



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 8

3rd Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, April 2, 1980 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake
DEPUTY SPEAKER — Geoffrey Lattin, MLA, Whitehorse North Centre

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government House Leader — responsible for Executive, Council office, Public Service Commission, Finance and Pipeline.
Hon. Doug Graham	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Education, Justice, Consumer & Corporate Affairs, Information Resources, Government Services
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Highways and Public Works, Municipal and Community Affairs, Yukon Housing Corporation, and Yukon Liquor Corporation.
Hon. Meg McCall	Klondike	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources and Workers' Compensation Board.
Hon. Peter Hanson	Mayo	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, Tourism & Economic Development.

Government Members

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Jack Hibberd	Whitehorse South Centre
Geoffrey Lattin	Whitehorse North Centre
Grafton Njootli	Old Crow
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake
Howard Tracey	Tatchun

Opposition Members

(Liberal)

Iain MacKay	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West
---------------	-----------------

(Independent)

Maurice J. Byblow	Faro
Robert Fleming	Campbell

Clerk Of Assembly
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)
Sergeant-at-Arms
Editor of Hansard

Patrick L. Michael
Missy Parnell
Jane Steele
G.I. Cameron
Lois Cameron

Whitehorse, Yukon

Wednesday, April 2, 1980 — 1:30 p.m.

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?

TABLING 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 Democratic Party's Jaguar, I am certain that we will have achieved the dual objective of bettering his health and not depleting his personal pocketbook to a great extent.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member will feel that he can receive this gift from a bunch of Conservatives, a Liberal, an Independent, a few Civil Servants and some, horror of horrors, capitalists.

I would ask the Page to come around but first maybe I can give the names of people who have contributed to this gift to our Socialist friend. It is presented on April 2, 1980, by myself, Paul Koring, Dan Lang, Al Falle, Terry Weninger, Danny Nowlan, 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 them 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.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Foothills Property Tax/NPA

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, my question today to the Government Leader is with regard to recent statements by an official of the Northern Pipeline Agency, Mr. Barry Yates, who seemed to say that the Northern Pipeline Agency does not agree that the Yukon Territorial Government is entitled to \$5 million from Foothills at this time. Can the Minister state or confirm if this is the official Northern Pipeline Agency position?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased to advise the House that I have heard officially from the Northern Pipeline Agency today, as well as from Mr. Yates, in respect to what has been attributed to what he has said. Mr. Speaker, the stand or the opinion of the Northern Pipeline Agency has not changed in any way, shape or form.

When we began these negotiations with Foothills Pipeline Limited, Mr. Speaker, we advised the Northern Pipeline Agency that we were doing so. We also advised them that it was our perception that this was something that should be resolved between this Government and Foothills Yukon Limited, and that we would not be seeking nor would we expect any actions on the part of the Northern Pipeline Agency until such time as we actually ask for their intervention.

Mr. Speaker, the Northern Pipeline Agency is simply someone on the outside looking in, in respect to this matter at this time.

Mr. MacKay: Can the Government Leader then state categorically if the Northern Pipeline Agency supports the YTG's requests?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would think that I could state categorically that virtually everyone supports our request or our stand in respect to this, except Foothills Pipelines Limited. We have not asked the Northern Pipeline Agency if they support our stand because, Mr. Speaker, it is our stand at this point in time and we have a legal opinion that says that we are on the right track in respect to this \$5 million. I, frankly, have not asked the NPA for support in this thing.

Mr. MacKay: As it appears that the NPA are not going to volunteer any support, can the Government Leader tell us if he has asked the Government of Canada for their support?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, once again, I have advised the Minister of what we are doing and I have also told the Minister that should we deem it necessary to seek his support we would be doing so and we would expect it. That was the sum total of our conversation on the matter, Mr. Speaker.

Question Re: Land Claims

Mr. Penikett: I, too, have a question for the Government Leader. Yesterday, the Government Leader said a paper regarding Land Claims which was Tabled in this House three years ago still prevails today as Government policy. Was the Government Leader, yesterday, referring to the Paper entitled, "Position Paper - Meaningful Government for all Yukoners"?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, can I ask then, if other positions and resolutions on the policy of Land Claims adopted by the previous Legislature also in substance continue to represent a policy position of this Government?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to answer the Honourable Member's questions directly, knowing exactly what papers and policies he is referring to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once again we are getting into this question of Land Claims and I am going to get boxed on confidentiality.

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member would come to me with what he thinks these policies are and these papers that we should be referring to, let me have a look at them and then possibly we can develop a line of questioning that will be meaningful to the House.

Mr. Penikett: Let me simplify the matter and make a very simple and direct question. Would the Government Leader be prepared to make a statement to the House, identifying which documents and positions previously adopted by this Legislature, which continue to represent the policy of this Government on this important question?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we are in a very, very touchy area. Now, I am not prepared to undertake a commitment whereby I can be then hit with the business of — I missed listing one document. I just do not want to do that and I do not want to make that kind of an undertaking at all.

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 on-going active discussion in this area. I am not exactly sure where it is at at the present 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, vis-a-vis the Federal responsibility, but it is one that is being examined on an on-going basis and I am sure, in time, will eventually evolve to a situation where the Government of the Yukon Territory assumed almost total administration 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 apprised of the severe 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 renovations are possibly 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. Hanson: 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 were 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 for us 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 President of CNR, Mr. Bandeen, whether he was 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 we 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, having recovered that tumble he could perhaps answer this question: has the Government Leader 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 this Board fits into this procedure. It is the Board that makes the recommendations to 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 he 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 or 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 good citizens, 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?

Mr. 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 from Hootalinqua, 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 Yukon request the Government of Canada to direct its Revenue Department to honour the Prime Minister's election promise and to maintain the northern transportation bonus as being non-taxable.

