



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 4

4th Session

24th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Monday, March 30, 1981 — 1:30 p.m.**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Grafton Njootli, MLA, Old Crow

## CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Public Service Commission, Pipeline, Land Claims, Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, Tourism and Economic Development, Government Services, Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Workers' Compensation Board.
Hon. Geoffrey Lattin	Whitehorse North Centre	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, Education and Information Resources.

## Government Members

### (Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Doug Graham	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Jack Hibberd	Whitehorse South Centre
Peter Hanson	Mayo
Grafton Njootli	Old Crow
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake
Howard Tracey	Tatchun

## Opposition Members

### (Liberal)

Ron Veale	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	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Editor of Hansard	Lois Cameron

**Whitehorse, Yukon  
Monday, March 30, 1981**

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

**Mr. Speaker:** We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper.

**DAILY ROUTINE**

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

Reports of Standing or Special Committees?  
Petitions?  
Reading or Receiving of Petitions?  
Is there any Introduction of Bills?

**BILLS: INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that a bill entitled *Interprovincial Subpoena Ordinance*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that a bill entitled *Interprovincial Subpoena Ordinance*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that a bill entitled *Survival of Actions Ordinance*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that a bill entitled *Survival of Actions Ordinance* be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health & Human Resources, that a bill, entitled *International Child Abduction (Hague Convention) Ordinance*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, that a bill entitled *International Child Abduction (Hague Convention) Ordinance*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, that a bill entitled *Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Ordinance, 1981 (No. 1)*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, that a bill entitled *Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Ordinance, 1981 (No. 1)*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that a bill entitled *An Ordinance to Amend the Labour Standards Ordinance* be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that a bill entitled *An Ordinance to Amend the Labour Standards Ordinance* be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further Bills for Introduction? Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?  
Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period. Are there any questions?

**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Question re: Foothills' Property Taxes**

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, the Government Leader advised that, in his opinion, Foothills was obligated to pay the taxes set out in the pipeline agreement. Does the Government Leader agree, then, that Foothills is obligated to pay this Government, for the 1980 year, the sum of \$5 million, and for the 1981 year, a sum of \$10 million, making a total of \$15 million they are obligated to pay this Government?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned my word of caution before, I must do so again very very emphatically. This was our opinion, this Government's opinion, and it might even have been a wishful opinion, Mr. Speaker. It is an opinion that at this point in time is being tested by the law fraternity throughout some sections of Canada. We are still negotiating with Foothills, Mr. Speaker, on that basis: that the \$5 million is something that this Government was entitled to, for the fiscal year 1980.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, can the Government Leader advise as to just how the legal fraternity is testing the wishful thinking that the Government has about this money?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, there are various legal opinions bashing around about this. Now I would suggest that at a point in time that it is considered prudent, possibly a court issue might arise. I believe that it would be our responsibility to seek the advice of our people, and either accept that advice, disagree with it, or whatever. But, Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are in negotiation with Foothills Pipe Lines Limited, and that is the best I can do as it stands now.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that our opinion, as a Government, is not one that is shared by the senior government in this country.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the Government Leader how long this Government will continue negotiations before it makes a decision to seek its legal remedies in court, with respect to the pipeline tax money.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I will continue these negotiations as long as I think that there is a chance that they will be fruitful for this Territory. I am not out to prove any legal point at all. I am trying to get the best deal possible for the people of this Territory. That is where my interest begins and ends, Mr. Speaker. I am not particularly concerned with the wording of the Act, or what legal points there might be in it. I am not interested in going to court, quite frankly; I strongly believe that we can negotiate a better deal than we can ever get out of the courts on it.

**Question re: Wire Tap/Minister of Justice**

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government Leader about a matter that continues to "bug" a number of us. The Government Leader last week told the House that he first had a meeting with the RCMP about our wire tapping case in December of 1979.

Will the Government Leader now state whether he had any other conversations or meetings with the RCMP investigators prior to that December date to which he referred, or after that December date — other, of course, than his most recent meeting in January, 1981, this year?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I think I can safely say, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is all that this House to be concerned with, that I did not have any sort of a meeting or conversation with the RCMP, with respect to this matter, prior to that meeting in this building in December of 1979; nor did I have any kind of a meeting or further conversation with the RCMP subsequent to December of 1979, nor prior to the time that the Committee was established in this House.

**Mr. Penikett:** Just to confirm, if I may — because the Government Leader will understand that this is an important point — in January of this year he was advised that the Minister was

under investigation. In December of 1979, he was advised the Minister was not under investigation; neither prior to that 1979 date, nor following that 1979 date, had he conversations with the investigators about the investigation.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that at all.

**Mr. Penikett:** Then perhaps I could ask the Government Leader if he could recall — because I am sure it would help all Members understand and appreciate this issue — the exact date of the meeting in December, 1979. If not, could he undertake to find it out for us?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, I know that I have that exact date in my files. If the former Minister of Justice would recall the exact date that he tendered his resignation to me — I believe it was a Thursday. I know that it was the Saturday previous, prior to that Thursday, that I met with the RCMP and that was when I was officially notified. In fact, it was 4:30 on the Friday afternoon, the day before, when I was officially notified by the RCMP that Mr. Graham was under investigation. The RCMP phoned me in my office; they asked me to come and make a statement to them with respect to an investigation that they were conducting concerning Mr. Graham. That was the first that I knew. That was the Friday prior to Mr. Graham's resignation.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a supplementary on the same topic, Mr. Speaker. I would like to enquire of the Government Leader: during the time surrounding the date upon which he was made aware that his former Minister of Justice was under investigation, what were the reasons given for the Minister's being under investigation?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Oh no, Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not think that that is information that I, in all conscience, can make public.

**Mr. Byblow:** As a final supplementary, is the Government Leader aware of the duration of time that the former Minister of Justice was under investigation?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I advised the Committee in August of 1980 that, to the best of my knowledge, and to the best of my belief as well, — and by the way I still believe it, Mr. Speaker, — the Minister was not under investigation until I was advised on that late date in January that he was under investigation. Until that point in time, Mr. Speaker, I knew of no reason why he should be under investigation, nor was I ever told of any reason why he should be under investigation.

#### **Question re: Crossroads' Budget**

**Mrs. McGuire:** I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources. A chairperson on the Board of Directors from Crossroads was concerned about certain funds that were withdrawn from their budget, and they have made a sincere and reasonable request to appear before the Committee of the Whole, during the consideration of budget item Health and Human Resources, to plead their case. I understand this request was rejected. Could the Minister tell the House why it was rejected?

**Mr. Speaker:** The difficulty is that I do not believe I can allow that question. Apparently the question relates to a decision which has to be made by Committee of the Whole; this House cannot question, except by report, any conduct of the Committee of the Whole, and I believe that question would have to be taken up in Committee of the Whole.

#### **Question re: Agricultural Policy/Country Residential Lots**

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. The Minister has indicated in the past that he intends to release country residential acreages this spring. Would the Minister agree that an agricultural policy should be in place for the Territory, so that such a release of land would not impede the development of agriculture in the Territory?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mr. Speaker, I think we are talking about two different classes of land. I do not see any relationship between country residential land and agricultural land. Under

our agricultural policy, agricultural land will be designated as such, and will be provided for agricultural people only. Country residential is different, and we will not be mutilating agricultural land for country residential lots.

**Mr. Veale:** Well, if I understand the Minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, he is indicating then that there will be a release of agricultural land this spring. I ask the Minister how he can release agricultural land before there is an agricultural policy of this Government.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. What I said is that we were thinking of releasing country residential lots this spring. I understand that we are working on a plan for the agricultural land, and when that plan is in place and the necessary lands are designated, we will deal with that at that particular time. I might inform the Member across the House that most of this land that is designated as "agricultural" is still under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister then to confirm that, in the release of country residential acreage this spring, there will be no prime or suitable agricultural land released.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mr. Speaker, I think he is asking the impossible.

#### **Question re: Wire Tap/Minister of Justice**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have, unfortunately, another question for the Government Leader, on a topic that I previously asked about. The Government Leader informed the House in his answers last week that he made an official statement to the RCMP about the investigation. Could the Government Leader advise the House if he recalls what date it was that he gave this statement to the RCMP; the statement referred to is the one on page seven of *Hansard*.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, if you give me just half a moment, I might have it written down here.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the Honourable Member may consider putting these questions in the form of written questions, inasmuch as they would appear to be taking up quite a bit of time in the House to determine answers, due to the very technical nature of the question.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham resigned as the Minister of Justice on January 30; I therefore made my statement to the RCMP at 10:00 a.m. on the morning of January 24. I was phoned at 4:30 in the afternoon of January 23.

**Mr. Penikett:** I appreciate Mr. Speaker's suggestion, and if it would facilitate matters I would be prepared to do that.

However, in the hope of finally closing the matter, if I could ask the Government Leader then: was the statement to which he referred of January 24 the only statement which he has given to the RCMP on this investigation during the time period we are talking about: the last couple of years?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I am not absolutely certain what the Honourable Member is digging for, but it should be well known, Mr. Speaker, that I see the investigative officer virtually every Sunday of the year, since both of us try to make a habit of attending church worship services on Sunday morning, and we both go to the same church. So, Mr. Speaker, it is virtually impossible for me to say that I never — in fact I know of a time when I was in the RCMP building between the dates that have been talked about, and I talked to Staff Sergeant Wool at that time.

Mr. Speaker, there were no official statements given, asked for, sought, nor taken at that time.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand and sympathize with the Government Leader's irritation about this matter, because I share it. We have, as he will understand, an unresolved dispute about the facts regarding an investigation. Mr. Speaker, the Government Leader has recognized that, in a small town situation, he has inevitably had a number of informal meetings with the RCMP investigators of a Christian nature, as well as that one statement that we referred to on January 24. I just want to be perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, on that particular point. Is that the only statement that the RCMP has solicited from the Gov-

ernment Leader, and that he has given on this particular investigation?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, as far as an official statement, yes. But, Mr. Speaker, I am very aware of the fact that the RCMP have my voice on tapes of telephone conversations, so I cannot possibly say that that is the only thing that —. You know, I honestly do not know whether there is any other information or anything else that I have said. But, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, to my belief, the only official statement that I have made to the RCMP was the one that I made on that Saturday morning.

**Question re: Recreational Funding**

**Mr. Byblow:** I will direct this question to the Minister responsible for recreation; however, the Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs may wish to respond. I would like to enquire of the Minister: has he given any consideration to the resolutions adopted by the Association of Yukon Communities, in its recent annual meeting pertaining to recreational funding?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** We have given it some consideration; I am presently about to begin a review of recreational funding, so this will be much under discussion.

**Mr. Byblow:** The review that was alluded to is the review that was promised approximately six months ago in the House, during last fall's Session.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, I did not make that promise, but I imagine it is about the same sort of undertaking.

**Mr. Byblow:** Can the Minister indicate if her Government has taken a position as to whether or not recreational funding should be the sole responsibility of the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** No, Mr. Speaker, we have not done that.

**Question re: Watson Lake Sewage Treatment Lagoon**

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. On October 21, 1980, the Minister advised the House that he was reviewing the situation of the sewage treatment lagoon in Watson Lake as a result of the Government's having been turned down by the Water Board in an application to have sewage discharge directly into the Liard River. Would the Minister advise the House as to what steps he has taken to correct the situation in Watson Lake?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing that project; we have spent roughly \$100,000 on that particular project. You are correct that the Water Board has turned it down. We are taking our plans back, and when the plans are completed we will consult them.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that some time in the future we will be coming to the House for the amount it is going to cost to correct this deficit.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister advise the House as to when the matter will be taken to the Water Board again?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I am not able to say that, until we get our plans completed.

**Mr. Veale:** Is the Minister considering the implementation of a two-cell lagoon system, which would be met by capital expenditures in the fall Capital Expenditure Budget?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mr. Speaker, we are considering different types but, at this particular time, we have made no decision and I am unable to answer that question.

**Question re: Lobird Trailer Court Highway Sign**

**Mr. Penikett:** Perhaps I could direct a question as well to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Last week I gave notice to the Government Leader, for the Minister, of a question concerning the turn sign to be installed at the Alaska Highway intersection at the road to the Lobird Trailer Court. This sign was promised a year ago, and then again six months ago. I asked the Government Leader if he would give notice to the Minister concerning this case of the missing sign. I wonder if the Minister has any information at this point?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for

asking about that sign. I am aware of this particular sign. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of a comedy of errors. The person who was looking after it is no longer in our employ; the person who relieved him is no longer in our employ. We checked with the City of Whitehorse; they had some problems with it as well. This particular sign went to an individual operation who did not approve the sign. We are back to the City, and we are going to get together and get the appropriate sign installed.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to inform the Member across the way that when we do get that sign up - and I hope that will be very soon - I shall gladly take him up there so that we both can witness the sign - finally.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, it would be my pleasure to share witness with the Minister. I wonder, if I were to offer the Minister my labour or any other assistance I may give, if it would facilitate the erection of the thing? Would that be useful?

Perhaps, though, supplementary to the question: the Minister has previously been asked by myself, concerning that area of Hillcrest, about the timing of the release of Hillcrest lots. In a letter to me recently, the Minister has indicated that the timing would be the subject of some discussion this spring with the City of Whitehorse. I wonder if the Minister could tell me whether those discussions are concluded, and, if not, what proposals he would be making to the City about the timing and the release of the first lots in the Hillcrest subdivision?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mr. Speaker, no, we have not concluded the discussions. I hope they will be concluded in the near future, and when they are, I will certainly inform the Member.

**Mr. Penikett:** Could I ask the Minister if he is prepared to "go wild", and really go out on a limb and commit himself to say whether any of these lots will go on sale in 1981?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** At this particular time, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer not to say that, but I will certainly let him know when the decision is made.

**Question re: Keno Mine Strike**

**Mr. Byblow:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Government Leader, and it is on the subject of the Keno Mine strike. Considering that the United Keno Hill Mines Strike has gone on for, I believe, seven months, and that the Yukon's economy is suffering some set-backs from this labour dispute; can the Government Leader indicate if he has taken, or is planning to take, any steps to expedite the resolution of that dispute?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, the United Keno Hill strike has been a very very painful one for Yukon. We are suffering; every person in the Territory is suffering as a result of it. The suffering is not as immediate or as severely felt as the strike at Cyprus Anvil some years ago, but, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what the Honourable Member for Faro has said: that everyone is suffering as a result of it, particularly the people working for United Keno Hill, or the previous employees of United Keno Hill, and the company itself.

I have been in fairly close contact with the President of United Keno Hill with respect to this strike. I have not personally talked to the union people for a considerable length of time, because there were negotiations going on. They were meeting, and they were having negotiations — albeit not very successful — but they were meeting and having negotiations, and I feel very strongly that Government should not be involved at that point if at all possible.

Now I do not know at this point in time whether a true stalemate has resulted. I will be following up on this, because I am very concerned, both as a Yukoner and as the Government Leader, that we do everything we possibly can for both sides in resolving this matter.

**Mr. Byblow:** Recognizing and respecting the conciliation and arbitration process as established in labour law, would the Government Leader consider approaching the Federal Minister of Labour, Mr. Regan, to expedite resolution of this strike?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Oh yes, if in fact the ball, so to speak, was in Mr. Regan's court, I would contact him without hesitation. I must say, Mr. Speaker, he was here for the World Cup

event, and he indicated a keen interest in Yukon and everything that is going on in the Territory, and I am confident that any request from us would be very well received by him.

**Mr. Byblow:** Still on the same subject, has the Government Leader responded, or does he intend to respond, to the recent allegations of questionable housing conditions and other community services, as prepared by a report of another union executive, regarding conditions in Elsa?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have not looked specifically into this. I do know that there was a request that came to our administration, to our Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of just exactly where that is at. Certainly we could take that as notice, and get a reply for the Honourable Member?

**Question re: Speech Therapist**

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources. On Thursday of last week, the Minister indicated that she had the matter of hiring a speech therapist well under control. Would she confirm or deny that she will be unable to fill the position until August of this year?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, there are at least six people being interviewed for this position, and I cannot imagine where he got this date.

**Mr. Veale:** It appears, in any event, Mr. Speaker, that there will not be a speech therapist hired for some time. What specific action is the Minister taking to ensure that speech therapy, which is required on a continuing basis by many young children and adults in this Territory, will be available on an interim basis?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in what the Honourable Member is saying. I do not know where he is getting his information; I do not know why it is thought that the position will not be filled for a long time. There is no reason why not. In fact, further, we expect in the very near future to be creating a department, a small department but nevertheless a department, of speech therapy.

**Mr. Veale:** In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister's department released a report in August of 1980, indicating that there was a minimum requirement of five speech therapists for the Territory, would the Minister advise the House if she will be seeking legislation or bringing forward legislation to license and regulate private speech therapists in the Territory?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, we are just getting a department together. I think that is as far as we could be expected to go.

The report that the Member speaks of, I think, was the report done by the speech therapist at that time. It made a recommendation that there should be more done in the way of speech therapy, and that is exactly what we are doing.

**Question re: Local Hire/Mobility Clause**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the Government Leader. Last week, the Government Leader said that job training would make it possible for Yukoners to be able to work on the pipeline. Given the lack of job guarantees on the pipeline, as a result of the introduction of the Mobility Clause in the Constitution, can the Government Leader indicate what exactly leads him to his view that training will be as good as guarantees in law?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a bit of misinterpretation here. The Mobility Clause does not give us any more job guarantees, nor does the lack of a mobility clause take away any of the job guarantees that we presently have. Mr. Speaker, the Mobility Clause factor was one that we were very concerned about, because of the other effects that were going to happen: in my opinion, the disastrous effects that might happen in this Territory as a result of the in-migration; not the job situation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in a lot of talks and discussions with the unions and the proponents of the pipeline. I am just talking off the top of my head now, but I believe that the upshot of those

discussions is, that if we could properly train 900 Yukoners, they could get jobs on that pipeline; that is how many we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, within the next two months, we anticipate having a very extensive training program in place which we will be bringing to the Legislature, and that will hopefully get this training program underway. It is being worked on very actively right now in YTG. We have one committee that has done the preliminary work, and we are now on the specifics. The training, Mr. Speaker, will cover a multitude of various jobs. We know, from the proponent and the unions, for instance, how many cat skimmers are going to be required for the construction of that whole pipeline. Not only that, but we know when they are going to be required, given the date of the beginning of the construction. As a consequence, we know when their training has to be completed, and we also know what the proponent and the unions expect for training.

