



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 13

3rd Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Monday, April 18, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake  
DEPUTY SPEAKER — Andy Philipsen, MLA, Whitehorse Porter Creek West

## CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Finance, Public Service Commission, and Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs, Highways, Yukon Housing Corporation, and Yukon Liquor Corporation.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Renewable Resources, and Government Services
Hon. Clarke Ashley	Klondike	Minister responsible for Justice, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and Workers' Compensation.
Hon. Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South	Minister responsible for Education and Tourism/Heritage and Cultural Resources

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

### (Progressive Conservative)

Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow
Andy Phillipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West

## OPPOSITION MEMBERS

### (New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West Leader of the Official Opposition
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre
Piers McDonald	Mayo
Dave Porter	Campbell

### (Independent)

Don Taylor	Watson Lake
------------	-------------

Clerk of the Assembly  
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)  
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)  
Sergeant-at-Arms  
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms  
Hansard Administrator

Patrick L. Michael  
Missy Follwell  
Jane Steele  
G.I. Cameron  
Frank Ursich  
Dave Robertson

<sup>01</sup> **Whitehorse, Yukon**

**Monday, April 18, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

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

*Prayers*

## DAILY ROUTINE

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

## TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Pursuant to the provisions of the *Interpretation Act*, Section 37, I have for tabling a report entitled Report on Regulations for the period October 25, 1982 to March 17, 1983.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have for tabling the 1981-82 Annual Report of the Yukon Housing Corporation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any reports of committees?  
Petitions?

## PETITIONS

**Mr. Porter:** I have a petition to present on behalf of 244 resident Yukoners. Most of these petitioners are from either Ross River or Faro. They allege that their conservation officer, Mr. Jerry Michalski, was unjustifiably dismissed from his position with the Government of Yukon and, among other things, pray that Mr. Michalski be reinstated and that there be an inquiry into the situation which led to the conservation officer's dismissal.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further petitions?  
Introduction of bills?

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill No. 6, *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that a bill entitled *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

<sup>02</sup> **Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further bills?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 7, *Financial Agreement Act, 1983*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader, seconded by the hon. Minister of Justice, that a bill entitled *Financial Agreement Act, 1983* 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?  
Are there any statements by ministers?

## STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I would like to draw to the attention of the members of this Assembly that today has been proclaimed nationally as "Law Day" in recognition of the first anniversary of the *Canadian Rights and Freedoms*. It is intended that "Law Day" be a national day of legal education and information in order to increase the basic legal knowledge of lay people.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Yukon Law Society for all the work which has been put into organizing the

activities in Yukon and to the participants who have given generously of their time. Their efforts have resulted in such things as general interest articles being written and submitted to the press; distribution of literature from the federal Department of Justice and Yukon Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs at the Qwanlin Mall on Saturday, April 16th; the holding of a poster contest; appearances on both radio stations; and culminating in a public seminar to be held this morning, commencing at 7:00 p.m. at Jeckell Junior High School. Topics to be discussed at this seminar by various lawyers from our community include: Separation and Divorce, Consumer Protection, Wills and Small Debts Court.

I sincerely hope that this effort will be rewarded by a good turn-out of members of the public.

Thank you.

**Mrs. Joe:** We, also, would like to thank the Yukon Law Society for the excellent work that it has done. I am sure that the people of Yukon will be much more informed in these matters.

I can sincerely tell you that I know of the work that they have done in the past, in terms of relating their expertise during the JP training councils and that they, certainly, have been very good about providing the information that they have to the people of Yukon.

<sup>03</sup> **Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further statements by Ministers.  
This brings us to the Question Period.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### Question re: Legislative select committees

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the government leader and I might, in passing, congratulate him on his victory at his convention's leadership review this past weekend, and ask him: since it appears to be the policy of this government to oppose the formation of legislative select committees, could the government leader explain why the government apparently wishes to deny the opposition and the public full opportunity to examine, study and comment on important matters before this House?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is not a case of there being a policy that we are opposed to select committees. We have in the past used select committees, and I am confident that, given the proper occasion, we will want to use select committees again. In parliamentary procedure there is ample time, and I am confident that the leader of the opposition is not implying that we do not give the opposition ample time to inspect and discuss any legislation that we put before this House. We try to be very careful that we do not "railroad" anything through the House. It is a procedure that I do not want to see implemented and I will be opposed to it at any time. In respect to select committees, it is this government's prerogative as to when we will establish select committees and for what purposes. We will exercise that prerogative.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would draw the government leader's attention to the fact that no select committee has been struck in the life of this Legislature and ask him if, as a matter of policy, or as a matter of government intentions, he or his ministry plan to establish a select committee for the purpose of studying such controversial and complicated measures as the *Child Welfare Act* so that all members of this Legislature can receive and benefit from the public's input on such a measure?

<sup>04</sup> **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, we do not intend to have a select committee in respect to this legislation. There are specific reasons: some of them are kind.

I am confident that when the legislation is tabled and the leader of the opposition has had a chance to take a look at it, to read it, and read it carefully — and we will give him enough time to do that — he will be satisfied that there is no need for a select committee, that it is a piece of legislation that we can deal with adequately in this House.

**Mr. Penikett:** Given that in the last Legislature, members of the House gave themselves a pay raise in anticipation of future full-time involvement in-between session committee work, and given this government's current reluctance to strike special committees on the matter, is the government intending to introduce adjustments to members' pay to account and adjust for the fact that

we are not busy in committees?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** If the leader of the opposition would like to make that kind of a recommendation to the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee, he is quite free to do so.

It is a fact that we established a select committee for a piece of legislation at a particular time. We perceived, at that time, that we were going to have another piece of legislation and I thought it would be highly likely that we would want a select committee to work on it. Because of circumstances, mostly beyond our control, we have had to set that particular legislation aside, and I hope it will be coming up soon in our legislative program but, until it does, I do not anticipate that we will need another select committee.

If the leader of the opposition wants to seriously consider making such a recommendation to Rules, Elections and Privileges, he can do so. I certainly will not.

#### **Question re: Cyprus Anvil**

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is to the government leader on the subject of Cyprus Anvil. The continuing erosion of livelihood and confidence as well as the hardship being imposed on individuals is a matter of serious concern in my community. Can the government leader advise whether he has had any indication respecting the current status of the Cyprus Anvil aid package within the federal bureaucratic circles and, if so, at what stage is it really at now?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** With respect to the federal bureaucratic circles, I know that some week-and-a-half ago it was going to a subcommittee of deputy ministers. I know that it has been there. I understand now that it is a case of the package going to Cabinet. As I am sure all members are aware, the Cabinet agendas are secret; nobody knows for sure exactly when it is going to get to Cabinet.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has assured us, on numerous occasions, that he was going to get it to Cabinet at the earliest possible opportunity. I would anticipate, and I am very hopeful, that sometime during the course of this week, we will get some definitive word from the Government of Canada. Members here have to realize that it is something far beyond our control. It is even beyond the control, I would respectfully submit, of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development at this point because he does not control the Cabinet agenda.

**Mr. Byblow:** Can the government leader confirm whether, as a result of the corporate restructuring of Dome, that the aid package is, in fact, the same as previously presented from the senior bureaucratic officials to Cabinet?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have not been advised that there has been any change at all.

**Mr. Byblow:** There is some concern that a decision is needed shortly in order that the stripping program get under way before June 4th in order that the union contracts, signed last December, are not endangered. Has the government leader had any communication with the union locals respecting the contract status, should the aid package not materialize shortly?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I discussed this topic with the president of the union when I was last in Ottawa. We discussed the real need and desire for this decision to be made at the earliest possible date, given that the decision is going to be positive and people are going to go back to work, so that they can get back to work at the earliest possible date because June 4th is a very black day in Yukon's history; that is the one-year anniversary. That is also the day that unemployment insurance benefits are going to run out for an awful lot of these people, so it is very critical. I am cognizant of it and each of the ministers whom I talked to are also cognizant of it. I hope that that is just another spur, if you will, to get this decision made.

#### **Question re: Social assistance**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I have a question about social assistance. Last Friday, a long-time Yukoner, born and raised in Dawson City and a Yukoner for 50 years, informed me that even though she was only able to find work for one month of the last 12, the application for social assistance was refused on the residency requirement. Will the minister look into this individual's case and report on this abuse of the residency requirement for social

assistance?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** First of all, I will not accept the statement that it is an abuse of the residency requirements. I am not aware of the circumstances but I am fairly confident that my department has taken into consideration all of the aspects of this individual's application and, if they denied it, they did it on good grounds.

However, if the member wants to provide me, after the Question Period or sometime today, the name of the individual, I will be quite prepared to look at it, but I do not accept the fact that it is an abuse.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The minister stated, on April 13th, that the residency requirement was not in writing. By what means did the minister communicate this policy to the departmental officials?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This policy of residency has been in the department for quite a few years. I only bolstered it by being the minister and expressing my opinion of what should happen in that department. I am firmly convinced in my mind, and I have expressed my opinions on the floor of this Legislature about the residency requirements and why they should be there. The department has taken me at my word and they have operated under those assumptions.

I am not even sure that the charge that the opposition member has made today was actually refused on a point of residency. I would have to investigate the situation and, until then, I will not accept his charge.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** On April 13th, the minister invited me to speak to departmental officials about the matter. Will the minister publicly state that it is a government policy that departmental officials should speak candidly to me about the residency policy?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I told the member that if he wanted more details about the residency requirement to speak to my department and that is as far as I will go. I told him to go; my department knows that if he comes they should speak to him about it and, if he cannot accept that, well, I am sorry for him.

#### **Question re: Stokes Point**

**Mr. Porter:** I have a question for the government leader.

It has recently been suggested that Stokes Point could be used as a headquarters for a new national park in the northern Yukon. What is the government's position on this?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I thought that that was a most interesting suggestion. I believe it was made by a vice-president of Gulf Canada. I heard it for the first time this morning. I do not know whether it would be feasible or viable but certainly it may be one way. We are hopeful that there will be a park on the north coast of Yukon. We have advocated for a number years that there should be a park on the north coast of Yukon, and maybe that would be a good example of taking one specific area and using it for all of the development that has to take place. The suggestion would certainly lend itself to keeping as much of it in its natural state as we possibly can.

**Mr. Porter:** Given the fact that a recent socio-economic study indicated that a majority of the benefits of the proposed Stokes Point project could accrue to businesses located in the Northwest Territories, what kind of guarantees has this government negotiated with the proponents of the project which would see a reversal of the study's conclusions?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not know what study the member for Campbell is reading. The study that I read the other day said exactly the opposite. It said that given some limited development at Stokes Point it would allow for Yukoners and Yukon businesses to be the beneficiaries of that development.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the government leader confirm that there will only be 25 permanent jobs at the proposed project for Stokes Point?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I cannot positively confirm it, but I do believe that the proposal that Gulf has put to Canada is limited to that extent; that in the final analysis, at the end of the project, there would be some 25 permanent jobs.

#### **Question re: Women's Bureau**

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a written question for the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau.

The minister stated that the Women's Bureau and the Public Service Commission are working to develop a policy on the issue of sexual harassment. Could the minister inform us, number 1, how long these departments have been in the process of formulating policy? Number 2, what progress has been made? Number 3, when is the policy expected? Number 4, how present complaints are being processed? Number 5, are complaints from the Indian bands being dealt with under Yukon legislation? Number 6, when will legislation be introduced to replace the *Fair Practices Act*?

**Question re: Labour standards legislation**

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the same minister and I will give him the opportunity to respond right now. The minister said recently that the House may expect the introduction of labour standards legislation in the fall of this year. Has the government drafted any employment standards legislation to date?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** What I was telling the members opposite was that I was hoping to possibly have legislation ready by the fall. However, our chief labour standards administrator, Mr. Dornian, has been seconded to the NEED programs in the Department of Education, so he is not there and he is the chief person to be working on that. It has put the schedule back. I do not know if we can have it for fall. We are still going to attempt it, but we have no legislation drafted at this point.

**Mr. McDonald:** Can the minister state specifically what stage of development the legislation is at currently? He has already mentioned that no legislation has been drafted to date. Has there been any drafting of any kind done on legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I just answered that. There has been no drafting. We have not started drafting. That is what I just said.

**Mr. McDonald:** Will the government be soliciting further public input in developing this legislation and if so what form will that public input take?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I will be diving into that after this session; it is one of my summer tasks. I will be working with the department on that. When and if I deem more input is needed, it will come about.

**Question re: Contracting out government jobs**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the government leader. In this session's Speech from the Throne, the government indicated it was considering transferring programs to the private sector, in other words, contracting out public service jobs. Could the government leader now indicate exactly which departments are considering contracting out?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I am in no position to do that. We are doing a program-by-program evaluation of this government. I anticipate that it is going to take some considerable length of time and I also anticipate that, as a result of that evaluation, there will be recommendations coming to Cabinet in respect to reorganization and contracting out.

**Mr. Penikett:** Since this is about the first time this question has come up, could I ask the government leader if included in the list of potential jobs to be contracted out are some of the same positions which the government contemplated contracting out a year ago about which at least one minister made some tentative announcements?

<sup>98</sup> Are those same positions on the block?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I thought I made it clear; we are evaluating every program in the government. It has just been suggested to me, by one of my colleagues, that maybe we should consider the Legislative Assembly as well: contract it out.

**Mr. Penikett:** You could save more money if you contracted out most of the jobs in the Cabinet since they spend more money than the Legislature now. Let me ask the government leader a serious question: since a number of public servants, including some of the people who are doing custodial work in this building, are suffering some considerable uncertainty right now about their future employment with this government, is the government leader prepared, or intending, to make a statement on this question during the life of this Legislature so that these people at least can have their minds put to rest on this question?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes.

**Question re: School Act**

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is to the Minister of Education. The minister indicated in the House on Thursday that it was her government's intention to reopen the *School Act* for the purposes of legislating a lay-off clause and making some changes to Christmas holidays. However, that was not exactly the message delivered to the Teachers Association on Saturday. What is the real intention of the minister respecting the reopening of the *School Act* — to introduce a lay-off clause?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** If I remember the exchange of debate correctly, it was not my comments, as the Minister of Education, that I was opening the *School Act* to legislate lay-offs. I believe that was an assumption the member for Faro was under. The purpose of opening the *School Act*, and the policy that I announced at the teachers' meeting, was that we would be extending the Christmas holiday season from six days to ten days so that they would get a two-week holiday season during the Christmas period.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is the minister telling the House that it is not her intention to reopen the *School Act* to introduce a lay-off clause during this session?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The member for Faro will have to wait and see what the legislation says.

**Mr. Byblow:** Given that the minister has indicated the need to wait for policy direction, would she confirm for me then, in any tampering with the *School Act* respecting the negotiated rights of teachers, that she will fully consult, in the future, with the Teachers Association?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We always have.

**Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation rental rates**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** A question again about government employee rental rates in Yukon housing: on April 14th, the minister stated that the YTG rents were \$50 to \$60 below market rent in the communities of Teslin, Pelly Crossing and Old Crow. What is the means whereby the government establishes market rent?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I am sure the way the department evaluates that is to find out what other people are charging.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** There is current conversation about a \$20-a-month fee for washers and dryers. Is this proposed as a rental increase or a user fee of some other kind?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** That is not a possibility as of yet. The whole area of what we provide as a landlord to our various tenants is being reviewed and there is going to be a submission prepared for the purposes of Cabinet deliberation during this next month, and decisions will have to be made.

<sup>99</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** Will the minister assure that all staff will be notified of any increases pursuant to the *Landlord and Tenant Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think it is safe to say that if we are required to abide by that legislation we would.