Mr. 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.

Then, Mr. Speaker, 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 perpetrate 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 am sure that in the Feds 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; secondly, that in 1980 most 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 sane 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 dark day for all 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 indiscrimination 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 can be enacted.

Yes, Mr. Trudeau, we await to see if you will honour your election promise. If you do not it can only be construed as one more devious 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 herrings across my track and I shall not be disposed to follow them, particularly, but I would like to say that he 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 this country.

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 and who were thrown out, fortunately, before they did too much damage.

I think that we were very fortunate that the Liberal Government was elected because they were the only ones who were prepared to take any action on this and, indeed, we are seeing some action.

I would like to address the substance of the Member's motion, though, because I do find that the thing he is addressing is, of course, very important to many, many Yukoners. However, I do not think this particular motion is broad enough in scope to satisfy me and I am going to suggest why now.

The narrowness of this motion with respect to just talking of the northern transportation bonus leaves out many, many other items which presently, as a matter of practice, have been not taxed by the government, Mr. Speaker, and they include housing allowances in some of the mining towns, subsidized fuel oil for government employees and others, many other benefits that have

gone past the Tax Department's nose without being taxed.

So, I do not think that this particular motion really meets the need of the day. I think we have to step back from it further, though, too, and we have to say "Why should northern residents be taxed any differently from any other resident in Canada? Why should there be some discriminatory legislation that we seem to be asking for? Why should that legislation go on the books at this time?"

I think that the Member previously did address that when he said that it should be part of a general policy of the Federal Government to encourage migration to the north and to the development of the people and resources there.

I think if that is a principle, I think that the underlying principle behind all of this argument is whether or not there should be some incentives given to people living in the north and I think we are probably all agreed there should be in this House.

Now, the next question is, okay, why, and how much, and this was not really addressed by the Member, he is just concentrating on the transportation bonus. I do not think that is enough. If the only thing that brings people to the north is a free trip back to the south, I do not think we are going to build a stable and permanent population, so, we have to look at the thing in a much broader scale.

I suggest to you that perhaps the major reason for needing incentives from the tax system to live here is our cost of living. It is much higher than other places by virtue of the fact that we are so far away from the sources of supply that provide us with our daily bread. I think that the cost of living that we suffer from here, the very high cost of living, is the main argument that we should present to any Federal Government that we deserve a better tax deal.

Now, the reason the cost of living is one half of the equation the other half is that, okay, we do have higher, on the average, we do have higher earnings in the Yukon than any other jurisdiction in Canada. So, the Federal bureaucrat goes back and says, in fact, we do not have to give you any incentives because you are being paid more. For living up there, you are being paid more so why do you need any extra incentives?

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 to you, many, many Yukoners here are living 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.

Another problem, I think, that this resolution does not tackle is the fact that there are many people who, in fact, do not receive these so-called tax-free benefits. There are many employers, mostly smaller employers, who cannot afford to grant their employees a free trip out once or twice a year. The majority of small businessmen I would say fall into that category, that they do not pay for the employees to leave the Territory nor do they pay for subsidized housing or subsidized fuel so I think that this resolution does not address that particular segment of the population because there is quite a large segment.

So, for these reasons I do not feel that I can support this motion as it reads. I think that we have to lay out our argument more clearly to the Government because, presumably, this resolution will be forwarded there if it is passed. I think we have to make sure that they are aware of the principle behind it, that the cost of living is high in the north and that graduated tax rates eat into our higher income and as a result we are left with less disposable income.

I think we have to point out that a major change in the ad hoc system of not taxing these things would seriously disrupt collective bargaining, would seriously increase the cost of operations of many of the larger businesses that presently build in these tax-free benefits to their employees.

The mines, for example, have had some indication from the Northern Mineral Advisory Task Force Report that tax-free benefits in the order of \$8,000 per year are built into the wages of the workers in the Cyprus Anvil Mine. So, if you take away the tax-free benefits, all of a sudden Cyprus Anvil is going to have pay a much higher wage bill. So that, in turn, cuts its profitability which, in turn, cuts the amount available for reinvestment and leaves us somewhat poorer and the Federal Government somewhat richer.

I think the final point, and this is something just to weigh against everything else said before, is that last Session in this House, we passed a Yukon Income Tax Ordinance, which means that we will collect our direct share of income taxes in the future from the Federal Government. So, whatever we recommend here, with respect to reducing the amount of tax that the Federal Government, that these terrible bureaucrats in Ottawa have decided to collect,

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 doing. 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, and

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

(1) a moratorium upon the taxation of northern benefits, and
(2) 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 Honourable Member from Kluane, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane, THAT Motion Number 5 be amended by deleting all words following the word "recognizing" and by 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:

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

(a) ways and means of reducing the 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.

The Member for Whitehorse North Centre has raised the prospect, the possibility that the North is being punished for having failed to deliver to the Liberal backbenches any trained seals from the north to stand there and stand up when they are told to stand up, sit down when they are told to sit down and thump their desks on instructions from the Liberal Whip.

The Liberal Party did not win any seats here and it is just possible that we are being punished for our sins, for the errors of our ways.

I do want to say, though, that the kind of negativism and hostility and resentment that may emanate from Ottawa towards these unwashed colonials in the far north who cannot see the error of their ways and the impropriety of them continuing to vote against their best interests as perceived by the mandarin leadership of the Liberal Party, which I would point out to the Member for Whitehorse North Centre, are, in the case of our national government, often the same set of people.

However, there will be another election in a couple of years from now, probably, and the Prime Minister may think the people of the north are fairly stupid and they have short memories, but the people here will remember a little better than that, if he does not change his mind on this one.