So, we are getting down to the hard facts on this, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be a very very expensive program, but one that we feel is the kind of program that we should be spending our money on, with respect to the pipeline.

**Mr. Penikett:** I thank the Government Leader for his answer. Given that the Mobility Clause will probably also affect our ability to pass local hire laws, and given the problem of the lack of union hiring halls in the Territory, and the fact that workers are dispatched for such jobs, and will be for the pipeline, from Vancouver and Edmonton hiring halls; can the Government Leader explain how Yukoners will get priority over southerners, in our large category of pipeline jobs?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot explain all of that, other than to say to the Honourable Member that these very problems have been the topics of discussion for the last three years, between the Pipeline Committee, the Northern Pipeline Agency, the proponent, and the unions involved. Mr. Speaker, our best information is that if we could train these 900 people, they would get jobs on the pipeline. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, what we are looking at is not only the pipeline training, but a situation where in virtually all cases the training can be used after the pipeline, as well, for other employment in this Territory, principally in the mining industry.

**Mr. Penikett:** This is all very useful information and I appreciate the Government Leader's answers. I also am pleased there has been three years of discussions. I would be very interested to hear more of the conclusions. Given the problems of training 900 people in a relatively short period of time, and given the fact that many outside firms will soon hire fully qualified outside workers — their own employees, before they hire unqualified or partially qualified local residents for pipeline work — I would ask the Government Leader if he could focus his attention on this problem: what specific steps is the Government taking to ensure that Yukoners have a reasonable and fair chance, — "preference", if you like — for these jobs before the pipeline actually starts.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, there are no steps possible. Also Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am not quite prepared to accept the Honourable Member's "givens". That happens to be a fact. As I keep reiterating Mr. Speaker, we have been in serious discussions with the proponents and with the unions in respect to this. Mr. Speaker, our best information is that, if we can launch our training programs during the course of this coming summer, then we are going to be in good shape and our local people in Yukon are going to be in good shape; for the pipeline construction specifically, and secondly for hire in other industry in the Territory after the pipeline is finished.

**Question re: Labour Legislation**

**Mrs. McGuire:** Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Government Leader. Has this Government planned to establish and legislate a Yukon Labour Act, during this Session or perhaps during the near future?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, it is a burning question at

this point in time. As soon as we have researched the subject thoroughly, certainly I will advise the House one way or the other. I must say that it is a real possibility.

**Mr. Veale:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: will the Government Leader include in that legislation provisions requiring that hiring halls of labour unions be located in the Yukon Territory?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I am not prepared to make any undertakings at this point in time. If I were so prepared, I would table the bill, but I am in no position to make any sort of undertakings at this point.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Government Leader agree that the lack of such legislation in this Territory is one of the greatest problems we are facing, with respect to having local people employed on the pipeline?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I might agree that it certainly has created a problem. I do not know that it is the greatest one, but certainly it has created a problem, and one that we are well aware of, and one that we hope we can solve.

**Question re: Students' Financial Assistance**

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, we will take one head office for every hiring hall we get.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Last week the Minister of Education could not confirm that the Student Financial Assistance Committee had in fact turned back to Ottawa money budgetted for post-secondary education aid programs for Yukoners. I would like to ask the Minister if she has now had an opportunity to check into this situation and satisfy herself as to whether or not it is the case; and, if so, could she tell the House what she has learned?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, students who want a federal loan apply to the Federal Government. They do not send a block of money to be distributed. So when a student applies, they either get a loan or they do not, and there is no money to be refunded and none has been refunded; none has been received.

**Mr. Penikett:** The Minister is denying a role for her local committee: the role in that committee in allocating the maximum amount of money available to it. Let me ask the Minister, since she has indicated that a review of the program is taking place; could she now tell the House when the review began, and give us some indication of when it will be concluded, and, more importantly, who is conducting it.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, the review has begun since I have taken on this portfolio. I have no idea when it will be concluded, and I am conducting the review.

**Mr. Penikett:** The Minister appeared to indicate the other day that it is her definite intention to introduce some changes to the post-secondary assistance program for Yukon residents. Could she confirm that is in fact her intention?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, somebody was talking to me, and I did not hear the first part of the question. Could I have it repeated please?

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, I was talking to the Minister. Last week the Minister indicated that it was her intention to introduce some changes to the post-secondary assistance program for Yukon students. Could she confirm for us that it is her intention to do that in this Session of the Legislature?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, I am not making any promises as to what I will do. I said that I am making a careful study of the assistance program to students, and that is exactly what I am going to do. The Member must not confuse, by the way, Federal loans to students, with Yukon grants to students. I have a feeling the Member has been confusing those two.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to Orders of the Day, under Government Motions.

**Mr. Clerk:** Item Number 1, adjourned debate: Mr. Veale.

### Motion Number 1

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, the Budget presented by this Government can be referred to as the "Bad News Budget". The Government Leader insists on calling it the "Walk to Work Budget" but that really misses the point, because walking to work is not something that is available to all the people in the Territory.

Sir, the one cent a litre increase in Territorial tax on gasoline will cause incredible economic hardship, particularly for the many people who do not have options, but have to use their vehicles to drive throughout this Territory.

I am astounded, sir, that with the full knowledge that this Government has of the plans, no doubt imminent, of OPEC countries to increase the price of oil and gas, and, of course, of the on-going negotiations of the Government of Canada and the Province of Alberta, which will undoubtedly lead to increases in the price of gas and oil in this country, if that province is to be satisfied in any serious way — I am surprised and dismayed to see that this Government feels it so necessary to add its one cent worth to the price of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of that one cent a litre — which is more than four cents a gallon, I would add — is far beyond what an individual consumer is going to pay at the pumps at any part of the Territory. In fact, when you increase a tax on energy, sir, it increases inflation; it goes well beyond the price at the pumps.

Let us talk about the price of food, and what this four cents and over per gallon increase is going to mean for the price of food coming into this Territory. We are already well aware of the fact that Super Valu and Kelly Douglas charge for transportation and they add it on to our costs, but, in addition to that, this Government is well aware of the fact that Kelly Douglas add a mark-up. So, we are going to get that one cent, which is going to be reflected in food prices, and then we are going to get the mark-up that Kelly Douglas adds to it.

Who, Mr. Speaker, is hurt by the impact of this budget? The people who are hurt, of course, are every Yukoner who planned and budgeted for this coming year. All Yukoners have fallen behind in their ability to keep up with the price of goods and services in the Territory, but most of all, Mr. Speaker, it really hurts the low income Yukoner: that person who is barely able to keep his head above water at the present time.

What relief do we see in the budget for those people? Well, the relief is an increase in the Home Owner's Grant of \$50 for the entire year. That will be eaten up in two months at the gas pumps. The Pioneer Utility Grant has been increased by \$60. That, sir, will also be eaten up very quickly.

No, when one considers the severe economic impact and the inflationary impact that this Budget is going to have on the Territory, the real question is: why are we not using the \$700,000 surplus which this Government has budgetted, to alleviate that inflationary impact on the consumers of the Yukon Territory?

Furthermore, the obvious question - the question that one begs to ask - is, what about the \$15 million that this Government has been unable to collect from Foothills? Why are those funds not being collected, so as to make any of the inflationary increases in gas prices and health premiums completely unnecessary?

Mr. Speaker, one can go further, and say that Foothills has not paid to date, and of course that is true. But one can go even further, and look at the Budget and say, "Well, what areas can be cut back? Where is the Budget unnecessarily padded, or unnecessarily fat?"

We have all heard the clamour in this Territory for several years now for day care funding, and, of course, it was pleasing to see that some limited amount of funding is now available. But who clamoured for the \$176,300 expenditure for an Ottawa office? Maybe it was that person in Faro, that lonely soul who asked for a new liquor store. Maybe it is the same person who asked for the Ottawa office. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but in the light of the inflation that this Government is going to put on



the people of this Territory we do not need that Ottawa office. That, sir, is one budgetary item which can be cut back and postponed until the Foothills' pipeline money comes on stream and is used by this Government for budgetary expenses.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, there is a budgetary item of \$55,000 - that is an increase - for the Inter-Governmental Affairs Office. Now what is that being spent for? Trips to Ottawa, no doubt. Well we can postpone those. We can wait another year for those, sir. The expansion of the Executive Council, Mr. Speaker, is something that we can also wait for; particularly in light of the fact that there has actually been a decrease in the number of Members of that Council. They have lost one along the way, and yet their expenditures are going to increase substantially.

What about the priorities of this Budget? It is quite clear where the priorities of this Government lie. They do not support Renewable Resources. The Wildlife Branch of Renewable Resources is one of the few departments that is not only not going to stay up with inflation, it is going to fall back 9.3 per cent. Now, if that is going to be happening, this Government is not going to be looking after the wildlife of this Territory, and the populations that are so necessary for people to hunt.

Yukon Housing Corporation, housing for the citizens of this Territory - that also is barely going to stay up with inflation. It is going up at less than the inflation rate.

In Parks and Historic Resources, it is the same thing, Mr. Speaker; the increase is not sufficient to keep that department up with inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to bring forward an amendment to Motion Number 1. The amendment is moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Kluane: that this Motion be amended by adding, after the word "government", the following words: "but regrets that the Government is obtaining most of its revenues by increasing health premiums, fuel and diesel taxes, rather than by collecting the property taxes to be paid under the Pipeline agreement."

**Mr. Speaker:** We have an amendment before us. It has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane, that this Motion be amended by adding, after the word "government", the following words: "but regrets that the Government is obtaining most of its revenues by increasing health premiums, fuel and diesel taxes, rather than by collecting the property taxes to be paid under the Pipeline agreement."

Is there any debate on the amendment?

Question has been called; are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Disagreed.

*Amendment negatived*

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the Motion?

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this Motion. I felt that the Government Leader's opening Budget Speech had covered almost all areas; however I am moved to speak after hearing the inane prattlings of the Member opposite. I see in his motion that he feels that we should collect property taxes to be paid under the Pipeline agreement. Mr. Speaker, what he fails to understand, or maybe what he just chooses to ignore, is the fact that it is the Federal Government who does not support the Yukon's claim to the revenue that we believe is owed to us under that agreement. It is the Liberal Federal Government, I might add, Mr. Speaker. I also see that he feels that the Government is obtaining most of its revenues by increasing health premiums, fuel and diesel taxes. Mr. Speaker, this may be where we are increasing a certain amount of the revenues, but I think that the Member's inability to read a budget, or at least to understand what he is reading, is becoming extremely apparent to me, and I think that perhaps it is time we educate the new boy a little bit.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, he says we do not support Renewable Resources. Mr. Speaker, this Budget gives us an increase in the man-year complement, from the 65 in last year's Operation and Maintenance Budget to 70 this year. Mr. Speaker, that would have been readily apparent to the Mem-

ber, opposite had he bothered to read.

Mr. Speaker, what he also seems to fail to understand is that we have also planned, under this Budget, to establish a Renewable Resources conservation officer in the area of Old Crow - an area that we consider extremely important in the wildlife concerns of the Territory.

He also says that we are actually losing ground in the Housing Corporation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Government made it extremely plain that we did not wish to stay as heavily involved as we once were, in supplying housing in the Yukon Territory. In fact, we have introduced several plans: buy-back schemes, and that type of thing, to enable this Government to get out of supplying housing in the Yukon Territory; an area which I believe the private sector is more equipped to handle.

Mr. Speaker, I also see that the Member opposite has, at some point in time, said that a more equitable manner of obtaining some of these revenues would have been an increase in the level of personal taxation in the Territory. I guess, Mr. Speaker, he does not consider that that increase in personal taxation will hit the average Yukoner. I guess he understands the average Yukoner must not pay any income tax. I do not know exactly how he feels that the money is going to hurt less; if it is taken out of your pay cheque, or if you are going to have to pay it at the gas pumps. At least if you pay it at the gas pumps you have some kind of alternative, as the Government Leader has indicated: try to do other things. You can at least attempt to cut down the amount of fuel you use. It is pretty darn difficult to cut down the amount of income tax you pay, especially if the Government chooses to increase it. That has got to be the most illogical argument that I have ever heard - I have not heard that many arguments from the Member opposite that make sense anyway, but that is the one that really sticks in my mind.

Mr. Speaker, there are several things in this Budget that - though I was in some small manner involved in coming up with this Budget, I still believe there are a few things in this Budget that we should be asking the Members of the front bench about, and I am sure we will get some reasonable explanations for the questions that we will ask. All in all, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very responsible Budget. I think that the Budget presented here today is an indication of the Cabinet's concern about the way in which the Territory is being run, and I wish to offer my compliments to the front bench - even though there are only two of them here today - for coming up with this Budget. I look forward to discussing it in more detail.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, I had originally intended to give a long address on the Budget today, and I am sure that all Members would have enjoyed that. However, after riding my bicycle to work this morning, I came to the conclusion that I was sufficiently in agreement with one or two of the items in the Budget and I could not summon the necessary anger to sustain myself through one of my normal 40-minute speeches. There are, as I have said, a couple of things that I liked about the Budget. There are a great number of things which, I feel obliged to say, I must also concur with, since they are things which myself and other Members of the Opposition have enthusiastically pushed for in the last couple of years. The Government will recall that, on occasion, I have been a bit of a nag when it came to bugging them about their campaign promises of 1978, which read, "Only the Conservatives will combat inflation, unemployment, and rising prices". It is that particular slogan I have used, to beat about the head, among others, the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

I will say this for the Government, that I think they have begun to do something - not what I would like to do about the jobs issue - but they have begun to do something about the jobs issue, and I am pleased to see the new initiative in the direction of job training, because it has long been a concern of mine that we have a school system which has been educating our kids for export yet all the while we import all our experts.

I think what we have lacked - and we are only beginning to



see some sense of it in this Territory — is an economic plan, or some real sense of economic planning. We have gone from the early stages of this Government, where I thought a lot of fealty was being paid to the "Big Bang" theory of economic development, to where there now is a lot of optimism, a lot of faith; and perhaps even some wishful thinking about the mines that are going to be coming on stream in the next couple of years. I am sure the Government Leader will recall that some of those same mines have been coming on stream every year for the last 20 years. So, if they do not happen in the next year or two, we should not be too deeply disappointed. It does suggest a problem, though, in terms of planning.

The fact of the matter is, as I have conceded before in criticizing the Government, that it is very difficult to do effective economic planning here in this Government, because we lack the basic levers and control devices to achieve economic planning.

I am going to speaking about this later, but one of my major criticisms of the constitutional initiatives at the national level is that I think that they further remove from our hands, or even our grasp, the tools and the means to achieve the kind of control of our own economy, and the management of our own community, that should be appropriately our right as a democratic society.

The Budget, I think, has some interesting thrusts. As I have said in my remarks to the press, which some of the Members opposite were kind enough to comment on — Mr. Speaker, for fear of offending you, I will not repeat what they said, but they did advise me that they had heard them — that it did indicate a certain lack of priority. There is not a sense, in this Budget, that there is a number one, or number two, or number three item. In previous budgets we have been able to look through the list of expenditures and make a fairly accurate assessment of which Minister's career was going up and which Minister's career was going down; which department was in this year and which one was out.

I think that is a less simple proposition this year, partly due to the fact that the Ministers are being recycled so furiously through the Ministries, and the departments are being reorganized almost at a pace to confuse us as to who is responsible for what. Lest the Members opposite be too optimistic on that score, though, believe me, a couple of us have been to circuses, we have watched the shell game, and we know how to keep our eye on the pea. We may still lose our nickel, but at least we will have some idea of where the pea is.

The Budget has, as I said, a couple of good things in it, but I was perhaps a little too premature in my enthusiasm about the day care issue. I still want to say I am totally in agreement with this initiative. I am very pleased that there is going to be \$190,000 for day care. I only hope that this money is in addition to the present spendings on social assistance to get people into day care. There is a Member shaking his head across the way there. I will be interested to find out how much the Government is now spending on social assistance to get people into day care. If it is anything in excess of \$180,000, you can expect one Member from a certain constituency, namely Whitehorse West, who is going to be very mad, and we may have a longer Budget Session than had been planned — even that I planned.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the responsible thing for an Opposition to do in these times is not to carp about picky things; not to whine about matters beyond our control, nor to parrot criticisms that we, ourselves, or other people have made on previous occasions; but to help the Government, wherever possible, to live up to its own promises, particularly in connection with inflation, unemployment, and rising prices.

I know, because they are all good and noble people opposite, that they have really in their heart of hearts wanted to achieve these goals that they set for themselves in November, 1978, and I know that, as responsible government grows, and they acquire more control over the leaders of government in the public service here, they will want to indicate that these really are their priorities.

So, Mr. Speaker, in this Budget debate, I am going to be doing my best to make sure that, or help the Government live up to, its own promises. I will not be doing anything negative or destructive; I will just be helping them along as best I can. I will be looking at each one of their expenditures: assessing it as an investment in the future of the Territory, and seeing how it stacks up as an investment in jobs and in training, and in gaining control of our local economy.

One of the things that we have all given rhetorical speeches about is this question of colonialism. There are two types of colonialism: there is political colonialism and there is economic colonialism. It will do us no good at all, in spite of the new Canadian Constitution, if, when at some point we are able to gain some control of our own community, become maitres chez nous; if, at the point we achieve that desirable end, following land claim settlement and a number of other logical developments that must precede it, we find our ability to manage the Yukon economy has been rendered impossible by virtue of the fact that the control of it is entirely outside our borders.

Now, I am a New Democrat, and proud of it. My party has a close allegiance to the union movement, and I do not apologize for that. Also, I am not ashamed to say that the question of the hiring halls is a matter of concern to me, which I have raised in this House today and on other occasions. I may get some flack for doing that, but I am not afraid of it because I think it is important; I think it is serious.

The Government Leader was in Calgary a few days ago and was reported to have invited some of "them fat and sassy oilmen" down there to invest in the Yukon economy. Well, as much as I understood his desire to bring investment here and to create jobs, I did have some lingering concern about his generosity, his invitation. I know the Government Leader did not study classics in university, but there is a famous old Greek phrase that says, "Beware of Albertans bearing gifts." I am sure the Government Leader has heard of it.

