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Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. We will proceed at this time with Prayers.

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the class of Grade Threes and Fours from Christ the King Elementary School, the teacher, Mr. Mark Cant.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Documents or Returns for Tabling?

TABLEING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a Legislative Return, in respect to question asked by the Member for Campbell, on March 25th, 1980.

Mr. Speaker: Reports of Standing or Special Committees?

Petitions?

Reading of Petitions?

Introduction of Bills?

Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, recently, the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West made several unkind comments about the cost of my old, second-hand means of transport.

This gentleman of admittedly little or no real property assets then referred to his inability to raise sufficient funds for the purpose of purchasing adequate two-wheel transportation for himself.

Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that many Members of this House are warm, responsive, kind, understanding people, who do not take offence at such unkind statements, we have gathered together our meagre, extremely hard-earned resources and attempted to purchase a vehicle suited to the Honourable Member's status and his ability to pay for both the upkeep and the operation.

In purchasing this vehicle, Mr. Speaker, we took into account the Honourable Member's health, or lack of health, as the case may be, and in purchasing the vehicle that we shall refer to as the New Swede Hanson, Iain MacKay, Jack Hibberd, Howard Tracey, Geoff Lattin, Missy Parnell, Pat Michael, and Chris Pearson.

We expect to see the Honourable Member appearing in the Members' Lounge at the first coffee break to appear with his two-wheel transport and he is going to, I would hope, give us a demonstration of his ability to ride the same thing in the parking lot during that coffee break.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I am still not exactly sure by what method I shall be taken for a ride by my friends in the House. I do appreciate the gift. I trust that the Minister's psyche has not been permanently abused by any references I might have made to his foreign sports car but I thank the House for this tribute and I do promise that I shall repay them in kind at the first opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further statements by Ministers? This then brings us to the Question Period.
I think that this is something that the Honourable Member and I should sit down with privately and discuss seriously.

**Question re: Airport Management**

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs respecting airport management.

Is the Minister anticipating any increased authority by his Department in the area of airport management in the Territory, extending from his Government's present arrangements with MOT?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing active discussion between officials of MOT, as well as the Department of Public Works.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I am a little hesitant to get into that area until we know just exactly what the responsibility of the Government of the Yukon Territory would be. It is a discussion that is ongoing and will eventually evolve to a situation where the Government of the Yukon Territory assumed total administrative responsibility in many of the areas where we do not presently have it.

Mr. Byblow: Would the Minister then indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether or not his Department is planning any increased personnel in the attention to management and planning?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Byblow: On a more local issue, Mr. Speaker. I would like to enquire of the Minister, I believe he has been approached about congestion problems at the Faro terminal and with the increased traffic there and the reluctance, on the part of MOT, to install any increased cargo or passenger facility, would his Department then be prepared to move any expansion on the facility immediately to handle this coming summer's traffic?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the situation is such that we do not have any money voted in the Capital for such a project as the Member has indicated. Also at the same time, it is my understanding that MOT is in the same situation. I do not think it is any secret, Mr. Speaker, that all levels of Government, whether it be this level or the Federal level, do have problems financially at the present time.

We are looking at the possibility of renting, perhaps, a trailer for that particular depot to help with the congestion. Once I have some word on that, I will get back to the Member on that particular matter.

**Question re: Day Care Ordinance and Regulations**

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health this afternoon, on the Bill 15 Day Care Ordinance and the proposed regulations. The Bill supposedly is to come into effect around May 15. The proposed regulations, will they also be coming into effect on May 15?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it is actually May 1. I could be wrong there, it may be May 15 that the Regulations will come into effect. They are allowed six months' leeway.

Mr. Fleming: In the event that this is true, and due to the fact that the Regulations will cause some disruption in the Day Care Centres, in the areas of renovations and so forth to the buildings, will the Minister assure that the Day Care Centres will have time to do these renovations and so forth and so on, before they really step hard on them through the Regulations?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, six months' time is the amount allowed and we feel that is ample time for them to make any changes they may have to make.

Mr. Fleming: I thank the Minister for that six months' time, that is very good. In the event that these revisions are not possible or a little hard through maybe the resources that the Day Care Centres may have, does the Minister feel that there is any way that she could help them financially?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Member that if there is any way that I can find, I will find it.

**Question re: Ross River Bridge/North Canol Highway Upgrading**

Mr. Mackay: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development today. The Government Leader in his Budget Speech referred to future mines. Mr. Speaker, one of which is located in the MacMillan Pass area. In view of the expectations of this Government undertaking, have they undertaken any planning at this stage for a bridge at Ross River and the upgrading of the North Canol Highway?

Hon. Mr. Hansen: In the matter of roads and bridges, it should be referred to the Honourable Member on the far left.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it is not often said that I am on the far left but, I would advise the House that I have sent correspondence to the Chamber of Mines in respect to the upgrading of the North Canol Highway. I have received some preliminary correspondence. I am expecting more, further, in the upcoming month. I am hopeful that we can get a resolution from the Chamber supporting the upgrading of the North Canol but we do need some facts and perhaps some partial commitments from the various mining interests in that particular area.

I would like to think that over the course of my tenure in this House, during the life of this House, that we can get something underway in that area.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the upgrading of the highway would be first, if it comes to come about, and the bridge would then come into play once various mining anomalies were to come into production so we are making steps in that direction but I would suggest we are two years off before any decision can be made.

Mr. Mackay: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my supplementary to the original Minister because I am moving away from roads and bridges now to ask this Minister if there is any truth in the rumour that seems to be around that the AMAX Mine may well be right on the border of the Yukon and the mill would perhaps wind up on the Northwest Territories side, thus cutting substantially into the Yukon revenue.

Hon. Mr. Hanson: The Honourable Member across the floor has the facts right, but it is still under negotiations, we are still talking with AMAX. I think we are meeting again within the next month over the subject.

The ore is in Yukon and they want to build in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Mackay: Would the Minister be able to characterize that particular difficulty as a major stumbling block in the building of this new mine, or is it a minor one?

Hon. Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, the ore is in Yukon. We have to do all the improvements in Yukon to mine that ore and I would suggest that it has to be a stumbling block, whether he was anxious to do these improvements when we are getting no benefits from it.

My officials have indicated, to pay for this over the improvements that are needed in this area, we would have to have at least 200 jobs for ten years. So, if they want to build in the Northwest Territories, I would say it is a stumbling block and a great one.

**Question re: White Pass and Yukon Route/CNR**

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Government Leader. In the House yesterday, the Government Leader said it was the Yukon Government which had suggested to the Federal Government that CNR be ordered to take over the White Pass and Yukon Route and that this was one of the options put forward by YTG.

Has the Federal Government yet responded in any way to this YTG option?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, other than I was assured by the new Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development that this would, in fact, be an option that is being considered by the new Government. It is one of the many options that are open. It is still there.

The only reaction ever, in respect to that option, that I have heard, Mr. Speaker, is evidently someone unofficially asked the Prime Minister of Canada whether he would be anxious to take over White Pass and frankly, Mr. Speaker, he said no.

Mr. Penikett: Prior to the Yukon Government initiative on the CNR takeover, had the Federal Cabinet made any firm proposal to YTG which included any form of Crown Corporation, either Territorial or Federal, to resolve the White Pass problem?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am most intrigued by this line of questioning that keeps popping up from the Honourable Member, in respect to the Federal Cabinet making some proposals in respect to White Pass.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whereof he speaks. I know of no Federal proposals from the Federal Cabinet made to anyone, in respect to White Pass.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should have a private dialogue about this one too. I would like to ask the Government Leader if he has any knowledge at all, following his discussions with the Federal Minister, as to how quickly we might anticipate any Federal decision on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Minister, Mr. Munro, impressed upon me just prior to leaving Whitehorse that it was his firm opinion that there were two burning issues in Yukon that he had to deal with immediately.
One was Land Claims and the Land Claims Negotiations and the other issue was the White Pass and Yukon Route.

I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that we will be hearing from the Minister very, very shortly. He leaves Yellowknife this evening, on his way back to Ottawa, so tomorrow will be his first day back in Ottawa again.

**Question re: NCPC Rate Increase/Public Utilities Board Rejection**

Mr. MacKay: I would like to give the Government Leader a chance to clarify a position. Will he state today whether or not his Government supports the decision of the Public Utilities Board to request the rollback of NCPC’s latest rate increase proposal.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, frankly I seriously considered rising on a point of privilege at the opening of the House today as a result of all of this.

Mr. Speaker, for anyone who wishes to read yesterday’s Hansard, I think I answered the question directly. Yes, of course, this Government supports that Board, that Board is a part of this Government and if it did not support the Board, Mr. Speaker, the Board would be no longer. I stated yesterday, I thought quite clearly, that yes, we support them and we do not have any problem with that at all.

