BLANEY: Actually, there's only one type of sign for size and content, but it can be hung either outside or inside.

MR CHAIRMAN: It doesn't matter how many offices they have, they get a sign for each office.

MR APPLEBY: That's a communication allowance charge.

MISS BLANEY: I've been a little stingy on that.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's not the word. It's frugal.

MISS BLANEY: If they didn't like the sign we offered that Members' Services had approved, they had the option to use their communications allowance to have something bigger, better, or different.

MR CHAIRMAN: That communications allowance is like charity; it covers a multitude of sins.

MR STEFANIUK: In effect, Mr. Chairman, what we need, now that the legislation has been passed, in addition to the allowance for the office space and the secretarial help, is \$55,140.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: So we need a motion for that.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're content.

MR WOLSTENHOLME: So moved. I don't see much to complain about on that.

MR CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question? All in favor? Okay. So the increase to control group 002, general administration, element 10100, at \$55,140 is approved.

Now, we had funding for security.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, what about item eight on the agenda. How does that fit in with members' constituency offices?

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe just an explanation is in order there. I understand that that is going to result in crediting back to members the amounts taken out of their \$10,000 for supplies, because the amendment was made retroactive. Just a report item, really.

MR GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you'll excuse me. I'm already running late.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there anything you'd like to express a last minute concern about, John?

MR GOGO: No. I'd like to take an entire meeting for the estimates. I don't know what you're going to do about future meetings. I would suggest the day following the House rising.

MR CHAIRMAN: If the House rises Wednesday -- what's a week from Wednesday?

MR PURDY: That's the 16th.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. The 17th?

MR GOGO: Well, I wouldn't feel uncomfortable the day following the House rising.

MR CHAIRMAN: We can't do it on that basis very well, John, because we have to get notices out. We may not know until the last day when the House rises.

MR APPLEBY: Could we not do it on that basis right now? Give notice on the basis of the day after the House rises.

MR STEFANIUK: Even if it's a Friday?

MR APPLEBY: No, you'd have to put that exception.

MR CHAIRMAN: So unless the House continues on Thursday, the 17th, we'd have a meeting. Would we start at 1:30?

MR GOGO: Any time after 12 noon suits me.

MR CHAIRMAN: If we find our own lunch, that saves a certain amount of monkey business.

MR APPLEBY: We'll bring sandwiches.

MR GOGO: It's fine with me.

MR CHAIRMAN: We wouldn't be providing lunch if we started at 1:30.

MR APPLEBY: I'm kidding.

MR CHAIRMAN: So is it agreed that the next meeting is Thursday, December 17, at 1:30?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Unless the House is sitting that day, in which case signals off and we'll get you on the phone.

MR GOGO: Thanks very much.

MR STEFANIUK: You have three members missing now.

MR CHAIRMAN: I know. There are still four left, so we're a quorum.

The next is funding for security in the Legislative Assembly Chamber. Just briefly, the concern there . . .

MR STEFANIUK: I put it in a memo.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's right. The Clerk's memo of November 24.

MR APPLEBY: I was trying to find it on the agenda, though.

MR PURDY: Business arising.

MR APPLEBY: Oh.

MR CHAIRMAN: The thing simply has come down to this. It's nice to give the work to the commissionaires, and it's nice to have them around. But if something really serious took place, they just wouldn't be athletic enough to handle it. In order to get people who are a little fitter and younger, we're going to have to pay more money.

MR STEFANIUK: That in itself is not the problem, Mr. Chairman. We're getting to the stage where we have difficulty getting commissionaires. As I mentioned in this memorandum, we have one working at the age of 87, which is pretty ridiculous.

MR PURDY: Don't tell that to my father. He's 86, and he's all over the place.

MR STEFANIUK: If he had to take on somebody in those galleries . . .

MR PURDY: He probably could, knowing him.

MR STEFANIUK: There's the difficulty we have. You've probably noticed that as this fall sitting has gone on, we've had a change in personnel, simply because they're losing people. We're hard pressed to get them replaced.

MR APPLEBY: What is the solution then?

MR STEFANIUK: A House force. That's what I recommended in the memorandum of November 24, and provided a breakdown. We know we can recruit people from among recently retired RCMP and city police who are able-bodied, are on a pension, and would look at this as a way of supplementing their pension and would be happy to do the work.

MR CHAIRMAN: Just had another fellow from city police. He's going to take an early retirement, wants to do some travelling, and he is willing to come and work here for as long as we sit each year.