It is a problem in the following way: we already have considerable Alberta investment in our economy. There was a recent article in the *Edmonton Journal*, which talked about the six most powerful men in Alberta; it talked about people such as Ron Sutherland, Dr. Allard, and people like that who, it is worth noting, have considerable investment in the Yukon Territory already. These are people who have considerable power over our lives, and we have none of the power that the Alberta Government has, or the potential power which it may choose not to exercise, of regulating or passing laws to govern their activities — or a very limited ability to do that.

My point is: when we are inviting investment, if the interest rates were not so high right now, I would be very much more in favour of encouraging loan capital, rather than equity capital. I believe — and it is fundamental to my own philosophy — that if we are ever to achieve the kind of community that I want, the kind of democratically controlled and run community that I want, we are going to have to have much more capital formation in this community, both at the small business level and as well, I hope, some of it cooperatively and community-owned. The steps that are required to achieve that end may be very much contrary to the kind of investment patterns that the Government Leader may or may not have been encouraging. I do not want to say that I am overly critical of his invitation at this point, but I want to exercise some caution, because I do not want to wake up the morning after we achieve provincial status in the year 2040, or whenever it is, and find that Alberta has bought the mortgage on our house, and we have now traded some masters in Ottawa for some masters in Edmonton. It does not seem to me a terribly good trade off; it is not a very good deal, and it is really not something I want to spend my life fighting for.

Mr. Speaker may be wondering what this has to do with the Budget, because I know he always pays close attention to things I say in this House. If I appear to stray into a couple of other areas, Mr. Speaker, it is because these financial questions are important. The way in which we manage our eco-

nomy, the extent to which we are able to manage our economy will be, as I have said before, the best argument we can make for achieving more responsibility.

As I have said before, if we manage the resources we are now responsible for, such as game, it seems to me that is a far more convincing argument to the powers that be in Ottawa, in terms of gaining control and responsibility for other resources, than perhaps any other we can make. I say that, Mr. Speaker, C-48 notwithstanding.

Now, the Government Leader was quite proud of the fact that he kept his word in connection with his income tax promise. That is good enough, and I have presented my argument about reducing Medicare premiums rather than increasing them on previous occasions in this House. I have also made some arguments about the wisdom of increasing fuel taxes. I think the Government, when it develops an energy policy, is going to have to do some clear thinking, because right now there is an obvious contradiction in its policies, between what it wishes to do in terms of subsidizing rural electrical rates, and — a policy which may be desirable from a conservation point of view — increasing the taxes on fuel, which will also impact most seriously on people in rural Yukon, gasoline taxes especially.

Well, the Government Leader shakes his head. Let me suggest to him, with respect, that someone who lives in Hootalinqua, and who works in Whitehorse, really does not have the option of riding a bike to work in January. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that even riding my bicycle downtown on March 30 was a bit of a frosty experience, and the ice on Two-Mile Hill makes it a much more exciting trip than I normally enjoy.

The problem the Government Leader addressed though, in terms of funding this Government, is a serious one. I, for one, have become deeply concerned about what has been happening; not only to the federal deficit, but also about the way in which the Federal Government has decided to resolve their financial problem. They have used the second oldest political trick in the book; that is the one known as "passing the buck". Unfortunately, when you pass the buck to a community like this, it really does stop here, because there is nowhere else to go. As much as I might be angry and upset about the increase in Medicare premiums, I must, if I am a fair man — I am not always objective, Mr. Speaker, but I am always fair — say that the real reason for this is what I think is a totally unjust transfer of the burden for universal health services to the junior governments in this country; especially when some of the major taxing powers — not as they affect a place like Alberta but as they affect this community — namely income taxing powers, the resource royalty taxing powers and those things — are in the hands of the Federal Government. We are now going to be faced with a problem of radical and arbitrary increases in the police contract this year. That is something else which we are not only not prepared for, but I do not think we have, with respect, a great deal of ability to bargain our way out of it.

So, as I say, Mr. Speaker, rather than droning on *ad nauseam*, I would like to move an amendment.

I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Faro, that the Motion before the House be amended by adding the following words:

"and that this House also condemn the Federal Government for transferring the burden of costly health and police services to the provincial and territorial governments."

With that amendment, Mr. Speaker, I will now conclude my remarks.

Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that the Motion before the House be amended by adding the following: "and that this House also condemns the Federal Government for transferring the burden of costly health and police services to the Provincial and Territorial Governments."

Is there any debate on the amendment?

**Mr. Byblow:** Rising in response to debate, Mr. Speaker, I

find it a little regrettable on my part not to have risen to my feet sooner on the last amendment, because I think there were a couple of pertinent points which were worthy of further debate and which made very good sense, that we, without debate, passed out of the House.

I think the comments made by the previous speakers have raised some very good points regarding this Budget. I think that in a general sense the Budget does have some very good direction in where it is placing funding towards programs: programs that are useful, programs that demonstrate progressive attitudes, and certainly programs that do contribute to the enhancement of the quality of life.

The choice of this Government, as noted in the amendment, to assess a higher cost to health care by the degree to which they have chosen to do it, to me, is an unfortunate mistake. If this Government wishes to tie the cost of health administration and the delivery of service closer to the recoverable revenue from it, I do not think they should have done it at the speed with which they have chosen to do it in this Budget, because it does contradict the very goals that the Budget sets out to achieve.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I have some concern that this Government also chose to increase the fuel tax. I do not agree with the Member opposite, who said that it is a most illogical and irrational argument to suggest that the fuel cost increase is not going to be transferred through the system and result in a higher consumer cost for goods as a result of that fuel. I think that you have placed an unnecessary burden particularly on people in outlying communities, people in low income groupings, because, in a lot of cases, you do not have a choice in eliminating the use of transportation that requires fuel. I certainly do have some very serious reservations on those two fronts: having increased the health care insurance premiums to the degree and the rapidity that this Budget does, and the choice of the Government to increase fuel at a cost that is going to be reflected and contradict the very goals of the Budget that they wish to achieve.

It is a fact that, because of the position of the Federal Government, the health and police services to the Territorial Government are going to be increased in the form of a transfer of the burden to the people, because they have not met with the necessary escalating cost differentials. For that basic reason I can support the amendment. I would expect to hear some explanation from the opposite side as to why this Government chose the excess of health premium increase, and have them confirm whether or not they agree that what they have done, in a philosophical and practical sense, is transfer the burden of health care services to the people.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, although any motion or amendment thereto that condemns the Federal Government I am tempted to vote for by the very fact that it condemns a government which I consider to be totally unfair to junior governments; however, Mr. Speaker, I think that I personally will have to vote against this amendment due to the simple fact that the police services contract has not yet been negotiated, and, although it does look like we are going to get stuck with a tremendous increase, that is not yet fact.

I think we have a great deal of problem condemning that government before they actually stick it to us, as it were.

Other than that, I think it is a tremendous motion and, given any other circumstances, I would love to join with the Member opposite and condemn the Federal Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the amendment? Question has been called.

*Amendment negatived*

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the motion?

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Item Number 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Government Leader prepared to deal with Item 3?

**Motion Number 5**

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

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that the Government of Yukon undertake such action as is necessary to inform the Members of the British Parliament that it is the earnest desire of the Yukon Legislative Assembly that the British Parliament not act upon the proposed *Canada Act*, or any other Canadian general constitutional reform proposal, until the British Parliament receives evidence that any such proposal has the popular support of the Canadian Federal, Provincial, and Territorial governments and therefore, the support of the people of Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I feel that a motion of this kind which relays our concerns and the concerns of this House is very appropriate at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Liberal Government in Ottawa has made a decision that, no matter what anyone else in Canada wants or wishes, we are going to have a Constitution, albeit made in Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am of English descent; I feel a very strong allegiance to the British Crown; I have a tremendous amount of respect for Westminster, but, it is, I think, repugnant. It will always be repugnant to me that the Parliament of Canada does not feel that it is competent to pass a piece of legislation that will be the Canadian Constitution.

That is the basic underlying major problem that I personally have with the proposal that has been put forward by the Prime Minister of Canada. But then when we looked at the proposed *Canada Act* and the *Constitution Act*, Mr. Speaker, we find that there are some very major factors lacking in it for us, as Yukoners. In fact, the basic question can be asked: "Are we Canadians?" Now, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be a lot of derisive remarks, I am sure, from across the floor as I go on my way, but this is the fact of the situation: Canada, north of the 60th Parallel, two-thirds of the land mass of this country and 60,000 souls that live in it, were not considered, were not heard from, there was no input from them in respect to the drafting of this Constitution or this proposed *Canada Act* and Constitution in the first instance.

Mr. Speaker, it was not from the lack of trying to get some kind of input. We very quickly reminded the Prime Minister of Canada that we did live here; that we considered ourselves Canadians, that we thought that we would have some specific concerns that should be considered in any Canadian Constitution that we believed, at that time, was going to be a made-in-Canada Constitution. Mr. Speaker, for whatever reason, the Government of Canada chose not to hear from us. It took an all-party committee of the House of Commons, considering this bill at second reading, before we were heard from.

Our concerns, Mr. Speaker, are fairly specific. I think probably the first one that I should discuss with the House today is the lack of any mechanism for new provinces in the new Constitution. In fact, there is no way that we are recognized as being part of the federal system in Canada, nor is it perceived that we, as citizens of Canada, can ever attain the same status as other citizens — that is: provincial status.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that it would have been quite proper for the new Bill of Rights, which looks after language rights; it looks after those under arrest; it looks after mobility rights; but, Mr. Speaker, it does not look after a basic, fundamental right of those people who live north of the 60th Parallel in Canada, and that is the right to become first class citizens in this country someday. We are not going to achieve it, not ever, according to this Act.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the old section of the *BNA Act* is still in place; that is true. But, Mr. Speaker, I must ask myself how long that is going to be in place once this is back here, and exactly what is going to happen. We put the argument, on behalf of the people of the Territory, to the Standing Committee that there should be some recognition of that basic right; the right to become first class citizens in Canada should be given to us. It seems that that argument fell upon deaf ears.

Secondly, we read the whole Act, which goes into a great

amount of detail as to what is going to happen for the first two years, after this constitutional act is in Canada, with respect to amending formulas and so on, and so forth. Every person in Canada was going to be invited to, and be represented at, conferences that were going to be held by the Prime Minister to come up with a consensus or an agreement. That is, Mr. Speaker, everyone but those people in the Northwest Territories and those people in the Yukon Territory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada and the Minister of Northern Development, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, rightfully so, have stated that we are the properly elected Government of the Yukon Territory; we represent the people of the Yukon Territory. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has said that under no circumstance does he want to represent us in any way, shape or form: that we should be there representing ourselves. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost constitutional experts in Canada, Senator Eugene Forsey, stated emphatically when this question first arose, that there was no logical reason at all why Yukon and Northwest Territories should not be represented at these conferences.

It did not happen, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, after appearing before the Committee, there has been an amendment proposed that says, in effect, that if the Prime Minister of Canada deems that whatever is being discussed might directly affect us — and, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how anything, if we are Canadians, being discussed at these conferences cannot affect us — then we shall be invited. Mr. Speaker, he shall invite some sort of elected representative. It does not even say that the Government will be representing the people of the Territory, though it says that the provincial premiers will be representing the people in the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is a fair statement that we, as Canadians, should only be represented if the Prime Minister of Canada — no matter who he might be — deems it likely that whatever is being discussed might affect us directly. I suggest, respectfully, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a perpetual argument every time there is one of these meetings, as to who should be there and who should not.

Mr. Speaker, I raised the probability that the proposed constitution was going to adversely affect our negotiated terms and conditions with the Northern Pipeline Agency, the Government of Canada, and the Foothills Pipe Lines Limited, with respect to the construction of the pipeline, if that clause went in in the way that it had been suggested to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was accused by the now-Leader of the Opposition of raising unnecessary and unfounded fears. I was accused of crying wolf and told that, after all, there was no need to worry, because he had had the word from the Prime Minister of Canada that there was no way that this was going to affect that Mobility Clause.

My reaction to that was, "Great. I am glad to hear it, very fine," because, once again, my only concern was that in fact those terms and conditions, as we had negotiated them, would be signed. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to tell you that those terms and conditions have not yet been signed. They have been on Senator Olson's desk since the day that this constitutional act was tabled in the House of Commons, and he is under instruction from the Department of Justice not to sign them, because, in spite of what the Leader of the Opposition says, and in spite of what the Prime Minister of Canada said, my worst fears were realized.

Mr. Speaker, we still do not have any terms and conditions in respect to the construction of that pipeline. It is a very real concern. Now, I probably spent more time on this one subject when I appeared before the Standing Committee, because I felt it was a very, very important thing for us, and it was an immediate concern. There was a lot of sympathy, Mr. Speaker, from the Committee: from all parties I might add. I truly believe that they were very concerned about how this was going to affect us.

I pointed out to them that if, in fact, somebody had listened to

us earlier, we could have pointed out the pitfalls of such a section, and maybe it could have been written differently at that point in time. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is the feeling of the Government of Canada now, that now that they have got that clause, the way they have got it, there is no amending it; there is no changing it, or else what it would seem to be doing is giving one area of Canada an edge over another area.

We put forward the argument, Mr. Speaker, that that may well be true, but certainly that area would not necessarily always be the North, nor would it always be Yukon. It may be something that would be highly desirable, in the case of an area in another part of a province as well. The argument did not fly, so as a consequence that concern has been overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, I think probably running through all of these concerns of ours is a real thread, a basic thread, and that is that the Government of Canada really does not care about us.

They are not concerned with what we are concerned with. The present Government of Canada wants to get this *Canada Act (1981)* made in Great Britain in Canada. Mr. Speaker, that troubles me greatly and I propose that this House go on record and tell Westminster that we disagree with some of the proposals in that *Canada Act*; that it should be something that at least a majority of the people in Canada agree with. Certainly it is unfair for Great Britain to pass such an act just because the Government of Canada has asked for it, with a clear indication that it does not matter how many provinces, shown by the Gallup polls — anyway that it is not a popular move at this point in time. Not, Mr. Speaker, because it is the wrong thing to do. I think every one agrees, without exception, that patriation of Canada's Constitution is a great thing. Everyone wants that, Mr. Speaker; the basic objection is number one, how it is being done, and number two, some of the terms and conditions of the Bill of Rights that are imposed in that patriation package.

Now, I am confident that if the Prime Minister of Canada suggested tomorrow that we patriate the *BNA Act* to Canada with an amending formula — Mr. Speaker, even if it was close to the Vancouver Formula — he would have 100 per cent unanimity amongst all the provinces, amongst all the people, everyone would be very happy. Everyone would boisterously support that kind of a move on his part.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal, as he has put it forward, to my way of thinking and certainly to those on this side of the House, and I submit the majority of people in the Territory, like the majority of people in Canada, is not a good one, and we propose that we make our feelings known to Westminster. Now, I was advised by some of the Members opposite that they did have a concern as to how we, as a government, saw such proposal being transmitted to Westminster. I want to assure Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that neither I, nor any Member of this Government, have any intention whatever of transmitting these feelings to Westminster personally.

Mr. Speaker, the motion is worded in such a way that we can, after due discussion with you and your good offices, determine the most effective and best way to convey our sentiments to Westminster.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate?

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Speaker, the Government Leader began by referring to our Queen and his English roots, which caused me to think for a moment on the words of four famous young Englishmen who remarked that, "Her Majesty is a very nice girl, but she doesn't have a lot to say." That really, unfortunately, is the situation in terms of this Constitution. It is a tribute — if you like, a footnote, a black mark, on the record of all governments, federal and provincial, in this country, for at least a generation back — that we have failed to patriate the Canadian Constitution before now. Unfortunately we are now locked into the personal timetable of one man. We have all become slaves of his ego, being dragged down a very divisive route to patriate the Constitution with a Charter of Rights and an Amending Formula in a way that I think does deep injustice to at least two regions of this country, and will produce a new

catalogue of grievances in both western and northern Canada which will plague this country for perhaps another hundred years.

Recently, the Prime Minister was quoted in the one remaining Ottawa paper. He said, "the reason I am doing this is to take care of Quebec; someone else will have to take care of the West." That was an accurate quote. I think the cynicism of the remark ought to be engraved on the man's tombstone, because, not only may it serve as his personal epitaph, but there are days and nights when I believe it may prove to be a kind of epitaph for this country.

I am a person who most Members realize is deeply concerned about the constitutional question. I have, like the Government Leader, contributed considerable energy and thought to the question. There have been times when I have found myself in a distinct minority in my own party on this matter, and I must say that one of the things that has sustained me through what has been a very painful debate inside the ranks of my own organization has been the number of occasions in which I have found myself in agreement with other Members of this House — not in absolute agreement, but in agreement on particulars. I think that one of the things that so very much moved and impressed me about the meetings of our constitutional committee of this legislature as compared with the constitutional committee of the province of Ontario was the wide range of issues in which we, the five members of that committee, agreed, and the way in which that agreement was so very evident when faced with the views of some people from another jurisdiction.

One of the problems with the parliamentary system, in legislatures like this, is that we have become intensely preoccupied with the differences between us. We often get into quite heated discussions about very small matters. That is the fate of legislators everywhere, but I want to say that I found the experience in the committee, when we met with Ontario, a real education to me.

The process we went through, of the five of us deciding that each of us was going to lead discussions in a different area, rather than one person being the star; the fact that we all were briefed in those discussions; the fact that we all came to some kind of broad agreement on those things; indicated to me what is possible in the constitution-making process.

As I have argued in this House before, I think constitutions are the foundation stones for a community, and they ought to be for the country as well. And when they are imposed over the objections of any region, or any minority, or any people, or any significant community, a profound injustice is done; a grievance is institutionalized and a flaw is embedded in the structure of society.

Now, as a colony of Canada, constitutional questions have been a continuing interest to Yukon since this community was established. Yukoners have expected national political leaders, when they come to this community, to address this concern whenever they set foot in the Territory. I recall, even though our Member of Parliament seems to have conveniently forgotten this, that in June of 1976, the newly elected Conservative Leader Joe Clark, came to Whitehorse and promised "provincial status in the first term of the national Conservative Government". In the summer of 1978 the Liberal Prime Minister, a gentleman named Trudeau, arrived in the Territory and declared, "Not in my life time will provincial status come to Yukon." Quite predictably, local partisans excited themselves about both statements. However, as I have said before, I found it a phony debate. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I did not give a damn for either statement. Both statements assumed, by their tone, that it was exclusively up to the Prime Minister of Canada to decide Yukon's future. While it is true that he does have that power, from my point of view, he absolutely does not have that right. I believe it is up to the peoples of Yukon to write the constitution for Yukon. I believe it is up to the peoples of Yukon and nobody else to decide how, when and if we join Confederation. Unfortunately, in the constitution that is now about to be

imposed on us, the province of Ontario have more say in our future than we ourselves shall.