Mr. MacKay: I am flabbergasted by the Government Leader’s innocence, however, perhaps he could have, having recovered that tum he would people that this Government received any assurances at this point, from NCPC that his Government’s recommendations will be heeded.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it seems that once again I have to go into the lecture process with the Honourable Member on where the Board fits into this procedure. It is the Board that makes the recommendations. It is the Northern Canada Power Commission, not this Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can either support or not support that Board. We do that by either leaving them in office or taking them out of office. If we leave them in office, it must be interpreted as support.

Mr. Speaker, it is not extraordinary for the Northern Canada Power Commission to receive these recommendations from this Board. It has happened before, in spite of the implications made by the Honourable Member yesterday, that possibly, you know, we were too nice to NCPC, because I happened to be a personal friend of the Chairman. I was quite surprised at such a remark coming from the Honourable Member.

I took that as somewhat of a personal insult that he does not give me the benefit of that doubt for my veracity. I chose to ignore it at that time, but, if he is going to persist in this, then we might as well get it all out on the table.

Mr. Speaker, the board makes these recommendations to NCPC and they expect NCPC to react and the worst thing that we could do would be to interfere in any way at this point in time.

Mr. MacKay: I think the Minister, in the course of using up a lot of time in Question Period, has successfully avoided answering my question again.

Can be tell us if he has had any communication with the Chairman of NCPC, since yesterday, with respect to this rate increase?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, none whatever.

**Question re: Land Block Transfer**

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister who has newly found himself on the far left of the Government Leader, the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Before the federal election was called, the territorial government agreed not to request block land transfers for recreational lot subdivisions until May 1st, this year. Can the Minister state how these plans have been affected by the recent election and the installation of a new Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt about it. It has made it very difficult in respect to land use planning and whatever and I sometimes find it difficult that the Member opposite stands up and wonders why, in some cases, land is not available and, on the other hand, says that land should not be released.

I am caught in a Catch 22 situation and I am sure the Member opposite would, if he reviews some of the questions that have been asked over the course of the last Session, agree.

As far as the land planning is concerned, Mr. Speaker, in some areas we are continuing with our planning. I think we would be irresponsible in not doing so. I am hopeful that we can get some land transferred to us so that we can do what we all said we would do when we ran for election, and that is to provide land to all people in Yukon for whatever reasons they would like to pursue.

Mr. Penikett: I am constantly amazed at how often the Minister opposite mixes up or confuses Members opposite.

Last Session, the House was told by the Government Leader that there were no plans to request block land transfers for land other than recreational land. Can the Minister clarify his Government’s position, in the light of statements by Federal officials that the YTG and the Federal Governments have agreed in principle to transfer of Federal land from the Mile 928 to Mile 934 area on the Alaska Highway to the YTG?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement.

Mr. Penikett: When the Minister is seeking advice on that question, would he also be prepared to clarify this Government’s position to inform the House on the request for the hundreds of square miles of land involved in the Whitehorse North study area and the Whitehorse South land study area and whether this Government is requesting that that be transferred from the Federal Government to the Territorial Government, as well?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we are making some requests for some land transfers in that area so that we can put some fairly large rural residential properties on the market for those people who would choose to have that lifestyle. I do not have the maps in front of me.

As I said earlier, we are caught in a very difficult situation as far as the land situation is concerned as I would like to think that it will be resolved fairly soon because we do have people. I would suggest very, very rapidly, who have been waiting for a long period of time to be able to get a piece of land legally and be able to exercise their prerogatives on a piece of property and I think that we put them in a very difficult position over the last number of years.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further questions, we will proceed to the Orders of the Day and Motions other than Government Motions.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**MOTIONS**

Mr. Clerk: Item number 1 standing in the name of Mr. Lattin.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared at this time to deal with Item One?

Lattin: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 5

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hoolalina, THAT this Legislative Assembly go on record as recognizing the value of the northern transportation bonus and be it further resolved that the Government of Canada direct its Revenue Department to honor the Prime Minister’s election promise and to maintain the northern transportation bonus after it is taxed.

Lattin: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour and also a duty to my fellow Yukoners to move this motion and now to speak in favour of it. I appeal to all Members of this Assembly to support my stand in this motion.

Mr. Speaker, let us review the situation. For years now, the Government has voiced the need to develop Canada’s North. Many of us here in this Chamber believe this and I respectfully suggest that many of us are here as a result of this ideal.

One of the incentives employed to foster northern immigration and development by private business and Federal Government has been prepaid trips outside. These trips have not been taxed. They have, until now, been conceived as incentives for northern employment.

Yet the Minister, alas, some bureaucrat in Ottawa, for nothing better to do, suddenly saw that there was a loophole in the Taxation Bill that would enable the Government to collect taxes on these trips. Thus, these bureaucrats in Ottawa, these same technical bureaucrats who are fueled by money, score again.

To add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, these Federal bureaucrats have the audacity to try and collect retroactive from the private sector but not from the Government sector.

Mr. Speaker, if we let this go unchallenged we have failed, failed in our duties to our people.

The Department of Revenue would perpetr ate a mockery if they allowed us to relegate our people to two classes of citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this brings to mind a quote from the internationally recognized economist, Mr. Jerome F. Smith. I quote, “People are
ruled in direct proportion to how much they are deceived." We must not allow the wool to be pulled over our eyes or the people deceived.

Mr. Speaker, another type of incentive, in many of our mines, and other frontier projects, is a minimal charge for accommodation. I think that in the Fede cadre, this incentive will not go unheeded. This could mean an increase in taxation of many points and this will be an unjust hardship on our working people.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the recently formed United Front for Defence of Northern Employment Incentive tabulated the following observations: that 85 per cent of the work force are affected; second, I note that the Collective Agreements are due and this will undermine collective bargaining and lead to inflationary agreements. Three, disruption in essential services can be expected. Four, it will be more difficult to tempt people to come North to work. Five, there will be a negative impact on the health of tourism and mining industries.

I concur with these objectives and appeal and welcome them to the fold of those who would want justice and same understanding restored.

Mr. Speaker, other countries recognize and have incentives to entice their citizens to seek employment and work to develop the northern frontiers.

Do we not have the foresight in this country of Canada, to at least match the wisdom of governments of other countries? It will indeed be a shame if this country of Canada and especially Canada North of 60 if our Liberal Government does not awaken to the injustice it is perpetrating on Canada's northern citizens. I can only ask myself, Mr. Speaker, ask myself out loud, if it is a diabolic plot of the eastern Liberal Government to chastise the voters of Canada's Northern Territories.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that this is not so, because we have sufficient enough frustrations in western and northern Canada. Already secession-type parties are emerging that will, if they are successful, only tear this country asunder and leave the pieces for others to gobble up.

This unjust discrimination is just one more wedge to divide this country. I ask all Northerners to stand up and demand our government in Ottawa to heed the wishes of its northern people. It does not seem to me to be very much of a problem to proclaim a moratorium now until the necessary legislation to correct this injustice be enacted.

Yes, Mr. Trudeau, we await to see if you will honour your election promise. If you do not, it will only be construed as one more deviant ploy to deceive the people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the Right Honourable D.L. DuCann: "Like love, democracy can survive all attacks, except indifference or neglect."

Thank you.

Applause

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in some other assemblies, it is more appropriate instead of to thump your desk to actually clap, and I would like to thank the previous speaker for his speech.

There are a few things in it that I could reply that I think he was dragging some hurrings across my track and I shall not be disposed to follow them, particularly, but I would like to say that he was only prayed that somebody could help these northerners. Well, I would like to tell him that his prayers are being answered and his prayers are being answered by that very Liberal Government that we deserve a better tax deal.

That is well and good, Mr. Speaker, but then you look at the graduated tax rates and sure, we are paid more but every time we get paid more we are into a much higher bracket of tax and I suggest you, Mr. Speaker, maybe examining at a level of income and being taxed at 50 per cent which only gives an equivalent living of somebody in the South that is being taxed at 40 per cent or 35 per cent. So we may earn more but we are having to pay much more for that privilege so I think that problem has to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, other countries recognize and have incentives to entice their citizens to seek employment and work to develop the northern frontiers.

Do we not have the foresight in this country of Canada, to at least match the wisdom of governments of other countries? It will indeed be a shame if this country of Canada and especially Canada North of 60 if our Liberal Government does not awaken to the injustice it is perpetrating on Canada's northern citizens. I can only ask myself, Mr. Speaker, ask myself out loud, if it is a diabolic plot of the eastern Liberal Government to chastise the voters of Canada's Northern Territories.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that this is not so, because we have sufficient enough frustrations in western and northern Canada. Already secession-type parties are emerging that will, if they are successful, only tear this country asunder and leave the pieces for others to gobble up.