**Question re: Salmon Fishery Treaty**

**Mr. Porter:** This question is directed to Minister of Renewable Resources.

The Governor of Alaska has taken the position that the international treaty covering the Salmon fishery should be reopened for further negotiations. As a statement of policy, does this government agree or disagree with the position taken by the Governor of Alaska?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We do agree that it should be opened, and we also agree that we should be involved in the negotiations. In fact I will be attending to make the position of this government well known when they do deliberate here in Whitehorse.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister inform the House exactly what he has done over the last year to assist the salmon fishery industry of the Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No I cannot inform the member of what we have done to assist the salmon fishing industry of Yukon. However, I do know that a Special ARDA grant was given to the people in Dawson City in order to develop the fish processing plant. There have been ongoing studies done regarding salmon in various areas of

the territory. We, as a government, and my ministry in particular, are going to become much more involved in the salmon industry in the Yukon Territory in future years.

**Mr. Porter:** In the compilation of positions taken in respect of the economic development agreement, has the minister advocated a specific program to assist the fishery resource sector of the economy?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The specific programs that we will be developing under an EGDA will be dealt with at a future date. We are now dealing with policy, not specific programs.

#### Question re: Mortgages at Wolf Creek

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

In 1980, purchasers of some lots in Wolf Creek had trouble obtaining mortgages because quartz claims had been staked for subsurface rights to their properties. What steps has this government taken to ensure that a similar situation does not develop in regard to the part of the Hillcrest Subdivision where the Qwanlin Dun intends to relocate?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have been legally advised that it is not seen as a problem. It is very clear in the *Quartz Mining Act* just exactly what procedure is utilized if that conflict were to come into play. I have also indicated to anyone who has purchased lots that if this question were to go to court, the Government of Yukon Territory would take that case forward.

**Mrs. Joe:** The cost of developing the lots in the new Hillcrest subdivision is reported to have been about \$15,000 per lot. Could the minister tell the House what it intends to charge for each lot now?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It is the development costs, plus whatever interest has accrued. That is what will be charged.

**Mrs. Joe:** Water and sewage systems for the new Hillcrest subdivision will have to be tested before sale of Hillcrest lots can be completed. Who will be doing the testing, and when?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I will have to take notice on that question.

#### Question re: Agriculture Development Council

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the same minister, in his capacity for being responsible for agriculture.

Last week, in response to a question requesting information regarding the Agriculture Development Council's activities on an on-going basis, the minister suggested that he might divulge further information when he deemed it necessary. Does he now deem it necessary to divulge all of the council's decisions to date?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Not today.

**Mr. McDonald:** That answer has a strange boomerang quality to it.

On what basis will the minister be deeming it necessary to divulge information in the future?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I guess he will just have to trust my good judgement.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** What kind of information does the minister deem necessary to divulge, and will the information include the reasons given for accepting or rejecting individual applications?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No, I have no problem bringing forward general policy statements, et cetera, but I do not believe it is really my business to, perhaps, bring the member's own private business in here and say why we accepted or rejected an application he made, whether it be for agricultural land or otherwise. I think it would be very unacceptable and, furthermore, I think it would be very disrespectful of people's rights, as far as I am concerned, if that is what the member is looking for.

#### Question re: Landlord and Tenant Act

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question about people's rights which I want to direct to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

On March 23rd, the minister told the House that he would not ask his department to investigate a matter brought to his attention by a member of this House on behalf of a constituent. Was the minister saying that he will not, as a matter of policy, deal with complaints

raised by members of this House on behalf of their constituents, in respect to the *Land and Tenant Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** What I was saying was that, in the *Landlord and Tenant Act*, it says that a complaint must come from one party who is directly involved. If the members opposite are directly involved, yes, I will take it forward.

**Mr. Penikett:** To be precise, the act says that in respect to complaints to the rentalsman, not complaints to the minister. Let me ask the minister, since he appears to be saying that there are some pieces of legislation or some areas of his jurisdiction in which he will not entertain complaints from members of this House on policy matters, for the record, what other legislation under his responsibility will he refuse to hear complaints on from this side of the House?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I am not even going to bother answering the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, I would consider the question as being argumentative.

**Mr. Penikett:** I may get more argumentative if I cannot get any answers.

I want to ask the minister: since I asked him on March 23rd to investigate the matter of the service charge-based rent increase at the Kopper King Trailer Court, which was almost twice the actual increase in charges to the landlord, has the minister's department investigated this matter and if not, why not; and, if he has, will he table the results of this investigation?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I told the member opposite then that we did not put rent controls in and that is exactly what that is.

**Mr. Penikett:** It has nothing to do with rent controls.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Read it.

**Mr. Speaker:** There being no further questions, we will now proceed to orders of the day, under government motions.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

##### Motion No. 8

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

**Mr. McDonald:** I am rising in this debate to make some brief comments in response to those recently spoken regarding crown corporations. It was suggested, I think, that somehow the crown corporations in Saskatchewan were responsible for destroying the economic fabric of the Saskatchewan economy, and it took a Devine government to expose this ugly spectre of mismanagement. The member of course neglected to mention that in the first ten months of Devine rule there was a hundred percent increase in business and personal bankruptcies, sixty-two percent increase in unemployment, forty-four percent increase in the number of unemployed employables forced onto welfare, and a fifteen percent drop in building permits in Saskatchewan cities.

The government was obviously open for business but closed for success. The real issue is whether the Yukon government should be taking a leadership role in the economy and discourage the vagaries of the boom-bust, directionless nature of most economies. The issue is whether there should be publicly or more democratically controlled direction of the economy. There have of course been crown enterprises which have shown losses, not unlike a far larger number of private ventures. Because, in the case of crown corporations, the democratically elected government is the investor, there is quite rightly a large measure of public scrutiny focused on the enterprise. Many efficiencies are ruthlessly investigated and exposed. And all that is good, in my opinion.

We of course know that a smaller measure of scrutiny is focused on private business because their business is private. Nevertheless, every one who has worked in the private sector — as I have done all my adult life — knows that inefficiencies do exist, as does fluff, nepotism, patronage; all the costly and, in some cases, unethical practices which we try to rule out of the public sector. The shareholder, the public, has every right to constructively criticize public enterprise, and they do. It is all fair game, and it is all very necessary. It is quite important to remember, for those members in

this House who have obviously forgotten, that the public interests in crown corporations extend far beyond maximizing net income. There are public interests to protect which may only be considered marginally profitable in the business sense. One cannot, for example, argue that certain services provided to northern or rural areas are not justified because they are unprofitable or are justified because they are profitable. Many times the public will decide that a government service will be universal, meaning that unprofitable areas will be subsidized by those which are profitable. Many times, the public will insist that these same ventures do not seek profits which will unreasonably inflate costs to the consumer. Many times, the market is not working in the interests of a particular government's public. The government may also use crown corporations to promote, steer or maximize returns from resource development. They have been used as legitimate tools by most provincial governments to ensure that the public benefits accrue from public resources.

I think we should look at Saskatchewan, as this is the example used by the member for Porter Creek West as a case where crown corporations do not work. The first resource corporations were formed in that province in 1945, just after the war, and were established as an instrument of public policy. At the same time, the public clearly held Cabinet accountable for the activities of these public ventures and the Saskatchewan model, I think, virtually ignored in the federal experience, was notable for establishing an appropriate balance between the need of the corporation for a high level of operating independence on the one hand and the need for an appropriate degree of financial and policy direction from the government on the other.

I am not going to go into further detail on the control and accountability structures of Saskatchewan crown corporations, unless the need arises, but the member for Porter Creek West suggested that it did not work and should therefore not be established in Yukon. I am sure he received most of his information from a Devine press release.

13 Notwithstanding the fact that the entire country is in the clutches of a serious recession, largely prescribed by modernist economists, and notwithstanding the fact that all kinds of enterprises are suffering bankruptcy at the expense of our social and economic fabric, I believe that the statements made in this House about the viability of Crown corporations were unfair.

Let me read from the list of the 17 commercial Crown corporations in Saskatchewan in 1979. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation, on gross revenues of \$398,000,000, received a net income of \$40,000,000 and employed over 3,000 people; Saskatchewan Telecommunications had a net income of \$25,000,000 and employed over 4,000 people; Saskatchewan Water Supply Board had gross revenues of over \$2,000,000, a net income of \$350,000 and employed 16 people; a Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had gross revenues of \$275,000,000, a profit of \$77,000,000 and employed over 1,300 people; the list is quite lengthy.

The minister for renewable resources suggested that there were 35 other commercial Crown corporations in 1979; that is simply untrue and I am sure he is not trying to mislead the House.

The Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation made a profit of \$52,000, employed six people and the list goes on and on. The total net revenue for all 17 commercial Crown corporations was well over \$100,000,000 and employed over 11,500 people. The public employed 11,500 people, who made well over \$100,000,000 to provide economic leadership and to demonstrate public initiatives in the interests of the public and that, in my opinion, is not a bad record at all.

I think, because it is more timely to mention BC corporations, I will just mention a few. If the government front-benchers have any suggestions on things I should mention, I will be happy to oblige. The BC Petroleum Corporation has been the subject of some debate in the election to the south and it was set up by the NDP administration to adequately compensate British Columbians as owners of the resource for selling it to US buyers. In the first year of its operation, it made \$21,000,000, then \$92,000,000, then \$135,000,000 then \$160,000,000, then \$118,000,000, then \$182,000,000 and then, finally, in 1979-80 it made \$310,000,000.

It has, in total, contributed over \$1,500,000,000 to the taxpayers of BC and it is the subject of some debate even today in the election campaign.

I think it is fair to say that I am standing in debate to set the record straight, in a manner of speaking. Government, as the elected representatives of the people, should be providing direction for the economy through the Crown corporation, as long as there is a large measure of public accountability and public scrutiny as a legitimate tool. The federal experience requires improvements in terms of accountability, and towards this end we have always believed that Crown corporations should be guided by the public they serve. To put it mildly, the use of Saskatchewan, in an anti-Crown corporation speech, was a fairly big mistake. Yukon should not rule out the use of Crown corporations as a vehicle to exercise public policy.

14 **Mr. Penikett:** I welcome this opportunity to debate territorial budget policy for this year.

As I see it, Yukon has two possible futures. Our government can choose to lead us in one of two directions. We have a choice between what I would call a positive option or a negative option. Our leaders can select the active alternative or the passive. We may take an optimistic approach or a pessimistic one. The first is the way of hope, the second the road to despair for many of our citizens.

We must decide a very basic question. Do we wish Yukon to grow or to stagnate? Will the economy expand or contract? What future do we want and what are we prepared to do to create our own future?

The budget before us makes clear the choice of the Conservative Government of Yukon. This budget policy, which my colleagues have called "Robinhood in reverse", is in my view the wrong direction for Yukon. It is passive and pessimistic and negative in its outlook. One may say it continues the policy which is designed to do more to help the Conservative government than it is the people of Yukon.

These estimates are based on a number of assumptions, among them some assumptions about the decline in Yukon's population. But these assumptions may well be wrong for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is that there are few jobs anywhere else in Canada. We may lose a lot fewer than 4,500 persons from Yukon. Even under the pessimistic government scenario I now believe that our population may fall by as little as 1,500 persons and in fact some of the detail in the Department of Education's budget seems to indicate that that Department is at least at odds with the Department of Finance or the Department of Economic Development in these projections.

I pose this question now because this projection is obviously very important in the planning of public expenditures and the anticipation of public revenues.

As has been said this budget proposes to tax the ordinary struggling citizen in order to provide some relief to successful, local business enterprises. In itself, that is not surprising, Conservatives throughout history have always favoured taking from the poor to give to the rich; however, this plan is not that simple, especially the property tax aspect of the budget.

The City of Whitehorse, as you know, happens to have a variable tax rate. In Whitehorse the higher tax rate is applied to non-residential properties, the lower to residential properties. The territory, which levies a school tax on property, wants to move in the opposite direction and reduce the non-residential rate. According to this government, that would help small business in this city but, according to the city, most of the non-residential property is government-owned, not commercially-owned. So the real beneficiary of this tax cut would have been government, not business. 15 Not surprisingly, city council has adjusted its own tax rates to nullify the effect of this budget item in Whitehorse. This is the city's right. In Canada, property taxes are a municipal form of revenue; they are properly within municipal jurisdiction and ought to be the exclusive domain of municipal governments within their boundaries.

I have long argued that, to be fair, property tax should be used only to finance services to property which increase the value of that

property. Now, in most Canadian towns, municipal school boards set education budgets and school budgets are a part of the local revenue picture. However, because property taxes are regressive, in that they are not based on an ability to pay, I believe that they ought not to be used to finance universal human services like education or health.

The fact is that the territory continues to invade the municipal tax field with its school taxes. The result, I believe, is both confusion and inefficiency. The other day, I heard the government leader claim that everybody knows who collects school taxes. He insisted that no one blames the city for them. Well, I submit he is wrong. I have been an alderman for the city and I can tell him that many, many people are very confused about who taxes whom and for what in this city, as they are elsewhere.

The present system is also impractical. The territory, through its school tax, takes from the property owner in the municipality with one hand but then, with the other hand, it makes grants and contributions back to the same municipality. I suspect that it would be administratively much more simple for the territory to vacate the property tax field within the municipalities and adjust its municipal affairs' budgets accordingly. That, in an ideal world, would put municipal politicians back in control of municipal budgets, as they should be, and the public should then have a much better idea of what was going on with its money.

Much was made in the finance minister's address about this being a balanced budget. Well, call it what you want, but the territory did not balance this budget; the federal government did that. The fact remains that this government still owes Ottawa an awful lot of money and I look forward to finding out exactly how much in the detailed discussion of the finance estimates.

The federal government is keeping the Yukon government going, but some Yukon communities are struggling. The government benches will forgive me if I say that this administration has sometimes seemed indifferent to their fate. Faro — which has usually been seen as a source of revenue — and Elsa, have been described as businesses and not as communities, so, I sincerely hope that the current depression has at least given this government a new appreciation of the importance of these centres and their residents.

While I was away, I gather there was some discussion about my party's attitude on the proper role of government and the public sector, so I am pleased to say something on this subject during this debate on the government's budget policy.

During the last election, we emphasized time and time again that tough times were upon us and that decisive government action was required to deal with the crisis. Our Conservative opponents said that there was no problem and that nothing would change if they were re-elected. Well, I believe I am entitled to say that we won that debate, even if we did not win the election.

Throughout last year's election, we called for the redirection of public spending towards the priorities of job creation, job training and economic development. We suggested that certain discretionary expenditures that did not advance these priorities could be cut. <sup>16</sup> Government travel outside the territory was one such area. When I suggested it, the proposal was ridiculed. After the election, of course, travel was cut. At no time, then or since, have we proposed the dismantling of the public service. We did not support "six-and-five" legislation. We did not support contracting out to the private sector. We did not support lay-offs. These were Tory proposals. It was the Conservative Government of Yukon that chose confrontation with Yukon Indians, confrontation with public servants and I say to the Minister of Education, with respect to her speech over the weekend, confrontation with the teachers. Our choice would have been for cooperation, like the Manitoba government, which the government leader referred to a moment ago.

Instead of a rigid "six-and-five" program, Manitoba chose to increase the income for those earning the lowest wages. Unlike the Conservative Government of Yukon, the New Democratic Party Government of Manitoba froze, or limited, charges or fees that fall heavily on low income groups. Manitoba encouraged wage settlements that reduced the gap between cooks and clerks at one end and

senior executives at the other. Manitoba negotiated wage reductions with its employees and all the money saved has been directed to job creation.

Yukon's government announces a ceiling on public service employment while, at the same time, the government contemplates cutbacks, contracting out and lay-offs. It is the passive approach. If nothing happens, the government says, there will be cutbacks; if the economy does not improve, there will be lay-offs; if the sun don't shine, we won't plant the garden.