It seems to me that, to the ordinary, non-native citizen of the North, provincial status is a slogan to express their desire for local control of their community, similar to that enjoyed by the citizens of the provinces. To the average Indian person in the Territory - I do not mean the Indian political leader, but to the average Indian person - land claims is a cold word to express their desire for something like the same thing. Until recently, both aspirations were being negotiated with the Federal Government. On this point, the Government Leader and I agree; they are, or ought to be, parallel processes. However, because non-natives and natives are so colonized by Ottawa, what has been missing in this process is a legitimate dialogue between natives and non-natives about the forms of local government to follow a land claims settlement. The Federal Government has never yet indicated that they would legitimize that kind of dialogue, even though, I submit, in a democratic community, the kind of enduring constitutions that have been made anywhere in the world have been the product of that kind of accommodation between significant minorities and majorities in any community. They can only be achieved as a result of a mature dialogue between two responsible communities, whoever they may be. They cannot be imposed. As Harry Truman said, "Those who do not know history are doomed to repeat it." And if anybody does not know this, let me recite the case of reconstruction after the Civil War in the United States. When a new social order was imposed on the region, with many desirable ends, many good ends, former slaves were brought into Congress and at new positions of power, but this order was imposed by outsiders. It was a structure of alien design, a foreign imposition. For that reason it did not survive.

Mr. Speaker, I have argued that if we are to make a relevant and enduring Constitution for Yukon, the Legislature, which represents a wide range of non-native Yukon opinion, must sit down with Yukon Indian leaders and work toward a consensus on our future.

Initially, I think that there are many Members in this House who are, perhaps, disposed to think that this is an outrageous proposition, but I would say, with respect — and I say this out of respect to all Members in the House, Mr. Speaker — that I think all of us have moved considerable distance towards realizing the wisdom and the necessity of that objective in the last couple of years.

I believe that we should be employing, in this community, all our wisdom and imagination in the task, for we are the ones best suited to design local institutions appropriate for our population's geography and cultures. Many Members will remember that it was this argument that persuaded this Legislature to establish an all-Party Constitutional Committee to begin discussions about our future.

I want to emphasize the following point: this Committee has had some success. I hope that it shortly will be meeting with the Council for Yukon Indians, as I understand there has now been a statement of willingness to have such a meeting, by some of the leadership.

I want to say this, and I want to say it in flattering terms, because I think the kind of action I am going to comment on should be encouraged: the Government Leader referred his statement on the patriation resolution to the Committee, and a consensus position emerged. It was not a statement that reflected absolutely Conservative government policy, it was not a statement that represented the views of the Member for Kluane, or a perfect replica of my own individual perceptions on this issue, but it was, I submit, a position much closer to the core of the hearts and minds of the people of Yukon than any statement yet that has come from any Government of Yukon or this Legislature.

The process, Mr. Speaker, can work; it really can.

Having made this argument, what can I say about Mr. Trudeau's unilateral patriation of the Canadian Constitution? Well, as I have indicated, I believe that when it comes to

constitutions, the process is everything. Nothing in my experience, Mr. Speaker, tells me that good ends can come from bad means. I am a federalist. I am a democrat, but I believe that Trudeau's resolution is a betrayal of both ideals. Nobody in the national Parliament has a mandate for this measure — nobody. And there will be no referendum on this question. Mr. Trudeau is so in love with referendums that he wants to install this very dubious measure into the Constitution, but there will be no referendum on this measure. It is a referendum to fix the provinces, but not a device to allow for an expression of Canadian people on this important question.

Let me say something about referenda, because I think it is an extremely dangerous proposition to install in a Constitution; I think they violate every principle of parliamentary democracy.

The last great thinker of the Conservative Party, Edmund Burke, in his famous speech to the electors of Bristol, talked about the responsibility of members to exercise their judgment on important questions. That is why they are sent here, not to be robots or voting machines.

Referenda are an abomination on most questions. There is not, I submit, a referendum in recent history, on a constitutional question, from which the results can be accurately judged or finally determined. Everybody will tell you that the "yes" side or the "no" side, I forget which one it was, got 60 per cent of the vote in the Quebec Referendum recently, and the "no" side got how many. But, given the arguments made about "for sovereignty association" and "for re-negotiated federalism", what do the results really mean? Did it mean that 40 per cent, or whatever it was, of the people wanted to separate, and 60 per cent of the people wanted to keep things as they were? I doubt it.

There was a recent referendum in Scotland on a constitutional question; on devolution. The rules of the referendum required, I think, 40 per cent of the electorate to say yes: not 40 per cent of those voting, but 40 per cent of the electorate. The measure passed, but there was such a low turn-out that the consequences did not flow from the result.

The referendum on Britain's joining the EEC was an extremely confusing question. I think that, because parliament copped out on that question in Westminster, and dared to go to referendum, all the parties remained divided on the question. They had not yet resolved the internal questions on membership in the European Economic Community.

I think — and we should be realistic about this — our votes in a referendum will diddley-squat. It will be a measure used to impose it on us. We have as many votes altogether as are contained in many high rise apartment buildings in downtown Toronto, so we should have no illusions about how much impact we will have on most events.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a constitutional deadlock recently, but was unilateral patriation the only way out? I think not. In any case, if a constitution is to be worth anything, surely you should not be able to change at only one level of government. Are the provincial powers meaningless? I mean, have all the notions that I was schooled in about co-operative federalism been abandoned?

Anybody who suggests that unilateral patriation, in the face of opposition from eight provinces and one or two territories, is not an affront to the tradition of co-operative federalism, is dreaming or planning to retire.

Mr. Speaker, I submit we have been shafted on this question. I have been trying in Question Period the last couple of days to solicit from the Government Leader some kind of agreement to my concerns about the mobility clause. He has not yet ventured onto that dangerous ground, but I yet have hope of persuading him of more additional problems for that clause than he has already conceded.

I believe the resolution can work permanent damage on the Yukon community. I fear that the mobility clause alone may make it impossible for any Yukon government to manage the local economy. I will give you one example. For years, and



nothing has changed recently, we have had operating mines in the Yukon economy which, for very good reasons have hired the majority of their work force outside the Territory, yet within an hour's drive of every one of those operating mines was an Indian community with practically, I won't say complete, but a very high level of unemployment.

The fact of the matter is that it is, and always has been, economically cheaper for the companies to hire people from outside than to train local people. In my view, it is an entirely appropriate step, in the case of such disadvantaged people, for a government, such as the Government of Yukon, to take legislative measures to correct that injustice; to stabilize the community, to reinforce the local economy, to encourage the spending here, to train a local work force, to bring them into the economy, eradicate poverty, and all sorts of desirable results. I submit we have not seen the end of it yet, and that this mobility clause may make impossible some reasonable and just measures to deal with problems such I have indicated. Now the comment has been made, by a wide number of political spokesmen I have talked to, that the mobility clause is so incredibly popular across the country that nobody dare argue against it. Well, I dare, Mr. Speaker, and I think the rest of us ought to.

We will know soon when we get some reliable data; but recently we have had figures which indicate that up to a quarter of our work force is unemployed at some time during the winter. It may be that high now, I do not know. I submit that most of those people would prefer some kind of jobs in this community. They would prefer that to a combination of some rights which they may or may not already have, and some economic left-overs, which is basically what people in many of those communities are now getting.

Mr. Speaker, why not have this Charter of Rights ratified by every provincial or territorial legislature in the country, the way the Americans do? If that were done, if that kind of respect and courtesy were shown to some of the legislatures, I submit that the passage, with some amendments, might have a reasonable chance of getting through. In fact I do not doubt that it would be improved, and what would be so bad about that?

Failing that, what we have is incredible, lingering doubt about the legitimacy of the measure. And I go back to my earlier point, Mr. Speaker: you cannot impose rights on people. Rights are something people win for themselves. When they are imposed, they are not rights, but an imposition.

Mr. Speaker, I fear for this resolution. I fear that our colonial status is now fixed, is now frozen. We shall have no voice in our future in Canada, but the Senate, that glorious old representative, old elite, responsible only to a group of dead prime ministers, shall have the last word on everything.

Ottawa will control our resources forever. As Bill C-48 makes clear, Yukon is about to become an industrial park for Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about my Federal party's support for this measure, or at least the majority of the Members of the Federal Caucus' support for this measure. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have had a number of frank and comradely discussions with my Leader about this measure. I should also tell you, Mr. Speaker, that our relationship is perhaps not as warm as it once was, and that is a matter of personal regret to me. It is not particularly, I will say to the Members to the right here, a laughing matter, but if they found it amusing, I guess that is their privilege Mr. Speaker.

My Federal Leader has expressed satisfaction in obtaining from Mr. Trudeau, from the Parliament of Canada, in addition to the resolution adding provincial control of provincial resources, a statement on aboriginal rights and improvements in the Charter of Rights. However, Mr. Speaker, I remain unenthusiastic about those additions, those amendments as they affect Yukon. It is clear while there is maybe a statement of provincial control of provincial resources, we are to continue to have federal control of territorial resources, and therefore, there may not be the kind of economic base to make the kind of

just land claim settlement that I would want to see possible.

Let me confess that one of the things I had high hopes for in the land claims process, was for the Indian people of Yukon to achieve some measure of control over non-renewable resources on their lands, because in the chess game of history, I had expected, had they achieved that, that the prospect of our achieving something similar following the land claims settlement would have been considerably enhanced. For that reason, let me confess now that I was concerned about this Government's apparent opposition to that goal.

We talked about the Charter of Rights. My Federal Leader is very pleased about the changes that have been achieved in that Charter of Rights; however, I remain somewhat despairing concerning what I think is a fundamental right: the right of the people of this community and the Members of this House to have a decisive voice in determining their future in Confederation has been denied us, and apparently it will continue to be denied us.

As I said, I think the Amending Formula makes it clear, and the Government Leader addressed this, that Ontario and Quebec are going to have more say in our future on the decisive questions than shall we. Unfortunately there are many people in Ottawa who are inclined to characterize the non-native population in the North as a group of ignorant red-necks. The people in Ontario are inclined to regard people in the west in Canada as petty-provincials, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario provincialism is the worst conceit of all. I say that because Ontario provincialism masquerades as nationalism. Ontarians perhaps are pleased about this resolution, I think probably because it changes very little for them. For us, I think it may change things a great deal, and it may change them for the worse.

Friends close to the Prime Minister's office — and I will not go as far as to say some of my best friends are Liberal, but one or two of my friends in Ottawa are Liberals — have told me that the Prime Minister's greatest hope was to see minority language rights enshrined. That was the germ of this Charter of Rights; that was the one thing he wanted to enshrine. I consider Ontario's support for this resolution, and consider the fact that French minority language rights in Ontario are not going to be enshrined in this measure. The English minority rights in Quebec are, but not French in Ontario. When there was an agreement of convenience to guarantee Ontario's support for this measure, Ontario was big enough to get what they wanted. Unfortunately, we have been a voice crying in the wilderness.

Mr. Speaker, Yukoners opposed to colonialism, of whatever kind, now have fewer political options open to them. The remaining choices are very hard. In the dying days of the parliamentary debate, let us hope and pray that the Prime Minister can yet be drawn into a dialogue with the provinces and the territories, before it is too late.

I will support this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I move that debate be now adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there a seconder to the motion?

**Mr. Veale:** The Member for Kluane, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane that debate be now adjourned.

**Some Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** I must declare that the motion has not carried.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I speak against this motion. It is interesting that in this country there is a great deal of rhetoric, emotion, and discussion about this Constitutional package, and I might say, as was said by the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa, Mr. Broadbent, that is the way that it has always been in this country, Mr. Speaker. There has never been unanimous agreement on any subject of the Canadian Constitution. I would point out, however, that this particular Act and Constitutional Resolution does have the support of a provincial Conservative Party and the Federal New Democra-

tic Party.

So, the support for the resolution, sir, goes across party lines in this country, and certainly goes across regional lines.

I am surprised that the Territorial Government is so adamant in its opposition to the constitutional package, because the Territorial Government was the first government of this country that went to Ottawa, with general support from this Territory, and asked that aboriginal rights be enshrined in the Constitution. They have achieved that objective, because it has been put in this constitutional package.

They have also achieved the inclusion that they asked for: that the Government Leader be invited to future meetings of First Ministers. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that the *Canada Act* is somehow the end of constitutional development for this Territory is absolute nonsense, because, in fact, constitutional development in this Territory has been proceeding at a good pace for the last few years and there is no indication that that constitutional development has somehow been abruptly brought to an end.

Great concern has been expressed, and particularly by the Government Members, that the constitutional resolution does not allow for future provincial status. That, too, is incorrect, because the section of the Constitution allowing for new provinces remains; and the historical process by which provinces have been admitted to this country is a constitutional process in itself which will take place in future times. There is no suggestion that the door has been shut and there is an end to the matter.

I find it interesting that when the present Conservative Leader came to the Territory, he stated that there would be provincial status in the first term of his government if Yukoners consented; he also added the rider if the provinces consented. So, I have some difficulty in understanding why this Government criticizes the present situation, where unanimous consent of all the provinces for the provincial status of this Territory is not required.

Concern has been stated, Mr. Speaker, about the mobility clause; indeed, it is a misfortune that that clause has not been able to be amended. The Conservative Member of Parliament of this Territory has indicated that it is simply impossible to amend it and meet the requirements of this Territory.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the mobility clause cuts both ways, because while it may cause problems for this Territory, it also gives opportunities for every Canadian to move across this country without any impediments. It is, to some extent, a red herring to be too concerned about the mobility clause, because for every job that a Yukoner in the Territory leaves behind in this Territory to take on a pipeline job, we are, in fact, going to have in-migration as a result of that. So, it cuts both ways, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the major aspect of this proposed constitutional resolution is that of human rights. The code that has been placed in the document is something that all Canadians should be proud of, because it is protection for their rights. As a Canadian, I certainly support that.

I would indicate that the motion, Mr. Speaker, makes some suggestion that any constitutional reform proposal should wait for provincial support. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting, and waiting, and waiting, and it is quite clear that the provinces want to take something at every opportunity they can, and each province has a different demand. So even the provinces themselves, those provinces who are opposed to this constitutional package; those provinces cannot even have a meeting and get together and come up with one significant proposal that they all agree on, and all provinces in this country, that they can put in that constitutional package, on an amending formula, or on anything else; because they do not agree among themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a reference has been made to the land claims negotiations that are presently going on in this Territory. I expect they will continue to go on and be concluded successfully for all people concerned in this Territory. There is

no reason in the world, Mr. Speaker, that the people who sit at that negotiating table with, perhaps, assistance from this Assembly, cannot come to agreements which will be constitutional changes. They will be supported by all three parties that are at the table. Those discussions can continue and we all hope they will be successful.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, this constitutional proposal is something that Canadians can be proud of. It is something that they will argue about, but once it is passed, it will be done and gone. This Territory will continue to grow and have constitutional development, and Canada will be the country that we all want it to be.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Leader of the Opposition, I am impressed by his naivete; I think it is exceeded only by his inability to read the Budget, perhaps.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of meeting with representatives of the Ontario Legislature and of the Alberta Legislature, and I have had the pleasure of chairing this Legislature's Committee on Constitutional Development. It is interesting, if we go back a year and a half or almost two years to the time at which this Legislature set up a committee to deal with the constitutional development of the Yukon Territory.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, this Committee was not set up to investigate and report back to the Legislature on the changes to the Canadian Constitution. We were set up to discuss with all interested parties, including the Council for Yukon Indians, the Yukon Native Brotherhood which was then in effect — with interested parties around the Yukon Territory, to make recommendations as to the development of the constitutional process in the Yukon Territory. This Committee was set up because our Conservative Party agreed that the only way we would reach a consensus in this Territory as to the future development, the future role that Yukon should play, was by having all-party consensus.

It is a consensus not only of the political parties represented in this Legislature, but also a consensus of the native people, the business community, and if necessary, the municipalities in the Territory — because we felt that they played an important role in the constitutional development of Yukon — and the people in Yukon. We felt that they should have the right and the capability to make comments about the information that we came up with.

So, Mr. Speaker, based on the model that we saw for constitutional development in the Yukon Territory, I am amazed that the Government of Canada would reject all of the principles that we held dear: the principles of negotiating, the principles of considering other people's views, the principles of taking our time and coming up with some kind of an all-Party consensus. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has disregarded those principles entirely, and decided to change the Constitution, to patriate the Constitution of Canada unilaterally. They do not have the intestinal fortitude, Mr. Speaker, necessary to patriate the *BNA Act*, and then battle, in Canada, to change that *BNA Act*.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that no Canadians — and this is supported by public opinion polls, Mr. Speaker — those are the numbers that the federal Liberals bow down to twice a day, I do not know if they bow to the east or to the west, but definitely they never do bow to the north — even the public opinion polls agree that no one in Canada, or virtually no one in Canada, disagrees with patriation of the Constitution. It is the Made in Great Britain aspect of this *Canada Act* that we especially disagree with.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot get as emotional or as upset about the mobility clause, and the fact that we will never politically, in my opinion, become a province under this *Canada Act*, because I believe that, even if we did not become a province in name but had all of the powers of a provincial government, then I would not mind being called Yukon Territory, *ad infinitum*. That would not particularly bother me, if we had the powers.

But, Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition seems



not to realize is that Ontario is the one that is going to dictate which powers we will have as a province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was at a federal-provincial conference some time ago, where I heard, verbatim, a Minister of the Crown from Ontario say that it is not Canada that needs the north's resources, but Ontario who needs those resources. Ontario needs the territories because, after all, Ontario is the industrial heartland of the country, and they require those natural resources.

It has often been said that Canada has become a nation of hewers of wood and drawers of water for the rest of the world. Well, Mr. Speaker, Canada's role to the rest of the world will be nothing compared to Yukon's role to Ontario, if this *Canada Act* is passed in its present form.