This unjust discrimination is just one more wedge to divide this country. I ask all Northerners to stand up and demand our government in Ottawa to heed the wishes of its northern people. It does not seem to me to be very much of a problem to proclaim a moratorium now until the necessary legislation to correct this injustice be enacted.

Yes, Mr. Trudeau, we await to see if you will honour your election promise. If you do not, it will only be construed as one more deviant ploy to deceive the people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the Right Honourable D.L. DuCann: "Like love, democracy can survive all attacks, except indifference or neglect."

Thank you.

Applause

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in some other assemblies, it is more appropriate instead of to thump your desk to actually clap, and I would like to thank the previous speaker for his speech.

There are a few things in it that I could reply that I think he was dragging some hurrings across my track and I shall not be disposed to follow them, particularly, but I would like to say that he was only prayed that somebody could help these northerners. Well, I would like to tell him that his prayers are being answered and his prayers are being answered by that very Liberal Government that the majority of people have elected from this country to Ottawa to run the Government.

I might also add that we did not hear any such moratorium being proposed to follow them, particularly, but I would like to say that he was only prayed that somebody could help these northerners. Well, I would like to tell him that his prayers are being answered and his prayers are being answered by that very Liberal Government that the majority of people have elected from this country to Ottawa to run the Government.

I might also add that we did not hear any such moratorium being offered by the other gentlemen who are trying to run this country.
whatever we recommend here is going to have a direct effect upon our budget in a year following.

So, we have to bear that in mind, as well, and we should probably assess the cost of that. I will throw out one figure that, were the government to accede to the request of an $8,000 tax-free deduction, a deduction for northern living, which is a suggestion of the Northern Mineral Advisory Task Force Report, it would cost the Yukon Government, somewhere in the region of $2 million to $3 million in revenues in a year. That is a very rough guess, but it is certainly a big enough number to make us think twice about the cost of what we are and an awful lot of day care centres could be funded for that kind of money. There are an awful lot of roads that could not be maintained if we do not have it, too.

So, in view of all these items, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move and amendment to this motion. The amendment is: THAT Motion Number 5 be amended by deleting all words following the word "recognizing" and substituting therefor the following: "the principle that northern residents should pay commensurately less tax than other Canadians.

THAT the Government of Yukon make representations to the Prime Minister of Canada requesting:

(a) a moratorium upon the taxation of northern benefits, and
(b) a review of the policy respecting taxation of northern benefits to determine:

(a) ways and means of reducing taxes of all northern residents on an equal basis, and
(b) the impact any tax concessions would have upon the revenues of the Yukon Government.

This is seconded by the Honorable Member from Kluane. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honorable Member for Kluane, THAT Motion Number 5 be amended by deleting all words following the word "recognizing" and substituting therefor the words "the principle that Northern residents should pay commensurately less tax than other Canadians, and that the Government of Yukon make representations to the Prime Minister of Canada, requesting:

(a) a moratorium upon the taxation of northern benefits, and
(b) a review of the policy respecting taxation of northern benefits to determine:

(a) ways and means of reducing taxes of all northern residents on an equal basis, and
(b) the impact any tax concessions would have upon the revenues of the Government of the Yukon.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are talking about this subject today, but I do not want to be talking about the bureaucrats.

I want to talk about the boss, the big boss, the Prime Minister. I want to talk about this telegram that he sent and I would like to read from it for you.

It says, "Today Liberal Campaign Headquarters received a telegram from Pierre Elliot Trudeau, contents of which is as follows: I am greatly concerned with reported unfairness of interpretation of the Income Tax Act as it applies to Northern residents. A new Liberal Government will immediately, following the election, call a moratorium and review the situation as it applies to northern residents."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Election, if I remember correctly, was February 18 or something. Today if I am advised correctly by the calendar, and I know you cannot always trust them, because they are printed in the south, but I am advised that it is April 2. It seems to me that you would have to have an extremely liberal interpretation of the word "immediately" before you could conclude that the action promised in the Prime Minister's telegram has taken place.

We have been well advised in the past to take the Prime Minister's word on this kind of thing, with a grain of salt. Of course, a lot of people have not forgotten wage controls and the famous campaign promise of 1974 that, Vote PC and zap, your wages will be frozen. Vote Liberal and they will not. Of course people did and they were.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to the amendment proposed by the Liberal Leader. It is quite nicely written, very polite, it has the reverential tone of a supplicant. The key word in it is "requesting," cap in hand, down on our knees, bowing and scraping, please sir, can we have some more bread.

Well, you know what the guy in the poor house said to Oliver Twist.
keeping them now. That is a real problem here, that has been the basis of these kind of benefits. The plain fact is that companies in the private sector, mining companies, will have to pay more for wages, as a result of this sort of Revenue Canada’s anti-north, anti-working person scheme in the North.

It may not make that much of a difference to some companies, but I understand there have been product communications from the other companies that the fact of the companies that the fact that they have an extremely well-educated, well-paid, stable workforce. The reason they do that is because not only are those people much better employees, but they do it because they have the opportunities for small business in the retail and service sector in that kind of community are much greater.

We have got to realize that if this administrative decision, or, I think it is now political because we have had too many days since the election for it to still be administrative. If this political decision stands, it will produce serious damage to the whole Yukon community, not just for the people who are now receiving those benefits, but for everybody who derives income and employment from every single sector of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the original resolution. I am going to vote against the amendment because the amendment, it seems to me, is pussyfooting around and, I think, just, is too weak, too mealy-mouthed and inadequate a plea on such an important and profound subject.

Mr. Hibbert: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the first of the motion proposed by the Member from Whitehorse North Centre and the arguments that he raised in concern of this very serious matter before us at the present moment.

I also listened to the Leader of the Opposition offer his comments and indeed they were comments of value with regard to taxation but I again, find myself in the dilemma of having the Liberal Leader squirm under the position where he has to find himself still posing as a Liberal and yet supporting a motion which is in contradiction to the wishes of his Federal Liberal Government.

He has a great deal of trouble doing that at times, Mr. Speaker, and in his attempt to do it this time I think he has succeeded in water down what was a very good motion to start with to the point that it no longer would have any major thrust for those who might be listening at the other end.

The Leader of the NDP, indeed, did have some good thoughtful material to offer us in our consideration. There is one thing that the Member from Whitehorse West seems to refer to day in and day out in his debates. An issue came up yesterday which I find it difficult to put the two things together which he is saying.

Today, Mr. Speaker, he said, as he has often said, this is subversive to the basic principles of democracy and he is the bastion of what are the principles of democracy for us in the Yukon.

Mr. Speaker, I might have believed that, except yesterday when he saw fit to derogate the Canada West Association, he stood in his chair and said that he would refuse to fund any organization, body, movement, or any voice that differed from what he said. Now where is the basic principle of democracy that the Member wishes to expound?

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that we have recognized an issue here but I think various Members have different ideas on how they would like to see it resolved and so I would therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Motion Number 5, with amendment, be moved to Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the Amendment?

Mr. Hibbert: There is a motion to move the motion into Committee.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has not received such a motion. I believe the Honourable Member stated that he felt that it should be referred to Committee. There has been no Motion proposed as yet.

Mr. Hibbert: Mr. Speaker, I am proposing a motion. It is moved by myself, that this motion be moved to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that Motion Number 5 be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure at this time?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.
Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee to order. At this time, we will have a ten minute recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I shall call Committee of the Whole to order.

Before we start the Second Appropriation Ordinance, I would like to announce that tomorrow, in Committee of the Whole, we will discuss first thing the motion we were discussing before.

Mr. Hibbert: Do you mean the motion proposed by the Member for Whitehorse North Centre regarding taxation of northern subsidies? I think there is a clarification needed by Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Now that we have that concluded, I presume we can get back to the Department of Education and continue with our Department.

Last day, we had cleared Program 60000. We are now considering Program 80000. Manpower, $209,900. I refer you to pages 51 and 52 for information.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The Manpower Branch is responsible for manpower planning and policy development in Government of Yukon and for maintaining a Women's Bureau.

The Branch is responsible, primarily, for research, planning, evaluation and policy development in Manpower, for example, in the areas of employment, manpower and training delivery and other related areas. They are also largely responsible for any policy changes in connection with women's issues.

The Branch is also responsible for the provision of research and the Secretariat Services to the Department, various internal, Federal Territorial and labour industrial government committees and councils.