We are going to have to get the message to them very clear, because this ain't a small matter. We have estimates from this Government's information that there are something between 11,000 and 12,000-plus people in the Yukon workforce. The President of the Yukon Federation of Labour has estimated that 7,000, at least, people in that workforce are directly affected by this decision. That is 7,000 people, 7,000 producing, taxpaying, productive workers in this Territory are receiving some form of northern allowance.

Only Canada Tungsten and Cassiar Asbestos have issued T-4 slips so far. Whitehorse Copper and Cyprus Anvil are, I understand, on hold until word comes from the Government. In those mines they are talking about taxing not only airfares, but tool allowances for 1978 and 1979. The workers there will each have to pay up to \$1,000 extra, maybe more to cover these years' benefits.

It will especially affect Cantung workers, not residents of Yukon, but they are pretty close to us and we ought to have some fraternal concern for them. Cantung workers, who in their collective agreement, because it is not a fully developed community with a lot of resources and a lot of facilities and a lot of services, their collective agreement provides for four trips per year outside, to be paid by the Company.

Now the issue, Mr. Speaker, is not just these benefits, but what the taxation will lead to.

A Revenue Canada spokesman told CBC last week that any benefit "regardless of the type of benefit", as long as it was equivalent to or in lieu of money, is taxable including, but not limited, to housing subsidies, including the YTG employee's buy-back housing scheme, fuel and electrical subsidies, tool allowances, safety bonuses, clothing allowances, discounts to employees at local merchants, isolated post allowances, they are already taxed, as a matter of fact, but that was included in the list, school bus subsidies for rural Yukon residents, Medicare and dental plan benefits negotiated in collective agreements and so on, and so on, and so on. Mr. Speaker, this is a horror story.

Look at the situation regarding workers at the Cyprus Anvil Mine. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to the cost of the non-taxable benefits in their pay packages and it is estimated at about \$8,000. Now that is a pretty significant sum of money if you start taxing that back a year or two for each employee. According to, I think it was one study, those benefits range as high as between \$7,100 and more.

There are Federal Government employees in the north, some of whom get annual, presently non-taxable benefits in north to the tune of some \$7500. Now, if the Federal Government, itself, seriously wanted to tax those benefits, it would have to substantially increase the Isolated Post Allowance for northern workers, possibly as much as \$10,000 per worker, to make up the equivalent and all for the sake of a tax policy decision.

Now, I do not know what the point of view is of a Liberal mandarin in Ottawa or Quebec, because I guess that is now where they work, over the river there in Hull, is on that kind of thing but from my point of view, that is dumb. It is really dumb. It would have to increase the size of its own payroll to collect as much tax as if it attempted to provide the same level of services and chances are it would just have to cut back services, again, like it always does, when they did that, people in northern Canada would suffer once again by what I think is a false austerity.

How long would a place like Cyprus Anvil be able to keep skilled workers? I understand that they have a problem recruiting and

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 head offices of some companies to some Members of this House and I suspect that there is some level of concern there.

It may not be a serious matter in terms of the wage patterns, the wage bill, the total operating cost of the company, but it is a very serious matter when it comes to recruiting skilled workers.

The country itself is short of skilled workers, skilled tradesmen in a number of fields. That makes it doubly hard for the north to get the same skilled workers. We must look at it, for the moment, from the other side of the coin. At the moment when an employee is paid overtime, the rate is calculated on his wage rate, when, to be fair, he should get overtime in benefits as well as money. So perhaps they should be getting no benefits and all wages, so that overtime would be calculated realistically. This thing, every time you look at it, produces a whole new generation of complexities and problems.

Now the Member for Whitehorse North Centre mentioned that other countries have recognized the need for substantial monetary incentives for workers in isolated areas. He is quite right about that. Greenland, for example, requires no income tax to be paid after three years of residency. Australia has instituted similar measures for workers in its northern territories. Once again, our Federal Government, with its strange, unenlightened view, treats our north with neglect, indifference and the kind of neglect and indifference that the Member for Whitehorse North Centre said in his excellent speech that ends up being essentially disruptive and, may I say, subversive of the basic principles of democracy.

Now let us have a look, there are a lot of problems here. NCPG for example, NCPG workers if they negotiate an increase in their wages to cover for these increased taxes which the Federal Government is going to collect, power rates would go up, probably, to cover it, power rates from the Federal Crown Corporation, that we would all have to pay, to go back to the coffers of that company.

Who would benefit from such a fact? The only people who would, would be the Federal Government. It would not be us. People here who are marginally employed, only just getting by now, such as women who are single parents, anybody who is a single parent would be hurt.

The problem is that this could have a profound depressing effect, psychologically, on this community. You know, if you are in a company town, or a mining camp, the free trip outside ensures a kind of light at the end of the tunnel, the target that you work towards in putting in your days in the place. I do not frankly, myself, like the notion that these trips are negotiated because we all need them to be de-bushed or to get outside once in a while, as if this was somehow a horrible unpleasant place to live. That is not the reality.

The reality is that these benefits were negotiated as a local, practical, sensible solution to the basic hard economic fact of life that the cost of living ranges from 30 per cent to 50 per cent higher here and many employers must negotiate wages on the same basic assumptions or the same levels from one end of the country to the other. That is why these special provisions have been put into northern pay packages, not only to get and recruit workers, but also so that some people can have some commensurate equivalent position in terms of real incomes.

The Liberal Leader in this House, the Leader of the Opposition made some pertinent points about the tax system and the need for overall reform and I would agree with the need for overall reform. I am not sure he would agree with some of my views as to what would constitute major tax reform, but we will have to leave that discussion to another time.

There is a problem, as he says, about this. It could be that if this horrible decision went through and many employers here could not get employees from the south, that they would have to go out into the communities here and find local people, people who are already underemployed and unemployed and untrained, in the Yukon community, to take those jobs. They would have to go to the great expense of training them and getting them into the wage economy. It would be very tough and very, very painful. It might have that small benefit.