At the same time as the government talks itself into reductions in the public service, the Cabinet continues to spend money like a sailor on a spree. It hires people at huge salaries to perform political tasks which could be performed by volunteers or MLAs. It squanders money on patronage appointments, political advertising, Cabinet cars. And what have all these appointees to the big, new Executive Council done for the economy? What has the Cabinet done about unemployment except in its own shop? The answer is: precious little. What have they done to expand the economy? What have they done about the declining revenues that caused them to consider lay-offs and cutbacks? They have opened their hands and Ottawa has filled them with money. But, have they settled land claims? Have they reopened Faro or Elsa? Have they got the trains running again? No, they have not. If they had done that, they could claim their management of the Yukon economy was a success. They have not, and they cannot. Their management, by any objective judgement, must be judged a failure.

It is true that if nothing happens and the economy shrinks to the point where it is only a shadow of its former self, then the government will inevitably shrink as well; just like it did after the gold rush.

I do not want that to happen and I do not want to sit and watch this government sit and watch it happen. I want the economy to recover and I want the government to act to achieve that end. We want to see services to people, like health and education, to be maintained, but, of course, we do not want to see a huge bureaucracy presiding over an economic wasteland.

We shall, as we have before, oppose cutbacks, contracting out and lay-offs because such policies are an admission of failure. We want to fight unemployment not cause more of it. We want the government to attack the problem, not retreat from it. We do not want Yukoners serving the Conservative government, we want the government to serve the people of Yukon. We want the government to act on their behalf.

<sup>17</sup> Some people on the other side, and I just heard one of them muttering, believe that no government is the best government. It makes you wonder why they cling so tenaciously to their participation in it. I say, if we ever got to the point where there is nobody and nothing left to govern in Yukon, I might possibly be persuaded to agree with this position, even though it sounds vaguely anarchistic to me. I think more probably I would conclude that the truth is something different. The truth is that even if there were no-one left here, Canada would send a mountie to guard the place; DPW would send someone to build the mountie a house; a contractor would come to feed him; someone else would arrive to do his laundry, and so on. Members opposite have said they would be opposed to Cyprus Anvil becoming a Crown corporation or to a Crown corporation having any participation in the management of that entity. I even gained the impression that they would prefer no mine at Faro to one run by a public company. The other day, the government leader said he would rather see the Americans run the mine than a Canadian Crown corporation. That was, in my view, an incredibly unpatriotic statement, and I want to say further, a betrayal of some of the best traditions of his own party.

We have all talked about small business in this debate. Both sides of the House support small business; both, I believe, recognize, as did our MP recently, that free enterprise operates mainly at the level of small business. Corporate capitalism has very little to do with free enterprise. The dictatorial power of giant corporations to fix prices, to control supplies and determine the life and death of communities like Elsa and Faro is enormous. The power of the multi-nationals even challenges the power of nation states.

Canada is not a weak country, but it has the dubious distinction of



having more foreign ownership per capita than any other nation in the world. Quite literally, the control of our economy, and therefore of our society, lies to a large extent outside our borders. As a democrat and as a patriot, I find that situation totally unacceptable; however, the solution to this problem is not that easy. My party supports a mixed economy. We want a mix of private and public enterprise. We support cooperatives. We support worker-owned enterprises. We support small business. But, no matter how much we admire the small business sector, it cannot repatriate our economy. All the small businesses in the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce are not likely to come to the rescue of Cyprus Anvil for the simple reason that that mine is a big business, and because Canada is a big country with a relatively small population, the choice of investment capital in Canada has usually been between Crown corporations and foreign big business — not between domestic capital, domestic private capital, and domestic public capital, but between domestic public capital and foreign private capital.

The Minister of Renewable Resources says "garbage". I will not bore him with the facts on the economic accounts of this country, because he would not be interested in having any information about the subject, he just wants to perpetuate his own prejudices, but the facts are as I have stated them. The reason that that situation has prevailed is, as I said, because we are a relatively small population in a very large country.

18 That is why Conservative governments all the way through Canadian history have used Crown corporations to achieve their public policy — it was not because they were secret socialists. It was because they recognized that no one in Canada but the government could assemble the capital necessary to build the first canal in this country, to build the railroads which they gave to the private sector — but which they paid for with public money — airlines, radio networks and public utilities. What we have had happen in this country is Conservative governments, Liberal governments, nationally, have looked at the choice between private foreign capital and domestic public capital when it came to developing major projects and time and time again they realized that the national interest, the public interest, required a Crown company because that was the only way the people of this country were going to keep any control of their own future. I would point out that Conservative governments, as well as governments of every other stripe, have realized that in tough times only our government, not some foreign company, might be concerned enough to come to the rescue of regional economy like ours.

In Yukon, small business dominates the service sector. That sector depends for its success on the resource sectors and government, both of which are big businesses. If I ask myself which I prefer, American or Canadian control of our big businesses, our economy and our society, I reply Canadian. The government leader says American. If I am asked which I prefer, Canadian control or Yukon control, I reply Yukon control. To the government leader I say again, and I say this sincerely, he has long wanted an objective of provincial status or provincehood; if he would achieve that without any control over the local economy, whether it is over resources or anything else, that power, the power of a province, would be meaningless.

Foreign control means a branch plant economy. It means that the foreign investor can take his money and go home with our jobs any time he likes and there is nothing we can do about it. The government leader mentions Dome; the national government has the potential to do something about Dome, but there is nothing they can do about Standard Oil running away with our jobs. Outside control of our economy aggravates situations like we now have at Elsa and Faro. Foreign investors have no reason to care what happens to Yukon. The public cannot influence their decision.

The minister opposite mentions Elsa. Falconbridge is of course a Canadian multi-national which has been busy moving jobs out of this country into Latin-American dictatorships in South Africa and the Dominican Republic for years.

Even with a Tory government in Ottawa, I would choose domestic rather than foreign control, as have most Conservatives in Canadian history. As a supporter of active, accountable, responsi-

ble, democratic government, our option I believe is in the public interest. It is the better alternative. Given a choice between us and them, I am going to choose us every time.

Today we have a choice. We can have the guts and the will and the brains to start to do things for ourselves in this country or we can let Ottawa and the Americans do it. I know my choice.

Tomorrow there will be a federal budget. I sincerely hope there will be some good news for us in it. I am particularly anxious and hopeful that there will be some announcement about Cyprus Anvil and Faro. I am not willing to leave all these things, all these decisions, to Ottawa. I want to see this government's economic recovery plan. I want to see this government say where it wants to go with our economy in the next few years. I want this government to tell us how we are going to get there. I am not willing to sit passively by and watch dozens more of my friends and neighbours forced to leave Yukon.

I am not willing to watch and wait for Faro to die. I want Yukon to get back to work, all of it, and I want our government to lead the way. I want to see this House debate this government's strategy for economic renewal. This, I submit, is the kind of work that this House should be doing and we should be doing it now. I respectfully suggest that that is what the budget debate should have been about. Unfortunately it is not. Thank you.

19 **Mr. Brewster:** I keep getting confusing signs from across the road as to just where we are going. I notice in a number of speeches from that side that they complain about us, as they call it, getting bail-outs from the federal government. I would suggest to them that if somebody owns all the land and all the water and all the fish and all the rights that maybe they owe a little something here. I would also suggest that the territorial government has got money from the federal government and they have got this simply by hard negotiations.

I might point out that this is a much better way of doing things than to, as the hon. member for Faro has done, organize an advertising campaign to go down to eastern Canada to beg, and that is all it is, begging. I would like to inform the member that I consider myself a Yukoner and I will not beg now and I will not beg at any other time.

Let me suggest that maybe if the NDP could support us on our position on land claims and we could go with solid support to Ottawa, along with the CYI, maybe we could get our royalties and the riches of our resources. Then we would not be going back to Ottawa, as the opposition says, to get bailed out, we would be going back, in fact, in a position like Alberta where, maybe, in the years to come we would be bailing out Ottawa.

My government has tried to equalize property taxes for people all over Yukon and put them on market value. They have also set a lower rate for isolated places that do not have sewer, water, fire and other protections and services. This is a first in Yukon: I saw nobody on that side of the House give us credit for this.

The New Democratic Party says continually that we do not help little businesses. I come from an area where there is a large number of small family businesses. Let us look at this for a moment. The first thing is that we have reduced their school taxes a little; everybody says, "Oh, that is not enough." Well, they have their taxes lowered, too, by a small amount, because they are not in an organized community. They do not have fire protection; they do not have water and things like this. They have to put these in themselves and our government has recognized this and has given them a small rebate there.

Through talking with the people in government, I have managed to succeed in getting the homeowner's grant recognized to go to small businesses. You say this is not much. Well, you add all these things together and this helps pay for another tank of fuel and this means an awful lot to small businesses.

If my motion on electrical subsidies, which was passed by this House, had cleared the bureaucrats in Ottawa, they would have had another small amount of money. When you add these things up, it makes a great, great difference to people with small businesses.

We have also given them a credit on their corporate taxes, and this affects a lot of small businesses that are desperately trying to stay in business at the present time.

Yes, in some places our taxes did go up. There are many people on the street, when they look at this, who are quite relieved that the taxes did not go up that much; in fact, we still have one of the lowest rates in Canada — and I see the hon. member for Mayo smiling. We are still the third lowest in Canada, but he still shakes his head because he cannot accept facts as they are.

Look at our senior citizens. We have kept the Pioneer Utility Grant; in fact, we increased it. These people get homeowner grants and we are finding more and more that older people are staying in Yukon because they can live here and survive here about as well as they can outside.

The member for Faro wants us to hire more people to start a Crown corporation. The member for Whitehorse South Centre says that he wants us to fire government employees and to cut down our costs.

I only wish that these members across the floor could all get together on the subject and get their act together just for once, so that we know really where they stand.

I am just a little confused about what the leader of the opposition was saying in his speech. The member for Whitehorse South Centre was invited over to our side of the House, the other day, by my friend on the left. I might suggest that, no matter how you try, sir, there are none of you coming over on this side to be in bed with us.

In closing, I notice that the government leader has stated that the government will be studying transportation. I hope, in this study, that he has people investigate the possibility of a port at Tarr Inlet. In fact, to hurry this situation on, I invite both the government leader and the opposition leader to visit my office, where we have a map. We can show them exactly where Tarr Inlet is; it is in the north, it is not in Yukon, but it is in BC. I invite both of them to look at this and maybe start a program to see if this is not feasible.

**Mr. Porter:** In replying to the previous speaker, in the tradition of responding to debate, I would like to say that we did not know, on this side of the House, that the member for Porter Creek West was indeed on the left of things. With respect to his statements about needing our party's support to get back to the land claims negotiations, I suggest that this government stop acting like a child and waiting to be told what to do. I think, if they are indeed a responsible government, as they contend they are, then they should act in a responsible fashion. Most Yukoners agree that going back to the land claims negotiations would be a responsible action on the part of this government.

As to the whole question of accusing the member for Faro and the people of Faro of begging for support from the federal government, I ask the member if he has read, indeed, this very budget that has been tabled by his government in this House. If he has, he would find a majority portion of that budget is provided for by funds from the federal government and it is a question of asking the member to what degree does it stop: is it one dollar from the feds or is it a \$1,000,000? Is he, in fact, true to his principles of philosophy of no government involvement and the economy will serve it all.

When the government leader opened his speech on the budget, he stated that it was an occasion of great pleasure. I hope that the government leader used the phrase "great pleasure" as a formality in the text of his speech and not that he was, indeed, taking pleasure from increasing the tax burden on the people of the Yukon.

Moving quickly to the major thrust of the government's budget, we see that once again the communities and the individual taxpayers are being asked to shoulder the brunt of the economic depression. As my colleague for Whitehorse South Centre put it, the little guy is again expected to pay for everyone else.

I think the philosophy of shifting the economic burden entirely on to the shoulders of the average Yukoner is grossly unfair. The pursuing of this philosophy can only expose the government to political unrest. More importantly, the cost in human terms is simply too great. The confidence of the people of Yukon has been stretched to the breaking point. Already, many of our young skilled workers have made the decision to leave the territory; some of them will never return. Our young people do not want to leave, but the majority of them have no choice. They are driven by their determination to survive. They are going because they have families to feed, bills to pay and, most importantly, they are seeking

employment to fulfil their sense of dignity and responsibility.

Government spending is the only part of our economic machinery that is presently working and in the absence of the usual dominant force of the mining sector in our economy, government has little choice but to take up the slack. I believe the message to government is very simple: a greater degree of direct government involvement in the economy is a fact of life. The government must use all of the resources towards stimulating the job market and initiate immediately an economic recovery plan that would concentrate on employing as many people as possible. The method to achieve this objective is not to do as this government has done, by increasing the tax burden on the consumer and taking away what little buying power the consumer has, but rather by instituting a plan of action that puts cash into the hands of the consumers.

Government could prop up private enterprise all it wants to, but if the consumer has no money to spend, the businesses' life expectancy will only be prolonged for a short period. It simply then becomes a question of time before the inevitable becomes a fact of life and a once-healthy business becomes just another statistic. A closer examination of the impact of the government's spending would reveal that the single largest beneficiary is the City of Whitehorse. There must be a shift away from this established trend. If the economic situation is bad in Whitehorse, it is twice as bad in the communities of the Yukon. One has only to travel to those communities and speak to the residents to confirm this fact. If this government truly believes itself to be responsible, then it must be responsible to all of the people of the territory and not just to the populace of the major centre.

If the government is indeed serious about fair play and equal opportunity, then the government must immediately undertake a program of decentralizing the thrust of its spending power. The government must not penalize communities of the Yukon in order to benefit the minority of the business interests. Unfortunately, that is exactly what is being done as a result of the government's budget. The short-term benefits that the business sector will be receiving is at the expense of the towns and municipalities and the people of the Yukon.

In the budget, the government has announced that it is setting the school tax rate for business at .21 percent and for residents at .34 percent. In addition to the change in the tax rate, the government has frozen municipal grants this year to the same level of last year's expenditure. The effect of these measures are going to force the communities to drastically cut back on services or to raise dramatically the property taxes of the residents. The territorial government politicians are, in effect, asking their municipal counterparts to take the blame for this government's gesture of generosity to the business sector. We have seen, I believe, in Teslin over the last week, that that community has been forced to double its tax rate. If they were to truly pay for all of the costs that are needed to maintain the same level of services in that community, they would have had to raise the taxes two-and-a-half times; but much to the benefit of all the parties that were concerned, in that particular situation, there was an agreed-upon arrangement of compromise. That compromise, as announced in the House last week, entailed the community raising its taxes to .82, I believe, and the government agreeing to make up the expenditure that it would cost the community to maintain its level of services for the year. I suggest that, had the government not interfered with that particular community's tax base during the election, the situation would not have arisen in the first place. Clearly, that is the problem that faces the communities of Carmacks and Mayo as well.

Clearly, our party is on record as supporting the business sector of Yukon's society. What we are not in favour of is their welfare at the expense of the Yukon taxpayer. We advocate the policy of fairness. If the government wants to introduce a benefit to business, we encourage that position; but at the same time, the Yukon taxpayer should not be asked to pick up the tab. Our message to this government is very clear: give the taxpayer a break as well as the business operator.