Also, in the recent past, the Manpower Branch has become involved in several ordinances which we are investigating, with the view to changing in the next year. These ordinances include Labour Standards, Occupational Health and Safety, Fair Practices, which will probably evolve to a Human Rights Ordinance, and the Apprenticeship Ordinance.

In all cases, we feel that it is mandatory that we involve the Manpower Branch in the planning and policy development of these various ordinances.

The increases in the Budget are due, primarily, to the increase in funds available for job creation, as well as the career development. The job assistance program has also been increased. Most of the other increases are simply salary and merit increases.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I think as I said last year, this is one of my favourite Departments. I have a number of questions about the Department of Education.

Mr. Penikett: I am surprised at the Minister's answer. He sounded so keen about it when he first announced it. I hope nobody was putting words in his mouth.

One of the things the Minister also said, on the same subject a year ago, that they were "looking at means to involve women in developing policies and programs for Yukon". I know we have the Women's Bureau and, given the commendable statement in the Throne Speech, on affirmative action for women, even that I have money on it yet, could the Minister say exactly what his Department is doing in terms of involving women in plans and programs of the Department of Government?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the area in which the Women's Bureau becomes involved. Wherever we are planning policies, the Government or even planning a new direction where we think that women will be involved in the labour force, or women's views in general should be taken into account very seriously, we contact the Women's Bureau and use them as a focal point for organizations in the Territory to express their concerns.

The young lady that we have running the Women's Bureau at the present time is actively involved in many women's groups around the Territory and, I am sorry, I could not name them, but I know she is actively involved on an on-going basis, soliciting advice and viewpoints from these various women's organizations.

Mr. Penikett: I know there was some discussion of this kind of involvement in consultation, during the preparation of the Matrimonial Property Ordinance. I seem to remember something to this effect, that at some time in the not too distant future we might expect some human rights legislation, or give a general commitment in that area. I think that is commendable.

Can the Minister say if, beyond the liaison of the Women's Bureau, which is excellent, he will be having any personal dialogue, consultation in the policy development stage of the preparation of that human rights legislation with the groups who are likely to be interested and affected in the community?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I have every right of proceeding with the Fair Practices Ordinance or the Human Rights Ordinance, as it may be called, in the same method that I proceeded with the Matrimonial Property Legislation. We presented the policy paper, we look that policy paper to interested community groups and organizations around the Territory. From those discussions we developed an Ordinance which we again sought advice about, and I think that we changed the Ordinance and we, in fact, modified Gov-
I fully expect to do that with the Human Rights Ordinance or Fair Practices Ordinance, as it may be called, and anticipate, as a consequence, it will probably be another year before that Ordinance is brought into the Legislature.

Mr. Penikett: Just a couple of points on that subject and I would ask them in a very general way because they have a bearing on the future spending trends of the Department. If the Minister can give the House any indication as to the line of his thinking in terms of this legislation, whether he is inclined toward the ombudsman route or the board route or a legislative committee route, any of those things, I am curious, of course, because in such a small jurisdiction, the different methods have a different price tag on them. Some of them can be very, very expensive, some of them can be modest.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, as I said, we do not anticipate the legislation will come before the House, until, if we are very fortunate, in the Fall Session. I would estimate that it would probably be a full year from this date. Consequently, any funds that need to be expended will be in next year's Budget.

The Department of Education has the ability to move funds around from establishment to establishment within their Vote. We do it reasonably successfully over the years and we find that when we decide that a program is no longer fulfilling the purpose, we have no hesitation to spend it in an area where we feel there is a higher priority.

If, in fact, a Human Rights Ordinance was brought in, it would be a high priority Item and I imagine that we would find the money somewhere.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I just conclude and would thank the Minister for his answers and I assure the Public Accounts Committee will be most interested in the last statement.

Mr. Byblow: I notice that there is a substantial increase under the job creation portion of that Budget and the creation of a new program, the Career Development Program. Could the Minister elaborate on those two programs as to what they constitute?

Hon. Mr. Graham: The Job Creation Assistance Program or Job Creation Program is to provide for Territorial initiatives in job creation and training. This basically is on a short-term basis and is to avoid people just arriving in the Yukon coming for a year to see the world and taking a little while getting back. Then when they come back they want to take up residence here and go out to school, they no longer qualify.

There seem to be a few little areas like this where I think the rules were made to avoid people just arriving in the Yukon coming for a handout. I can certainly understand that, but where the parents have been long-time Yukoners, I think some kind of flexibility should be built into it. So I draw that to the Minister's attention.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this is not a question that is unknown to me. I receive complaints on an on-going basis during the year and I found that after investigating most of these complaints I did not substantiate them.

The Committee is a very, very good committee, made up of all old time Yukon people. They, wherever possible, give money to students. They interpret the Regulations to the students' benefit in all cases that I have seen to date. The only thing that must be understood is the Ordinance is quite clear in that a person must spend the last two years of high school in the Yukon Territory or they are not eligible.

There are several other things that are simply laid down in the Ordinance in Regulations and there is nothing they can do about them. We find that, on the average, any deserving Yukon students are getting money.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I must express my shared concern with the Leader of the Opposition on this question. It is something I raised I guess a year ago with the Minister on the omnipotence of the Committee. I think, as a general rule, he is quite right, that where the people have been denied, it
honourable Member that, in fact, is not the case. They do not have to return to the Yukon during the summer months if they have prior authorization from the Student Financial Assistance Committee. We find that some students have not bothered to write some kind of a letter to the Committee advising the Committee that they will not be coming back to the Yukon during the summer months. If they lose eligibility, only for a limited period of time, I am sure the Minister who just spoke must have had some difficulty in establishing the Ordinance and Regulations.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion? As there appears to be no further discussion, shall the total appropriation for the Department of Education be $20,511,100 carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare this amount carried. This concludes the Department of Education in the Committee of the Whole.

I will now direct you to the next item. Consumer and Corporate Affairs. $721,400, on page 60. I will anticipate general discussion.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Me. again, you lucky devils.

Mr. Chairman. Consumer and Corporate Affairs is responsible for the provisions of licencing and registration, systems and information on business and professionals operating in Yukon, registration of all motor vehicles, and testing and licencing drivers in Yukon. The administration of consumer oriented legislation, licencing of lotteries and games of chance, public awareness programs and co-ordination of any government activities relating to metric conversion, also occupational health and safety education and enforcement.

The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department is also investigating, at the present time, the possibility of, especially in these days of high interest and problems that consumers are running into the area of credit, consumer credit and consumer purchasing education classes.

We have not budgeted any money for these two areas, but we are looking at the possibility of establishing these classes at some time in the future.

Mr. MacKay: I do not have a lot to say about this Department.

Hon. Members all remember that this is the particular department that had to come up with the supplementary for some $800,000 and possibly we may be looking for some more next year, depending on how things work out on the Credit Union.

I am just wondering if the Department, having gone through this experience with the Credit Union, has, in fact, looked at other legislation, for which it is responsible, to see if there are any other sleepers out there that could be coming home to roost for the government.

I can, perhaps, give you a couple of pointers on that, with respect to the provisions of the Societies Ordinance. This requires the presentation of audited financial statements annually by organizations. I wonder how much that is being policed.

I am not suggesting that perhaps these things should be policed any heavier, but maybe the legislation should be made a little easier to comply with.

Likewise, I think, under the Companies Ordinance, I suspect there are a number of areas where legislative requirements are there for this Department to be supervising and it may or may not be looked after.

I think that is the major concern I would have with this Department. The previous concerns. I think, have been expressed in election campaigns more often than in the House about the zeal with which inspectors go around the Territory inspecting under their various posts.
I have to say that I, in the last year to year and a half, received no complaints from any Yukoners about being over-policed with respect to inspections. So, either Yukoners are becoming much more law-abiding or inspectors are getting a lot easier to deal with. It may well be a combination of the two. So, I will leave that one alone.

The general method by which this Department services its customers seems to be going quite well and I do not have a lot of other things or complaints about it.

Mr. Penikett: I hope the Minister will bear with me, but I have a number of questions on this Department. None of them, I think, propose any threat of bringing the Government down, they are all small, serious things which do involve the Department which seems to have so many tentacles and so many parts, even though it is not huge.

A year ago the predecessor of the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs told the House there was a full-fledged investigation of insurance in the Yukon, being conducted by his officials. I wonder if the Minister could briefly tell me something about the scope and subject of that investigation, when it might have been concluded, what the results were, or when we may expect them, and if I may now ask a couple of sticker questions.