But that is not the way to achieve that desirable goal. This method is far too high a price to pay for that desirable goal of getting more Yukon people into the economy, because what would happen to our overall economy in the meantime would be devastating.

You know, sometimes you see in the Chamber of Commerce publications, advertisements for little towns in the southern United States, trying to attract industry on the basis of the wages alone—they don't have any unions. So they have got a lot of cheap labour here and come here and everything will be fine.

I do not know how well some of those towns are doing, but it also has not escaped my notice that there are other communities, in other parts of the United States, that also advertise on the basis of 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 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. Hibberd: 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 watching 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 contravention of 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 watering 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. Hibberd: 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. Hibberd: 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. Hibberd: 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: Yes.

Mr. Penikett: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to get that clear, because, clearly, the Member for Whitehorse South Centre was giving a speech about the Canada West Foundation, which was not the subject of the motion.

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

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: Mr. Chairman, 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 Sports services, 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 though. The Throne Speech said that the Government was working on affirmative action programs for women, native and handicapped people. I was pleased to precipitate a debate last year on an affirmative action programs for women. I think that is a subject that we have had before the Legislature for at least a year now.

I would like to know from the Minister if he has yet got any kind of price tag affecting such a program and how far along he is in the development of it.

Hon. Mr. Graham: We have a three person committee working on affirmative action. Generally, career programs in the Territorial Government Civil Service, the people on this committee are from the Manpower Branch, from the Public Service Commission and one from the Vocational and Technical Training Institute. They have, as yet, not come up with any firm policy proposals that they have put to the Cabinet. I have had several discussions with the Committee, discussing where they are heading and the timeframe we are looking at.

We hope to have something concrete to present to the Legislature

in this Spring Session. I do not believe we will have. We have not budgeted any money in the Manpower Branch for this specific program but we have served notice on Cabinet that money will probably be required in the upcoming year and since it is a priority of this Government, that money will come in a Supplementary Estimate.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I was clear on the last point. I wonder if the Minister yet, has obtained any kind of estimate, just from a planning point of view, as to what the cost would be.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to say because we are dealing with so many different areas. In my first meeting with these people, a figure of \$50,000 was tossed around for initial program funding in just the first year with estimates up to half a million dollars, depending on how seriously we intend to get into affirmative action, employment of handicapped people and that type of thing. But you know, that is at least a very, very loose guideline. Mr. Chairman, the \$50,000, to begin working up over a period of years to something substantially more than a \$50,000 outlay.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, last year the Minister, I think it was on the International Women's Day, gave a commitment that YTG was preparing a plan of action for inclusion in the Canadian Government's submission to the United Nations. Can the Minister give any kind of progress report on this and say what the status of that plan is and whether we can expect it soon?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, a policy paper has been given to me by my Department. There were several changes that I requested. I sent it back to the Department roughly a month ago and I have not gotten anything more from them. So, I will attempt to find out where the Department is in the development in the areas that I indicated that I would like to see development proceed and, as soon as it is available, I will bring it back to the House.

Mr. Penikett: Last year, when we were dealing with this Estimate, too, the Minister gave a commitment regarding sex stereotyping in educational materials. I believe he said that there would be a review of materials in Yukon schools. Can he give a progress report on this review and say how far along the review is and when it might be completed?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that is an area I have not done anything in. I just do not have any information at the present time.

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, even though we do not 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 policies of the Government?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the area in which the Women's Bureau becomes involved. Wherever we are planning policy in 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 Properties Ordinance. I seem to remember the Minister indicating that at some time in the near 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 took 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, molded Gov-

ernment policy to fit that, that we felt represented most of the opinions of the Yukon people.

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 commission 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 this legislation will come before the House, until, if we are very fortunate, in the Fall Session, but 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 am sure the Public Accounts Committee will be most interested in the last statement.

Mr. Byblow: I note 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 areas. This is basically to redirect program priorities. We have wage top-up assistance where an employer is willing to hire a handicapped person but will only pay them \$2 an hour and we provide the additional \$1.50 or \$2 an hour in order to keep that person at a job. It is usually for a set period of time such as six months and then we request that the employer pay the whole amount.

I can think of one that comes to mind immediately because I was personally involved and that was where a local establishment hired a handicapped person for a six month period at a subsidized wage, subsidized by the Territorial Government. After that six month period we were kind of apprehensive because the person had a severe handicap and in fact we found that the business in question hired him on a full time basis at a higher salary than he had been subsidized with, so, we are finding that it does help and this is basically to hire both handicapped people and people who need special assistance to find a job.

Mr. Byblow: I do not believe the Minister commented on the career development program.

Hon. Mr. Graham: This program is both to provide Yukon students with career-oriented jobs within the Territorial Government during the summer months and it is also for the work experience for school drop-outs.

The program that we have is for early school leavers or people that leave school early requiring some kind of direction and useful job experience. We provide some funds to help both in counselling and for them to gain experience in the job that they hope to make a career out of.

Mr. Byblow: Can the Minister confirm whether there is any active process by which the public and the employer is informed of the availability of funding under these categories?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, a lot of these people are referred to us through the Federal Manpower Branch, others are referred to us from Departments within the Territorial Government that have people applying for jobs that qualify for assistance under either of these programs. Many others are just referred to us through schools, the Rehab Centre and other organizations such as that.

Mr. Byblow: Is any of this entire vote recoverable or is this the Territorial portion?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I do not think any of this is recoverable. These are the funds that we pay, I think. I could be wrong.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I neglected to do this when I was asking my questions on 80000. I noticed in one of the Yukon newspapers sometime ago an advertisement which read as follows: "Have you had employment problems because you are a woman? Have you been discriminated against because of your age or pregnancy? Have you been sexually harassed on the job? Find out what your rights are from the Yukon Government's Women's Bureau. Contact Sheila Rae at 667-5182."