We will be nothing but a supplier of raw resources to whomever Ontario decides we should supply raw natural resources. Mr. Speaker, they have no interest whatsoever in the political evolution or the economic evolution of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed the Member opposite complained about the one cent a litre, YTG-inspired rise in fuel cost in the Territory. Mr. Speaker, what he did not say is that we at the present time are paying a couple of cents a litre to subsidize fuel costs in Ontario and eastern Canada. Now that is an increase in our fuel costs directly applied by the Federal Government, and is directly applied to support or subsidize fuel costs in the East. He did not say anything about that. It will be interesting to see what the Member opposite says when we get another one or two or possibly three cents a litre increase in our fuel costs to pay for Petrofina. You know, that was that glorious acquisition of the federally controlled PetroCanada. It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker —

**Some Member:** They are not buying it.

**Mr. Graham:** Oh, you do not think they are buying it; they are trying to make a whole pile of Liberals rich back East, and I think they will succeed in doing that. It will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see what economic benefit Yukoners will realize from the acquisition of Petrofina and the continued efforts of PetroCanada in Canada's north.

I think that too many of our economic controls, Mr. Speaker, are currently in the hands of easterners and southern Canadians, and I do not think that is a good thing because unless we can control our own economy, unless we can control the rate of development of our natural resources, it does not matter if we are ever called a province, it does not matter what we are called; we will not have the capability of controlling our own destiny. I think that is what we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker.

I notice the Member opposite again said, we will be invited to First Minister's Conferences, Mr. Speaker; he did not put the rider on that one. The rider was that if the Federal Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, in his wisdom, determines that the issue affects us directly, then and only then we will come at his invitation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust that man about as far as I can throw an elephant — not a great distance.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I think we can live with a few things. We can live with the Mobility Clause. It would cause a great hardship on the Yukon, but I think we can live with that; people here are fairly resourceful. If people in the Territory really want to work on that pipeline, I think we will find some method of employing them. It is interesting to see the Federal Minister of Northern Affairs saying, "We will find a loophole." I guess that is the Liberal answer to everything, "We will find a loophole." I think there are a great number of things that we can do.

But, Mr. Speaker, as long as the economic control of Yukon Territory rests in the hands of the Federal Government, I think we have a great problem. You only have to look at the fact that the Federal Government owes almost a one year's budget as a deficit at the present time. In extending that to the Yukon, if we allow the Federal Liberal Government to continue to manage our economy, the Territorial deficit, in a few years, will probably be about \$100 million. We do not have any deficit right

now, Mr. Speaker, but if we allow the Liberals to control it, it should be \$100 million in a few years. That really scares me.

So I guess, Mr. Speaker, what I am really saying is that it is the economic concerns that would result from the *Canada Act* that really worry me, and having met with many people from Ontario, legislators from Ontario, Federal Cabinet Ministers, I do not have a great deal of faith that those people will show any concern at all for the Yukon Territory. If they are not willing to show any concern, Mr. Speaker, then I think it is up to us to do it, and I think that this Motion is doing that. I will be supporting this motion wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that it is supported almost unanimously, at least with the exception of one Member opposite. I truly hope that every other Member in this House supports the motion.

**Mr. Tracey:** Just by the fact that we are discussing this problem here today, this resolution, that we, as a Government, would like to send to England, just shows that divisiveness that we have in Canada. We have the Federal Government in Ottawa trying to impose one man's belief on every citizen of Canada. It is a unilateral action that he has decided to take in order to put his name down in history books, as, I guess, the second Father of Confederation.

This confederation of the provinces of Canada, Mr. Speaker, was conceived in 1867 by a group of people who sat down and argued out, and hashed out, a way that we could survive in Canada. It has worked very well, Mr. Speaker. It is still working today. I, myself, and I think many other citizens of Canada, are beginning to wonder just what this one man is doing to our country. We have everybody fighting everybody in Canada today. It does not matter what subject you want to pick, the Federal Government has somebody fighting somebody else. We are fighting about energy, we are fighting about the Constitution, we are fighting about referenda, as to whether we should have minority language rights, or you name it, we have it. We have the Leader of the Opposition talking about human rights as a major consideration in this Constitution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is something that we should look very seriously at: human rights. We, as citizens of Canada in the Yukon Territory, also have some rights. We have some rights to have input into what our country is going to be today, tomorrow, and a hundred years from now. We have as much right to have some input into Confederation as any other person in Canada. But that right is being taken away from us. We have Mr. Trudeau and his henchmen imposing on us what we are to have in this Territory, today and tomorrow. We have Bill C-48, which is going to take our resources away from us. We do not have anything left in Confederation, and then we hear Eastern Canada saying, "What is this separatist feeling in the west? Why does the west want to separate?" Well I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Trudeau goes through and imposes this Constitution on Canada, and in particular on western Canada, then he is going to hear a lot more about separatism. I think there will be Members of this Legislature, and I am certain members of this Territory, and members of every western province, who are going to be taking a very serious look at separatism. That is a terrible thing to have to think about: that we would actually consider separating from Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Government has said that in his past, his genealogy, he came from England. I think that most of our genealogy and our history comes from England. I am certain that mine does, but that does not mean that I think England should tell me how I am supposed to live today, and I do not think that Ottawa should tell me how I should live either.

Mr. Penikett, from Whitehorse West, has said that referendums are not a parliamentary form of government. They are not a parliamentary form of government, as he so accurately stated, and they do not really say what the people really want anyway, Mr. Speaker. You can have a referendum on almost anything, and read whatever you want into it, because it is nothing more than another poll. We have a form of government that has worked very well. It has worked in all of the parliamentary forms of government that have come from our

English parliament. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that a lot of people in this Territory, or a lot of the people in Canada, have really stopped to think what this Constitution will do to our parliamentary form of government. If Mr. Trudeau brings in his Constitution, that is the beginning of the end of our form of government. We will see a gradual shift towards a republican form of government, because that is the only things that can operate under this Constitution. We are going to see the powers of parliament eroded and given to the courts. I do not want to see that, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that many other residents of Canada do not want to see that happen, even residents of Ontario, who have the most to gain by this Constitution. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very, very saddened to hear that even one member of this House would stand up and say that he supported Mr. Trudeau in his actions, considering what those actions will do to this Territory.

In a speech to this Legislature the other day, I said that supporting the proposed Constitution would absolutely relegate us to second class citizenry, and that is exactly what it will do, and yet one Member across the floor will stand up and say that second class citizenry is best for us. He is satisfied with that. Mr. Speaker, I find that it is just terrible, in my own mind, to think that one man would stand up and say that we are not as good as the rest of Canada. I am just about speechless on this, because I find it hard to believe.

I would certainly hope, when it comes to the vote here in a minute or two, that that Member would reconsider and vote with the rest of us. We will send the message to England that we want to be first class citizens along with every other citizen in Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the subject before we vote. The Leader of the Opposition has said that we have progressed constitutionally in the last little while. I must tell the Leader of the Opposition that constitutional development had its greatest impetus during the Conservative Government's tenure in office in Ottawa. There is simply no defence for the Liberal Party, and I must say I admire the gall and the fancy footworks of the Opposition Leader in this House in his attempt to do so.

It is almost impossible to be a loyal Yukoner and be loyal to the Liberal Party in Ottawa. I am sure there has been a great deal of agony involved, with those struggling with these conflicting loyalties. I applaud the NDP Member in following his conscience in putting the Yukon before party loyalties, and the fact that the Leader of his party is so misled as to support this one-man crusade in Ottawa.

All Canadians know that we have grown up. All Canadians know that we must patriate the Constitution, but the Prime Minister of Canada, flying in the face of all Canadians, must do it in his way. The only people who agree with him are those who have a vested interest in agreeing with him: "Whose bread I eat, his song I sing." Perhaps the Liberal Party members in the Yukon do not understand that they are sentencing the Yukon to servitude on into infinity, if Mr. Trudeau has his way. I can only believe that they do not realize this, otherwise they would be extremely shortsighted and disloyal Yukoners.

One has only to go, cap in hand, to Ottawa once on behalf of the Yukon's interest, to realize what it is to be a second class citizen; to be told that the Minister of Northern Affairs speaks for us, the Minister of Northern Affairs speaks for Yukoners, and to be told that we cannot speak for the people who elected for us. I was told that once only. It was like a sharp spear in the eye. My reaction was such that I was never told this again, and was recognized as a full Minister from that time on.

I also am a dedicated federalist, but I do fear for the unity of the best country in the world in which to live, if the leader of this country is not opposed in his pathological needs to fulfill his private destiny. As loyal Yukoners, we cannot do otherwise than support this motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the Motion?

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to Government Bills and Orders.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill number 5, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

##### Bill No. 5: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Human Resources, that Bill number 5, *Second Appropriation Ordinance (1981-82)* be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, that Bill number 5 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill number 6, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

##### Bill No. 6: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill number 6, *Loan Agreement Ordinance (1981) Number 1*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill number 6 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill number 7, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

##### Bill No. 7: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill number 7, *Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1981*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill number 7 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill number 8, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

##### Bill No. 8: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse-Porter Creek West, that Bill number 8, *Third Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse-Porter Creek West, that Bill number 8 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill number 10, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

##### Bill No. 10: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill number 10, *Municipal General Purposes Loan Ordinance, 1981*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill number 10 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill number 11, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

##### Bill No. 11: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill number 11, *An Ordinance to Amend the Tobacco Tax Ordinance Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill number 11, *An Ordinance to Amend the Tobacco Tax Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill Number 12, standing in the

name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

**Bill Number 12: Second Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill Number 12, *An Ordinance to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill Number 12 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill Number 13, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

**Bill Number 13: Second Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, that Bill Number 13, *An Ordinance to Amend the Fuel Oil Tax Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, that Bill Number 13 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure?

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Tatchun shall take the Chair in Committee of the Whole.

*Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair*

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could rise on a point of order?

So that we may, during the course of these proceedings, show you proper respect, may we know by what authority you assumed this position?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, you were instructed by the Speaker to assume the Chair as the Chairman of Committees.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will read the section under Chapter Eight of our Standing Orders:

40.(4) "If the Chairman and Deputy Chairman are absent, Mr. Speaker shall, before leaving the Chair upon the Assembly forming the Committee of the Whole, appoint a member to be acting chairman."

**Mr. Penikett:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Congratulations on your new position. May I ask the Government Leader, just on a procedural point, if it is his intention to formalize you in this new elevated status at the earliest opportunity?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about it; it is my intention to elevate him.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I do not know if that is good or bad.

For the record, I would like to welcome, from Haines Junction, Paula Masyk and Deveron Hurlburt, who are serving as the Pages in this House.

*Applause*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Before we get into Bill Number 5, we will have a short break.

*Recess*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will call Committee to order.

This afternoon we will deal with Bill Number 5, Clause 1, and we will call for a general debate.

**Bill No. 5, Second Appropriation Ordinance (1981-82)**

*On Clause 1*

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to put a question to the Government Leader, but he does not seem to be here. I wonder if I could serve notice of my intention to ask a couple of questions about Clause 1 as soon as he gets here.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Mr. Penikett, if you would like to address your questions now?

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, what I will do, rather than doing it under general debate, I will wait until we get to the specific vote, and defer it until then, as long as the Government Leader is still here.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to say a few things about this Budget prior to us getting into the page by page detail of it. There has been a tremendous amount of work and real effort on behalf of the people in the Finance Department to produce the Budget in a different format this year, Mr. Chairman. It is one that we sincerely hope will be easier for all Members of the House, and for the general public, to understand. One that, we think, presupposes some of the basic questions, the questions that are asked by Members at each Session in respect to Budget. We hope we have foreseen some of those questions and they are answerable in the statistics, and so on, that have been put forward.

Just so that everyone does understand exactly what kind of information we are giving in the Budget, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that if everyone look at page 3, at the financial summary for the whole Government in respect to Operation and Maintenance, you will see three headings there, 1981-82 Estimate, 1980-81 Forecast and 1980-81 Estimates. Mr. Chairman, on this page, and throughout the Budget, the 1981-82 Estimates and the numbers below that are the number of dollars that we are going to be considering at this time.

For Members' information, on the first page of each summary, what used to be Vote Summary, we give you the 1980-81 Estimates for the department. Mr. Chairman, this is the amount that was voted and was reflected in the Budget that was tabled in this House last year and passed by the Legislature.

When you get into the detail after the first page of each Vote, you will find that there are no more 1980-81 Estimate figures, but instead, the comparable figure that we use is the 1980-81 forecast. Mr. Chairman, that is the latest available figure that we have for our expenditures for this year. It is our actual expenditures to the end of Period 9, or December 31, 1980. So, they are actual expenditures from April 1, 1980, to December 31, 1980. Then, added to that is our best estimate on what the expenditures will be from January 1, 1981 to March 31, 1981 — until tomorrow.

So, it is felt very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that the latest numbers that we can possibly give to the House are the ones that are going to be of most value to you in respect to what went on last year, or during this current year. So, the Budget is built on that basis.

Just remember that the forecast for 1980-81 is a new figure; it is something that has never been used by this House before; it is the actual for nine months of the year, the last three months' estimate.

With that, I believe it is fairly straightforward and I welcome, Mr. Chairman, the advice and the concerns that I am sure are going to be forthcoming from Members opposite.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, just on the subject of the form of the Estimates, I feel I should say a word or two. It will be some days yet before we have an opportunity to have tabled or even debate the Public Accounts Committee Report, so it would be appropriate for me to comment on the form of the Estimates.

The Government Leader was kind enough to remark in his Budget Speech that the form of the Estimates was, at least in part, as a result of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee.

I want to say that it was a major recommendation of the first Public Accounts Committee Report. I know that all Members

on that Committee were concerned about the amount of Legislature time wasted arguing about whether there should be another skidoo in Carmacks for this and that department, or whether Riverdale needed another social worker or not, and that we were not doing what we ought to be doing in a budget debate, which is talking about the programs, policies and the priorities of the Government.

I think the expressed need of the Committee for better narrative about the departments' operations, some statistical information and reliable figures, is being met in the new format. I think the natural desire for Members to be able to relate the Estimates to the accounts, a very important step for Members in trying to logically make judgments about the spending of the Government has been achieved.

I want to say that I am extremely pleased that the Government Leader, as Minister of Finance, has succeeded in implementing this new format in one year. I want to say that, because I do not think many Members realize what a big step it is. For a number of years the Auditor General of Canada, who is the auditor of this Government, too, has been pressing the Federal Government to do such a revision of its Estimates. In the face of considerable intransigence by Deputy Ministers at the Federal level, the Auditor General had been quite frustrated about their inability to develop what they would call "model projects" for revising the form of the Estimates.

Last year, following the Report of the Public Accounts Committee and the tabling of that Report, the debate of the Report, I had occasion to be in Ottawa, when Mr. Raymond Dubois, Deputy Auditor General, who had done, I think, fine service as an expert witness before the Public Accounts Committee, took me in to see the then Auditor General, Mr. J. J. Macdonell, who expressed some interest in the Committee in Yukon and the Committee's recommendation about the form of the Estimates. It was following that conversation I suggested the Government Leader of Yukon was a man of great common sense, experienced in the public service, a man who understood the needs of both the Legislature and the bureaucracy, and someone who might be well-persuaded to the wisdom of doing a revised form of the Estimates for Yukon, especially if the Auditor General picked up the bill.

In my assessment, on this one occasion, I happened to be reasonably accurate, and there flowed, I gather, a number of conversations, or some communication, between the Auditor General's office and the Head of this Government, to begin a project to revise the form of these Estimates. I must say that I never expected that we would have the entire budget of Yukon revised in this new form in one year with all departments in this new form. I want to say, and this may be one of the only times I do it, that I congratulate the Government Leader and his officials for having achieved this step, and I think it will be a very positive and useful move in facilitating the debates on the spending of this Government.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that the format is indeed an improvement over the one that I looked at last year. I have a question, though, for the Government Leader. It seems to me that it would be of assistance if the 1980-81 estimates were actually included in there as a figure, on the breakdown in each particular objective or expenditure summary by program. The only way now that you can now make that connection is to go to the Supplementary, and determine what the difference was between the — well, I do not know what you can do. You really cannot do it. You really cannot arrive at it, can you?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, this is one of the problems that does arise, this being the first year of this format. A tremendous amount of work has gone into breaking that 1980-81 forecast down into the classifications, or subdivisions, that are shown in this Budget because, of course, they have never been kept this way before. It will be a simple matter next year. But, Mr. Chairman, I seriously question, even next year when we would have all of these numbers, if it is just another row of numbers. At that point in time, when we are dealing with the

new budget, to my way of thinking, they are meaningless; they do not mean anything. The numbers that really do mean something, and I think are far more revealing, are what we actually spent.

Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully put to the Leader of the Opposition that the latest numbers we can possibly get to the House must certainly be the most relevant ones. It is no problem. Each Member can certainly have a copy of the old Budget. But in most cases, it is very difficult to relate, without a tremendous amount of interpolation at this point in time.

**Mr. Byblow:** I agree with the Government Leader that it certainly cannot be done for this present budget, but next year it would be very simple to take the 1981-82 estimates and place them in as a column, so that we can see the difference between the actual forecast and the estimate broken down.

Just with respect to the debate taking place now, as to regarding the inclusion of that additional column of figures reflecting the previous year's estimate, I think the benefit would be mainly to make a judgment on how well the Government estimated its figures, its costs. I agree with the Government Leader that the really relevant one is the current one, but in response to the Leader of the Opposition, its real application would be to make an assessment of how well they estimated previous years' figures, which are available in an old Budget.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I want to assure Members opposite that I am not trying any fast and fancy footwork here. We are accountable for what our Estimates were, and what we voted at the last Session. In the Supplementary Estimates, if there is any deviation from those estimates at all, Mr. Chairman, we have to stand up and be counted in respect to the Supplementary Estimates. So there is no way that Members opposite do not get a chance to make a very very close comparison with what our estimates were, and what we have actually spent. That exercise is still sacrosanct, and will still be followed; there are no two ways about that.

**Mr. Byblow:** I was not for a minute suggesting that the Government Leader was trying to pull a fast one. I was just commenting on what the row of figures would provide in a comprehensive picture of the entire Budget. Just in response to the previous speaker's comments regarding the pressure from the PAC in the form of the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I think that in addition to the very useful function that Committee served in promoting this, upon which the Government capitalized and prepared and presented the Estimates in the form that they are, it should be noted that from the first day of debate on the Budget, in this present House, a couple of years ago, there was the constant questioning regarding a way to get more information into the Budget. Certainly, in the first fumbling year that we had two years ago, that was the predominant question repeating itself, and I am very pleased to see, in this short course of time, that the Government has come through with this form of the Estimates.