As he knows there have been a number of areas in the Territory where people have had trouble getting insurance. I think people, for example, who have ten year old house trailers, that one category of people live in. I think certain times key businesses which reside in sub-standard buildings in some of the smaller communities have also had problems. I understand that was part of the investigation. I wonder if the Minister could give any kind of report and see if it is ongoing or if it still in the budget or if it is finished or whatever.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I will have to take that question under advisement.

Mr. Penikett: I wanted to ask then about the Demerit Point System which was recently announced by the Minister, the driver demerit point system. I understand it is something that has been due a long time, because of some legislation passed by previous Administrations, I suppose. I understand, somewhat surprisingly, it was just a question of time before it came in.

I had expected to receive a number of calls from truckers or taxi drivers complaining that this legislation would discriminate against them, as opposed to the Sunday driver. Quite to my surprise I have had none at all.

I am interested in knowing if the Minister, in the course of deciding to implement this system, had had any communication or complaints or had at all been concerned about the effect of it on professional drivers, truckers and taxi drivers, for example, or professional operators, as opposed to people who are only occasional motorists.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this legislation, as has been pointed out earlier, has been based on Saskatchewan legislation so I would have thought that it would be eminently acceptable to the Member Opposite.

I also had no calls from concerned citizens about the unfairness of the legislation in talking about long haul drivers, compared to Sunday drivers.

I did have a few calls about people who were curious to find out exactly what it meant and whether it was retroactive and if the severity of tickets that had at the present time would be all counted. That is not so. It started yesterday. I believe and will continue from this point forward. It was basically to get a handle on some of the people who are driving around with seven speeding tickets and a couple of impaired driving offences, careless driving offences, things like that. We want to be able to get off the roads, if they are proven to be a hazard to the normal driving public.

I think the legislation will succeed in that respect.

I think that that answered most of your questions.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about the other Ordinances that could be smaller, as he put it. What we have done is made a check of all our Ordinances to decide which ones we required reports from, any organizations, we are making sure that those reports are forthcoming or else the company, society, or whatever are going to be struck from the Registrar. One thing that must be understood is that we do not have, or do not think we have, any financial commitment to any of these societies or companies or organizations that are presently being registered by Consumer and Corporate Affairs. We feel fairly safe that we will not be spending any $800,000 to bail out a company or society that is currently registered by the Government of the Yukon.

Mr. Penikett: I want to just pursue this question of the drivers for a second with the Minister. I want him to understand that my remarks are in no way critical. They are just an observation, I think, of Yukon reality.

The first time I took a Class 1 Driver’s Licence test here, my test consisted of driving a pick-up truck to the top of the tailings dump at Clinton Creek. It was not a very rigorous exam, I'm my point.

In the long period since then, the signing and signalling of roads, particularly in the Whitehorse area, has obviously become much more sophisticated and perhaps the knowledge and skills and so forth required to drive in a city are perhaps different from those for all practical purposes, that you need in a small rural community. But the obvious exception, of course, is people here develop the ability to drive, particularly in rural areas, but on roads and dirt roads and so forth that might not be enjoyed by some people in urban centres down south.

I would like the Minister to tell us briefly where we are at in terms of the testing of people in rural communities. I know what it is now for Class 1 licences but I was thinking for others because I suspect new Ordinances the problems we have with the problem drivers may go back to the root of their basic qualifications, that a lot of people may have got licences a few years ago when the tests were not very difficult and they really did not, prior to getting a licence, have a proper knowledge of the rules of the road.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, that possibility does exist. At the present time in rural communities, the RCMP carry out the driver tests. It must be expected, not all of them are professional driver examiners. One of the things that we hope to accomplish also with Legislation concerning the demerit system is the fact that a person may get points removed from his licence. If he takes a driving course and passes, then his driving record is updated, So, we think that that will help the drivers that do get a lot of points against them. It will help them to become better drivers if they take a couple of these courses. I think that that aim of the Legislation should prove to make better drivers in the Territory.

Mr. Penikett: Recently, the price of beer went up again. I am not talking about the Budget-related increase, but the one that came from the wholesalers. I will mention that the Yukon brewery is still selling its product at the wholesale level to Yukoners, about 90 cents less than their competitors and another brewery has not increased their price at all.

I gather, though, that at least some retailers in Whitehorse have made a conscious decision, if you like, not to have a variable price in the different brands of beer, and I did send him out one night to do some investigation on this. He did find places where there was no difference between the brands, even though the wholesale price was much cheaper.

I think that is unfortunate, because if there is to be any advantage for a brewery keeping the price down, I think this Government ought to encourage them to keep the price down, because that advantages their sale.

In view of the tough regulations that we have off-sale prices for liquor, it surprises me. But, Mr. Chairman, rather than go into this in detail in Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I will hold my questions until I get to the new found left over there.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear, too, that I do not drink a large amount of beer, but I do have a loyal researcher and I did send him out one night to do some investigation on this. He did find places where there was no difference between the brands, even though the wholesale price was much cheaper.

I think that is unfortunate, because if there is to be any advantage for a brewery keeping the price down, I think this Government ought to encourage them to keep the price down, because that advantages their sale.

In view of the tough regulations that we have off-sale prices for liquor, it surprises me. But, Mr. Chairman, rather than go into this in detail in Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I will hold my questions until I get to the new found left over there.

Mr. MacKay: I was going to suggest it to save us all a lot of time, that the two of them could go out for a beer and discuss it.

My question is related to a statement made by the incumbent Minister last year, in which he indicated, when we were talking about minnows, that the issue had been almost totally due to the increase in the wage sector for the additional 1.5 man years to the Department. One year is requested in Consumer and Corporate Affairs to handle workload increases which will occur with the proposed new Medical Professions Ordinance.

I am just wondering how much work has, in fact, arisen because of that new Ordinance and whether or not that increase in man years is still justified.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the increase in man years as a result of the 1979 Main Estimates was used within the Department
in several other areas, as well as the Consumer Affairs Department.

As a result of the Medical Profession Ordinance coming into effect and the Board meeting on a regular basis, especially in the recent past, we found that one person is tied up whenever that Board meets, and after the Board meets, that person usually spends a great deal of time researching questions that the Board has asked.

I know. I was at a recent meeting of the Medical Profession Board and they were going through all of the proposed regulations and coming up with new regulations or proposals that they were making to the Cabinet.

I would imagine it is going to take a great deal of time for the person that we have provided to them as a secretary to do all of the research and writing that is going to be necessary. We have managed to use that man year in other areas during the meantime.

Mr. Penikett: On a related subject, I want to ask about the Dental Professional Ordinance. I do not remember how many Ministers or which Minister it was. Yes. it was the immediate predecessor to the present Minister that I put some questions to last fall specifically. I think, in October and November concerning a complaint under the Dental Professional Ordinance. I think the Minister at that time said there would be an investigation. I would like to ask the Minister about the extent of that investigation and about the findings.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman. I have met with the dentist that made the complaint and the people that were the object of the complaint. We have decided that the Dental Professional Ordinance that was passed lacked some refinement in a few places. They have got together with the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department and have suggested changes to the Dental Professional Ordinance. We have not finished writing them up as Legislation yet and we have not as yet determined whether to present them to the House, but we think that we have solved most of the problems in the proposals that have come forth from these meetings and hopefully, the changes will be presented to the Legislative in the fall.

Mr. Penikett: That is fine, because I think there were a number of questions that were raised in Committee at the time that Bill went through. Can the Minister explain why he did not appoint a two or more person inquiry on this matter in connection with Section 10? I understand that Section 10 of the Ordinance really only covers dentists, not the hygienists and therapists and assistants and that may have been the reason. Perhaps I should ask the Minister if that was the reason and if, in considering amendments to the Bill, he will be tightening up, straightening up or eliminating the inquiry provisions.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we will be eliminating the provisions for inquiries. The other question I will have to take under advisement, I do not know why a commission was not set up and why they were held. I simply do not have the answer but I will undertake to find out.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is doing that, would he also find out for the House whether the investigation thoroughly assessed whether there was a breach of Section 22(2) and if a breach occurred particularly in that Clause which says that no person shall perform the services of a dental hygienist or dental therapist pursuant to this Ordinance? I know the Minister at that time said there would be an investigation. I would like to ask the Minister about the extent of that investigation and about the findings.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Penikett: One other point: the Minister has alluded. I cannot remember whether it was in the letter to me or in the House that they have had a reply to an explanation from the Dental Association and I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to table the reply as well as the initial letters from the officials in his Department on this inquiry.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I am not sure which reply the Member is talking about. But I would undertake to see what the correspondence is and if any of it pertains to the subject that we are talking about. I would be happy to make them available.

Mr. Chairman: As there appears to be no further general discussion, we will proceed on program by program. The first program being 10000, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, $678,800. Is there any discussion? In absence of discussion, shall this amount clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare this amount cleared.