I would be curious, and I know the Minister will not have the information at his hand, but could he tell me how many calls came as a result of this advertisement. I would be especially interested as to how many calls on the first two items came from a response from YTG employees.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I will get some of that information and bring it back.

I might add that we are looking at establishing a program in the Vocational School just to expose women, who are interested, to various courses that are available through the Vocational Institute and, in fact, these will involve a few days' training in each of the various programs that are offered, just to expose them to the various options that are available to them. We expect that it will be a great success.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no further questions, shall Program 80000, Manpower, for \$209,900, clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare this amount cleared.

I would refer you to page 53, Expenditure Recoveries, and pages 54 to 56, Transfer Payments. They are there for information only. If you have any queries, we will now hear them.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of these are controversial. I wonder, just for our edification, on the Expenditure Recoveries identified on page 53, if the Minister might just briefly outline what the DND recovery is, what the Friendship Centre recovery is? Has that got something to do with the Skookum Jim Estate?

I guess those are the two I am curious about.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The Friendship Centre is the grant we get from the Federal Government because we turn it over to Skookum Jim Hall. We act as just an interim agent.

The Teachers Salary for DND, I think I will have to bring back a full answer to you. I think I know, but I am not certain, so I will bring back an answer. You got me.

Mr. MacKay: I have just a question with respect to grants and bursaries to the Yukon students. I appreciate that the guidelines set down for the granting of these are in legislation and being administered by a Committee of the Government. I would just like to make a point when we are on this, there seem to be a few problems with regards to the flexibility of these rules. There seems to be some instances where the son or daughter of a long-time Yukon taxpayer, whom you would think, by some sense of Yukon loyalty, be able to qualify for this who are being cut off because when they left high school they decided they would go to Europe for a year to see the world and took 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, almost none of them are well-founded.

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 or 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 last year and I must express my disagreement 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

has been with good cause. I can think of a couple of cases though where I, on the basis of what I would think of as natural justice, do not share the conclusion of the committee.

I think you are going to find an increasing number of kids in the Territory who are entering careers and professions which training programs require their attendance, or in a work place related to the training programs in the summer, and in some cases, those work opportunities may not be available to them.

Let me give an example: there are some university engineering programs requiring a season with a semester when the student is not in school, that they work in the industry. It may be in the technical or specialty which they are training, there may not be jobs available in the summer here in the Yukon.

I can think of someone training for an architect's degree, they may not do that, and if they do not come back here for a certain summer they may become ineligible. That is my information, Mr. Chairman, and if that is not the case, I would like to have the Minister correct it.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, 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. Consequently, they lose their eligibility, only for a limited period of time though.

They become eligible once again if they establish residence in the Yukon at another period of time so they do not lose their eligibility permanently.

What we are doing this year is preparing an information sheet that will be sent out to all students who receive financial assistance from the Government of the Yukon Territory. Hopefully, this will eliminate a lot of the misinformation that some of these students are getting. It will become apparent to these students that they do not have to return to the Yukon if they can show the Committee that they have a legitimate reason for doing so.

Mr. Chairman, I have one more answer on the Teachers Salary/DND. These are for teachers who go to Europe for a two year period. They are chosen by the Department of Education and DND personnel co-operatively. We keep them on salary for these two years and the money is recoverable.

Mr. MacKay: With all due respect, the Minister does not usually miss my point, but I think he did when answering the one I was making. That was that I was saying that there are a few instances where it seems that if there was a little more flexibility in law, these long-time Yukoners who are sitting on the Committee, for whom I have the highest respect and I was no way criticizing, would have the ability to be able to make the kind of sound judgments that they generally try to make.

Sometimes, there is just an occasional quirk that comes up and they say, "By the rule of the law and the Regulations, we cannot give it to you. I am sorry. That is it." I am suggesting that perhaps there are one or two areas the Committee know about and you may know about some of them too, which may, if there was a little more flexibility to the Committee, I am sure that all the justified complaints would be eliminated.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I sat on the committee on numerous occasions and discussed some of these points. We have planned some changes in a few Regulations, nothing substantial really but I think that they are going to meet the requests of the committee. Hopefully, when we introduce the new Regulations at some time in the future it will allay the fears of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to echo what my colleague just said. That legislation was designed in such a manner to try to make it clear, in law, and the request of the committee who have been there for a number of years. I think we have managed to do that.

I should also point out the other reason for tightening up the legislation was that we made a substantial increase at that time as far as the financing was concerned, as far as the grants for the students were concerned. It was also a case of question of money versus eligibility. One only has to go back not too long ago when people were taking advantage of that particular program to the point where I think it was called the 24-hour grant.

The committee did not have any legislative guidelines and was put in a very difficult position. Granted, there may be some areas that may be a minor area for flexibility but, overall, I think it is a good piece of legislation. It clearly defines, through mandate, and, subsequently, they can operate within it.

I think we have to be very careful when we start dealing with

something like that because once you start opening it up it starts to complicate things further and further down the line.

Mr. Byblow: I am sure the Minister who just spoke must have had some part in establishing the Ordinance and Regulations.

Just to concur with some of the points raised from this side with respect of eligibility requirements and flexibility within that Ordinance, I would extend, as well, that there have been many enquiries with respect to that particular Ordinance on financial assistance and the Minister would be well advised to re-examine the regulations and stipulations therein. They are not flexible enough and, on a mere technicality, you can have students who disqualify when there is no other apparent reason for them not to be receiving that money.

Mr. Penikett: I just wanted to say that, as always, we thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs for his lectures on the obvious. I do not think I could disagree with anything he said.