Coming back to the question of economic decentralization, the government must immediately embark on a strategy that focuses on increasing expenditure of social capital throughout all of the Yukon

communities. The two immediate areas that come to mind are the areas of road construction and housing. If the government were to ask their officials in the highways department as to the general conditions of the highway system in the Yukon, I am certain they will be told that our roads could use an awful lot of attention. There are many young Yukoners who are trained in the area of road construction, but face no prospect of a job in their area of expertise this construction season. We need to employ these people, and we can. Aside from the employment factor of an aggressive road construction and maintenance program, we would be assisting the only other hopeful sector of our economy: tourism. Simply put, better roads coupled with a successful marketing strategy means more tourists.

While on the topic of tourism, the government would be supported by our party if it stopped playing political games with the federal government and moved more quickly toward consummating an agreement with regard to the economic development agreement.

Again, the broad emphasis of this government's position should be toward job creation. I believe that the government must assign a higher sense of priority to the area of housing. An increase in housing starts in the Yukon will not only have a positive social benefit but it will also have a tremendous impact on creating meaningful employment. As of March 9th of this year, the local carpenters' union reported that only nine of its 207 members were employed. As a growing territory, we cannot afford to lose too many of our skilled workers such as carpenters. Other tradesmen such as plumbers and electricians stand to benefit from increased activity in the housing construction industry as well.

In order to mobilize the housing industry, this government should be looking at accessing more federal program dollars such as those provided for by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

To summarize, what is needed at this time is for the government to seriously re-examine the priorities in the area of government expenditure. To capsulize what I have stated: number 1, the government must equalize its tax burden to all the taxpayers of the Yukon; number 2, government must reverse the trend of encroachment into the property taxing areas of the local municipalities; number 3, government must undertake a move to decentralize its spending power to all the communities of the Yukon; number 4, the Yukon government must increase the pace of negotiating an economic development agreement with the federal government with the main emphasis on job creation and the renewable resource sector of the economy; and finally, number 5, this government should step up its activity in the area of highways and housing.

The ideas presented are not necessarily designed to be a blueprint for the future of the Yukon's economy but rather they should be seen as measures that are proposed to address the immediate needs of the territory. Long range planning in the mineral sector of the economy and the areas of energy and transportation infrastructure are an ongoing process that must be modified to incorporate the more immediate economic recovery plan for the Yukon that is desperately needed at this time.

I do not believe that any sitting member of this House must be reminded of the importance of the settlement of the land claims question and its impact on the economy. The direction to take for the government is obvious; they must return to the bargaining table now.

In concluding my address to the budget I would like to say to the government members in the House that we understand their predicament. We can well appreciate the enormity of the task that lies before this government. We, as members of the opposition, will encourage and support this government's actions provided that we are convinced as to the fairness and equality of their policies. We urge the government to table in this Legislature a meaningful plan for economic recovery. Failure to do so will mean a continued erosion of the people's confidence in this government. T.S. Elliot once said that "April is the cruellest month". The government's budget only reinforces that statement in the minds of many Yukoners.

I move that debate on Motion Number 8 be now adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved that debate be now adjourned.

#### *Motion defeated*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I know the member is afraid about what I am going to have to say about him and his socialistic ideas so I was quite well aware that he would propose some idiotic move such as he just did.

I would like to address some of the remarks made by some of the members from across the floor and add some of my opinions to them.

I will start with the member for Whitehorse South Centre. He said that this is not a balanced budget. He said it is one-thirds Yukon and two-thirds Canadian and that is not balanced and we should be looking at finding the other two-thirds within the Yukon Territory. I would ask him why, on a great many occasions, he does not support us in our attempts to get our resources and certain other things from the federal government when we are after them rather than criticize the position that we take with the federal government. I am sure that if the federal government was taking five times as much revenue out of the Yukon as they were putting back in, he would be one of the first ones to say that we should be down there getting that revenue.

As long as the federal government treats Yukon as a colony, they have an obligation to look after it as a colony and if three-quarters of the budget is required from the federal government, that is their responsibility.

He says the size of the civil service should be reduced, and I am very surprised to hear him say that. I am sure that the members of the public service of the Yukon Territory were very surprised, as we heard on the radio. In fact, they were very surprised. I am also very surprised that he, as a member of a socialist party, would even contemplate that. I have never heard any member from across the floor, under any circumstance, ever suggest to this government that we reduce the civil service. They have never made a recommendation that we get rid of such and such a person or such and such a position or get rid of a program. I have never heard, in my over four years in office in this government, the opposition members from across the floor ever recommend that we drop the programs; always that we increase them. They have done it under this budget speech. Even today the member for Campbell suggested that the government not only continue the programs but we should become involved in everything. We should produce most of the work in the territory so that everybody could work. I am very surprised that one member from across the floor would suggest that we reduce the civil service. I will deal with that a little bit later, as well.

The member for Faro's only comment of any substance at all in his speech was that we should buy Cyprus Anvil. That is his only solution to the problems in the Yukon Territory: buy Cyprus Anvil. Well, I, and a great many other people, have seen government involvement in a great many agencies and businesses in this country and very few of them, contrary to what the member for Mayo has said, make any money. If you look at all of the hidden costs in financing these Crown corporations, you will find that there is a great deal of loss in these companies. The member quotes facts and figures — that these companies made \$300,000,000; made \$70,000,000 and they made \$50,000,000 — I would like to ask him where the \$800,000,000 heritage fund disappeared to? If they do not need money, where did the heritage fund go? It went to finance these companies but they do not have the heritage fund; where is it? It disappeared and it disappeared because they used it to finance their socialist programs and their socialist ideas of running a country.

They also socialized the land in Saskatchewan. When Grant Devine won the election, the Saskatchewan government controlled 1.3 million acres of farm land. The farmers in Saskatchewan were serfs to their government. Is that what we want to see in our country?

The leader of the opposition asks, "Do we wish the Yukon to grow or to stagnate?" Well, I want to see it grow and I want to see it grow by people wanting to come to the Yukon Territory, who want to develop the Yukon Territory, who want to start a small business in the territory. I do not want to see it grow by government taxing people somewhere else in Canada in order to produce jobs in the territory, as the opposition members are suggesting.

He says our budget is a pessimistic budget based on a declining

population of approximately 4,500 to 5,000. That is not what we said. What we said was that our estimate would be that if the population did decline, it would decline by approximately 4,500 to 5,000 maximum. We based a budget on that maximum decline so that we would know that the budget that we tabled in this House was capable of getting us through this next year. We have used pessimistic figures in order to produce a budget that we knew would be adequate to do the job and if the population did not decline, we, as a government, would be much better off than the projections that are shown in the budget. It was a very responsible budget. It was done expressly for the purpose that it would be an optimistic budget.

He says that during the election they suggested that we cut government travel and after the election that we, as a government, did cut government travel. We cut government travel only after the economy declined so badly that we did not know if we were going to have enough money to get through. Quite often, the government travel that we cut out would have been beneficial to the people of this territory. Every one of the public and the members of the opposition certainly recognize that we, as government employees, have to travel and have to negotiate; otherwise, we might as well put a wall up around the territory and forget about it.

I will get back to the government lay-offs. The leader of the opposition stood there and said that we do not, as a party, believe in laying off people. I suggest that the member for Whitehorse South Centre resign his position in that party. I would like to quote from *Hansard*. In speaking about the very large federal budget payment that we got, he said, "It is not a justified expenditure simply to maintain the structures planned two years ago and which are now no longer appropriate." He goes on to say, "The existing level of government service is inappropriate to the present economic and social situation."

24 He recommends that we reduce the size of the public service; in fact, he said that specifically on a radio program, through the media. I would suggest to him that, if he is in total contradiction to the leader of his party, he should resign his seat and sit as an independent.

I would like to get back to the business part of it. The leader of the opposition says that we have a choice between foreign investment and public enterprise. He says that we do not have the capital pool in the country to finance large corporate businesses. Well, for a country the size of Canada, we have one of the largest corporate capital pools in the world. We have five of the largest banks in the world which have financed billions of dollars, not only in Canada, but everywhere else in the world. In fact, they have such levels of financing-out to various countries in the world, such as Mexico and Argentina and places like that, that they are afraid that if the governments in those countries devalue their dollars or if the price of foreign oil drops too much, it will actually take the banks down in Canada; that is how much money we have in our Canadian banks to finance business acquisitions in this country.

The leader of the opposition may be trying to make some political brownie points with his socialist ideas, but we certainly have the financial capital pool to finance businesses in Canada. We do not have to have government take-over of business or government financing of business; we have adequate financing within our financial capabilities of the country.

The member for Campbell says, "Don't get the money from the feds" and then he says, "Don't take it from Yukoners". I wonder where the money to run the government is going to come from. Do not tax Yukoners, but do not get it from the feds either. It is totally, totally beyond my comprehension where the member thinks we are going to get the money to run a government. Where is the money going to come from to produce all these jobs that he is suggesting we produce. That is a question that I would like to hear him answer at some future time.

He suggests that school taxes and corporation taxes are reducing the community revenue and their ability to supply services in the community. Neither school taxes nor corporation taxes go to the communities, so I do not know where he gets his financial management expertise when school taxes and corporation taxes go to the territorial government in the first place. What have the

communities to do with it?

We collect the taxes in all of the communities except Whitehorse — well, except in the municipalities, I should qualify that. I do not know where he gets the basis for his argument. I would be very interested in knowing that, as well.

All in all, I think that we have listened to a lot of socialist gobble-de-gook from the other side for the last four or five days in which we have been dealing with the budget speech. I think that if the members across the floor would come up with some constructive ideas and some constructive criticism that this government could listen to, we could probably implement some of it, but we certainly cannot implement ideas and suggestions that they contradict in their very next breath. I am totally in support of the motion to approve the budgetary process and policies of the government and will be supporting the motion.

Thank you.

25 **Ms. Nukon:** We are here today to discuss the budgetary policy of the Yukon government. Although I am not going to discuss the details of the budget, I am going to be discussing a matter that may have financial implications for the Yukon government this coming fiscal year. I am referring to the upcoming decision by the federal government on Gulf's application to construct a deep water port at Stokes Point.

In recent weeks, this subject has become the topic of many debates and a decision is expected soon. The Old Crow Band Council is very concerned about the Porcupine caribou herd. This herd is a very important part of our livelihood and we want to make sure it continues to flourish in the years to come. The Old Crow Band Council has passed a resolution against development at Stokes Point until a land claims agreement-in-principle and a public hearing process are completed. The band is concerned that development at Stokes Point will have harmful effects on the caribou in the nearby calving grounds.

I, too, am concerned about the effects the construction of a port at Stokes Point will have on the Porcupine caribou herd. The caribou are a fundamental part of the traditional way of life of the Old Crow people and we must do what we can to ensure these animals are protected. In a motion passed in this House last fall regarding a port on Yukon's North Slope and the resolution passed by the Old Crow Band have the same basic goals in mind. Neither the Yukon government nor the Old Crow Band want development on Yukon's north coast if it is going to cause unacceptable environmental and social damage. Both the government and the band are concerned about the safety of the Porcupine caribou herd and I am encouraged to see there is so much interest in their presence.

At present, we do not know what the impacts will be if a port is constructed at Stokes. So far, most studies have not been released. Before the federal government issues a land use permit they must be satisfied that the Porcupine caribou herd will not be harmed. This is an essential condition. Before the port is allowed to be built, they must have done whatever amount of research is necessary to determine the impacts of a port on the calving grounds. The protection of the caribou is what the Old Crow Band is fighting for and the Yukon government would only support the port if the future wellbeing of the herd is not jeopardized.

If the federal government does allow a port to be constructed at Stokes Point, I hope the Yukon government will work to make sure Yukoners get jobs on the projects. In Old Crow there are many people who believe the traditional way of life should be continued. As I have said before, I believe that hunting, fishing and trapping must be protected for the Old Crow people but there are many young people who do not want to make their living in this way. If the federal government does its research thoroughly, determines that the caribou will not be harmed and allows the port to be constructed, then we must be prepared to work to make sure these young people get jobs at Stokes Point.

I do not know exactly what the budgetary implications of the Stokes Point question are, but I do feel that this issue is of such importance, especially to the people of Old Crow, that the Yukon government must be prepared to provide whatever funds are necessary to ensure the protection of the Porcupine caribou herd. To the people of Old Crow, this is a very important budgetary

consideration.

**Mr. Falle:** I have been sitting on this side of the House for all of this session and intend to stay here, by the way, but it is very interesting that the people on the other side of the House seem to be telling me we support small business; we support small industry. The most interesting thing to me is that I have yet to hear one question from the other side concerning placer mining. I would like to know where they stand on placer mining.

I would like to hear, in the days to come, whether or not they support the small family business which happens to be a heritage of the Yukoners; it is our way of life, it is the way we can make some dollars. There are two members on the other side of the House who come directly from mining communities: Mayo and Faro. All I happen to hear from the one from Faro is "gimme, gimme, gimme" and the Feds pay or we pay. Mining is a business; you have to make a dollar. There are big bucks in it if you make money but you have to spend a lot of money in order to make it and when free enterprise cannot make it because they are losing money, what you seem to be asking is the government to turn around and spend the money. Never mind, we do not know what we are going to do with the zinc or anything, just hold it for future times; it may go up or it may go down, nobody really seems to know.

Another point that I would like to bring up that the opposite side has brought up is land claims. To me, land claims is very interesting. This weekend, we had a convention and I had the pleasure of asking Mr. Michael Smith a very pointed question. He was the person speaking on behalf of the CYI at our convention. I asked him whether or not he trusted the feds. I do not know if his answer was evident; he smiled and he sat down. It was quite apparent that he did not trust the feds and I do not think that we do either. They have played some cool ones on us in this House. I think that it was interesting, in Mr. Pearson's speech at that convention, that probably there is some leeway: we are seeing and we are talking. That makes a whole lot of sense to me. Basically now it seems to me Yukoners talking. I do not think either one of us really trust the feds.

As far as I am concerned, I am still waiting to hear where the NDP stands on one of the most vital issues that I think is facing Yukoners today and now: placer mines. Where are they? Do they support it? I do not know, but I hope to hear that before too long.

**Mr. Byblow:** Until the last speaker rose, I had not intended to speak in the debate but I do want to set the record straight on a couple of points. The member speaks about trust. I wonder if he had asked Mr. Smith whether the organization he represents trusts the Conservatives and then we would have an interesting circle of trust. I also get up to ask the member if he was present in the House last Thursday when the member for Mayo responded with a position on placer mining. If the member for Hootalinqua still has difficulty in knowing where we are coming from, I invite him to join us in our ongoing meetings with placers miners, with the industry in addressing the problem.

I would not want the member for Kluane to leave the House with the misleading impression that I have organized an advertising campaign to Ottawa. If he is referring to a lobby represented by a broad cross-section of Yukon interest that took a 20-page consensual submission to Ottawa then, yes, I will take all credit and criticism related to organizing that lobby along with those participants who equally shared with me in the preparation.

<sup>27</sup> If the member, on the other hand, is referring to an ad placed in the *Ottawa Citizen*, that he alleges I organized, I will tell him that I had nothing to do with the organization of that. The organization of that was done by representatives of the union locals.

I want to tell him further that I support their initiative. So did the municipal council of Faro support that initiative. So did a number of other organizations, individuals and groups in the territory support that initiative. I find it singularly ironic and a hypocritical contradiction that the member, or anyone in this House, would stand up and accuse the people of Faro of asking for federal aid to help their community when the budget that we are looking at represents over \$70,000,000 in federal aid, which the government leader spent the last six months trying to achieve. It is unreal.

At the same time, a couple of members have made reference to

Crown corporations, drawing on ill-advised research on Saskatchewan. The member for Tatchun says that there was no heritage fund because somewhere it disappeared. Well, things do not disappear; they, in fact, represent the social programs that Saskatchewan lead the country in developing and presenting. It was after the Devine government that those Crown corporations started turning belly-up and showing losses instead of profits, as, under the Devine government, since a year ago, the unemployment rate has moved from four to seven percent.