MR STEFANIUK: What I have recommended as a budget is \$74,200. We've done some comparisons. The closest one to this amount is in Quebec, where it's \$75,300. In Manitoba, they spend \$100,000 a year. In British Columbia, they spend \$250,000 a year. In Ontario, they spend \$266,000 a year.

MR CHAIRMAN: Some of those are year-round.

MR STEFANIUK: B.C. is sessional.

MR APPLEBY: What would they do in the non-session periods?

MR PURDY: Service for contract is what the Clerk says.

MR STEFANIUK: Not necessarily.

MR CHAIRMAN: The doors of the Chambers, the galleries. You know, we had an incident last year. Somebody in one of the galleries got obstreperous, and the commissionaire -- a very decent fellow, but there was no way he was able to tackle him.

MR PURDY: Can I ask a question on that? How long does it take to get a response from the Premier's security staff? He has three people on staff. Is there any liaison or communication . . .

MR STEFANIUK: We have a direct call signal from the table to the front door security.

MR CHAIRMAN: So have I.

MR PURDY: So they could be there. And that's the same with the city constable.

MR STEFANIUK: He's part of that force.

MR CHAIRMAN: The indications are that that kind of thing will increase.

MR APPLEBY: I think it's high time it was looked at in that respect.

MR CHAIRMAN: I think we'd have egg on our faces. Something can happen anyway.

MR PURDY: The other night I came back into the building. It's nothing to do with the staff of the Assembly, but there's a commissionaire sitting down at the entrance to the building from the parkade. I walked through, slammed the door, and he never batted an eye. He was just sleeping the world away. I

walked right on by him and into the building. So I brought it to the attention of the security people the next day.

MR CHAIRMAN: We asked for representation on the security committee, as you may remember. We made several requests, but no reaction.

MR PURDY: Haven't you got the power, Mr. Chairman, to go ahead and do this anyway?

MR CHAIRMAN: It's recognized, even in Alberta, that I'm responsible for security in the Chamber.

MR APPLEBY: This staff we're talking about now, Mr. Chairman, is to replace the present commissionaires. I think we better go for it.

MR PURDY: How is the money now being supplied for the present commissionaires?

MR STEFANIUK: We have money in the budget for the commissionaires. But as you can appreciate, it is considerably lower than this because they're paid a mere pittance, on an hourly rate.

MR PURDY: The ones at the front door of the Assembly, the back door, and up in the galleries are on a part-time basis?

MR STEFANIUK: On an hourly basis. You can regard it as a contract with the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires.

MR APPLEBY: The people in the parkade too?

MR STEFANIUK: No, that's not ours. That belongs to building security, which is part of Solicitor General. I'm talking about the people who man the Chamber.

MR PURDY: How does the Sergeant-at-Arms feel?

MR STEFANIUK: The Sergeant-at-Arms feels very strongly that we go this route. In fact, he is very much prepared to do the recruiting, to the extent that he could have a force in here within a week. He's done preliminary enquiries.

MR APPLEBY: What do you think, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: When you say a seven-man force, does that replace all the commissionaires we have in the building now?

MR STEFANIUK: No, just the ones around the Chamber. We have four upstairs in the galleries, one at each of the back doors of the Chamber, and one at the main door of the Chamber. That's who we propose to replace.

MR APPLEBY: These are all over 70 right now.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR MANDEVILLE: That's only while we're in session.

MR STEFANIUK: That's right. The Speaker does not have, nor does the Assembly have, authority for security in the building. The Speaker only has control of security relative to the Assembly.

MR CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking, if it were necessary, we should also be looking after the library.

MR MANDEVILLE: In other words, it wouldn't be an extra cost of \$74,200. That would be the total cost.

MR STEFANIUK: That's the total cost.

MR CHAIRMAN: Including what we're now spending.

MR STEFANIUK: But I would even venture to say that if the Assembly went with this, it would make it easier for the Solicitor General to follow suit, if you like, for the rest of the building. I think it's recognized that they're lacking personnel as well. You've seen changes in personnel around the building, and they're really not familiar with it. You mentioned the parkade entrance. There was an elderly lady commissionaire at the little booth at the garage entrance. I came in one night last week and was honking my horn. She didn't hear me. That's the kind of thing. My God, if she couldn't hear a honking horn, how much could you do before she would become aware of it?

MR MANDEVILLE: We've really been fortunate to date as far as avoiding something like this. We did have one tragedy.