The fact of the matter is that there are people, my constituents and, I am sure, the constituents of other people in this House, who, by any commonsense standard, I am not talking about any type regulations, but by any commonsense standard, seem to be Yukon residents, would, by my judgment of them, be Yukoners who have had, from time to time—and it is not a great number, but have had problems with post-secondary grants.

I would concur with the Minister's view that the system is good. I would probably disagree with the Minister if he claimed the system were perfect. That is all I am saying.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion?

As there appears to be no further discussion, shall the total appropriation for the Department of Education, \$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, 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 in 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. I think the Members all remember that this is the particular department that had to come up with the supplementary for some \$800,000 and possibly 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 things, but serious things which involve this 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 stickler 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 Assembly. It is, I understand, something that was probably inevitable, 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 to me by my colleague, 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 seven tickets they 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, those are the people we want to be able to get off the roads, if they are proving 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 sleepers, 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 we do not have, or we do not think that 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, is 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 for driving on icy and difficult roads and gravel 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 about where we are at in terms of the testing of people in rural communities. I know what it is now for Class 1 tickets but I was thinking for others because I suspect that some of 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, a safe drivers course or other driver training. 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 guess Yukoners were fortunate that one 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 to go with the one-price system. I doubt that we do have any legislation right now covering this kind of thing. Has the Minister had any reason to have any concern or make any representations to the people in the industry about that kind of thing?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I was not even aware that it was happening. I do not, as a normal habit, drink beer.

This is something that we discussed in the Cabinet when the new pricing policy was brought forward. I am not even really that familiar with it, other than what I know about the pricing system. The rest, I think, should be more properly answered by my colleague to the far left 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 sales.

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 lefty 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 man years, "The increase in this Department was 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 Profession 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 Profession 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 and both sides have decided that the Dental Profession 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 Profession Ordinance. We have not finished writing them up as Legislation yet and we have not, as a consequence, presented 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 Legislature 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 an inquiry 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 unless he is registered as a dental hygienist or dental therapist pursuant to this Ordinance?

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 funds 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 Landlord-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. Hibberd: 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 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, as to whether or not the premiums paid into an 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 it is a simple fact of life.

Mr. Penikett: Just on that point, that investigation I asked about of 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 68 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 children 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 provide 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. The Budget includes an increase of one 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 parttime 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 pains me to 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 call it missionary work 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 to be improving. 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 have had 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 afraid this Minister in my view and considered opinion, serious opinion, 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 develop 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 Member has almost disillusioned me and possibly even brought discredit on some well-known Socialists who were motivated by idealism. It might be thought that this lonely Member is being guided only by political expediency and personal ego-tripping.

It is very easy to drone on, financially, criticising ad nauseam sincere efforts to improve life in our community, 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 all fairness to this situation, Mr. Chairman, if one looks in the past year, there has 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 was discussed in public from this particular individual, I was not sorry, at least from this side of the House, 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 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, whether we like it or not, and I think the Members should take that under consideration as well.

I think in fairness to the situation, Mr. Chairman, the Member Opposite would be in a very difficult position if the majority of the people of this House decided that his ability in this House was 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, or appear to have had.

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 Motion on the 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 Depart-

ment 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's argument just 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 process.

If we reflect for a moment just what has been happening in the Department of Human Resources over the past year, it is a sad story. There were problems of a serious nature, problems relating to the delivery of the services expected by the Department in this area.

I do not think that I want to spend time as to what took place over the past year that justified a criticism of the Department as 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 had 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 whom the blame should be given, but I think the case that is being made is that the problems have not been solved fast enough and there is not enough evidence of improvement taking place.

I think this is where the Department must defend itself and this is where the Budget that we are going to be looking at, clause by clause, policy for policy, program by program, must be defended in terms of an improvement over what has been happening in the past year, which has been a disaster. That is the point, is enough progress being made? Those are the questions that I am going to be asking, but I will not be supporting the motion as it stands.

Mr. Hibberd: It would appear that the only time I have an opportunity to get to my feet today, I have been attracted to do so by 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 this 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 point of personal privilege, because that I would consider to be slanderous and quite out of order in our proceedings. It would not be appropriate for our debate, Mr. Chairman.

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 predicaments, 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 Members 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 occurring and they are problems in themselves, 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 that is refusing to help someone, or is having difficulty, but is trying to help someone, when it merely, by analogy, is not scraping 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 an 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 would have been acceptable ten or fifteen years ago. That is how it is and even the Conservative government has this as their 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 then 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, we all have 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 leanings that he has towards the socialistic programs, the social problems of people and the type of socialism that, actually, his Party entails.

I, myself, I 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 behaviour, of any kind. I feel that I cannot say that the Member in that Department, I would not say that that Member, has not 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, but 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 there are a couple of things that I should put on the record before getting into the meat of it.

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 quite 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 motion in the House 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

sat on this side of the House, or any side of the House for that matter, to put together, over the year that he has been in here, an opinion that, in fact, the chief executive of a department is incompetent, and should be fired. Nothing wrong with that. I do not see why anybody should construe that as being a personal attack. After all, what you are judging it on is the professional ability of that person to carry out his or her job, and earn the \$45,000-odd that goes with it. So, I do not think our friend should be attacked on that basis.

I think we have to look at the problem again and see whether or not this particular Ministry and Minister has carried out her duties in sufficiently good a way to merit the continued confidence of the House.

That is the issue. Does this House feel that this Minister has carried out her duties in such a way as to merit the continued confidence of the House?

Well, I have thought about that. I have thought about it quite a lot and I weighed quite a number of things in my decision. I weighed the fact that I do not think the particular experience, professional experience that the Minister has prior to this had prepared her to deal with a department of 150 employees. I think that is a new experience. I think it is a new experience for many people landed in politics and suddenly thrust into the front bench within about two or three months of getting there. So, you have to weigh that.