The Minister of Renewable Resources made reference to land. That policy came in to prevent the land from being gobbled up from outside provincial interests. That land was left for the people of Saskatchewan and is still in those hands.

The minister talks about no wise advice from this side on programs. Well, we have seen quite a few programs from within the Executive Council Office brought into existence that we have some question about. The Minister of Renewable Resources talks about taxation and he talks about taxes not going to the communities. From what I have heard from the other side, that is the fundamental thrust of their budget: that they cut the tax rate to business to incur a greater financing to the communities. It is a complete contradiction to what the minister is trying to say. From our point of view, you do not take it away from the individual to assist those who do not need it, reduce the spending power of the consumer and cripple the small business in the process. Somewhere we have not been listening to each other.

Having set those few points straight on the record, I would leave debate on the budget to other interests who may wish to rise and, perhaps, we could have question.

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

*Motion agreed to*

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

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I move 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 Minister of Education that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair*

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

We will now take a break, after which we will continue with the budget.

*Recess*

<sup>28</sup> **Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue with the budget of the Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower. We were on page 44, on Yukon Campus.

**Bill No. 5: Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84**

*On Yukon Campus — continued*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** To respond to a couple of questions I had made a commitment to bring back to House: a question had been asked about French immersion and the difference between recoveries and expenditures. I believe in the last budget debate we had, I responded in regards to this question already, and the response is that the maximum amount of money that is identified for salaries in the French immersion program that the Secretary of State gives back to us is \$50,000 and that in the French immersion program the teacher's salaries are budgeted in the other activity, as I indicated, under administration. I hope that clarifies that for the members.

We have 81 students taking a full grade of correspondence courses and we have 38 others taking single courses. That would be someone taking a math course or science course. The 81 are students taking a whole complete grade.

In remedial tutors, there is actually a 0.7 decrease in person years. The member has indicated that it is a 2.5 decrease that he can.

see since 1981; however the formula for remedial tutors is that as the numbers of students decline the formula also declines, and Ross River has 0.5 fewer person-years for remedial tutoring, and the other 0.2 is spread out for 1983-84.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have two questions on the information that the minister provided.

Why did Ross River get a decline? Is that related to the population of students or the needs of the children? The other question is: is there a specific formula for procedure that governs where remedial tutors are sent?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The 0.5 fewer for Ross River was a combination of students and need, and there is a formula based on the number of students and defined need for remedial tutors.

**Mr. Byblow:** I can do this in a written question but I would like to know where the locations of the remedial tutors are. I can probably procure that from the department, so I will leave that.

Are we proceeding on Yukon Campus, Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** We are on Yukon Campus.

**Mr. Chairman:** Could the minister indicate to me what is happening, physically, with the old campus as it were; the trailer units beside Christ the King High? Eventually, as the programs get moved out into the old Vocational and Technical Training Centre, something obviously will be happening to the space where the old campus used to be.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Regarding the comment about the remedial tutors, if you will read *Hansard* from the last budget debate, I gave a complete breakdown of where all the remedial tutors were located. I did have the page number in my head but it has gone. The trailers that have been facilitating Yukon Campus are going to remain there right at the moment and we have not finalized the plans for whatever restructuring we are going to be having. When we do that, I will indicate it to the House.

**Mrs. Joe:** I asked the minister a question during Question Period and that question was: since the women's program has been a success at the vocational school, does the minister have any future plans to develop any further courses through the Yukon college? The minister said she believed we would be discussing it during the budget, and I am looking forward to finding out what the minister has to say in that area.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** If I could discuss that when we come to the advanced education portion of the budget, I would prefer to. My notes are organized in that order, and I have all the new courses that we will be having later on in the budget. If we could dispense with Yukon Campus and move on to recreation, then we will be in the advanced education part.

**Mrs. Joe:** Yes, that is great. I just have one other question in regard to the dropout rate, if that is what you would call it. Out of a total of, I believe, 200 students, there were 44 students who left vocational school. I just wondered whether that was the normal or whether it was worse than it had been the year before. The reason was given that most of these people had left the Yukon to look for work or else they had had to leave school to go to work.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That is correct. The member is talking about the dropout rate in the vocational school. The usual reason is that they cannot afford to carry on with their studies and they leave to get a job or a job comes available somewhere else, or they find it necessary to move back to live with families. There are various reasons. They usually leave for a self-motivated reason.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just on the subject of Yukon Campus: does the figure in the line item under "Other, \$266,000" indicate, in its substantial or main part, fees paid to instructors for the various courses?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Are you talking about "Other" in the Allotments? That is not personnel costs; personnel would be salaries paid; "other" would be other costs, — supplies, facilities, services — anything that is not related to personnel costs, to salaries.

**Mr. Byblow:** That being the answer, the obvious question would be: how do we arrange for payments of the professors who present the courses that come in from Vancouver, Edmonton, or wherever?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** "Other costs" also includes professional and special services, which would be professors, local and UBC

contract honoraria, advertising, professional development.

**Mr. Penikett:** What I was getting at was that I wanted to know how much money we are spending on outside professional help to provide the courses. Of that \$266,000, therefore, what portion of that constitutes that kind of assistance?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I cannot give an exact number; however, I can tell him that we have a total of 12 instructors; two of them are living and working in Whitehorse. Also, we are paying for a part-time contract employee, who is a librarian, and we are paying for the clerk-typist position. I would think that quite safely I could say that the majority of the salary is spent on local instructors.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just to confirm that: if we have 12 instructing positions — the minister says part-time — that would therefore mean that they are people within the Yukon community, within the teaching qualification, as it were, who are providing these courses, and only two full-time positions are positions of instructors from outside. Is that right?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The coordinator of academic programs is located here and the director of programs is located here. That is correct; two instructors from outside and 10 instructors living in Whitehorse.

*On Operations*

*Operations in the amount of \$356,000 agreed to*

*On Recreation*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** There has been some re-organization in the recreation department, based upon direction and recommendation given by YRAC and the green paper committee. I think you will notice the increases in sports and arts amounts that are justified by demands shown on the pages following, pages 47, 48 and 49. You will see that there continues to be quite a big demand.

The YRAC committee is also identified. I am sure the member for Whitehorse North Centre will be concerned that, on page 48, the YRAC committee has no money identified for it. They were spending money out of four programs and, with the re-organization, money has gone into the programs now and allotments for YRAC's travel and so on will come out of the administrative aspect of recreation.

**Mrs. Joe:** I would just like a little bit of clarification on the last statement that the minister made. I was not quite sure what she said in regard of travel.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** In the past session, the member asked about a sum of money that was identified for YRAC for travel and it was quite a large sum of money — \$171,000. Some of that was actually for program as well as travel, and I believe I indicated to the member that it was for travel and she never questioned me further so I left it there. There was money identified there for grants as well and, in order to clarify it, we have identified travel in administration and we have put the grant money into "grant".

**Mrs. Joe:** I did not question the minister at that time, but we certainly had some discussions about it in private afterwards. I notice that there are some changes that were made through the recommendations of the YRAC committee on the green paper and I would like to know if, in fact, any recommendations that are put forward by YRAC will be implemented throughout this fiscal year. I am thinking in terms of the rate that is allowed for teams to travel outside.

As I mentioned last week, there was some thought as to the decrease in the amount from 75 percent to 25 percent, and the minister said that she had understood that it was the same. If it is the same, then that is great as far as the athletes are concerned, but if there is any possibility that it will be decreased throughout the year then I would certainly like to have some confirmation of that.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The recommendations that we will be following from YRAC and the green paper committee will be mainly in the lines of identifying more money for the communities for sports and arts. We are not having any change in the percentage allotment of funds for the teams; it will stay at 75 percent.

**Mrs. Joe:** The green paper committee and the YRAC are, of course, two different things. Does the YRAC go over the green paper and make recommendations, or how does that work? I would like to know what process is used. If they come out with recommendations, can YRAC change them?



**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I hope I can explain it clearly for the member. The green paper committee was formed to get input from YRAC and from the general public and make recommendations to the government for drawing up legislation. They give me recommendations based on what YRAC says. YRAC's basic function is the allotment and distribution of the grants. However, they are in constant discussion with the green paper committee as to whether the YRAC committee will advise the minister and advise the government in policy direction as well. There is a bit of a dual function; the green paper committee advises the minister as well as the YRAC.

However, the committee that I have meetings with is the green paper committee. There is a community sports representative and an arts representative on that committee.

<sup>32</sup> **Mrs. Joe:** In terms of the elite artist and the elite athlete, I think that is a good program, as I have said before. I would like to know how that person is determined. Is there some application that is made to the committee? Is there some application that is made to the department by the sports governing body, or whatever?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, for the elite — I understand I have been pronouncing that incorrectly — the elite athlete assistance program, we do get recommendations from YRAC and the Sports Federation as to who has applied and they have discussions as to the choice of the person who is the successful applicant. The same procedure would be involved with the elite artist assistance program. We would be looking to the Arts Council or the art body to give us some recommendations as to who should benefit from this.

**Mrs. Joe:** How would that benefit the elite artist to get more money? Would that be to possibly take further courses in art or whatever?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have identified \$3,000 to benefit them in whichever way we could with that \$3,000.

*On Administration*

*Administration in the amount of \$101,000 agreed to*

*On Community Programs*

*Community programs in the amount of \$253,000 agreed to*

*On Pool program*

**Mrs. Joe:** I would like a brief explanation on the pool program.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I believe the member asked about an explanation on the pool program, is that correct? Is there any specific question?

**Mrs. Joe:** I just wanted to know where the money was going for the pool program. Was it going to pay instructors or was it going to build new pools?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The pool program personnel costs cover the employment of a part-time aquatics supervisor and swimming pool managers in various communities that are not large enough to administer their own. Non-personnel costs cover items such as travel for the aquatics supervisor and a pool manager's workshop and general costs of operating the pool program in communities that are unable to administer their own programs.

*Pool programs in the amount of \$87,000 agreed to*

*On Sports, Games and Fitness*

**Mrs. Joe:** I would just like a brief run-down on the different groups that are going to be able to take advantage of that \$287,000. I understand that we are going to be having Arctic Winter Games. Is that what is happening? If we are, is there a large amount of money going to that?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am sorry, I could not hear the last part of the question the member was asking. Perhaps she could speak just a little louder please.

**Mrs. Joe:** I am sorry, I usually have a very loud voice and I am criticized for it.

I was asking whether or not this amount of money included the Arctic Winter Games; if that was going to be within this fiscal year?

<sup>33</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Sports, games and fitness is going to include grants to sport governing bodies, to Yukon Sports Federation, to athletes for Arctic Winter Games travel, and that \$3,000 is also identified in there for the elite artists assistance program, TEST program, and Canada Games.

*Sports, Games and Fitness in the amount of \$287,000 agreed to*  
*On Arts*

**Mr. Byblow:** I was curious about this item because it is a new citation as the line items go. The last budget did not identify arts as a program on its own; we had a culture program, we had games, but we did not identify arts. I would be curious about why this is now in that kind of a line and how it relates to the policy in recreation.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We identified arts as a line item now because it was recommended by the YRAC committee, because it was recommended by the green paper committee, because the arts people have been lobbying the government to do this; and I would just indicate that it is evidence that this government listens to people and responds to those people.

*Arts in the amount of \$71,000 agreed to*

*Recreation in the amount of \$799,000 agreed to*

*On Advanced Education and Manpower*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I think, because of the complexity of the changes shown, that I would give some very brief statements about the administration and then I would prefer to handle the debate with some more specific questions as opposed to getting bogged down in a lot of discussion, if the members opposite agree.

The large change in the administration is mainly due to the return of the 10-day fortnight, and to the re-identifying of the person-years of the vacancies that we had in advanced education and manpower; those positions will be filled as soon as possible. Also, in manpower planning and industrial training, there has been an indication of a large decrease; however, we are still fulfilling our commitment, as indicated in the Throne Speech, to the job creation program and I can give the members quite a detailed breakdown later on in this debate, if they wish.

**Mr. Byblow:** My first question would relate to the administrative component that the minister glossed over, indicating that it was because of a return to the 10-day fortnight and a reinstatement of vacancies. When I reviewed last year's budget, we had a 1982-83 estimate of \$110,000, and I assumed that that would probably be higher by the time the year was out. At that time, the staffing component was approximately three, in the administrative sense. We have now four times that amount in the administrative component. It is very difficult to accept that this is strictly a 10-day fortnight and the filling of vacancies.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** If the member recalls from last year's discussion, we had identified quite a large amount of money less for some four or five positions that were vacant and we are identifying the money this time for those vacant positions. One of them included the deputy minister and other program managers, and so on. When you take into account the number of positions, as well as the increase for the 10-day fortnight, I do not think the amount would seem unreasonable.

<sup>34</sup> **Mr. Byblow:** I will request the minister to identify the positions included in the administrative portion of this year's budget.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** They are the director of manpower, planning and industrial training; there are secretary services; there is a manpower planning officer; industrial training coordinator; industrial training officer; there are three clerk typists; assistant deputy minister; administrative officer; and the Yukon College personnel, to give a total of the 73.5 person-years. Yukon College would include the director, the assistant director, the various instructors, curriculum development officer, program planning and development officer.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am now totally confused. I was inquiring about the positions related to the administrative umbrella of this branch; of advanced education and manpower, as is categorized here in the budget. It reflects a \$427,000 expenditure, which would be constituted by so many clerical and support staff and so many administrators and so many program administrators. I was simply trying to delineate the number of people running this branch.

I am confused and maybe the minister could get back later if it is a complicated exercise to go through now.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** There are seven individuals in administration.

**Mr. Byblow:** Of those, how many are support staff and how many are administrative supervisors, or of a supervisory job description?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** They are all in a program manager capacity

or curriculum development capacity or administration.

**Mr. Byblow:** I thank the minister for that.

The minister has identified, on page 57, some of the monies that deal with manpower planning and industrial training or adult education. I would be curious: of the money identified on page 57, what money is applied to adult education and what money is applied to manpower planning? As the statistics on page 57 go, adult education reflects \$170,000. Am I correct in assuming that the other amounts identified below that are grants towards manpower planning and industrial training?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The amounts below are exactly what they say on page 57. It is a training allowance and the rest are job creation projects.

**Mr. Byblow:** Do those figures on page 57, therefore, reflect the amount of money under the funding programs supplied by the federal government? That is, it indicates NEED; there is special student employment, there is internal government summer student employment and a fee payers' training allowance. Is all the program money identified there recoverable under the joint agreement with the federal government?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The money identified here is YTG's contribution towards the Canada-Yukon Agreement, towards a program that is jointly delivered. That is all territorial government money except for the special student employment assistance program; we do not get any federal government money for that; as well as the internal Government of Yukon summer student employment training program and the fee payers training allowance apprenticeship.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a bit of confusion about how this government identifies the money that it gets from the federal government for the various job creation programs. If this is not part of it then my confusion is cleared up. I asked the question because the NEED program is identified here. At the same time, the Yukon-Canada community recovery program is not here and that is why I am a little confused.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I understand why the member is confused. This is territorial government contribution only. There is no federal money identified here. If the member would like, I can break it down for him and clarify it if we are moving to page 57 now. Is that the member's wish?

**Mr. Byblow:** Yes.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** All right. On page 57, the amount of money there is the amount that we are identifying in job creation programs. If you look at the line Manpower Planning and Industrial Training on page 50 in the expenditures, I can explain to you why there is that 30 percent decrease; why the amount seems different.