MR STEFANIUK: It's a small amount to pay.

MR PURDY: I think that's the way to go too. In asking the number of questions I did tonight, I asked them because I didn't know exactly what was required. So all you're looking for, then, is a motion to adjust that part of the budget by that much money.

MR CHAIRMAN: According to the recommendation made in the Clerk's memo to the Chairman and members of this committee on November 24, 1981. Any other questions or discussion? Is it agreed? Do you want to put your name on that motion, Bill?

MR PURDY: Sure.

MR CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Purdy and agreed that 430 be changed to provide for \$74,200 for the next fiscal year.

MR APPLEBY: What is the present figure in there?

MR STEFANIUK: \$19,024.

MR APPLEBY: I see what you mean by "pittance".

MR CHAIRMAN: Look at your memo, Frank, and compare it with the other provinces.

MR PURDY: I was talking with Maurice, who was at the front door there -- a great old chap. He said, I've just had enough of this.

MR STEFANIUK: 87 years old. He left because he wants to spend his last days with his father, who is 109.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh, that's right. He's from Saskatchewan, the French fellow.

MR STEFANIUK: You remember old Vince we had out there for years. Vince was a beautiful old guy, but he couldn't even see anymore.

MR CHAIRMAN: This Maurice guy used to cut my hair years ago.

Extended cafeteria service is the last item of business of the November 24 meeting. Who gave notice of that?

MR APPLEBY: What was that all about?

MR CHAIRMAN: This was a memo from Stu McCrae on October 14, announcing the extended hours for the fall sittings, until 7 p.m. for evening meal service.

MR APPLEBY: Why do we have to discuss it?

MR CHAIRMAN: Because it was raised before that by various people, and this was his response. The question is, are you content?

MR STEFANIUK: Was something said about this at the last meeting? Didn't someone give notice they wanted to discuss this?

MR PURDY: I think there was also a memorandum.

MR CHAIRMAN: John Gogo.

MR CHAIRMAN: The concern about it goes back to July 1980.

MR APPLEBY: It might have been Connie.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you're content, and if somebody has any further thoughts about it, we can put it on another agenda.

MR APPLEBY: If somebody brings it up again. I don't think we should just routinely put it on.

MR CHAIRMAN: That was the thing. In response to the concern, we were told by -- we carried it forward a number of times.

MR APPLEBY: We can always raise it under other business, if you wish, too.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we say it's agreed that unless there is further notice otherwise, we won't deal any further with the cafeteria service?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR PURDY: Whatever happened to that discussion we had a couple of years ago regarding a members' dining lounge? I'm still uncomfortable taking a constituent down there to discuss business.

MR STEFANIUK: I think the final answer was, if I recall, the Minister of Government Services said wait till this complex is going to be finished and you're going to have all kinds of nice restaurants.

MR PURDY: I haven't seen anything yet.

MR CHAIRMAN: If you want to put it on the next agenda . . .

MR PURDY: I don't think it's necessary.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, now that we have opened the general administration element, may I bring out one more item relative to that? It has to do with a grant section under CPA scholarships.

MR CHAIRMAN: Could we come back to that, because we're going to be dealing with estimates. There's one other item of business.

MR APPLEBY: We aren't dealing with estimates with so many people missing, are we?

MR CHAIRMAN: That's what we're going to be doing if we go to that.

MR APPLEBY: I have to be away in another 25 minutes myself. I thought we were going to try to take care of some of these items that are not with the estimates, and get the slate clear for strictly estimates next time.

MR PURDY: It's not fair if we have about three members missing.

MR STEFANIUK: Could I at least raise the point for members' consideration. The CPA scholarships, about three years ago, perhaps four, were raised from \$250 to \$400. In 1981, \$400 as a bursary or scholarship seems like nothing at all, hardly worth coming down from Saskatchewan to get, as we had one this year, who now happens to be going to school in Saskatchewan. I would simply recommend that the committee give some consideration to increasing the amount of those bursaries to something that will be meaningful in 1982, when the dollar will have shrunk even further, and in fact consider scholarships or bursaries valued at \$1,000 apiece.

MR APPLEBY: How do we fund those?

MR STEFANIUK: Out of an appropriation under our grant section.

MR PURDY: Have you any background information, Do, what other bursary funds are like for other organizations? What kind of money do they -- something to compare?

MISS BLANEY: You mean like achievement awards and things like that?