Our next program is program 20000 which is for Medical Profession Ordinance for $100. Should this program clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare this program cleared.

Program 30000 which is Legal Profession Ordinance, again $100.

Mr. Mackay: Could the Minister just clarify this? The Yukon Territorial Government is responsible for the costs incurred in the investigation of any complaints under this Ordinance. As I understand it, the function is still being handled by the Alberta Bar Association.

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is correct, we bear the cost but we also collect the fees from the lawyers for practising in the Territory.

Mr. Mackay: Mr. Chairman, are you also in the position where you are still collecting future from the lawyers' trust accounts. Interest on that, has that begun to happen yet?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes. Mr. Chairman. it has.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any more discussion on Program 30000? Shall Program 30000 clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Program 30000 cleared.

The next program is Program 40000 Public Boards. $42,400.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just two questions: the budgeted item for the Electric Public Utilities Board — does this anticipate the legislative changes that we shall expect in that Board and the Bill which we have been told we can expect considering the Public Utilities Board? That is one question.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it does anticipate the Electric Public Utilities Board increased duties and functions.

Mr. Penikett: I was fascinated by a remark by the Leader of the Opposition earlier today about the complete evaporation of complaints against the invidious government inspectors. He is not alone in having heard these at election time and I think if he went out on the highway in the Territory he could hear a lot about it. People for some reason who are normally very hospitable did not seem to enjoy these visits all the time.

The fact that there are no complaints leaves me to wonder, maybe there are no inspectors or maybe some of them have disappeared. I know that there is not vigorous inspection of some of the consumer protection Ordinances. I know we have the Labour Standards Advisory thing which I see is the next one there. Let me just ask a question, is there inspection of the Labour Standards enforcement; what are the instructions to the inspectors under the Labour Standards Ordinance?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, there has been no reduction in the inspections. It is just that the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department has become very aware of public opinion and the administration in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I think, has improved 100 per cent in the last couple of years and, consequently, their public image is extremely good. I do not know how else I can explain it.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that is sweet music for the small business sector, however, he will be aware that there is more than one public in Yukon. There are many publics in Yukon. Some publics, depending on which side of the issue they are, sometimes appreciate these inspections.

There is one public that appreciates the energy of Labour Standards Board. There are other publics that would like to see some enforcement of the Landlords Tenants Ordinance.

Let me ask about the Labour Standards Ordinance. Given that the Minister has said that the business community, that public in Yukon is ecstatic about the operation of the Board, does this mean that there is no inspection of the Ordinance or that the inspectors are under instruction to go slow or take it easy, or something like that?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No. Mr. Chairman, that is not the case. They are under no special instructions whatsoever, other than to enforce the ordinances as they are written.

Mr. Ward: Mr. Chairman, I would think it is terribly presumptuous of the Member opposite to consider that here we sit and work and pass legislation on the basis that that is now going to be the law of the land and it will be enforced. Now he is telling us it does not have to be if someone does not want it to be. I am sure that is not what he means at all.

He is the upholder of the democratic principles. Where are they going to go these days?

Mr. Penikett: The Member for Whitehorse South Centre obviously has not been talking to Winston Churchill recently. He could have told him a few things about the enforcement of legislation. In fact, I think it was Napoleon who observed that the fact that you give an order to your army is no guarantee that it will be carried out.

Anyway, that is not the point. I just want to narrow this down. On the Labour Standards Ordinance then, the inspectors have been told essentially to work to rule. Is that what they have been told?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman. I have a great deal of problem understanding where this Member is coming from.
It is very simple. The ordinance is written. We have a person who enforces that ordinance, the way it is written, and what else can that person do? It is quite simple.

Mr. Penikett: Good.

Mr. Mackay: Moving to a different area of concern, some jurisdictions in the south have some concern about the control of funds that are put in the hands of some agents. We have real estate agents under control now here and lawyers, of course, have always been under control — not always. I believe it was not too long ago they did not have trust accounts.

I am wondering if the Government has looked yet at insurance agents, and whether the premiums paid in that insurance agent's office should be maintained in a separate trust account until forwarded to the insurance company. That is not the law right now, but I know in British Columbia, for example, that is the law.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I really do not know. We have not been doing any investigation in that area, at the present time, but we would be happy to look at it.

We are constantly looking at ordinances that have become behind the times sort of things. It is just that it takes a whole lot of manpower to investigate especially some of the larger ordinances. We are in the process of investigating a few large ordinances right now and it takes almost the whole Department's manpower just to do those ordinances and we do not have time for the others. It is an unfortunate situation, but we have been doing any investigation in that area, at the present time, but I know in British Columbia, for example, that is the law.

Mr. Penikett: Just on that point, that investigation. I asked about an insurance. I think it was initiated as a result of a resolution of the previous House and I do not know. But it may or may not have covered some of the areas that Mr. Mackay was inquiring about. Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is good. Mr. Chairman. When I get the particulars about the investigation of insurance in the Territory, I will utilize the information, that is for sure.

Mr. Chairman: It would appear that there is no further discussion on Program 40000. Shall Program 40000 clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Program 40000 cleared.

Before we clear the total, I should point out, on page 67 is the revenue and expenditure recoveries. These are here for information only, but if you have any questions at this time, please direct them to the Chair.

In the absence of questions, shall the total appropriation for Consumer and Corporate Affairs, $721,400. carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare it carried.

I declare that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has cleared the Committee of the Whole.

I now direct your attention to our next department, which is Human Resources, $5,418,100. I refer you now to page 72. I will now anticipate general discussion.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Human Resources, as you know, is responsible for the delivery of services, the administration of a wide range of comprehensive and diversified social service programs. These programs include family and personal services, social assistance programs, youth services and services to seniors.

During the last year, the Day Care Ordinance has been introduced. A board will be established and licensing procedures introduced prior to May 15th, which may answer one of the Member's earlier questions. A day care centre and other persons with an interest in day care have been consulted as to the regulations appended to this Ordinance.

The last year has been a period of internal examination within the Department. Work is being done under revision of present policies and procedures. This review also includes a review of legislation, that is the Child Welfare Ordinance and the Social Assistance Ordinance.

To enhance the Department's ability in terms of forecasting, they have entered into an agreement with Ottawa to retain a consultant at the Federal Government's expense to help us devise a data base for statistical purposes within the Department.

Review has taken place of the Youth Services Centre and work is actively in progress to arrive at alternatives for the present program.

We are also reviewing our hiring practices and our classification system, with a view to making our hiring practice more flexible and to allow us to hire locally wherever possible.

The Department in its overall sense continues with its preventive thrust and working with community towards the development of appropriate social services.

The 1980-81 Human Resources' Budget includes rate increases and price increases and slight caseload volume increases over the 1979-80 Budget. This year, we have provided a man year to allow the Department to decentralize its programs in the next several months to Haines Junction and Teslin. The intent is to relocate existing social workers to these locations and add part-time clerical support to each of the offices, for a total of one man year.

Additionally, the Budget includes funds for two additional part-time contract positions for social service workers, to be located in Beaver Creek and Haines Junction.

These changes will allow the Department to more appropriately meet the needs of the community and individuals located in outlying communities and along the Highway. These changes are in line with plans to provide services at the local level.

Mr. Penikett: It frankly makes me say what I have to say today, but I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I have come to the conclusion that this Minister is not competent to run this important Department.

At the last Session, I, having concern in a number of major areas of the policy of this Department, which I thought were of profound importance to the people of this Territory and the people of my constituency, asked a series of questions of the Minister. The pattern of answer of which varied no more than three ways.

I received one answer that the Minister would take it under advisement, another answer that the Minister asked me to repeat questions, and the third answer, that the Minister just did not know.

I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is a person of considerable sensitivity, considerable feeling. She is, I think, as some of my constituents say, all heart, but no guts. I am convinced that, in this day and age, that what this Department needs is a Minister who is tough enough, strong enough, determined enough to defend the poor, to defend the unfortunate, to defend the defenceless in our society. I am afraid that this Minister fails on this count.

I think, as a rule, the Minister has excellent staff, even though, over the years, I have been continually troubled by running into rural field workers of this Department who have been working in frustration and annoyance, in some cases, probably, because they felt that they were the wrong people for the job or their skills were too specific for the problems they directed or that they felt that they needed a community development worker in the community, rather than a social worker or that they needed a social worker rather than a community development worker, or whatever.

I feel that it is a job of the Minister with these people who are doing this, let me say, which are out in the field, that the "mother church", if you like, the equivalent of the Pope, the top person. has a duty to defend and protect these people.