In 1982-83, the Yukon territorial government spent over \$1,000,000 in job creation. That included the incremental job creation program, section 38, small business job retention, student employment assistance, summer student employment program, and student apprentice allowance. In 1983-84, the amount you see, \$986,000, will include all the above except number one, the incremental job creation program, and we are adding the NEED program to that, which is a \$200,000 commitment. Section 38 is approximately another \$200,000.

On page 57, that gives you employment bridging and NEED, for a total of \$412,000. That was the correction that was made at the beginning. The \$250,000 is the special student employment assistance program that we identified, the SSEAP program, and the other programs have already been mentioned. I would just like to mention that, in addition to this job creation, the government leader has made a commitment on behalf of the government to identify \$1,000,000 for the Cyprus Anvil section 38 top-up contribution. I just want to make the point that if you add the \$986,000 and the commitment that this government has already made of another \$1,000,000, it, in fact, would involve quite a substantial increase in the percentage change.

However, we have made the decision to come back for the \$1,000,000 as a supplementary rather than identify it in the budget, once we know that we need it.

**Mr. Byblow:** The government leader expresses no hesitancy that we may need it, I am sure. The explanation the minister afforded me did clear up the confusion I had about the joint funding

arrangements in the various programs and this government's portion. Why has the incremental job creation program been dropped from this category of funding?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** If the member for Faro remembers, those were incremental jobs that had to be done, such as painting the government building and some highway slashing and so on. The jobs have been completed so there was no need to identify any further monies for them.

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps we can clear this out and I will not have any question when it comes up as a line item.

The minister identified \$200,000 under section 38 that this government was going to be contributing to that program and another \$200,000 under NEED which is, I believe, the program that is similar to the bridging program except that it is for exhaustees. Under the small business, the summer student employment, and the apprenticeship allowance, can she identify numbers for those four programs?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I believe the numbers are on page 57. There is \$3,000 for apprenticeship; there is \$55,000 for internal government summer student, \$250,000 for special student employment and \$412,000 for bridging and NEED program. They are all on page 57.

**Mr. Byblow:** That clarifies that.

Moving to adult education, could the minister identify under adult education the — I do not need a breakout of all the programs being offered because they are available — distribution of the money of the \$3 million spent. Granted, \$2.6 million is identified under personnel, but that would probably include some manpower planning personnel as well as administrative personnel. Of that \$3.6 million spent under adult education, what is program money, what is staffing money, what is support money for incidentals and materials, or whatever is required.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The salary costs for all administrative and instructional staff attached to Yukon College does come to the \$2.6 million. Other costs include professional and special services, adult occupational training, the community learning centres. It includes maintenance costs, grounds maintenance, advertising, materials and supplies, over \$500,000, and that includes supplies for all the programs, particular supplies, food and beverages et cetera. I want to indicate to members that we have identified extra monies here for the basic training and skills development program, which I believe the members opposite were asking about some time ago, and we have identified over 200 students in the territory who require these upgrading courses. Again the government has recognized the need of the people and we have identified some extra funds so that we could put on some extra courses to get particularly those students who have only grade 7,8 education and not even qualified to get into the Yukon College. We will be identifying this money and we will be accommodating these people.

Also, throughout the advanced education program we have identified some \$92,000 to add to the federal government money of over \$700,000 I believe the federal government will be contributing, under the skills growth fund. And it will be to assist with some of the programs of the Yukon College and some physical enhancements to the facility itself.

**Mr. Byblow:** Under the adult education portion or line item, I would assume that the expenditure is in place for the community learning centres which exist, I believe, in three communities, and to some extent, in a fourth. Can the minister indicate, perhaps in a policy way, what the intentions are in the course of this next year to deliver programs in the adult education area to the outlying communities. I ask this in view of the economic scenario where a lot of people are, at this point in time, taking the opportunity for required trades upgrading and improving their various skills, whether they be academic, in a general education program, or in a specific trades area.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We are planning to maintain our status quo when it comes to education in the communities, and we do have community learning centres in four communities. I think I probably understand what the member is asking, particular because of the riding he represents, and that in the particular riding of Faro they do have a fair number of unemployed apprentices. I believe we did



provide some short six-week apprentice training courses for heavy equipment mechanics as well as two journeymen upgrading courses in Faro; they were successfully completed and I believe approximately 35 tradesmen and apprentices were involved. Depending on response to some of the advertisements we have put out, we may look at having some more of those courses supplied in the community of Faro.

**Mr. Byblow:** I broached the subject the other day — and the minister smiles and I would like to ask her again: regardless of whether the stripping program goes or not, and I would be optimistic to believe that it would, it still nevertheless will leave, in essence, a half-empty school and I wonder if the minister has had more time to think about taking advantage of that physical situation?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have thought about it but I would hate to be presumptuous and make any plans before the school really is half-empty. I will reassure the member again that we are looking at it and we will be exploring every avenue to perhaps compensate those people who are experiencing difficult times in Faro.

**Mr. Byblow:** I trust the minister realizes this is not just compensating people in Faro who may or may not have work and who would desire upgrading, but in a very real way, facing the costs of education and delivering apprenticeship programs, upgrading courses in trades areas, Faro does afford an opportunity, firstly, in the face of available space. I am sure arrangements can be made within the community for accommodations, and the very fact that you have a training ground where a lot of the application can be done on site that is not available here in Whitehorse, perhaps it would be very useful for the minister to seriously contemplate some very real courses there, taking advantage of the factors that are available.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have told the member, twice I believe now, that I am thinking about it and we are very seriously considering it. I do not know what else I can say. I am sure he would like me to write him a letter and tell him we will do it, but I cannot do that at this time.

#### *On Administration*

*Administration in the amount of \$427,000 agreed to*

#### *On Adult Education*

*Adult Education in the amount of \$3,658,000 agreed to*

#### *On Manpower Planning and Industrial Training*

*Manpower Planning and Industrial Training in the amount of \$986,000 agreed to*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I will offer some comments now for the member for Whitehorse North Centre who had some concerns, I believe, about programs offered for women. We have no change in those programs that we will be offering and, because we have to respond according to demand and region, because we are bound by the federal government supporting us in our endeavours, we have not identified any additional programs, per se, for women. However, women have the opportunity to apply to the new programs that we are looking at. Some of the full-time programs we have at present include drafting, which is offered in alternate years with surveying; business administration; college preparation; basic training and skills development; some of the short courses, which are trades upgrading courses such as welding, painting and decorating; extension courses, the career-oriented ones; computer courses; college preparation; business education; business administration. Some of these are new, and the new mobile unit will be available to go late in 1983-84. It will probably be offering some housing maintenance and several modules.

Expansion in extension courses represents a reassignment of funds that we used for the heavy equipment operator course, and we will not be offering that again because of the extreme cost. I believe I gave a cost breakdown in the last session regarding that.

**Mrs. Joe:** The minister says that the women have the opportunity to apply for new programs and I would like to know whether that application would come from women, in general, or the women's group, or would it possibly go through her department on demand from any applications that they might have to a vocational school?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The women would apply on an individual

basis to the sports program for the course.

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a brief supplementary question to the one I asked the other day. Has the minister obtained the information she was looking for, yet, about the apprenticeship indenturing?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes. I had it written down for the member because, as I had indicated, it is quite a lengthy and quite a complicated answer.

The practice of indenturing apprentice unions is not as common as maybe the member indicated. The practice is not accepted in western Canada, generally. We surveyed, some time ago, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Northwest Territories and BC, and only in the Province of BC is the practice supported. Even then, a large percentage of the apprentices are not indentured to individual companies; they are indentured to joint boards and the joint board is comprised of contractors, signatory to the union, and union representatives.

We do have, presently, a few courses in Yukon that are indentured, indenturing apprentices to firms with a head office in another jurisdiction, for example, to a company. We have this situation with Finning Tractor, from Vancouver, and Carter Electric, from Edmonton.

In October, 1982, advanced education and manpower sent letters to unemployed apprentices and advertised in the local newspaper in order to determine a response to the offering of extended apprenticeship training programs. The response was poor when it came to indenturing them in that manner.

In union indentured apprentices, generally speaking, the union is not the employer of the apprentice; the contractor is. The union is often not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the apprentices' contract, simply because the contractor, and not the union, determines what jobs an individual will work on.

I did mention that, locally, we had some apprentices indentured to unions; however, it was a local union and it had a full-time office managed by a full-time local manager.

**Mr. Penikett:** As the minister says, it is a complicated question and I appreciate her answer. Will she be tabling the lengthy written reply or does she intend to put the detail in a letter to me? What is her intention on that score?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I had not planned to table the reply; however, I could write a lengthy answering letter to the member and put all the details in it for him.

**Mr. Penikett:** Thank you, I would appreciate that from the minister because I still do have a couple of people who have had problems continuing their apprenticeship because they have worked for one employer one month and another employer another month. The employer is sometimes neglectful about the apprenticeship documents. They have run into troubles and I am sure the minister's answer would be of interest to them.

*Advanced Education and Manpower in the amount of \$5,071,000 agreed to*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I believe the member for Whitehorse South Centre had a question. I am doing all the homework for the opposition members and I hope they realize that.

The member had asked me a question about page 55, regarding post-secondary student grants. I believe he had asked where the rest of the money went when there was a \$596,000 forecast in 1982-83 and \$631,000 in the 1983-84 estimates. That was a forecast, and we did, in fact, spend more money.

I had indicated to the member that we had spent some \$630,000, so we identified, in 1983-84, \$631,000 for the post-secondary grants, because we are anticipating the same high numbers, if not more.

*Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower in the amount of \$28,254,000 agreed to*

#### *On Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs*

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I will give an opening statement that should help explain things to the members opposite. A number of changes have been made in the 1983-84 estimates for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Some of these are actual organizational changes while others are primarily to rationalize the presentation of the estimates.

The Consumer and Corporate Affairs program contains an administration section, consumer services, corporate affairs, labour services and a new unit, transport services. Metric information has been included in consumer services, under which it has always been administered. Occupational health and safety is included with labour services, under which it is administered.

Transport services is a new section formed subsequent to the transfer to this department of the responsibility for the operation of the territorial weigh stations. The unit was designed to provide consistent and unified administration of motor vehicles' weigh stations and transport public utilities boards. Formation of the unit reflects our commitment to provide assistance and reasonable regulation to the transport industry.

Concurrent with the development of the transport services section, the former public utilities section has been discontinued. The transport and public utilities boards are now included, financially, with all the public boards for which the department is responsible. Administration support to the transport board is, as has been indicated, provided by transport services. We are currently recruiting for a support person to work exclusively with the electrical public utilities board.

There have been a few changes in departmental activities over the last few months and no major new initiatives are planned for this fiscal year.

Notwithstanding the establishment of a rentalsman position in January, demand has been negligible to date and we have not found it necessary to provide additional funding for personnel. Should demand increase dramatically, our commitment remains to provide the necessary support to ensure an effective level of service.

Within transport services, we have included a mobile enforcement and inspection position on a contract basis. It is anticipated that this will provide more comprehensive enforcement throughout Yukon than is possible through the use of permanent stations only. Consistent with our objective of financial restraint, whenever possible, we are establishing this position on a one-year contract to enable us to evaluate its effectiveness and further analyze the need for permanent facilities at the Cassiar Highway junction or other locations.

The department is continuing an extensive job of reviewing and updating some 50 statutes and relevant regulations. Included for review or revision in the coming year are such acts as *Miners' Lien*, *Legal Profession*, *Occupational Health and Safety*, *Employment Standards*, *Certified General Accounts*, *Society of Management Accountants*, *Institute of Chartered Accountants*, *Fair Practices*, *Insurance*, *Motor Vehicles*, *Business Corporations*, *Electrical Public Utilities Board* and *Transport Public Utilities Board*. Obviously, not all of these items can be brought forward to the Assembly during this year. However, work will continue in all areas and new legislation will be brought forward according to the priority and progress of each review.

The status quo with respect to departmental operations is reflected by the estimates. No changes have been made in the number of personnel to be employed from 1982-83. The nine percent increase in 1983-84 spending can be attributed primarily to two changes, with the high percentage of departmental expenditures logged to personnel costs. Return to the 10-day fortnight represents a greater percentage of the increase in funding.

You will also note what appears to be a large increase in anticipated Credit Union expenses. This estimate is for anticipated loss from disposal of Credit Union property by this government due to current housing market conditions but it is, in fact, a decrease from the estimated loss for the same property in the 1982-83 operating budget.

Although other expenses have been changed slightly, the effects are basically off-set, these can be addressed as we progress through each program.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am going to ask my questions one at a time as opposed to giving what amounts to a speech.

I would first like to ask about food prices. In Question Period I asked a number questions about food prices and the minister indicated a willingness to give an account of what the department has done already. I would ask if he is willing to give that now?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** No, what I have been doing is making a ministerial statement to the members opposite so they can go through it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I fully realize the minister is not going to tell me now what is in the ministerial statement but of course it may be relevant to the budget in the next year. I will ask this very general question with a motive of carrying on a budget discussion about the general question: will the ministerial statement, or any of the announcements, affect the level of expenditures or prioritization or re-prioritization in the department?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** In answer to that question, no. I have already advised the members opposite during Question Period that this department has very little to do with that food prices review study. There are only about two items in it that this department would ever handle.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would ask this general question, then: in the department, under the various lines, where would one find items related to food prices? I would expect it would be almost all on page 60, but are there any other places? Perhaps, in a general sense, I would ask what amounts are there, or if the question is more appropriately asked under a specific line, I will wait.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** It is on page 60, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and on page 62, under Consumer Services.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I take it then that the initiatives of the department as referred to food prices are going to be announced in a ministerial statement some time soon and there are no budgetary implications to that. If I am wrong, I am sure the minister will correct me.

I would like to go on then to landlord and tenant matters, in a general sense. The minister stated that the activity of the rentalsman is negligible and I would like to either ask the question or give notice of the question for the debate on the next page: what are the complaints, in a general sense, and what are they about? I am specifically interested whether there are any or several complaints about the raising of fees within the tenancy agreement, which are not called a rental increase but a raising of fees charged by the landlord, nonetheless. It is exactly the problem that the leader of the opposition asked about several times in Question Period and was debated a little while ago as the bill went through.

I would also like to ask about the rentalsman policy. I know that there is a rentalsman appointed. There was publicity about that, and public information about that. What are the frequency of complaints or questions referred to the rentalsman? My next question is: I realize the rentalsman is a civil servant and I am not attempting to state a position or be critical — I am attempting to elicit information — what are the terms of appointment or the policy of the government towards the direction to the rentalsman? I mean by that, there are analogous positions, for example, the chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board or the Public Service Commissioner enjoy a degree of independence and the minister is well aware of the relationship between the Public Transport Board and the government as it applies to transportation policy. I wonder if the minister can make a statement about the intention of the government or the policy around independence of the rentalsman and what degree of influence government policy will exert over a rentalsman's policies.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** There are a lot of questions there; they could be dealt with by line item, under consumer and corporate affairs. I will answer a few of them right now. The rentalsman is Vicki Hancock. As for the number of arbitration cases, there has not been a single one; they have not had one case to handle. The regular information is still being given out in response to the types of calls that were coming in and were being dealt with prior to rentalsmen being appointed; that is going on as usual. As I have said, they have not had to arbitrate one single case yet. As for the policy of the *Landlord and Tenant Act*, the policy for that is the *Landlord and Tenant Act*. I do not think there is any need to have an independent person. At least, at this point, it certainly is not. The *Landlord and Tenant Act* will govern that.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** On the next page, probably in a moment or two, I will re-ask the question about the government policies concerning landlord and tenant matters. It may be, and I am

inferring from the minister's answer, that aside from the legislation, there are no further policies of the government. But maybe, if it is not so, the minister will correct me of, course. I am going to leave the question of labour standards to my colleague from Mayo, who knows more about it than I do. Concerning the *Fair Practices Act*, the minister spoke about a list of matters requiring attention, and made the statement that the department was working on them. He also made the statement that there are no major initiatives in this year for budgetary reasons, I infer from that. I am specifically interested in several issues and I will simply ask a question about the priority of some of them. First of all, about property rights: there was a debate in the Legislature in the last session about property rights and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. I ask, is the minister's department doing any work or doing any preparatory analysis or looking at the question of territorial legislation around the general question of property rights?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I can reiterate, basically, what the member opposite said and that is: we have supported what the BC government has done. This House has supported that and this government certainly supports that; that the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* be changed to specify that property rights should be included in it. Aside from that, we have not drawn up or drafted any legislation within my department.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I take it the answer is that the department is not now studying the question of territorial legislation concerning property rights, or that the issue has a low priority in the list of items that the minister gave to us.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** That certainly would not be a low priority if we had jurisdiction over the area. The *Canadian Charter of Rights* has jurisdiction. I believe it would be under another department that it would actually be done, if it was to be done, but, unless we have the jurisdiction, we cannot do it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to discuss that, in a general sense, for just a moment. Clearly, if we were a province, property rights would be under provincial jurisdiction. The *Yukon Act* makes reference, in a very general sense, to these kinds of things.