I wonder if the Government Leader could respond, as to what degree this form of presenting the Estimates was an imposition on his department? Is there any estimate of the amount of additional time? I recognize that he cannot put a finger to it, but is it going to be, in the long run, two or three years down the road, easier now?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt about it. It is going to be easier next year. It constituted a major block of time for, I would guess, four people in the Department of Finance, for a considerable length of time during the course of this year.

In addition to that, the Auditor General's Department literally seconded two, and sometimes three, people to the Yukon, for as much as a month at a time, during the course of working this thing up. We would not have been able to do it without the help of the Auditor General's Department. There are no two ways about that. I think that they set aside some \$40,000 in their own Federal funds for this exercise.

But, from my point of view, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to believe that it is from a political point of view, very much a

political point of view, I am very much taken by this format. I think it is a good format for us to work with, and I think that probably, if I was a Deputy Minister in this Government, I would feel the same way, that I think this is a good solid way to present a Budget to the Legislature, in that what we are dealing with is programs, really. We are no longer dealing with the number of telephone calls that somebody in this Government might make. We are now dealing with programs, and the whole Budget is set up and predicated on that factor. We do not even have votes anymore, we are not referring to them as votes. It is all programmed budgeting.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Any further debate.

*Clause 1 agreed to*

*On Schedule A*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, if I might suggest once again, I just said that, in general debate, that we were going to be dealing with programs. Now, Mr. Chairman, the way that the Budget is set up, the cover page of each department has the complete over view of it. On the next page, you will see an expenditure summary by program. The actual amount that we are looking for to be voted is the amount in the blocked-off column, 1981-81 Estimates, Opposite that page, in each department, you will find a bit of an organizational chart showing the relationship between the organization that is in place and the programs that are reflected in the Budget.

On the Organization Chart we have shown the number of person-years that are directly allocated to each of these various programs, and also the number of dollars, in that case.

Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that what we do in dealing with the various programs is to go to the program pages which, in this case, the Yukon Legislative Assembly, actually start on page 12. So, in this department we would be dealing with the amount of money reflected on page 12, on page 13, and on page 14. Those are the programs. Then, on page 15, there is a page outlining Expenditure Summary by Standard Objects. Now this is just some additional information that we thought would be of interest to the Members. This money, by the way, by the time we get to this page, all things being equal, will be voted, so what this is really, is a recap page, showing how this money is spent, just a little bit different way, other than programs, than showing it by standard objects of expenditure.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Mr. Pearson, this page then gives us the total expenditure of each program, and it is open for general debate now. When it goes to each program, then the Members can switch over the pages to the programs.

**Mr. Penikett:** We all love the Legislative Assembly dearly. We are very fond of all the staff. The assistance we receive, and the services, the typing, clerking, intellectual advice, procedural advice, coffee, is a tribute to the educations, and parentage, of the staff.

However, last year this Legislature took a fairly strong position on the question of Members' privileges. One of the privileges which has asserted for itself is the right of private communication between a Member and his constituents. Such communication, I would mention, Mr. Chairman, as I am sure you would agree, is absolutely impossible in our quarters. All of us have talked about the delightful experience of interviewing a constituent with a mortal problem, while listening to the Member for Mayo chatting to one of his girlfriends on the phone in the next cubicle, or, as we heard this morning, the Member for Hootalinqua entertaining a Christian gentleman with a very loud voice.

Those of us who did not wish to listen to the conversation really had no choice, and found it, I am sure, affecting our ability to function. I do not want to be too frivolous about the question of privilege, but Members have raised the issue before, and the Government Leader has agreed that the working conditions of ordinary Members — not the minor deities in the Cabinet offices, but the ordinary M.L.A.'s — are really quite atrocious.

I would like to ask him if there are any plans to improve this,

not only for the five opposition Members, but for the six Government backbenchers who often have to labour under the same impediment.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Honourable Member that I do not care whether it is five or six or even two backbenchers, they are much more voiciferous about this, and insistent about it, than the Members opposite have been.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the House that I recognize the concern, and the inadequacy of what we now have. I regret that it has taken so long, but I did honestly think that I had a solution. I talked it over with the then Leader of the Opposition, who, of course, was the other Member of the Member Services Board at that time. We thought that maybe we had a workable solution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been proven that that is not workable, at first blush. I have not abandoned that possibility yet, because it seems to make some sense, but I think all I can say is that we do not have the answer yet. I would like to assure the Members opposite that expense will not be a stumbling block. If we can find the answer we will act on it immediately, and come to the Legislature because, after all, what I would do is seek the approbation of the Member Services Board, and then come to the Legislature at an appropriate time with Supplementary Estimates, if, in fact, we have to incur any costs.

Mr. Chairman, it is a difficult situation. It is not quite as easy as just putting up offices. That would be fairly simple. We run into architectural problems in this building by doing that, in that particular area, or we think we do, in some areas.

It is being looked at, it is a high priority item, and one, hopefully, that I do not have to apologise for ever again to this House.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to the Government Leader that the quarters that he showed us round last year were quite adequate, and the Deputy Minister, who is still in my office in that area, has been advised of the furnishing changes that I plan to make. But, on a serious note, failing that, I feel that under the present circumstances I would be more comfortably quartered where I am sharing a room with the Sergeant-at-Arms. It is a very nice room, and it is private. The door closes. Or perhaps, I was thinking perhaps of moving in with Mr. Speaker, because he has a little bit more spare room in his office than we have in our entire area.

Not to be frivolous, Mr. Chairman, I do hope something is done, and I hope something is done soon, because I think all Members are experiencing the reality of an increasing workload, an increasing number of constituents coming to see them in this building and, frankly, apart from the human problem of trying to have private communications, I think it really is embarrassing for some people to come and talk to Members and to not know really who is listening. If they look at the architecture at all, they will be very well aware that anybody in the room who cares to hear, can do so.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to lend my voice to this request, because I was quite shocked by the set-up as it is now, in terms of confidentiality with people you speak to on the telephone or whether or not they are there in person. It is amazing. It is almost difficult to get any work done in that sort of atmosphere, with people moving around. I would be interested in hearing what the original proposal was. I was not privy to that and I would be interested if the Government Leader could just discuss that proposal and why it is not possible to implement that.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, the problem has been one that has been foisted, if you wish, upon me as Government Leader. It is one I have undertaken to resolve.

Mr. Chairman, I would not be furthering the cause of any Member of this House if I started bringing all of my various thoughts to the floor for public airing. Any solution, Mr. Chairman, is going to mean a dislocation of people presently housed in this building. There are feelings involved. I would respectfully request from the Leader of the Opposition that he allow

me the discretion of possibly showing this to him privately, rather than on the floor of the House and accept my undertakings that I have not forgotten about this, and am actively working at trying to find a solution.

**Mr. Byblow:** I wonder if one of those thoughts surrounding the Government Leader's solution to the problem could have been, or might have been, relocation in the Credit Union Building. But nevertheless, I would like to add my sentiments to the concerns being expressed. We are repeating a concern of the year previous and the year previous to that, and I certainly can sympathize with the Government Leader, in that he is unable to find in this huge complex a location for some 12 or 13 members who would like some degree of privacy.

I think it would be noteworthy to mention that there has been some effort in the Assembly Office to permit some degree of privacy, by being told which drawer to go into and remove that particular phone and go into the Committee Room and plug it into the wall. You have your private communication, but that does not solve the day to day problem of meeting with your constituents, and exercising that degree of privacy that they expect when they talk to their Member.

Certainly I imagine we will be pressuring the Government Leader to come up with some solution, some alternative to enhance that obligation we do have in our elected responsibility.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, speaking specifically on this, the 11.4 per cent increase in the Legislative Assembly, the major increase in the expenditures of the Department, actually, are in fact an increase in the rent that we pay for this space that you people are not satisfied with. It is somewhat of an injustice, but it is a fact. Rent in this building has increased, and the rent paid by our Clerk on behalf of the Legislative Assembly is reflected in this Budget.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Any further general debate?

We will go to the Yukon Legislative Assembly Program, but I think, considering the time, we will adjourn until 7:30 p.m. and start on the Legislative Assembly Program when we return.

*Recess*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** We are dealing with the Yukon Legislative Assembly, and we will go to the program, Yukon Legislative Assembly on page 12.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, the increases reflected in this program which covers the Assembly, the Committees, and the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, amount to 9.1 percent for the year, or over our 1980-81 forecasts. About \$53,000, \$53,500 dollars, \$28.4 thousand of which is salaries. That is found, Mr. Chairman, under the allotments down at the bottom, "Personnel" and "Other". So the salary increases alone are \$28.4 thousand. The other \$25,000, Mr. Chairman, is reflected in an increase of \$9,000 for research staff for all back benchers in the House, and what amounts to a difference of about five dollars per day per sitting Member for the per diems that have been increased in the normal cost of living rising. Those are the increases that we can foresee in the program during the course of this forthcoming year.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Legislative Assembly clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare Legislative Assembly Program cleared.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The next one, Mr. Chairman, is Clerk of the Assembly.

Again Mr. Chairman, the personnel increase of \$32,000, is in fact the increase in the personnel costs, the salary costs of the staff of the Clerk's Office. The other cost of about \$10,000 in increase, is attributable just about in its entirety to the rent increase that we, as a Legislature, are charged, in the normal course of events in this Government.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Clerk of the Assembly clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare Clerk of the Assembly cleared.

Shall Elections clear?

**Mr. Veale:** What are the expenses for the Elections Board?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, you will see that there is a reduction. What happened is we were voting, in years gone by, \$5,500 a year, for the costs of the Election Board. These are indemnities paid to the Board: a Board established by this House that administers elections, it has specific work that it must do each year and has, of course, more work when and if by-elections and general elections are called.

We have also been including in the Elections Board allocation about \$3,000 in contract money to deal with elections. We have cut that out. We anticipate showing, under Elections Administration in forthcoming years, a sum of money, at least in order to keep that line item open each year. We had quite a bit of confusion with the Government of Canada, with respect to how these elections were going to be paid for and who was going to pay for them. In order to make certain points that we wanted to make, we felt that we had to take the Elections Administration completely out of our Budget, to establish a fact with the Federal Government as to who paid for them.

We had now have that resolved. We have got election expenses built into our base with the Federal Government. It is no longer a problem, and we can now come up front with it.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Government Leader could just explain the fact that there is no allocation for Elections Administration in 1981-82, and \$25,000 for the previous year? What does that relate to?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The \$25,000 related to the last general election.

We are taking about 1980-81, I am sorry. The \$25,000, Mr. Chairman, is what it cost the taxpayers of the Yukon Territory to get the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Riverdale South into his seat in this Legislature; it is the cost of running that by-election.

It is normal, Mr. Chairman, that all that we show under Election Administration in any given year is enough to keep the line item open, \$100 or \$1,000, whatever the number is that we choose. If there are by-elections or general elections, it is reflected in Supplementary Estimates, as this amount will be. That will be reflected in the Supplementary Estimate.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Elections clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Byblow:** Before we clear the entire Vote, we had the summary expenditure by Standard Object, under Personnel. I have a query under that, in reference to page 15, under Professional and Special Services, what the \$83,000 allocation in there is. Could we have a kind of break-down of that?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. It will take me a half a minute to locate it.

Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, is it going to be the Opposition's wish that we indicate something like this in every Vote? If it is, we can get ourselves ready for it. It is going to be very time-consuming, but we can do that.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, the Government Leader would appear to be raising a point of order. What I would suggest would that be the most expeditious way to proceed would be that on each Vote, or each department, as it is now called, if we could flag or indicate or give notice of any detailed questions that we may have; so that, before the Vote is finally cleared, the information can be brought back. I think there is probably quite enough paper flying around already, so we do not need to anticipate every one of these questions and bring stacks of paper, but as long as we can have the agreeable process that operated before, where we give notice of these things and, if necessary, the information can be brought back. I am sure that would be acceptable to this side.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, that is just fine. I do not have any trouble with that at all. I might advise Committee, with respect to Professional and Special Services in the Yukon Legislative Assembly Budget, that there is \$45,000 set out for the research assistance to the Members. That is \$45,000 of that \$83,700. There is an additional \$11,500 for legal services for the Statutory Instruments Committee which amounts to \$6,000;



another \$5,000 for other committees which we anticipate might need legal services during the course of the year; \$500 for hospitality services for various committees of the House; and \$4,600 under the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, professional and special services for various things: hosting dignitaries, delegations, and this type of thing.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Elections clear?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Yukon Legislative Assembly carry?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare Yukon Legislative Assembly carried.

We will now turn to page 18, Executive Council Office for \$820,800. We will now have general debate.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, this Budget covers the actual salaries of the Members of the Front Bench. This is separate and apart from their indemnities and expenses that they receive as MLAs. It also covers the salaries and staff for the office of the secretary to the Executive Council: the Deputy Minister, who is Mrs. Adams. It provides quite a wide range of services in this Government, but primarily to the Executive Council, and the people who work directly with the Executive Council.

**Mr. Penikett:** Could I ask the Government Leader whether this item also includes the expenditure for his special assistant, and if it does, because that position is the first of its kind, I think, in this Government, under our Budget anyway, I have a number of questions I wanted to ask at this point.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that position is covered, along with a number of others. Yes, that particular position is one that was discussed in detail in the last section.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, now that we have had some experience with the position, and recognizing that creation of such positions in some ways establishes precedents for this House and this Government and perhaps subsequent governments, and speaking as one who once held a position as a political aide, I just wanted to find out from the Government Leader a number of things so we can understand about how such positions may be filled in the future.

The first question is: how was the job description prepared and who prepared it? Was the Public Service Commission, for example, involved in the development of the job description?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Public Service Commission was involved, primarily because it was instinct for me to go to the Public Service Commission for assistance. I prepared the job description. I had, in my mind, a fairly firm idea of what I was looking for. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I did without one at least for a year and a half, and there was some suggestion that I should have had one much earlier. I wanted to really determine the need and try to set out the parameters for this kind of assistance, because I recognized it as being a new position in this Government; one that I think is very important.

I should tell the House now that I am giving serious consideration to the desirability of hiring more people at that level in the very very near future. I think it has become a necessity, in order to make sure that the work that is having to be done by the people with Cabinet responsibilities, is in fact getting done.

**Mr. Penikett:** Hmmmm, I cannot say that I am terribly excited about that bit of news. Let me ask the Government Leader: was there a competition to fill this position? In other words, were there ads placed, applications invited, and some brief description of the job contained in any published competition?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Chairman, there was no competition. I may also point out that this job is not a job under the Public Service. Although he is paid by the Public Service, the job is a contract job. We have a number of them: my own secretary is hired under a similar set of terms and conditions, again prepared by the Public Service. To all intents and purposes, they are public servants. Mr. Chairman, there was not a

competition for her job, I might add. I hired her without competition, as I felt was my right and my duty to do so. The same went with Mr. Morrison.

**Mr. Penikett:** Might I then ask, given that there was not a competition in any public statement, if you like, could the Government Leader give us a very brief outline, since, again, this is the first of these positions, of the duties of the incumbent, as he sees them?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Certainly, I can give a brief outline. Mr. Chairman, I expect Mr. Morrison to do whatever it is I perceive must be done. He is, for instance, at this moment, on his way to Ottawa to assist Mr. Lang in the work that is being done down there. Mr. Morrison has never been my personal Executive Assistant. He was hired as an assistant to all of the Members of Cabinet, and is used by all of the Members of Cabinet; far more by me than by anyone else, but, again, that is, of course, of necessity.

His general job description is one where he is involved. He assists me, in particular, with respect to my administrative duties in this Government. He answers a lot of the correspondence that I get; he deals with an awful lot of people on my behalf, on a personal basis; both inside and outside of the Government. I might add. He deals with the departments for which I have administrative responsibility on my behalf.

In the case of Mr. Morrison it was fairly easy, because he had worked for me administratively prior, so I did not have too much of a problem that way.

**Mr. Penikett:** I do not know if it was a slip of the tongue; the Government Leader seemed to indicate that since the position was filled, Mr. Morrison has gone from being a Special Assistant to an Executive Assistant.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, he is a Special Assistant.

**Mr. Penikett:** Oh, the Government Leader just used the words "executive assistant". It is an interesting debate.

Could I ask the Government Leader to briefly state, since he will understand the sensitivity of the issue as we are facing it for the first time, of this situation of a political aide, other than those researchers who work for us in Government and in Opposition, who is not hired by a competition or by the Public Service Commission, but based on a personal choice of the Government Leader, what the person's qualifications were for the position as he has described it?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that probably it is, to a very large extent, a matter of taste, and probably very much a personal feelings matter between the person doing the hiring and the person being hired.

As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, in the case of Mr. Morrison, it was fairly easy because he had been in a senior administrative position in this Government at one time, working for me. I knew him very well, I knew what his capabilities were. I felt that I was very fortunate that he was prepared to come to work. I was fairly certain that he could do a good job for this Government, not only for the Government but for the Cabinet as well.

In respect to qualifications, it is very difficult to lay them down. It is most extraordinary. It would be very hard, I would think, to lay down specific qualifications for that kind of a job. It is more of a personality thing, I would suggest.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, I hope the Government Leader will not feel that I am belabouring this point, but it is important because I think these kind of questions are exactly the ones that the House may wish to ask and properly should ask, about any such appointment in the future, given the normal kinds of checks and balances in the Public Service Commission, and the operation of the merit principle, and the fact that these people are paid by Government funds. I have no doubt that we will be asking questions as we move into an election year, if we see a large number of these people coming into the Government Leader's employ, especially if some of them happen to be known to us personally in their previous incarnations.