This person has the duty, in fact, to ensure that they are working under the happiest possible circumstances in tough, difficult jobs. I think that is not the case. The Pope always has to choose whether he is going to defend the Priests or the Cardinals and it is sometimes hard to do both but that is necessary.

I think we are in tough economic times. I think the social circumstances are going to be much worse in this community. I think we have got the pipeline coming with some enormously difficult, complex, serious social problems, potentially. I think we have got good people in the Department. I think we have got social problems which do not seem so severe. However, I think we have got a total lack of political leadership in this Department.

I see other Ministers in the Department in this Government that have tough problems. In fact, most of them I could say that they have got tough problems that have had to deal with have been able to get the resources, get the manpower, get the money they need. This Minister, I submit, has not. I am disappointed to say this, but I am sad, this Minister, in my view and considered opinion, a serious failure. Mr. Chairman, lacks the imagination, toughness and commitment to do this job.

I, therefore, move that the salary of the Minister of Human Resources be reduced to $1.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Penikett, the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West, that the salary of the Minister of Human Resources be reduced to $1.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member opposite must surely realize that we are not yet living in Utopia. I also yearn for the day that the Yukon becomes Shangri-La.

It is a virtual impossibility to provide social services without economic expansion and the development. I have said it time and
time again, that the development of Social Services is something that will take place together with economic expansion.

The Honourable Member must surely realize the complexity of the Social Services scene and he must also realize that Social Services do not only fall within the area of the Department of Human Resources.

I must say, again, I said it the other day, that I believe that an assault on the Department of Human Resources is simply a vehicle on the part of our Socialist Member for an attack on this Government as a whole.

A broad-minded Conservative will usually give credit to a Socialist for being at the very least, an idealist. Our solitary NDP guided only by political expediency and personal ego-tripping.

It is very easy to drone on, financially, criticising ad nauseam, situations which are the responsibility of that Department, but I say, and I mean, shame on Mr. Penikett. And I say also, with Dorothy Parker, that this ridiculous suggestion should not only be tossed aside lightly, it should be thrown aside with great force.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed with respect to the words opposite by the lone member of the NDP here. I think, in a situation such as this, the one member of the NDP opposite is completely ignored. If there have been a number of problems, whether it is real or perceived, I recognize that the Member Opposite takes it for gospel the words that were spoken by one individual of that particular Department from a rural community who resigned. When I heard what my NDP colleague said, I think I sense the very difficult area, and it is a very subjective one, that my colleague handled. And the language used was very properly and that was the area of Crossroads. That appears to be resolved, but as we all know, situations such as these are difficult and you are always going to have problems.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, and I am a little upset about the fact that the Member would take such a personal attack on an individual here, and I would like to think that perhaps we can keep the debate above that type of thing, and perhaps be looking at the policies in respect to that Department, for that matter all Departments, because I think we have to remember, Mr. Chairman, we do have to live with each other once we leave these Chambers, to see that particular individual to go, to leave the Department.

I think the easiest thing in the world, Mr. Chairman, is to sit there and ridicule, or say a Department is not doing its job, or this type of thing, but I would submit to the Member Opposite that there has been a number of issues that have been resolved. One that comes to mind, which is a very difficult area, and it is a very subjective one, and that my colleague handled, and I think handled fairly well, and that was the area of Crossroads. That appears to be resolved, but as we all know, situations such as these are difficult and you are always going to have problems.

I think in fairness to the situation, Mr. Chairman, the Member Opposite would in a very difficult position if the majority of the people of this country were to consider that he was the decision maker in this House. Under question and we were to put a resolution forward putting his salary down to $1.00, and perhaps all he would have left is a bicycle and one dollar for the remainder of the year. I just think it is totally improper, Mr. Chairman. I think it is almost to the point of being Out of Order. I think that the Member Opposite should reconsider such a resolution of that kind and actually read the Hansard tomorrow and just see what exactly he did say.

Mr. Mackay: I appear to have missed something, having left the House at the wrong moment, so you will pardon me if I seem not to have the same (unintelligible) generated into debate, as the others might have had the opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing a Motion that is before you at the moment, and the Honourable Member should be aware of this.

Mr. Chairman: I would repeat the Motion, so we discuss only the Motion. It has been moved by Mr. Penikett that the salary of the Minister of Human Resources be reduced to $1.00. That is the Motion under discussion at this time.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I too, think that this is an irresponsible part of the Honourable Member. He has stated that the Minister of Health and Human Resources has failed in her duty to fight in this Cabinet in order to get the necessary funds to properly carry on her departments in this Government.

Mr. Chairman, a quick overview of what has happened to this Budget indicates clearly that we put emphasis on Tourism, Economic Development, and Renewable Resources.

Mr. Chairman, these two Departments got the most money this year but then, let us look at what happens after that. The Department that gets the next most money in this Government, Mr. Chairman, happens to be Library and Information Resources. We think that there was a specific reason for that. Next, Mr. Chairman, comes Health and immediately after Health comes Human Resources. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member argued that we went out the window because there are thirteen more Departments that got less, so, I am not going to give this kind of a motion the credibility of any kind of debate.

Mr. Byblow: I am going to say a few words with respect to the Motion and the discussion at hand. I think, perhaps, the Member has overreacted on a personal level with respect to presenting this motion, however, I think he is making a point in the House that is not being as totally functional, as totally co-ordinated as it could have been.

If we can just rest the case that there were problems, it has its difficulties, this was the case.

I do not suggest that all of these problems have been solved. I would agree that they have been worked on. I do not wish to enter into a personal attack on whose fault it is, why it is happening, to the Tong. If that is so, then I would like to sit down now, and call the Speaker back to the Chair and deal with the Member for Whitehorse West.

Mr. Chairman, I, like others, am disturbed over the possible personal innuendos that are involved in this motion. It is well and good for a Member opposite to criticize this Government or a Department of this Government for taking direction with which he is not particularly happy.

He feels frustration because the directions that he might give to the Department are not being followed by the decision of this Government. Not merely by the Minister, but by this Government. I can appreciate his frustration in that situation.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept the principle that involves a personal attack on the Minister. If that is so, then I would like to sit down now, call the Speaker back to the Chair and deal with the Member for Whitehorse West.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Human Resources, as we all know, is an exceedingly high profile type of Department because it deals with individuals and it deals with those individuals' problems. Nobody knows when the grader goes up and down the road, we all know that it happens to have been done. But it involves people in their personal predilections, it inevitably gets talked about and it comes to attention as a personal dilemma. Therefore, everything that goes on in this Department, inevitably comes to the attention of the public and therefore comes to the floor of this House on a more personal basis.

It makes it a good deal more difficult to administer a Department than if it were simply a road and public works type of Department.

The people who are having all these difficulties, Mr. Chairman, there are inevitably problems that Government is constantly trying to face to help these people, but because these problems are as personal as they are private and they are problems that are yet to be faced by Government. It is that process of the problems coming up, that actually creates the dilemma that the Minister is forever finding herself in. She is looked on as a person whose responsibility is to help someone, or is having difficulty, but is trying to help someone, when it merely, by analogy, is not snack another mile of road. She is, indeed, under the gun, and whoever has this portfolio, will face this same type of pressure at all times.

I think we have to look at the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we are spending $5.5 million in one area — I do not have the figures with me.
and I wish I did, because if we compared it to ten years ago, this would certainly be a drop in the bucket. Not only that, our thinking would be quite different, too.

In this day and age, we think and are concerned about the other individuals in our society and we spend a great deal of money, whether we are Conservative, Socialist, Liberal or what have you. We express and have a great deal more concern about the individuals in our society than those who have been acceptable ten or fifteen years ago. That is how it is and even the Conservative government has this as its major concern. We are all people-oriented.

I think you have to look at changes in that Department in that light. Changes must come as we progress. As we find these problems, the government must develop the ability to deal with these problems. But, this is not an ad hoc thing. We must develop that ability. It takes time, it takes expertise, it takes planning.

I think this is the process that has been going on over the years, as this Department has enlarged to meet the continuing problems that keep coming up.

Mr. Chairman, the mover of this motion knew when he moved this motion, that this was the type of reaction he was going to get. He knew we would be indignant from this side of the House that he would pose such a motion. So he said to himself, okay, I will do that anyway because I want to embarrass them as much as I possibly can.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there is a tinge of a lack of moral responsibility in that kind of an approach. Mr. Chairman, all issues that we would like to see improved and we all try and do battle in one way or another to bring these issues about, but we do not see a means of a personal embarrassment to gain our own ends.

I would hope, very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that, in that is in the motion that has been proposed, that the mover would see it in himself to withdraw the motion and see fit to attack the Government and that Department in other ways than in the imputation of a personal attack.