You have to weigh the fact that Yukon has probably some of the most severe social problems of any jurisdiction in Canada. The alcohol problem seems to be eradicated. It seems to be a never ending one; it seems to be popping up in all kinds of different ways and it seems to be one which is becoming a spectre over the whole society.

So, there have been a lot of problems in that area that have cropped up during the year, too, in respect to the administration of it. Crossroads was a crisis and a crisis point for a period of time. That crisis seems to have passed.

The social workers and the general complaints that we heard from some disaffected members who quit, they seemed to have reasonable complaints. They seemed to say, "Look, we do not feel we are getting through to the top here about what we see are the problems in the field."

The co-ordination of the policies, which was the subject of some discussion, which I have difficulty getting a handle on, I must say, because it is a very loose area, but certainly there has been a committee established and it seems to be meeting regularly and trying to solve that problem. I do not think it has been solved yet, as far as I can gather, but nevertheless something is happening.

Wolf Creek, which is an issue that I keep harping on, has not seen any action yet, although, again, we are informed that it is under close study and that something will happen.

So, I guess the general impression I gathered from the Minister's tenure thus far is that she arrived on the scene with very little knowledge of what to do and all the problems facing it and what it really all meant, as many of us others would, too, if we were put in that position.

She then tackled it and has been getting a fairly rough ride from the Opposition, who are very intent on seeing improvements, but has, indeed, responded to some of these criticisms.

As a result of that, I feel that she should retain the confidence of this House in her duties, at least for another year.

We should not vote her salary down to \$1 on the basis of her being incapable of handling her portfolio.

That is my decision as far as this motion is concerned. It will not preclude me from criticizing the Minister in the course of this debate and getting into areas which I think are important. I hope that the Sir Galahads that she has around her will not feel like jumping to her defence should such criticism arise and be fairly fierce.

I must close in saying that I would defend to the end the right of my friend here to propose a motion like that because such is the parliamentary procedure, such is the way you express your confidence or lack of it. The administration of the Minister in this instance though, I do not agree with him and I will be voting against it.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, first of all, for not being here for the full debate. I did not hear the opening speaker. I just understand what the motion before the Committee is, and I must say that I think there are several things that must be understood.

First of all, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, Mrs. McCall was put in a difficult position. She was put in charge of some difficult portfolios that, unfortunately, none of her colleagues knew a whole lot about either. When I gained control of my portfolios, I,

fortunately, was able to call on the expertise of some of the people here and consequently do not receive the harsh criticisms that Mrs. McCall does.

I think, also, our lack of expertise in the field is translated in the fact that Mrs. McCall had 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 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. McCall's Human Resources 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, that there are no simple solutions. I know. I have searched for some too.

Another area is the Child Development Centre. Mrs. McCall 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, to enable these people to get further. I know she has done a lot of work, she has put in a lot of hard hours in that area. Again, there are no simple solutions other than the fact that money and man power is needed. I know how many hours Meg puts in, and productive hours, I believe, in her Department.

I find it difficult to express in real terms how much I appreciate having her opinion in our Cabinet, because I think 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 amount of work that she has 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. Falle: I would like to state that, from the Back Bench here, at least from this seat, I support Mrs. McCall. 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.

Mrs. McGuire: I have something very short to say on this. The only worthwhile speech that was made today on this, 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 restraint within her budget and considerable restraints from her Caucus Members as well.

I think the main grievance that the NDP Member has, is that the welfare dollars are not flowing fast or freely enough. Needless to say, I will not be supporting this motion.

Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I also have to rise in support of the Minister. I am, actually, very sad that the Member across the floor would direct a personal attack against anyone in this House. If he feels that a Department is not being operated efficiently, that is one thing but a personal attack on a very dedicated person is another. I have to echo the words of the Leader that I do not think it is even worthy of debate. I totally reject the proposal.

Hon. Mr. Hanson: Mr. Chairman, I still am in a little bit of a shock and a great deal of anger at what my friend across the floor said. It is pretty easy for him to stand up and make such a statement because he will never be in the same position as the Minister on this side of the House making decisions. So, therefore, he can make statements like that.

One of the Social Workers that did raise so much Cain in the Yukon last year about his Department was from my riding. But long before he resigned and came down here I had quit talking to him and now I will not answer his calls. The majority of people in my community feel the same way but as yet I am not too capable of talking about it except that I am a great deal upset, disappointed in the Member across the floor and will be supporting the Minister all the way.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, in my view, obviously, I feel that what we should have had here today was a roast. Clearly it has been a testimonial. I might, finding myself in the situation now, be inclined to proclaim to the Lord, alone at last, praise God, alone at last, but having heard from just about everybody in the House and I am not really quite sure who to reply to first, I somehow suspect that I must be reaching home, since, with the exception of the

response from the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition, every single reply amounted to a personal attack on myself including one which would give me, and fair enough, yes, the Minister of Education, the response of Dr. Hibberd who questioned my moral integrity and I may have cause to pursue that with a question of privilege upon reading it.

Anybody who thinks that the kind of Motion I made today was easy has another thing coming.

I am not a malevolent or vicious person. Clearly, most Members of this House do not realize that the motion I presented today is not only procedurally correct, and represents not a personal attack at all, but is, as the Leader of the Opposition said, and the only person who seems to realize it, a procedurally correct, and historically traditional, want of confidence motion in the performance of a minister of a line department in the government. It is a traditional, proper and correct motion in debate of the Estimates.

I have, on numerous occasions in this House, criticised the performance of the Minister's management of the Department in connection with whether it was day care, or alcohol, or any of the other few things that the Members recognized. I can only express my disappointment that Members here are inclined to say one thing in private and one thing in public, and I want to say that that is something that I am not going to do.