I am very interested in - given the Special Assistant's duties as described by the Government Leader - that person's responsibilities or authority. What authority does the person enjoy to



direct members of the public service or employees in the public service of this Government; and exactly what decision-making power does this person enjoy? Or is any power that they enjoy in this regard simply that which may be delegated from day to day by the Government Leader?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I think we can be very clear on this: they have no authority whatever, unless whatever they are saying is questioned. If, for example, Mr. Morrison says he is speaking on my behalf and someone doubts it, they have every right in the world to phone in and ask whether he is speaking on my behalf. He has no authority in this Government per se. He does not have the authority of a Deputy Minister, for instance, or even of a Chief Administration Officer.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, forgive me for pursuing this point, but it is an important one. During the time I was an Executive Assistant, I had fairly extensive authority over the staff of my employer. I was delegated that authority quite clearly by him, and it was laid down in the job description. I had other decision-making responsibilities, too. I want to ask, in connection with the Special Assistant, what decision-making powers he may have. It may seem that the Government Leader has answered the question, but let me suggest that there may be an area which he has not covered yet.

Let me take as an example. Say there was a visiting dignitary, the Premier of British Columbia, came to town; there was a dinner to be arranged; and the Government Leader did not want to be bothered with that type of thing, so he delegated the responsibility to his aide. The dinner is organized; the Premier comes, and you get a social gaffe committed by the person who arranged the dinner, in that only Government MLAs are invited to the dinner as opposed to the Opposition MLAs. Just to use a highly hypothetical situation like that, who would be responsible for such a decision?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** To start with, Mr. Chairman, in our unique set up here, it would not be my Special Assistant, or our collective special assistant, who would set up this dinner. It in fact would be Mrs. Adams and her staff. That is the very kind of thing that they are paid very handsomely to do. Hopefully such a gaffe would not occur, if she were setting it up.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, I just feel in passing, obliged to say that I apologize on behalf of all those people who are making slanderous remarks in connection with a certain hypothetical dinner that might have taken place a few weeks ago.

**Some Member:** Come on, be specific.

**Mr. Penikett:** I cannot be specific about the dinner, Mr. Chairman. I was not there. Let me ask, coming to the most important point: when I was a political aide, I was hired with one very important understanding in connection with my salary, and that was the principle that my salary should never exceed the salary of any of the political people whom I worked with. My salary, for example, would never exceed any of the Members of the Caucus or any of the MPs with whom I had to work. It is a very important principle to make sure that no appointed person, especially a person appointed without having gone through the process of Public Service Commission competition, should ever be paid more than the elected people with whom they work, for fear that some of the elected people might begin to perceive that person as having greater authority or greater power or responsibility than they. Of course, no democratic government would want such dissension to develop in its caucus, or in opposition caucus. For that reason, it has always been the universal rule that such an appointee would earn at least one dollar less than any of the elected people.

Could I have the Government Leader's assurance that that is the case, in connection with this person?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see that the Honourable Member is still so concerned about our Caucus, and what might be happening in our Caucus and so on.

No, I cannot possibly give him that assurance. To start with, I have hired Mr. Morrison on the same terms and conditions as

I ask each Member to come into this Cabinet. I expect them to work for me 24 hours a day, if that is what is necessary. Mr. Chairman, I expect to have to pay them for that.

Now, it is a fact of life that, at its own choosing, this Legislature pays itself as part-time Members. I cannot justify that or criticize that, Mr. Chairman. That is a decision that was made by this Legislature, but there is no way that the public service should be asked, or anybody working for this Government, should be asked to suffer as a result of that decision.

**Mr. Penikett:** Might I ask then, since we are dealing with a political appointee who is not subject to the privileges of tenure in the Public Service Commission, what is the salary of the Special Assistant to the Cabinet of the Government of Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised. I did not know when he was going to get around to asking the question. I have been wracking my brain.

His employment contract, needless to say, terminates tomorrow, like all employment contracts in YTG terminate tomorrow. Mr. Chairman, the mid-management group got an increase that amounted to approximately ten per cent, and if I have not done it yet — and I honestly cannot recall whether I have officially done it or not — it is my intention to offer Mr. Morrison the same ten per cent increase that the rest of the staff got, or is getting on April 1.

I believe his salary, at the present time, Mr. Chairman, including all of the fringe benefits that employees get that he is not getting, for instance, pension, this type of thing, is \$36,000. If he gets another ten percent, that is \$3,600 more. So, he is getting up to about the \$40,000 range.

**Mr. Penikett:** We finally know what a special assistant is worth: at least twice what an MLA is worth.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have found out more than I wanted to know on that question. Let me ask the Government Leader, before we leave this item, if he could be just a little bit more specific about his plans, in terms of additional staff. Does he contemplate, in the year for which we are considering the Estimates, adding aides or executive assistants or special assistants to the offices of each of the Cabinet Ministers, or exactly what is he contemplating?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, on the same basis as we hire secretaries, at the moment; if we feel that we need another person, we will be hiring another person. There has never been any suggestion, Mr. Chairman, by any Member of this Cabinet that each one of us should have an "executive assistant". That concept has not been one that has even been contemplated, but I do perceive — and it may well happen in the next few months, I just do not know — a possible requirement for another person of the same calibre and talent as Mr. Morrison, to work with the Cabinet Members.

**Mr. Veale:** Is the Government Leader indicating that there is going to be one more person hired, or are there possibly two or three more people being hired, because I understand there are three person-years that are available that are going to be taken up, that were not taken up last year?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Chairman, there is no reflection of that possibility in this Budget at all, none whatever.

Mr. Chairman, at the very outside, I thought I made it clear that unless something really extraordinary happened, we would be looking at one person, maximum.

**Mr. Veale:** Page 20, if the Government Leader would refer to it, indicates that the person-years total for the 1980-81 forecast was 10.5, and the 1981-82 Estimates are 13.5. What does that reflect in the three person-years increase?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Perhaps we should wait until we get to these programs, and then you could raise that at that time. We are in general debate right now.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I can say now, without any hesitation, that those positions reflected there are the Internal Auditor staff that has to be increased. The reasons for these increases are detailed in the narrative.

**Mr. Veale:** Coming back to the second Special Assistant, will that also be a \$40,000 a year salary?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I have no way of knowing. I cannot possibly say at this time. We are dealing with people on the open market, Mr. Chairman, and if we find somebody whom we want to hire, I guess we negotiate. That is what it is all about. It might even be a lawyer.

**Mr. Veale:** Just as a matter of a general question - I suppose it may come under the Standard Objects, Mr. Chairman - but I would appreciate an explanation of the increase in Transportation and Communication by the Executive Council, and what that applies to.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, as you know, with respect to my travel, there is \$11,400. With respect to my telephone, there is \$4,100. With respect to another Cabinet Minister - and it could be any one, Mr. Chairman, as these numbers will be for the next three Cabinet Ministers - travel inside and outside the Territory, \$3,400; telephone charges, \$1,700; and that is there for three more Ministers, Mr. Chairman.

Relocation of Government employees, \$1,200. This is now the anticipated cost of new employees in the department.

**Mr. Veale:** Is that the internal audit to which you are referring?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Well, Mr. Veale, there are, in this department, 17 employees in total.

There is \$1,200 for relocation; there is \$200 for freight and express; \$5,000 for telephone; \$3,000 for promotional items such as pins, gifts for visiting dignitaries, this type of thing; rent is something else again; there is \$7,000 for Cabinet tours in the Territory; there is \$500 for advertising with the print media. There are a number of items, Mr. Chairman, that make up that particular item in the Standard Objects.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that the increase is one that we have looked at very very carefully. Throughout this Budget, the one thing that we have concentrated on, and probably even to a fault with respect to some departments, is transportation and communication costs. We have impressed upon departments that we felt that there was just too much money being spent by everyone on Government travel. We have asked all of the departments to cut back wherever they can. They are asked to specifically identify conferences, studies, and so on and so forth that they anticipate travelling to during the year. We have arbitrarily cut them back to what I consider to be the bare minimum.

**Mr. Penikett:** On that subject of travel, I would like to give the Government Leader notice of a question which concerns the Budget, about which he may be able to provide some information.

We have again, to my regret, an item in this Budget for a contribution to the Canada West Foundation. I was pleased to hear some months ago the Member for Porter Creek West announcing that he was not going to vote for this, following his return from a conference in Banff to which he led a small army of Yukoners. My question concerns the number of those people in that army whose way was paid by this Government. The Government Leader will not have that answer now —

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Penikett:** Well, there was more than one employee of this Government who went, at least more than one person who benefits from this Government who went.

Then, if the Government Leader knows the answer, he can get back to me, because it leads me to the question of the item again. I always used to enjoy listening to the former Leader of the Opposition attacking this item, since the money, it seems to me, was being used to — at least in part — lubricate one national Liberal Leadership campaign. I do not remember the gentleman's name, but the past president has now moved on to a new job — Stan Roberts, that is right — as President of the Chamber of Commerce of Canada, which, I gather, is part of the fluid path he hopes to flow.

I have never been happy with this item, but I notice that in the last year we also contributed to the National Native Center and the Diefenbaker Center. I remember discussing this item with Mr. Blakeney, and asking him why he continued to contribute

to this infamous organization; his excuse was, well, they in fact contributed to about 47 little organizations all around the country. It was not a very good excuse, but I subsequently heard from him — and it is too bad I did not bring the letters in tonight — expressing considerable concern about some of the things that were being said and done by that organization, indicating to me that these statements by Mr. Roberts at least, which were being spoken on behalf of westerners or western Premiers on some issues; that was not in fact the case, in fact some of the documents and publications of any organization were doing nothing more than speaking for themselves.

However, I asked the Government Leader to take notice of a question, and he may be able to answer it now. I would be interested yet again to hear his defence of this contribution to this very dubious organization, which has I believe obviously not done much useful work, otherwise we would not have the constitutional mess we are now in. If it were at all successful according to its stated aims, we would not have the problem in which we now find ourselves.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, there were two people that this Government paid to go to this conference. One was the Minister of Justice and this House's Chairman of the Constitutional Committee. Along with him went Mr. Almstrom, who is on retainer with this Government with respect to legislative drafting and this kind of thing.

The other people from Yukon, and I can think of three off-hand who were there, were there at the cost of the organization, at least to some extent their costs were offset by the organization, as a result of this \$2,500 that is here. Now, I agree with what Mr. Graham had to say when he returned from the Canada West Foundation; however, I would like to see this Government continue, at least for another year, to contribute this \$2,500, because, Mr. Chairman, I still believe that this is money pretty well spent, in that if this buys us representation in that organization, I think it is a good thing to have. It is the only western Canada representation that we do have. Regrettably, and the Foundation has said since, regrettably, they have ignored the North, but, Mr. Chairman, when you see what kind of participation they get from the four western provinces as opposed to the \$2,500 that we send them each year, you would well understand why they do have a tendency to ignore us.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that they will not continue to ignore us. I honestly think that it is - not because I agree with their philosophy or disagree with it - a forum; it is a platform that is well worth \$2,500 for us, to make sure that we do have an "in" to that platform.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, I think we could buy better representation by buying \$2,500-worth of shares in the Saskatchewan Roughriders.

Mr. Chairman, I would move that Mr. D. Graham be heard on this question.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, that is a challenge that I cannot resist. Mr. Chairman, I made my comments perfectly clear when I returned from Banff. I see no reason to back down from those statements now. I consider the Canada West Foundation an organization which provides a haven for defeated Liberal Candidates in the west, led by a second-rate professor from a third-rate college in Alberta; they have totally ignored the Territory in all of their proceedings to date, and I do not expect that will change a great deal in the future. It might; I hope it does, if for no other reason than that we have given them \$2,500, and I would not like to see the whole thing wasted.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Is there any further general debate?

We will then go on to Executive Council Office for \$589,300. Shall that program clear?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare that program cleared.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Office of the Commissioner for \$96,200.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, as all Members are aware and very pleased, I am sure, there has been a new

Commissioner appointed. The previous budget, of course, the 1980-81 forecast, reflects the lack of a Commissioner for a long period of time. We are certainly pleased that there is a Commissioner appointed again, and we want to exhibit our responsibility as a Government, and would very much like to treat him in a manner in which we feel a quasi-Lieutenant Governor should be treated: hence the \$96,200.

**Mr. Penikett:** And a very nice Commissioner he is too, Mr. Chairman, and the Queen should be very pleased with the representative from the Territory.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Office of the Commissioner clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** We will then move on to Internal Audit for \$135,100. Shall Internal Audit clear?

**Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare Internal Audit cleared. Public Inquiries for \$100. Shall that program clear?

**Mr. Byblow:** Mr. Chairman, I have a question about that. Public Inquiries and Plebiscites each have a dollar. Will that Government Leader confirm that that is simply a pro forma statement, and that there are no plans of this Government to have either a public inquiry or a plebiscite this year?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is one of those pro forma things that goes on and on and on. It is deemed advisable that we in fact vote the \$100 to keep the line item open, on the off chance that there is some reason to have either a public inquiry or a plebiscite during the course of the Budget year.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Public Inquiries clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** We will now move on to Plebiscites for \$100; shall Plebiscites clear?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Are there any questions on the supplementary information?

**Mr. Veale:** I am sorry that I could not have given notice, Mr. Chairman, to the Government Leader, but could he give a break down of the professional and special services that the Executive Council Office requires?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, in professional and special services, there is \$5,000 for hospitality lunches, small dinners, this type of thing for Members of Cabinet, that may or may not be spent depending upon the requirement. I know that all of that has not been spent during the course of this year. It is necessary sometimes that we must host lunches, small dinners of this kind, so that is why this money is there.

There is some \$36,000 for contractual management services: specifically in the field of legal advice to the Cabinet, to Members of the Cabinet, and to the Executive Council Office with respect to various legal things that we get involved in, that we do not have the in-house competence for. An awful lot of this is funds that are spent outside of the Territory, just because the people whom we were contracting with for the specific items do not happen to live here.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** While Mr. Pearson is looking, perhaps I could say that it might make it easier to go through the Budget, if you are going to ask these questions, if you give notice during the general debate, and then when we get to the department, he could have the information available.

**Mr. Veale:** I am not sure that giving him notice during the general debate is going to clear it up any faster. It seems to me that he has to look through these documents, and I do not know how to speed that up, quite frankly. Giving him five minutes notice in the general debate is not going to solve this kind of problem.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, the courtesy that has been observed in the past, and one that has enabled us to get the information, has been to give notice, not necessarily at the beginning of the general debate on that particular vote, but to give notice at the beginning at the general debate on Clause 1 of the bill. The fact of the matter is that all of us, by now, have been through the Budget, and have identified the items which

are of concern to us; those things about which we wish particular and detailed information, it seems to me, now, or very soon, we should be able to give notice of the questions we have to the Ministers responsible. I have done that in the case of the Minister of Municipal Affairs on previous occasions, all the previous Ministers of Municipal Affairs, and I have done that to the Government Leader. Where we have particular concerns, I think it is not that hard to do, and we can do it for the record in the House, so that the hundreds of people who read *Hansard* the next day can take note accordingly, and find the information and get it to their Minister so the Minister can provide it to the House.

**Mr. Veale:** I might say that I think it is quite clear that the Expenditure Summary by Standard Object is going to be an area where we are going to want a breakdown on most things. I cannot see any reason why there would not be a breakdown, on each one of those, at the fingertips of every Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, if we are going to do that, then we should revert to the old system of budgeting, because that is what you had before. If that is what it is going to take, we might as well go back to the old system.

**Mr. Penikett:** Mr. Chairman, let me state my personal view, and if I am in a minority on this question, so be it. The purpose of a Legislature is to vote program funds for the Government. It is not for the purpose of the Legislature to get into picayune debates about the way particular funds may have been administered. After the money is spent the Public Accounts Committee properly reviews the individual expenditures.

It is not, in any legislature anywhere in the British tradition, deemed an appropriate use of a Legislature's time to get into a great deal of debate on an expenditure, except a new one that you may want to cover in some detail and you may want to get a lot of information about. It does not seem to me to be a terribly useful process to do what we have done in previous years: to answer the Government Leader's question, which is to ask about this skidoo and that truck and that lawyer and this accountant. It seems to be a waste of time to have 15 or 16 people sitting in this House listening to that.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, regarding the breakdown of Professional and Special Services in respect to this Vote, I do not have all of the information here, but I will get it in detail for the Member. If it is felt that we have to get this for all of them, then we will do so.

**Mr. Veale:** That certainly is my position, Mr. Chairman. We have spent half an hour on the various items of a new assistant, and I think we can spend that time on other important items, as well as programs.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that we are being questioned on something where we have been able to cut the costs over the previous year.

Although there is an increase, we have actually decreased the costs from our Estimates. There is an increase in the forecast over last year. We have been able to cut costs down in this area. I have a hard time foreseeing where we might be asked a question, so if Members can give us that information any earlier at all, we would be happy to get it. All of the information is available. We want to be as open and as forthright as we possibly can, but we cannot foresee every question that is going to be asked, and that is obvious.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Executive Council Office for \$820,800 carry?

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, I have not had an answer to my question.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I understand from the Honourable Member that he is not prepared to go on the basis that we have been in past years. If I, or any of my Cabinet colleagues, make an undertaking to get the information for the Honourable Member, is it his intention to hold up the normal progression of this until he gets those answers? If it is, that is fine, I just would like to know.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the undertaking of

the Government Leader. Has he undertaken to give a breakdown of that section?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, I am quite confident that I did, very explicitly, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Veale:** I will accept your undertaking.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Executive Council Office carry?

**Some Members:** Carried.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare Executive Council Office carried.

Before we go on to Education on Page 30, we will have a short break.

**Recess**

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

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I would like to indicate that I believe I have, as undertaken just previous to the recess, advised the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale South with respect to the detail of the professional and special services regarding the office of the Executive Committee Office. The one expenditure that I could not find was all attributable to the Commissioner's Office.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, if I might just make an observation: we have been around a bit on this point of what questions are a waste of time and what questions are not. It seems to me that the argument that the Public Accounts Committee does it in detail just does not wash; they look at a particular department once every three or four years. This is the opportunity to look at each department on an annual basis. If it does involve someone having to go look something up, I think that may be unfortunate, but the only other method we can use is to have individual Members go in beforehand, when this House is not in Session, and ask the Minister for breakdowns of particular areas. Then we can stand up in Committee and make the comments on the breakdown in each particular program area. One way or the other makes me happy, but I am unhappy to hear, "Oh, no, are we going to go through this again?" just because we have a question on a breakdown of a particular area.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, but, Mr. Chairman, by the same token, the Honourable Member has to recognize the fact that the budget is presented in a different manner this time — at the urging, primarily, of the Public Accounts Committee and also at the urging of the Members opposite in other Budget Sessions. The way we were presenting the budget was not conducive to good budget debate, in that we were discussing the picayune things like the number of telephone calls; how much for professional and special services; and we were not talking about programs. We were told time after time after time, Mr. Chairman, that it can be dug up in the *Hansard*; by every Member in this House, backbenchers and Members opposite included, that we had to figure out a better way to present the Budget. We think, Mr. Chairman, that we have presented it that way, but we seem to be wanting to revert back. I am a bit taken aback that, "Gee, we're still faced with the same problem", we are still going to be discussing the same things.