Perhaps I will state, rather than ask a question, that it is my opinion that property rights is a very, very serious subject. Everybody who is politically aware at all in this country and enjoys any degree of credibility is generally in favour of property rights and establishing property rights in their proper context in Canadian law, and establishing adequate safeguards to the ordinary citizen. I will make the statement that I would hope that territorial legislation concerning property rights is being looked at as it is and should be under territorial jurisdiction.

I will ask a more direct question. Is the question of the *Expropriation Act* being looked at in connection with the general question of property rights and fair practices, and that kind of thing? The *Expropriation Act* in Yukon is extremely wide and extremely general; I would say, uncharacteristically, compared with the majority of the other provinces. I would ask what priority, on the list that the minister gave, has the modernizing of the *Expropriation Act* got?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** With your approbation, I will attempt to answer the question because it covers quite a broad spectrum.

Because of what is happening at this point in time with the *Canadian Constitution*, the legal precedents that are being set and so on, we are going to be undertaking, as quickly as we can, a thorough review, particularly of our *Fair Practices Act*, because I have become very concerned just in the past little while that our legislation could end up being lacking and Yukon citizens could suffer as a result of it.

<sup>42</sup> I would think that in doing that kind of a review, because it will have to be comprehensive if we are going to do the job properly, we will have to look at things like expropriation because, of course, that does interweave itself with fair practices. I can assure the hon. member that it is something that concerns me just as much as it does him and we will be moving on it as quickly as we possibly can. We are going to have to, as well, get an awful lot of federal advice with respect to the Constitution and what they are doing.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I thank the government leader for that and may I say that I totally agree with those comments. When this review

comes I am assuming, for the moment anyway, that it is going to be financed in this department. Is that assumption correct or likely in the future and if there is any planning in a budgetary sense because, after all, we are talking about the budget, in the next year after 1983-84.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is something that I cannot wait until next year to have done. I think it is going to have to be done this year. The money for this kind of thing, at the present time, is in the Department of Justice and that is where that kind of review would take place. It is highly likely that the Public Service Commission would also be involved in some way — there is little doubt about it, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The legislation is so far-reaching that it will cover virtually every department of the government and our employees as well. We have found that the fair practices legislation should apply to our employees and, at the present time, it does not.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am going to simply give notice to the minister of questions I am going to be asking concerning the transportation policy of the government and the transport board. I am going to ask for an update, I suppose, of the old question of parity with the Yukon truckers and BC truckers with regard to licence fees and the sales tax that the BC government occasionally collects from the Yukon truckers.

I am also going to ask the general question about the current situation with regard to the transportation policy of the government and the policy of the public transport board and also the electrical board in a general sense. Electricity rates are clearly a public issue of some importance and I am interested in the government's policy and the connection between the board's policy and the government's policy in that area. Those, I think, identify the areas of questioning that I intend to be following.

<sup>43</sup> **Mr. McDonald:** I realize that we are coming very close to 5:30 and so, by way of giving notice, I would also like to let the minister know that I will be asking for some information on the supplementary information on page 65, regarding occupational health and safety and labour services.

I would like to ask details regarding the inspections and surveys, the reports and meetings that are outlined here, how the government determines where meetings are to be held, with whom they are to be held, how the department determines where inspections are to be held, with whom they are to be held, and when they determine that inspection reports are necessary.

Also, regarding labour services, I would wonder if the minister could provide, perhaps this evening, a breakdown of the types of labour standards complaints and fair practices complaints that are mentioned here, so we can determine the thrust that may be necessary in determining policy direction and legislative initiatives that the minister promises in the future.

Having said that, I think I will be asking this evening more about the person years and the relationship between occupational health and safety, specifically, and the Workers' Compensation Board, and that kind of relationship and how it is developed, and what is the current status of that relationship.

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

Would it be the Committee's desire, then, to recess from now until 7:30?

We will recess until 7:30 p.m.

#### *Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue where we left off with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

#### *On Administration*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I assume that we are bypassing page 60 for a moment and are going through the various lines on page 62? If that is correct, I have no specific comments on administration but I do on consumer services.

**Mr. McDonald:** Just as a matter of course, as there is only a figure for the total number of person-years, perhaps, as we go down these line items, the minister could make a habit of delineating how many

person-years there are and what the responsibilities of each person is. All 42 of them would be a nice idea. I notice that there is a two person-year increase in this particular section.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is a most extraordinary request: to ask what the duties of each of the 42 people in a department might be. I request that the member reconsider asking us to provide that information.

**Mr. McDonald:** I realize that the government leader considers this to be an extraordinary request. He has been in government for some time. I have not been in this Legislature for a very long period of time. In the last round of budgetary estimates, I found that the answers I was seeking were not comprehensive at all. I was left with a very sincere impression that I got very little out of the last round of budgetary estimates. I would very much like to know this kind of information; perhaps not specifically so much for administration as for labour services, or some of the other items on this page. Nevertheless, I think that this is all valuable information. I am not asking, as the government leader may be suggesting, that we be given a job description of every person. The government leader asked me what I was asking for. Obviously, the government leader is not listening to me. I asked what the responsibilities of each of these people would be. That could mean only the job title.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Respectfully, on page 61, there is an organizational chart that delineates in blocks that are very easy to understand, exactly what happens in the department, and exactly how many persons are allocated to these various programs.

**Mr. McDonald:** Presumably you are referring to page 61?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, he was.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes.

**Mr. McDonald:** I would like to ask the government leader if we are reading the same booklet. The blocks that I see under Consumer and Corporate Affairs talk about 43 person-years, as opposed to, as a matter of fact, 42 person-years, which are listed on page 62, so he has just pointed out a contradiction here. First of all, obviously, administration, consumer services, corporate affairs, transport services and labour services do not have a breakdown as the government leader suggests. I think it is a rather simple request. I do not see why the government leader should be putting up this kind of defence to prevent this kind of information coming out. I do not think it is a very difficult request to respond to.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** It would be impossible for me to answer the member opposite's question without going to the department and asking for every job description, but I will tell him what the title is for each person. If that is what he is after, that is what I will tell him.

**Mr. McDonald:** I did not want to get too hot under the collar at such an early time. What I was asking, once again, was not for job descriptions or for job titles. I repeated it once to the government leader; I repeated it again to the minister in a period of only a couple of minutes. I would like at least to know the breakdown of person-years in this department, if at all possible. That is not too difficult a request to make. I reiterate, it is not on page 61, if the government leader is jumping up to say so.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** As I advised the minister and the member opposite, there are four person-years in administration: one is a deputy minister, one is a secretary, one is a director of policy and planning and another one is an accounting clerk. They are all charged to administration.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Do you want me to run through each one right now?

**Some Member:** Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Other costs included in this area are travel, telephone service charges for the department, legislative consultant fees, repairs and maintenance of office equipment for the department and general office supplies for the department. That is what makes up all of the costs of the administration.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What are the amounts under legislative consultant fees and, by general category, what consulting is expected to be done in 1983-84?

**Mr. Chairman:** Can you tell me where the legislative consultant, that you are speaking of here, is on these pages?

**Mr. Kimmerly:** It is not on page 62; the minister identified it

in his last answer.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I do not mind answering that at all. That would come under professional and special services and it would be part of their \$196,000 to the total of about \$5,000. Personnel in the four years would be around \$162,000; transportation communication makes up about \$17,000; repairs and maintenance of office equipment just over \$3,000 and office supplies and services around \$9,000. The total comes out to about \$196,000.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Of the "about \$5,000" for consulting fees, is the subject of the legislation or the consultation already established, or is this a contingency for an unplanned project of the future?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** It is just for what we will be working on in the department as of the list I gave you in the opening remarks. That money goes toward whatever legislation we will be working on. In addition, there is a hosting of a labour standards committee meeting in May, 1983 here in Whitehorse which is actually \$2,000 of that \$5,000.

**Mrs. Joe:** On page 65, Statistics, under Labour Services, Fair Practices complaints, it is shown that there were 10 complaints last year. The minister had indicated to me, during Question Period, that there were two. Are those complaints confidential or public and, if confidential, I would like to have some indication from the minister whether or not those complaints had been resolved?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I believe these complaints would be confidential. These are just complaints and not necessarily something to be acted upon. I believe there were only two complaints acted upon and there may have been no justification to them.

*Administration in the amount of \$196,000 agreed to  
On Consumer Services*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Could the minister identify the various amounts, as he did in the previous item, in terms of thousand of dollars? I am specifically interested in food prices and what is allocated pursuant to the food prices report tabled in the Legislature 16 months or so ago.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I will answer both the questions, the one from the member for Mayo and the other from the member for Whitehorse South Centre. There are four person-years: the administrator, consumer relations officer, information officer and a secretary. The total payroll for the four personnel is in the range of \$128,000. Transportation communication is about \$12,000. Rental of equipment is under \$1,000 and library, office supplies and materials is \$3,000; for the total of \$144,000.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What portion of this expenditure relates to food prices in any way?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** In actual fact, food prices relates to very, very little of this information. As I have told the House before, this department looks after very little of what that food prices report dealt with; it only looks after about two aspects of it. It is really just in the consumer education side of things, so there is no need to put in extra dollars for this.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is the rentalsman person-year in this line?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Yes, the rentalsman is the administrator. Vicki Hancock is the rentalsperson and she is named as the administrator of the department.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is the minister able to give us any information as to the frequency of complaints or inquiries concerning arbitrary increases in services by landlords?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I do not have that information and I am not sure if I can even dig it out of what information is there, but if I can, I will get it for you.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would like to get into this subject of the rentalsman because I have so far failed, I might tell you frankly, to ask questions on this subject during Question Period in such a way as the minister could understand them. I have previously asked the minister about the provision that Mr. Kimmerly just referred to: the new provision in The *Landlord and Tenant Act* that permits a landlord to raise the rent to cover service charges. The minister persists in referring to inquiries on this subject as advocacies of rent control. If the minister waits a minute, I will finish the question and then he can answer it. That is clearly not only a ridiculous observation; it demonstrates either that the minister does not understand simple English or refuses to understand it.

The situation, as I understand it is this, and I would like the minister to tell me if this is not the case: the *Landlord and Tenant Act* describes the sum elements that ought to be contained in a contract, a lease agreement between a landlord and a tenant; a contract — normally for one year or longer — which, under most circumstances — if I could get the minister's attention — a contract under most circumstances which is binding on both parties. If I were a landlord and I contract with a tenant that that tenant will pay me so much rent and I will provide the facility, he will look after the property, and I have certain obligations as well. The law provides an opportunity for a landlord to pass on to the tenant additional service charges. That may be, in itself, fair enough, but the landlord does not have to justify the amount of those charges. So, we have a situation where a landlord can say in the middle of the lease agreement, a contract — and I say this is a question of law; the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs ought to be concerned about this — that allows one party to break it, because as a landlord all I have to say to do is say I now have a hundred dollar increase in my service charges. I do not have to justify them. I do not have to document them. I do not have to demonstrate that I have had any of these increases whatsoever to the other party of the contract. Unilaterally, and without supporting evidence, I can raise the rent by whatever amount I like. If the minister says this is not happening, he is wrong because I already have cases of it happening in my constituency.

<sup>07</sup> And I ask the minister, and I do not say this in a combative, provocative way, to deal with it, or to respond to it. It is a serious problem of a loophole in the law that allows one party to a contract to change the terms of the contract, without either the consent of the other party, or even the courtesy of advice to the other party, or even the documentation of the increase in charges.

If it were a situation where the landlord has some increase in his costs — he may be providing heat, he may be providing electricity, he may be providing water, any number of things — it is not unreasonable for the landlord to be able to pass them on to the tenant — not unreasonable at all. We are not objecting to that. What I think is unreasonable is that the landlord can pass on twice as much as the cost increase to the tenant, and under the minister's new law, there is nothing that the tenant can do about it, because the tenant is bound by a lease — by a contract — that the landlord is not.

All I ask for, apart from all silly nonsense about rent controls, is to deal with this issue, to respond to it seriously. Has he looked into it? Has he had any complaints about it, or will he entertain complaints about it? I know the problem with the rentalsman is that we cannot do arbitration on this because the arbitration procedure requires both parties to go to the arbitrator. That is not going to happen. This is a serious policy question, and I submit, upon examination, I am sure the minister, being fair-minded, will recognize that there is a problem in the law on this point.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Number one, a contract should not have been drawn up outside of the law. Both parties should have known what the law is. There is a three months' notice to be given, and that was given in the example that was given to me by the member opposite, in the letter that was given to me. I did look into that. Therefore, it is not a loophole, as the member opposite is suggesting, as I have been saying all along.

**Mr. Penikett:** What is the minister talking about when he says a contract outside the law? We are talking about land leases within the law; a standard lease within the law, a lease that follows to the letter, every requirement with the law. The law allows the landlord to raise the rent by any amount he likes, so long as he calls it a service charge, as long as he justifies it by saying that he has had any increase in service charges. He does not have to demonstrate, prove or document in any way the evidence, nor does he have to even have a service charge increase. That is the problem with the law.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** That is exactly what I am talking about: rent control. He does not have to dock me when he wants to raise his rent, but he does have to give three months' notice.

**Mr. Penikett:** If I make any kind of a contract with someone, most courts in the country will require both parties to live up to the

contract. If I make a contract with the minister to rent a property from me at a certain monthly rent — I am not talking about notice provisions or anything, but a contract for one year, that the minister will pay me a certain rent — as it is in the minister's law, I can now, without his consent, without both parties agreeing to a change in the contract, which is normally the case with the contract, raise his rent by simply calling it an increase in the service charge, even though I may have had no increase of anything like the level which I may be passing on to the tenant. In other words, it allows one party to breach the contract. I submit, everyone may feel philosophical about rent controls or anything else, but that offends my notion of natural justice.

<sup>08</sup> **Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member across the floor is suggesting that the government step in and make sure that someone does not make a mistake in a contract he draws up with someone else. A contract can be drawn up with anyone and if you are not astute enough to make sure that the contract is written so that it protects you, you should not blame someone else. I cannot understand the member wanting to blame someone else. If the contract is written up, then it is up to the renter to make sure that the contract is written so that it protects him, and if he wants to have added in that contract that the landlord cannot raise the rent when he gets an increase, except for whatever the increase was plus a certain percentage, or whatever, for the landlord having to handle it and make profit on it, as he would reasonably do, then that is up to the tenant, not up to the government.