MR PURDY: For other organizations. You have the CPA one here. You have other organizations that put up bursaries.

MR STEFANIUK: I don't have firm information, just general word of mouth discussion. In many other instances, we're talking in terms of \$1,500, \$2,000, \$2,500.

MR PURDY: What kind of money are we looking at here?

MR STEFANIUK: Two scholarships at \$1,000, which is basically tuition in this day and age -- if that, depending on the faculty.

MR CHAIRMAN: I felt a little uneasy and slightly embarrassed having the ceremony in the Chamber to give people \$400 each, even having the Acting Premier and the Leader of the Opposition give it.

MR APPLEBY: How do we choose those people?

MR CHAIRMAN: The boy is chosen by the Tuxis Parliament and the girl by the All Girls' Parliament. We don't choose them. It's very democratic; it's parliamentary.

MR STEFANIUK: The Girls' Parliament is run by the Girl Guides of Canada.

MR APPLEBY: What about our budget? Have we enough to cover that?

MR STEFANIUK: I'd like to see an escalation, because right now we've got the \$400 again for next year. That would mean throwing in another \$1,200 as minimum.

MR APPLEBY: How do you view it, Fred?

MR MANDEVILLE: I think that would be good.

MR PURDY: I'll second that. We don't have to have a seconder, but . . .

MR CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Appleby that the CPA bursaries, starting in the fall of 1982, be increased to \$1,000 each, and that the estimates be amended accordingly. All agreed?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR STEFANIUK: In light of the generosity, could we look at salaries?
[laughter]

MR PURDY: He caught us at a weak moment; now that moment has passed.

MR CHAIRMAN: One very short, simple item. I've been wanting to bring it up for the last two or three meetings. For each of these meetings, the *Hansard* people come in, set up all this equipment, and then they transcribe the meetings and there's a verbatim record. Do we want that? Do we need it?

MR APPLEBY: No.

MR PURDY: No, I don't think so.

MR MANDEVILLE: I wouldn't think so.

MR CHAIRMAN: Would I have your blessing if we discontinued it?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MR PURDY: Have we ever had an opportunity where we've had to revert back and listen to the tapes?

MR CHAIRMAN: Not that I'm aware of. I did once on something that made me angry.

MR PURDY: Are all select committees of the Legislature taped?

MR STEFANIUK: It's at the discretion of the Chairman.

MR PURDY: It's at the discretion of the Chairman, then.

MR APPLEBY: You have agreement from three of us then.

MR CHAIRMAN: Can we do this? There are three members missing. Suppose I get their blessings, and if there is any real objection taken, I'll put it back on the agenda. If there isn't, we'll just eliminate it. Is that all right?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. So it's agreed, unless the three other members of the committee raise objections on being asked that we discontinue the verbatim taping of the proceedings of these meetings.

Are there any other non-budget items?

MR APPLEBY: First aid program. What's that? No. 7.

MR CHAIRMAN: There is a proposal received from St. John Ambulance, by Bill Diachuk. He passed that on with the suggestion that this meeting consider it. I think I was remiss in not sharing copies with you. Briefly, they're prepared to present a two-hour basic lifesaving program to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, at any time -- an introductory, first-aid program. It consists of about 30 minutes of film and 80 minutes of practical application. They say that if we're interested, to go to their executive director, Ross Henry. Would you agree that we should circulate this to members and put it on the agenda of a future meeting?

MR APPLEBY: If we get some response.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, we have people in the building who are trained in first aid. With your indulgence, I would like to ask Charlene to explain what is provided, because she has been involved in some of this.

MISS BLANEY: We co-ordinate the first-aid training with the personnel administration office for the government. We select from the various floors individuals who have an interest in participating in the program, and they

attend half-day courses or weekend courses, plus refresher courses, to gain first-aid instruction. Dr. Anderson and Dr. Paproski have been very involved with the first-aid volunteers as well.

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you suggesting then that if members want this kind of training, they can get it in-house and we don't have to bring in St. John? This offer doesn't relate to training personnel. It relates to members.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, you could circulate the members and ask them how many would actually be interested in taking it. I have serious doubts if many members would be willing to fit this in. These kinds of things are available in our rural constituencies from time to time.

MR CHAIRMAN: In the urban ones too.

MR PURDY: Does that give you a certificate? I have the senior thing.

MR APPLEBY: I have one too.