Now, I may have over-reacted, but I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that any constructive questions are ever a waste of time of this House, because I feel very strongly that every Member of the House has a duty wherein if they have a question of this kind they should ask it. I do not consider that a waste of the time of the House at all, and I do not want to make that implication to the Members opposite.

I do expect that we will be looking at this Budget in relation to programs, and discussing the pros and the cons of the programs, and then leaving it up to our program managers to determine that the program is being managed economically and to the best advantage of everyone in the Territory.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps then the Government Leader could give the commitment that Members could actually have a look at the written breakdowns on each of the program areas, because that, surely, is a very important program issue. I mean, do we want to do it before, do we want to do it

during this Committee?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, what the Honourable Member is asking is that he be shown working papers of this Budget. Mr. Chairman, that just cannot be, because the working papers are produced by our people as recommendations to the Cabinet, and the Cabinet decides how much money is going to be spent in the final analysis. Mr. Chairman, that is just not feasible. If the Honourable Member feels that he really must have these answers, he is going to have to ask the questions, and we will have to answer them, there are no two ways about it.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall we turn to Page 30, Department of Education, and have general debate?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, I have a brief preamble I thought I would read that may just put the Members in the picture, showing the priorities and the direction in which the Department is going.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to announce several initiatives. Although I have held this portfolio for a short period of time, I want to firstly acknowledge the efforts of my predecessor, Mr. D. Graham, for the very sound condition of the Department of Education.

The overall Budget has increased 18.4 per cent, which amounts to \$3,734,000 over the 1980-81 Main Estimates as approved during the last Budget Session.

However, several changes have been initiated, during the course of the fiscal year. The pupil-teacher ratio has been adjusted downward, with the addition of eight new teacher man-years; four were new man-years and four resulted from internal reorganization.

Also, the Department's adult training branch has entered into an agreement with the City of Whitehorse, to construct as a training project the Porter Creek Alternate Access. This project provides the much needed high quality program so necessary to train heavy equipment operators. The industry appears very pleased with the quality of the graduates of this course.

These and several other adjustments will become apparent during the discussions of the supplementaries.

This year we have placed our emphasis in several areas:

- the native language program has been increased by \$130,000. This increase will be reflected in our contract amount with the Council of Yukon Indians and is to be used for research of the Indian languages, and very importantly, for in-service training for the native Indian language teachers.

- the Student Summer Employment Program has \$50,000 that is to be used to hire Yukon students, to work in their area of interest and competence for the summer months. These students will be working in various government departments.

- also this Budget reflects this Government's desire to enhance our rural communities, and in so doing, has provided for rural grade expansion of \$200,000. Most particularly, plans are progressing on schedule for inclusion of Grade 12 in Haines Junction. Other communities are still under review.

- this Government over the past has been concerned about those students whose ambitions and interests are not being adequately dealt with by the school system. A sum of money has been designated to implement a pilot project, to broaden the scope of the program offerings to include that group of students previously mentioned. Specific plans have not been finalized, and the Department is presently looking at several possibilities for piloting.

- in the adult training branch, the long awaited Mobile Training Unit will arrive, and O & M funds have been included for its operation. This mobile unit will have the capability to deliver a small engine repair course and an electrical course to the rural communities. Also this Budget continues our arrangement with the City of Whitehorse for the Porter Creek Alternate Access.

- in the Recreation Branch, funds have been set aside to assist the Yukon Arts Council and the Yukon Sports Federation in the administration of these organizations. I am particularly

pleased to be able to announce a \$25,000 grant to Yukon Arts Council.

- apprenticeship training has an increased emphasis now with two full-time permanent employees, thus necessitating some increased funds in this area.

Prior to addressing the specifics of the Budget, I want to comment on the overall man-year complement allocated to the Department of Education. While the number of man-years remains, it should be noted that the Manpower Branch was transferred to the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think that this particular Department has probably received in the past some of the most serious and in-depth scrutiny by previous legislatures.

While I certainly have no difficulty with the initiatives being taken by the Department and the general thrusts of certain programming, I do have one concern that I would like to voice.

As I say, I will not take issue with the improvement of the Native Languages Program, the enhancement of the Summer Employment Program, or the Rural Grade Expansion. These are the result of continuing discussions, in this House and out, over the past several years, and they certainly are evidence of this Government's responding to some of those indications. I think, however, that there is one area that has not been addressed adequately and, perhaps in the course of program by program debate it may appear to be addressed: that is the entire area of vocational training and enhancement of that aspect of student education.

I think this Government has the evidence of a couple of reports that have been done, commissioned by themselves, that emphasize that the schools must prepare those students either for post secondary academic or post secondary vocational, and with that mandate from society you must respond. I cannot be sure that the response has been met adequately.

The other point that I would like to raise, in a much more general way, is about the entire function of education. Having come through the system, I suppose it is fair to say I have some familiarity with the programs, the philosophies, and the actual practical results of education.

It seems to me that about six or seven years ago the full complement in the Education Department, in man-years or person-years, was in the order of approximately 350, with a budget of approximately \$12 to \$14 million — I cannot specifically recollect. The number of students being catered to in those numbers was in the order of 5,000, or just under 5,000.

Today, seven years later, we have the same number of students being catered to, we have a complement of man-years in the order of 500, or 496, and a budget exceeding \$24 million.

Granted it is a self-defeating argument when you compare the seven-year period, in that there are a number of cost factors that are naturally built into a system such as education that are on the increase, and to some degree those increases are accountable, but I do make the observation that there is a 150 man-year increase catering to the same number of students in the School Programs portion of the budget. No, that would be somewhat inaccurate because there are a number of other programs also brought in, so I will qualify that.

That is the observation that I am making, and making comparisons of the Yukon school systems to other jurisdictions, it can be substantiated that we do require more people to handle the educational needs on a per capita basis.

Now, again, you can argue that point and say that we are unique in our broad scope of delivering the service to a wide, or far distant, grouping of communities and so on; you can support those arguments. But I do make that observation of the increase in man-years over the last six, seven, and eight years.

I probably would just leave it with those observations; with, perhaps, the suggestion that when the training program of the Vocational School completes the Porter Creek Access Road, I have a very good suggestion as to which road they can then start reconstructing.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of

the Honourable Member opposite, and I have a few comments to make about his two specific areas of concern. The first area of concern was in the matter of vocational training. I realize, fully, that the Member opposite would like to see a vocational school in Faro. However, as he knows, and I am sure that everyone in this Legislature realizes, in the past that has always been totally impractical, due to a couple of facts. One was the extreme shortage of housing and facilities in Faro, something that could be overcome. The second fact was that the Cyprus Anvil Mining Corporation never hired any people out of the vocational school as apprentices in their areas of expertise.

In other words when we have someone graduate from the Vocational School as a heavy duty mechanic's apprentice, that person could not get a job with Cyprus Anvil Mining Corporation as a heavy duty mechanic apprentice. He first of all had to take what they called a job entry program which meant you had to start as a labourer, then hopefully you could work your way up and become an apprentice.

That problem, as I understand it, has been recently overcome, or is in the process of being overcome. I think that that bodes well for a future vocational school in Faro.

The second thing that the Member opposite does not seem to realize is that the Vocational School is continually changing and upgrading their programs. I know this year they are offering programs at the Vocational School that they never offered before, and they have eliminated some programs that they feel are no longer needed in the Territory.

We have also increased the training of students from F.H. Collins High School in various businesses around the City of Whitehorse. These students are now taking half-day training in school usually and a half-day training in businesses around the community, through the cooperation of not only the Education Department but the community itself.

I think there are things being done in the field of vocational training. I think the Member opposite must also realize that we have two options when it comes to vocational training: we can either train people here in the Yukon in a vocational atmosphere or we can send them Outside. Those are the only two options we have. If we do not have the facilities to train them here in the Territory, then we must send them Outside. Not that many people can afford to go Outside for the extended period of time necessary; therefore, it logically follows that we need a new facility. The Department of Education is moving in that area.

The second thing that the Member opposite, a former teacher, spoke of was the Budget increase and this really surprises me. I am sure he realizes what he was making in salary as a teacher, six or seven or however many years ago and I am sure he has a vague idea of what teachers are making now. He can figure it out for himself. I am sure also, as a teacher, he was one of the ones who was showing some concern about classroom size and I am sure he must realize that the classes that he taught six or seven years ago bear no relation to the size of the classroom at the present time.

All these things, Mr. Chairman, are brought about by school committees and parents of children in school, petitioning the Government, the Department of Education, for these improvements in their students' learning environment. We did not have things like special education and French Immersion seven years ago, all of which require dollars and manpower.

One of the other things is the rural grade expansion. We never used to have very many high schools in the rural communities, consequently we brought them all into Whitehorse and stuck them in a class with another 32 students in F.H. Collins. Now, we are expanding those classrooms in the rural areas and we are finding that we only have six or seven students in a high school but you still must provide teachers for those six or seven students, as I am sure you realize. Consequently, instead of having one teacher for 32 students, you are finding you have three teachers for 15. That is another reason for a Budget increase in the Territory. I think those things are all justified. I think the Department of Education and the



Minister should be congratulated for putting forth an extremely good Education Budget and I think we should be congratulating the Minister on the new initiatives that she has taken. She is doing an excellent job.

**Mr. Byblow:** Yes, I think the Minister and the Department of Education and the former Minister can take the credit that is due. I just want to elaborate on the references the former Minister of Education was making with regard to vocational training prospects in the Territory.

I believe he introduced his references to the subject matter by saying that Cyprus Anvil would not hire any graduates of a vocational program that was delivered in Whitehorse. I certainly am not going to come to a defense of any corporate entity, but my understanding is that those graduates were not acceptable to the employing group.

For that reason, then, I raise the point of whether the Government should not be reconsidering their total vocational thrust. If you are graduating students who do not fit into a job market, then the program that you are implementing is inadequate in some regard. I would expand on that, that it took an initiative, Mr. Chairman, by industry, by Education, by Manpower to actually set up a very workable system in the community that I represent. It required a rewriting of the contractual bargaining agreement with the Union, to permit the kind of program that has been implemented in Faro. The former minister is quite correct; it does pave the way to what is an ultimate objective of the community—a training ground for vocational and apprentice programs for the Territory.

So, I agree with him wholeheartedly when he says that recently there has been some resolution in improving the training possibilities for the job market, by using industry and by using business. I think the Minister, herself, came out with a complementary gesture recently, towards what has been taking place in this improvement: to putting people through a credible training period whereby they could come out with their certification in the long term.

I think the other reference I will leave. It was only an observation in comparing what is taking place over the past half decade or so.

The programs that have come into place during that time do perhaps justify the increase in the man-years, and, of course, the subsequent expenditure, but I do note it as an observation of what has taken place in seven years.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I think that the Member's fears in that direction are groundless. The thrust of the department in vocational training that was started by the previous Minister is definitely going to be continued, and in fact perhaps emphasized more under this Minister.

**Mr. Byblow:** I accept the reassurances of the Minister, but until we get to where the Minister is going to point out to me where she has money to initiate and further set up these pilot programs to increase the vocational nature of training for students both in school and in an adult sense, I ask her to point out to me how she can give me that reassurance.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, I was referring actually to the fact that the department plans to start vocational training perhaps at a lower level, aiming at children who do not intend to go on to an academic career. There is quite a demand for this, especially in the rural areas, and this requires a changing around of curriculum rather than more money. It requires a different emphasis, a different thrust. This is what I meant when I said that we were going to encourage the vocational direction of the department.

**Mr. Byblow:** Certainly, going along with that, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in my judgment, has to take the initiative in a much more positive way than to say, "all you are going to do is re-juggle staff in a school and set up a vocational program." There is money required for the costs that are associated with bringing in equipment to give these students the required training. I am simply asking: do you have the money in the budget to start that on its way?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** May we proceed with the budget, Mr. Chairman? We will see how things go as we go through it.

**Mr. Veale:** Before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could make some general comments that would put the Minister on notice as to some of the areas that I am concerned about. I would be interested in a little elaboration on the "Resource Core Program" and what that is to accomplish and how it seems to tie in with another department, or whether it has been transferred in some way, as indicated on page 47.

The other aspect that I would be interested in hearing about is any moves in the direction of decentralizing the administration in the Department of Education, at the superintendent level.

Mr. Chairman, the other area that the Minister could direct her attention to is career guidance. I understand there is going to be additional manpower in that area. Where will that be located, and what specifically will that person be addressing him or herself to?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister elaborate on the area of Special Education, both for the exceptional student and for the handicapped student? My perception is that we look after handicapped children, in particular, up to age five, and then we have a rehabilitation centre when they are over 18 or over 16, but I am not clear about what initiatives this Department has taken to provide the assistance, particularly that which the handicapped require.

I understand that there is a special program in the Whitehorse Elementary School which many people are critical, of because it centralizes the children in a particular classroom. In other words, those children should probably be in the classrooms of their peers and come in for special training, as opposed to all being in a particular classroom where everyone else is in the same handicapped predicament. In other words, it should work exactly the opposite way. I would be interested to hear if the department has any initiatives in that regard.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Is there any further general debate?

We will proceed to the programs. Administration, for \$1,960,100. Shall this program clear?

**Mr. Byblow:** If I am reading this correctly, there is a decrease of one man year. I would not be so brutal as to say, "Who got axed?" but why is that?

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, that came about as a result of the transfer of the Manpower Branch to Consumer and Corporate Affairs. One of the people in the Manpower Branch was considered to be administrative personnel.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, there were four people transferred to Manpower, so they are accountable all through the Budget; they will show up.

**Mr. Byblow:** Am I to conclude that four people were transferred from Education Administration into Manpower and the man-years remain the same, so therefore there is an increase of three? Is that correct?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** No, Mr. Chairman. With 4.15 new person-years in the Department, this is in relation to the adjustment to the pupil/teacher ratio, four-person years within other activities bring the teacher complement up by 8.15 in total. The adjustments for person-years were: Student Accommodation, 2.5 person-years were transferred to the teachers from the closure of the Pelly Block; 1.5 person-years was transferred to the teachers due to CYI contracting activity, the money was transferred to CYI for that person-year; four person-years were transferred along with the activity to Manpower within Consumer and Corporate Affairs. There were four man-years added to the program.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Shall Administration clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I declare Administration clear. We will now go to Schools Program for \$17,297,200.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, this would be a good opportunity for the Minister to elaborate on Resource Corps and Special Education.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr Chairman, I am not sure just what it is that the Honourable Member wants to know about the Resource Corps. It is a Federal cost-shared program to provide training for unskilled, unemployed Canadian residents through the construction of community facilities: building the school at Carmacks and the teacher at Burwash last year. The Resource Corps is working at the present time on the new building that will take the place of the old Wolf Creek facility. Is that what the Member was meaning, that seem to have changed departments? Perhaps the Member would like to elaborate on what he wants to know.

**Mr. Veale:** I was referring to Page 47. "Expenditures and recoveries for the Resource Development Corps are not included as this project has been transferred out of this Branch." That is a notation on Page 47.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, there are a few things I think you have to understand about the Resource Corps Development Program. That program has moved from department to department in that they do work for many other departments. It initially started out as a training program to build huts for the Wildlife Department in various communities throughout the Territory. The idea behind the program was that the Education Department would provide a person to train a group of people from say, Ross River. The person who was providing the training would involve four people from the community of Ross River. They would go out and build a wildlife hut, as they were called, and we would then recover the money, partially from the Wildlife Department and partially from the Federal Government. In that way, people got a certain amount of training in a useful trade and a wildlife hut was built for the Wildlife Department. They were very happy; you know, everybody was happy.

One of the other reasons is that it actually started out as a development project in the Renewable Resources Department; it started out with financing from Renewable Resources. The Department of Education has since taken over the program almost totally.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Thank you, former Minister.

I think I see what the Honourable Member across the way is asking. The Resource Corps was previously shown under the jurisdiction of Adult and Continuing Education. This has been transferred to the School Branch and is now the responsibility of the School Services Inspector. That is the switch you are referring to.

**Mr. Veale:** Is the Resource Corps program, then, under the Department of Education? Is this the first year, or the inception? From the comments of the former Minister, it has been carried in previous years. Is it the first year in the Department of Education?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I do not believe so, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, we have always cleared this kind of co-ordinator. In fact now, we have, in effect, a full-time co-ordinator of the Resource Development Corps Program. It is just a part of his normal day to day chore, but he is, in effect, the co-ordinator for the total Resource Development Corps Training Program in the Department of Education.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been in the Department of Education about two years.

**Mr. Veale:** I see. Well, if there is no forecast for 1980-81, maybe that is a simple matter to deal with. I am not clear why there is no forecast on page 34 for 1980-81.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, it was another department's. I think he will find there was something in the neighbourhood of \$400,000 in the budget of the Department of Renewable Resources in this year, and the Department of Renewable Resources transferred money, as the Resource Development Corps was in operation, to the Department of Education. So, they never really needed a budget. It was just attached to somebody in the Administration. The responsibility was.

Now, the Department of Education has actually taken the responsibility to pay our 25 per cent, or 15 per cent, whatever it is, of the total costs of the program.

**Mr. Veale:** Regardless of whose department it is?

**Mr. Graham:** That is right.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could now go into the comments I made regarding Special Education, and the location of the facility in the Whitehorse Elementary School.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, rather than ask the Minister to reply to that question, perhaps we can give the Minister a day to reply. I see it is rapidly approaching our time for adjournment, so I would move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair, and that we report progress on Bill Number 5 and ask leave to sit again.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Chairman, I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

**Mr. Speaker:** I now call the House to order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

**Mr. Tracey:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 5, *Second Appropriation Ordinance (1981-82)* and directed me to report progress on same and beg leave to sit again.

**Mr. Speaker:** You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees. Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave is so granted.

May I have you further pleasure?

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that we do now call it 9:30.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that we do now call it 9:30.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

*The House adjourned at 9:28 o'clock p.m.*