I feel my criticism of this Department's administration profoundly. I have said it here in the House. I have said it here publicly. I have said it here alone. I am not afraid. I am not embarrassed. I do not withdraw from anything I say. I have given up trying to ask the Minister questions, because I cannot get answers from the Minister.

I have reached a point of frustration in this regard, Mr. Chairman, and that has led me to move the motion today, in connection with the Department's Estimates, which, I repeat again, is a procedurally correct thing to do in questioning competence of a minister in a department.

I am sorry that the Members, in reply, chose not, with few exceptions, to respond to the substance of my concerns about the Department, and that goes for my colleagues in Opposition.

I do want to say that I feel those strongly. I guess I have reached the end of the rope in terms of my failure to get answers from the Minister. I feel frustration on behalf of the people who depend on the Department. I think the mean-minded and small-minded remark by the Member for Kluane, that I simply wanted to see a flow of welfare dollars, was an extremely ill-advised remark. That is not what I am about, that is not what my Party is about.

I am concerned about the social health of this community. I am concerned about the mental health of this community. I am concerned about the kind of decay that is alcohol-related. I am concerned about all the things that impact most emphatically on this Department.

I do not think, from the bottom of my heart, the strongest statement of conscience that I can make, that the performance of the Minister has been a success.

That is what led me to move the Motion today, which I did, the correct, procedurally correct, the only way you can do in the parliamentary tradition, and that is to move to do what the Leader of the Opposition described, to reduce the salary of the Chief Executive. I do not intend to call division on this, Mr. Chairman, since the outcome of this is clearly obvious. Even I am capable of counting to that point.

Mr. Chairman: We have a Motion before us. The Motion has been moved by Mr. Penikett, that the salary of the Minister of Human Resources be reduced to \$1.00.

Some Members: Disagree.

Mr. Chairman: It would appear that the 'Disagrees' have it. I declare the Motion defeated.

Motion defeated

Mr. Chairman: At this time I think we should have a short recess.
Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee back to order. We were considering the Department of Human Resources. We are still on general discussion. On this Department is there any further discussion before we go into a program by program consideration?

We will now consider each program. The first program we have is 10000, Administration, \$1,552,000. Your information pages are Pages 73 and 74.

Mr. MacKay: 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?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: In those personnel classes, there are the Director, the Assistant Director, the Departmental Administrator, 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, what departments are they administering, how many people do you have assigned to the various areas within this Department?

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I was bound and determined that I was going to exhibit Mrs. McCall'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 staff 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 that 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 here, each place was to be allotted, just what function would that entail.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Those would be Social Service Workers.

Hon. 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 these programs, let us have them ask those questions so that we can attempt to get the answers for them as quickly as we can.

Mr. MacKay: I am certainly glad the Government Leader appreciates what we are trying to do here.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not intend to do their work for them. If they want to get into this Department in detail, it is here to be gotten into, but Mr. Chairman, I am not going to bring the detail forward unless they ask for it.

Mr. MacKay: I certainly do not intend to ask the Government Leader to bring forward that detail. I would like to ask the Minister to do that and I guess what I would like, and I now have been supplied by my colleague here, an Organizational Chart which would appear to answer the question I first posed and that was: how is the staff broken down at the Administration level? Not that I am suggesting that you have broken down staff but I think the allocation of resources is what we are trying to get at.

The Community and Family Services area has a staff of five. What kind of programs are they administering and please give us some idea of what the objective of that particular staff is.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I really cannot see just what Mr. MacKay is referring to. Exactly which page and where are you? Where do you mean?

Mr. MacKay: The breakdown of the Minister's Department ap-

pears to be a Director and an Assistant Director, as she previously explained. Then she has field services, youth services, social services, placement and support services and community and family services.

So, it is the last item, the last part of her department that I am posing the question on. I would just like to know what the goals of that section of her Department are, what her understanding is of that.

I am being asked, for the record, where this breakdown is. It comes from the Department's own Program and Organizational Information Manual, which is, presumably, known to the Minister in terms of what is happening within her Department.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I will have to have a copy of that booklet before I know what the Members opposite are meaning.

Mr. Byblow: I think, perhaps, what would be useful here, Mr. Chairman, would be if this booklet would be provided to all Members of the House, as soon as possible. I am sure it is a matter of simply photocopying it. It does provide a review of the various departments and programs, a breakdown of the staffing allocations and would be very useful as we proceed through the Estimate.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I already have a copy so I would ask the Government to save the cost of Xeroxing one for me.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that this would be a great help, especially to the Opposition, because I know that in the years past that I have been here, before this Government even came in, we used to get these with the Budget and they were helpful in many ways. I think it should be done now and I am sure that the Department would have no problem in doing that and the Minister would have no problem in coming forth with those answers that are very likely to be asked.

It is a matter of saying that there are so many thousands of dollars spent here, so many there. There is an answer for it somewhere and it is a very simple thing to come in here with those answers ready and prepared.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will see that I have copies made, and see that everyone has a copy.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would just like some indication from the Opposition, since as soon as this Vote 5 is finished, I am Vote 6.

I have been following the debate fairly closely. I recognize that there is more or less general policy objectives have been requested in other departments, and we are getting into fairly technical administrative questions. I think, that the Members Opposite are looking for in Human Resources. Perhaps notice could be given 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 man year count, 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 staff 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 supplementaries, the issues that I want to pursue in detail, I have already identified. They are exactly the same questions I raised in the supplementaries, some of which have not been answered yet, 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

The following Legislative Returns was tabled April 2, 1980:

80-3-4

Teslin Elementary School: Taxation

(Written Question Number 1)