Mr. Fleming: Speaking towards the motion, I sympathize with the Honourable Member from the NDP Party. However, I think that the motion, coming from him, and at this time, is more or less because of many of the complaints that he has towards the socialistic programs, the social problems of people and the type of socialism that, actually, his Party entails.

I, myself, will say at the moment, that I will not be voting for the motion, definitely.

I think that we must realize also that this Government or any government, in the Department of Human Resources, is going to have problems.

It is a problem department, and I think the Member who spoke before me mentioned this fact, that we will progress and we will come out and get rid of some of these problems as we go along.

However, they have been there for many, many years, and it is going to take a long time to get rid of them. You can not get rid of problems when you are working in the field of alcohol, and you are working in the field of social behavior, of any kind. I feel that I cannot say that the Member in that Department, I would not say that he has probably tried to do her job to the best of her ability.

There is a possibility, which may have happened to any one of us, if we had that Department, who was new in the area of government, and I am sure that the remainder of the Cabinet would have helped, too, enough to see anyone through, in this case.

I just fail to really see the motion as being something that was very much needed in the House today. I am not going to belabour the question anymore. I will not be voting for the motion. I will be voting against it, definitely.

Mr. MacKay: I appreciate the other members speaking before me. It gives me time to collect my thoughts on the matter. I do feel that the intention of the Motion would help, to some extent, to separate the Cabinet from the House. So, I guess the general impression I gathered from the Minister’s comments is that we are not going to get rid of all the problems as we go along; we are not going to get rid of all the problems as we go along.

I think that one should not, and I say this not having heard the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West’s remarks, but I do not know what he said, but I have heard replies, and I do not think you should question the Member’s moral integrity because he puts a name on the file, and the file which he believes strongly in, to reduce somebody’s salary to a dollar.

In the big bad world of business, with which my friend to the left is not too familiar, when a chief executive goes wrong, his salary is reduced to zero, he is fired, and he is out the door. It is not a question of reduced to a dollar.

I think, therefore, that it is quite in order for a member, who has
I think also, our lack of expertise in the field is translated in the fact that Mrs. McColl has no one to call on for any great amount of help and for that I am sorry too, because I think she needed the help.

The other thing, I think, that should be recognized and, you know, I am not criticizing the Opposition either for this, but it is the fact that she has made a great deal of progress. I work with her on a daily basis in a few areas. One is the Wolf Creek Centre through the Justice Department. We worked with Mrs. McColl's Human Resource Department. There were a lot of good ideas thrown out. A great deal of investigation was done by both Departments.

The simple fact of the matter is, as difficult as it may be to believe, there are no simple solutions. I know, I have searched for some too.

Another area is the Child Development Centre. Mrs. McColl and I have both been working in the area of the Child Development Centre in an effort to co-ordinate our two departments. Education and Human Resources Department. There were a lot of good ideas thrown out. A great deal of investigation was done by both Departments.

I find it difficult to express in real terms how much I appreciate having her opinion in our Cabinet, because her opinions are different from ours, and come from very different backgrounds, and her use to our Cabinet is great. I wish that I would have heard the total debate, and again I apologize for that because I would have far more to say, but in conclusion, I must say that it is unfortunate that you could not see the whole picture, because I have put in productive work, because I am here to assure you that, whereas I may be one of her largest critics, in her Department. I am also one of her greatest supporters as to her personal dedication and work that she has put into her Department.

Mr. Failure: I would like to state that, from the Back Benches here, at least from my seat. I support Mrs. McColl. She may not be long-winded and articulate as some of the Ministers, but she certainly is doing a heck of a job. She is honest, she has really good morals, as far as I am concerned, and her judgment of character is very good. I have to disagree with the Motion, altogether.

Mr. McGuire: I have something very short to say on this. The only worthwhile speech was made today, of course, came from Iain MacKay, and in which I agree with him. I just want to add, and say, that I rise in defence of this Minister today, and I disagree with the NDP Member that the Minister of Health is not tough enough to do her job. I firmly believe that she is, and I have reason to believe that she is working within considerable restraints, and I want to say that that is something that I am not going to do.

Mr. Tracy: Mr. Chairman, I also have to rise in support of the Minister. I think the main grievance that the NDP Member has, is that the welfare dollars, is an extremely ill-advised remark. That is not what I am about, that is not what my Party is about.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I was going to do this anyway, but I think that in view of the previous discussion, it is probably more urgent than ever that we do a detailed study of this particular Department in the Budget Debate, which means I am going to ask a lot of ques-
tions, and hopefully you can provide me with all the answers, and from all that we can get a fairly clear idea of how your Department is functioning.

In the question of general administration, there are some 20 man years, up one from last year. Could you give me details of what the positions are within that Administration structure?

**Mrs. McC:ll:** In those personnel classes, there are the Directors, Assistant Directors, the Departmental Administrators, thirteen Region Administration support staff in the Whitehorse Office, and 4.4 clerical staff in the area offices. An increase of one man year for the two half-time clerk typists for Haines Junction and Teslin.

**Mr. Mackay:** Within these, the Director, Assistant Director and Administrators, can you give us a rough idea, of these 13 administrators, how many departments are they administering, how many people do you have assigned to the various areas within this Department?

**Mrs. McC:ll:** You mean the personnel costs within the Department? I will take that under advisement and have an answer prepared.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I was bound and determined that I was going to exhibit Mrs. McC:ll's capability of handling this Vote on her own. However, I would respectfully request of the Opposition if they are going to spring a question like this on any one of us, notice would be appreciated, because I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that there is one of us who can say what our full administrative stuff does.

That is just about impossible.

**Mr. Mackay:** I am sure that the more senior Members of her Department are well-known to the Minister and perhaps, insofar as she has knowledge of what to do, she could explain particular aspect. So, what I am looking for is how much emphasis, in terms of Manpower, at the administrative level, is being put into the various skills of endeavour in this Department.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think, perhaps, what Mr. Mackay is suggesting is that we propose to do a fairly thorough examination of every function within this Department and perhaps it would be well-advised for the Minister to take notice of that in a general context.

If I may suggest, in my attempt to establish a better understanding of what I felt to be the inadequacies of the Department. I went to the Department and spoke with a number of the staff and I acquired a Program and Organization Information Manual which I found to be quite useful in terms of how the staffing is allocated, a general purview of the programs delivered and so on. I note within that that there are a total of 91 staff in the entire Human Resources Department. This does not correlate to the figures given here. I propose that this is the type of thorough examination that we will be doing.

**Mr. Fleming:** Just a question, Mr. Chairman, on the increase of one in the general administration. I wonder if the Minister could inform us just what, I think it was Haines Junction and Teslin, this half of how, each place was to be allotted, just what function would that entail.

**Mrs. McC:ll:** Those would be Social Service Workers.

**Mr. Pearson:** We seem to be bogging down. Mr. Chairman. I would respectfully suggest that if the Opposition do have specific questions that they would like to ask in respect to the other Departments, prior to getting to them, that this is the type of questioning that is going to take place.

In fairness to the situation, if you look back at what has taken place up to now, it has been a very general situation, as opposed to a year man year, and this type of thing. I would just like an indication from the Members opposite as far as the rest of the Budget is concerned.

**Mr. Mackay:** I think I concur with what the previous Member has said. I was not intending to get into a very technical area. What I was trying to explore was the general policies or philosophies that are being followed in the Department. I got in the back door by going to the stuff thing.

It is my intention to try to stick to policies that are being followed, and whether or not the dollars are being spent in areas that are justifiable. All I think we are proposing is that in this particular Department, there are so many facets to it, that we would like to look at, in detail, the policies are being followed within the various subdivisions of the Department. Previous to this we have looked just generally at the Department as a whole, that is what we are intending to do. Insofar as any other Department being subject to the same scrutiny, I cannot guarantee this would happen. Public Works is another one we had in mind that we would like to take a look at.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, just speaking to the procedural point raised by the Minister of Municipal Works, you have heard the Liberal intentions clearly on this question. I just want to say what my own are. As I said, when we were going through the supplements, the issues that I want to pursue in detail. I have already identified. They are exactly the same questions I raised in the other departments, previous ones have been answered, and those will be the only matters that I wish to pursue in detail when I get to the Mains in the Minister's Department.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would like to enquire of the Minister if these organizational and program booklets would be available for tonight's sitting. If so, perhaps we could break to that time and pick up a program review at 7:30.
Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes. Mr. Chairman, we can make them available by tonight's sitting.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we take a recess until 7:30.

Mr. Chairman: Do you agree with the motion that we recess until 7:30?
Motion agreed to
Recess
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