MR STEFANIUK: My kids took something from them, where you watched a series of television programs, then went down and actually had to do the test. They got a certificate for that, basic lifesaving.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the St. John Ambulance proposal be circulated to all members, and at some future meeting [inaudible] concerning the response?

MR APPLEBY: I would say so.

MR CHAIRMAN: It's agreed that the St. John Ambulance proposal be circulated to all members, and thereafter I'll report the response.

MR PURDY: Maybe some of the members would be more interested in the CPR course, cardiac pulmonary resuscitation.

MISS BLANEY: I know the personnel office is trying to put together a program to go to all the departments with that. Executive Council has attended meetings on that topic.

MR CHAIRMAN: That's the one where you break the ribs.

MR PURDY: If you know how to do it, you don't break ribs. It doesn't matter; if you break a guy's ribs and save his life, what the heck.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is that enough for that? Now, is there any other item?

MR APPLEBY: No. 9, the national youth association of youth parliaments.

MR CHAIRMAN: Oh yes. This is a request for some money. The national youth parliament association is asking us for \$5,800. They have calculated it two ways. The second session of the youth parliament is scheduled for August 21 to 28, 1982. They're giving us this opportunity of participating in its success. They've enclosed audited financial statements. They have a deficit from their current year's operation of \$5,800 per provincial regional

delegation. They enclose a budget, and they are asking each province to underwrite, at a cost of \$500 per seat, the 11 seats occupied by the members of its youth parliament. So we're asked to provide \$500 per seat for the 11 seats accorded to Alberta, which is \$5,500.

MR APPLEBY: Does each province have 11 seats?

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I don't know that.

MR STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee should know that we supported this last year. A request was placed before government and, although approved, through some clerical error was delayed for some time. Then it was considered more appropriate that the Legislature should fund the program. So we were requested to do so, and did.

MR APPLEBY: At this level?

MR STEFANIUK: Yes. In effect, we funded the required sum for the Alberta seats.

MR CHAIRMAN: Do you remember what it was?

MR STEFANIUK: About \$4,800, if I recall.

MR PURDY: Where did you derive the appropriation to get the funds from?

MR STEFANIUK: What happened was that the government said to us: if you will take this on, we will provide you with the money by way of special warrant. As it turned out, when we were juggling all the figures at the end of the year, we didn't need it.

MR PURDY: You say the government. Who was that? Executive Council?

MR STEFANIUK: It was the Government House Leader who approached us.

MR CHAIRMAN: Because they felt that that kind of funding, since it was a parliamentary thing and somewhat related to what the CPA does, we should be involved instead of them.

MR APPLEBY: Another question: how are these delegates selected?

MR CHAIRMAN: By whatever mechanism is used within the parliament. I don't know what it is, Frank.

MR PURDY: You say there are 11 seats in Alberta. What Frank is getting at is how the 11 members are picked.

MR CHAIRMAN: Suppose we get this additional information and bring it back to the next meeting. Can you do that, Vera?

MR STEFANIUK: We have the thing described here.

MR CHAIRMAN: Well, we'll circulate that.

MR APPLEBY: Does it say how they're appointed?

MR STEFANIUK: Approximately 110 young people, aged 18 to 23, representing eight regional youth parliaments, will attend the second youth parliament of Canada in Ottawa. These young Canadians, representing every province and territory, will be intent on enlarging their . . . et cetera, et cetera.

MR CHAIRMAN: Let's just circulate this information.

MR STEFANIUK: We might need more.

MR CHAIRMAN: Vera can examine it, and then we'll circulate it and maybe have a summary for the next meeting.

MR APPLEBY: That takes care of the incidentals. I think we did pretty well, considering.

MR STEFANIUK: Under item 8, Mr. Chairman, members' constituency offices and supplies therefor, we should mention that now that Bill 99 was made retroactive and we had to reinstate the money previously charged, we may well be looking for a special warrant to offset that expense, which was unbudgeted in the current year. But I don't think we could very well help that, in light of the legislation coming in in December, retroactive to the previous April.

MR CHAIRMAN: Lots of work for Charlene and her staff, going back and picking up those items.

With regard to the meeting that is scheduled for December 17, do you want these other items? I think there was a suggestion that we deal with nothing but estimates.

MR APPLEBY: Unless something is critical, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Mandelbaum here now, wanting to deal with estimates, and we haven't even reached them. It's like going to police court, waiting for your turn.

MR APPLEBY: We haven't got legal counsel here anyway.

MR CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else?

MR PURDY: I want to ask something off the record.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.