**Mr. Penikett:** Clearly, that has to be one of the most ridiculous propositions I have ever heard in my life. Clearly, if you accept the minister's view, there is no point in having a *Landlord and Tenant Act*; there is no point in having any kind of consumer act to protect anybody, because it is the consumer's obligation to make sure that they write the contracts or they hire lawyers to protect themselves; that it is not the business of a law which purports to protect both parties to protect the consumer.

The minister is clearly talking nonsense. It is like saying to a person who just got murdered on the street that that was their fault because the law cannot be expected to do anything about that; they should have protected themselves. What we are talking about here is a contract, not a special contract, a contract which is agreed upon under the requirements of the *Landlord and Tenant Act*, a contract that fulfills all the specifics of that law. But what we have in the contract is a loophole in the law which allows one party to the contract to break the contract, with no protection to the other party. That, I submit, in an entirely non-partisan, fair-minded, objective way is a flaw in the law. It is bad law that allows one party to break a contract but not the other.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I have already stated that the member opposite is wrong on this. You cannot draw a contract up outside of the law and that is what they would be doing in that case.

**Mr. Penikett:** Nobody is drawing up the contract outside of the law. The problem is they are drawing up contracts within the law, the *Landlord and Tenant Act*, including the latest amendments, a contract that fits perfectly within that act. What the minister's law allows is for one party to the contract, the landlord, to change the terms of the contract unilaterally, the rent, by imposing a service charge which may not be justified on the basis of increased costs to the landlord. I submit again, and I ask the minister to look at it, that that is not only bad consumer law, it is bad law.

Mr. Tracey is talking nonsense again. We are not talking about rent control, we are talking about contracts. I understand that the minister, coming from where he is coming from intellectually, agrees that all power and all rights should be with the landlord. But we have a *Landlord and Tenant Act*, not a landlord act. It is supposed to protect both parties. What it does is allow one party to change the rent unilaterally, to change a contract, to double the rent, it does not matter, and with no grounds, without having to justify it. The law talks about it being a service charge, but the service charges do not have to be based on an increase in service charges.

<sup>09</sup> **Mr. Chairman:** In the rest of this debate, I would like you to direct your comments through this Chair.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I thought we were discussing the budget and

I would appreciate it if we would get on with the budget discussion.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Ashley, I would like to inform you that this is called grievance before supply and this is the appropriate time to discuss this. That is under the Stewart's House of Commons Canadian Law.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to get into the debate on the policy of this government as it relates to the Department of Consumer Affairs, but from a different angle. We had discussed, at some length, this exact problem when going through the amendments to the *Landlord and Tenant Act* and, I believe, the position of both sides of the Assembly was well-stated. We disagreed at the time and we obviously still disagree.

My question relates to a different aspect of the same problem. It is clear that after the first year of tenancy, a landlord can increase the fees payable by the tenant to the landlord if he calls them an increase in services and there is no requirement to justify the increase, although the landlord must give three months' notice.

In practical effect, what that means is that no tenant, who is properly advised or understanding of the implications of the law, would ever sign a lease with a term in excess of 12 months because, if a tenant signed a lease, for example, for two years, after the first year the charges that the landlord makes could be increased despite the agreement as long as three months' notice is given. The tenant, of course, would still be bound by the terms of the contract, one of them being the term of the lease which is the two years. It is a foolhardy proposition to advise any residential tenants to ever sign a lease in excess of a year because they may be falling into a trap.

The rent may be increased and they cannot get out of the term that they previously agreed to. Realizing that problem, I would ask the minister why the new publication published pursuant to the new act is the warning to prospective tenants concerning assigning a lease in excess of a year's term not in it when it ought to be there as a warning to all prudent tenants? The publication, in other respects, is fairly good. It is in simple language. There is a little booklet, I am sure the minister is aware of it, that explains the rights of tenants and the rights of landlords. It is a good approach and a good policy.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** That could be taken into consideration. We could actually add it into future publications of that document. It is paid for under this program. It has come out and I have seen it and I am aware of it. As far as the other, they still need a three-month notice of increase and it could be looked after in a contract if it was stated in the contract. We could put that in the information booklet; that would be no problem. I do not know how many have been printed up; I forget that figure, so I do not know how long that booklet is going to be around before we print a new one.

*Consumer Services in the amount of \$144,000 agreed to*

*On Corporate Affairs*

*Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$180,000 agreed to.*

*On Transport Services*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** There is a substantial increase and I wonder if the minister would explain the reason for it for the record. I understand that there is a sensible and rational reason.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Yes, there is a sensible and rational reason for it. The increase is mainly due to the restructuring of the department. The personnel costs have increased due to the return of the 10-day fortnight, and the transfer of two administrative clerical positions from the public utilities, which now comes in under this one. All the weigh stations come into this one as well. I will give you a rundown as to what this is: in the personnel, there are 23 person-years under this now, in the neighbourhood of \$700,000, which is what the majority of that is. Then there is transportation and communication to \$37,000; professional and special services in the neighbourhood of \$39,000; rental of equipment - \$22,000; repairs and maintenance of buildings and equipment around \$4,000 and material supplies and utilities- \$76,000 for a total of \$882,000.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Two questions remain. On the \$39,000 for professional and special services, could the minister identify what professional and special services, in a general sense, are planned in the budget year?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The professional and special services increase is to provide the contract position for mobile enforcement for

the weigh stations which I talked about in the opening address. It is also to provide relief assistance for driver examination.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** For the two people transferred into this vote from the Public Utilities Board, are the job functions in any way changed and what is the reason for the transfer, again, in a very general sense?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** They are basically the same positions. They are the administrator who is now in charge — he was in charge of the board before — and the secretarial service he had. They both moved over and they are doing about the same function as they were doing before, only that also comes under enforcement. The department has been restructured. I think it shows it on page 61.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would ask about the movement of these two people. Could the minister comment about the possible change in, I will call it, influence or policy with regard to the independence of the board? What I am trying to get at is, if the administrative support is transferred into this kind of an organizational chart, the influence of the government's policies is probably substantially increased as opposed to the policies of the board itself. Is the intention, in fact, to increase this influence or is there an administrative independence for the board contemplated in government policy?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Yes, this restructuring made the board even more independent than what it was before, although I deemed it to be independent. The person who is in that position now was the secretary of the board before. He was an administrator in the department; he is not secretary to the board any longer. The board has a secretary. The administrator very seldom sits in with the board. They have their own support staff, which is different than what it was before.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Do these people report in the administrative sense to the deputy minister, as indicated on the chart on page 61, or do they report to the board?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The board does not look after any personnel. There is one secretary who is assigned to the board basically as a support service. That secretary reports to the transport services administrator who in turn reports to the deputy minister.

#### *On Weigh Stations Internal Chargeback*

*Weigh Stations Internal Chargeback in the recovery of \$547,000 agreed to*

#### *On Labour Services*

**Mr. McDonald:** Before we get into some detail on this line item, I would just like to ask for some comment on the program objective of labour services. It has been altered radically in the last year to include the development of labour and occupational health and safety legislation to provide comprehensive education and enforcement services, which are rather intriguing. It is a little bit more than what was described last time: to administer labour legislation and programs. I wonder if the minister would care to elaborate a little bit on these program objectives before we get started?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** That basically describes what the department does a lot easier than what was there before. That is why it is there. I am not sure what he would like elaborated upon.

**Mr. McDonald:** All I am suggesting is that it seems to indicate that there is a good deal more happening in the department than has happened in the past unless the department description program objectives stated in the last budget were quite inadequate. I am wondering if the department's objectives have changed radically in the last year to include the development of occupational health and safety legislation and comprehensive education, which intrigues me a little bit. I would like to understand what comprehensive education is, but perhaps we can get into that, and enforcement services. Perhaps the minister, by way of encouraging him to elaborate, can suggest what structural changes may have taken place in the last year to make it necessary to develop such an elaborate program description in comparison with last year's. Perhaps he can explain what comprehensive education means. Perhaps he can elaborate on what he feels is the proper level of enforcement within this department, just for starters.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The department is basically doing what it



was doing before. Their goals and objectives were understated so that is why they have changed. Now, this unit of ministers' labour legislation and programs including employment standards, fair practices, occupational health and safety, legislation respecting industrial relations has been considered as a transfer of responsibility for mining safety from the federal to the territorial government. Like consumer services and corporate affairs, labour services devotes a considerable portion of its resource to public and business education respecting legislative obligations and formal mediation of disputes. That is the main part of what it does in that area.

The occupational health and safety unit provides inspections of work places to ensure the work environment is safe and employers and employees are conducting themselves in a manner conducive to the safety and health of the workers. Their officer provides short courses, seminars, et cetera, on an ongoing basis to both employees and employers. For accounting purposes only, occupational health and safety is identified as a separate activity element to facilitate recovery of calculations with the Workers' Compensation Board.

There are five person-years included in this unit: an administrator, two labour services officers, an occupational health and safety officer and a secretary.

**Mr. McDonald:** Regarding labour services, I notice in the program descriptions that this is a very popular department. The number of inquiries itself indicates that, perhaps more than any other area of responsibility in consumer and corporate affairs, this combined service of labour services and occupational health and safety receive a lot of public inquiries. It certainly would be interesting to compare the number of inquiries in each of these areas of responsibility and the numbers of legislative initiatives taken by the government.

By way of explanation of labour services specifically, on page 65, Labour Standards Complaints, I wonder if the minister, and I did give him notice, would be prepared to provide a breakdown of the types of complaints that are received by the department? By way of an example, perhaps he could tell us whether wage collection complaints, are more predominant than other types of complaints, et cetera.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The notice that the member opposite gave me was at 5:30 after the department had shut down and gone home for the day, so it is impossible to get that information until at least tomorrow.

**Mr. McDonald:** I have faced this situation before and would be perfectly happy to have this stand over until tomorrow. We can deal with it at any time tomorrow if the minister so chooses. I thought the two hour notice would be enough, but perhaps it is not. The leader of the opposition suggests that we were given five minutes' notice on the ministerial statement this afternoon and that certainly was not enough notice. Obviously, if the minister suggests that two hours' notice is not sufficient, we will let it stand.

I would prefer to have this information before this line item is accepted. I do find this kind of information very interesting and it certainly would indicate what legislative initiatives ought to be taken in the future. This is necessary information. If the minister cannot provide this information off the top of his head, perhaps he could answer a number of other questions under the labour services section on page 65? Why are more charges expected to be laid over the next year when the number of inquiries are expected to decline?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I believe the stats speak for themselves, once I really look at them. Labour services complained that there were 325. Three hundred and fifty were forecast. There was an estimate that only 25 charges would be laid. That should speak for itself as to how many inquiries are actually valid. There was \$100,000 in wages estimated to be collected.

**Mr. McDonald:** I wonder if we are reading the same stats on page 65. The forecast number of labour standards complaints in 1982-83 is 350. It is expected to decline to 325, yet the forecast number of charges laid under labour standards is 25 and then it is expected to increase to 30 over the next year. Obviously, with that kind of decrease in complaints and an expected rise in charges laid, I wonder if there is an explanation for that.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I would think that that is possibly a show of tougher times in Yukon. It is a guess, that is what an estimate is.

**Mr. McDonald:** I certainly hope that the guess is an informative one on the part of this department. If, as the minister suggests, it is only a guess, there is nothing more to it than that.

What can the minister say about the success rate of charges laid under labour standards; whether or not the department feels that they have been successful in the number of charges they have laid. Do they feel that they could be more successful in the future should the ground rules be laid down differently?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I think the figures speak for themselves in this case. They have collected \$100,000; I think that speaks pretty well for itself.

**Mr. McDonald:** With all due respect, you could conceivably claim \$100,000 in wages with only one charge laid. The two do not necessarily correspond in that manner. Does the minister know what the success rate is on charges laid under labour standards? If he does not, then we will get on to something else.

I take it from the silence that the minister does not know. We will get on to occupational health and safety. Could the minister elaborate a little bit on the relationship between the department and the Workers' Compensation Board and indicate what the reporting process is for the occupational health and safety officer who, I believe, is paid by the compensation board? Perhaps he could also state how the information that is collected by the occupational health and safety officer is used and whether or not there is an exchange of information of this type with the compensation board.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The Workers' Compensation Board and occupational health and safety do work together very closely. The Workers' Compensation Board is mainly concerned about claims and assessments, whereas the occupational health and safety officer and his area of the department is called in if there is a potential for injury as a result of an accident. They are looking at both accidents and possible accidents. Just to inform the member opposite, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island are the only places in Canada that have an occupational health and safety and Workers' Compensation Board together. The rest have it separated, as we do.

How the occupational health and safety officer gets his frequency check is from injury and hazard frequency rates that are set by the Workers' Compensation Board yearly. It is set on the rate that the board feels to be the higher class injury rates. Construction would be the highest class, and they would check that more frequently. Stores would be an extremely low class, so they would be checked less frequently. The injury and hazard frequency rate is set by the Workers' Compensation Board. That is where the officer gets his information as to what he should be checking, and when.

We do not inform the employers when they are coming around to check them — I think that is obvious, in itself — unless the employer has actually asked for the officer to come about and actually give an educational program to his employees and himself.

**Mr. McDonald:** That is partial explanation of what I was referring to before the break, insofar as the determination is made to conduct surveys and inspections and to issue inspection reports. Perhaps the minister can state briefly on when the occupational health and safety officer is required to issue an inspection report as opposed to merely conducting an inspection, and how the occupational health and safety officer responds to the investigation of complaints. Does he respond to every complaint? Does he respond only to complaints issued by employers, or by groups of workers? How is that specifically worked out?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The occupational health and safety officer responds when there is a call from either the employer or the employee, if there is a report of a hazardous condition. It is up to the employer to report that, and they are supposed to. That is aside from his regular investigations. If there is an injury, he must do an investigation. That is reported back to the Workers' Compensation Board as well. His report would go to them.

**Mr. McDonald:** On this particular subject, could the minister tell the House what rule of thumb is used to determine the severity of the hazard in order for it to justify an inspection on the part of the occupational health and safety officer? Could he also tell the House whether or not the occupational health and safety officer responds to complaints in other areas of Yukon as readily as he would respond to complaints in the Whitehorse area?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Ashley, before you answer that, possibly the House would enjoy a short break, but if Mr. Ashley would like to answer that before we have any further questions that will be all right as well. It is whatever the House desires.

We will now take a break until about 8:45.

#### *Recess*

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

Before we go any further with the budget I would like to read a short page here.

As you are all aware, one of the underlying principles of our parliamentary system is grievance before supply. This left a serious question in my mind as to exactly what that meant. For the people who have that same problem, it means that in the olden days when there was a king and he went to the people and demanded money, he was not given any money until he had listened to all the grievances. To clarify the practical application of that principle I would like to paraphrase from the *Canadian House of Commons* by Stewart. The business of supply gives members on both sides of the House an unrestricted opportunity to examine the performance by the ministers of all their duties. The procedures by which the business of supply is done should enable members to obtain an understanding of the operation of the various departments, branches and agencies and also to obtain adequate explanation of the policies followed by them. Second, they should enable the members to criticize both the operation and policies of those bodies. Third, they should enable members to discuss the shortcomings of the ministers, both their sins of omission and commission.

With that, we will continue with the budget under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I hope that Mr. Chairman did not think I was disputing his ruling. With that, I will answer a couple of questions that came from the opposite side.

The member for Mayo was asking, I believe, if we treated all calls the same, whether they came from outside Whitehorse or within Whitehorse and, within a reasonable time, yes. If a call comes in, the occupational health and safety officer certainly does respond to it. That is his duty, but he may be in Watson Lake, and a call come in from Whitehorse, or vice versa, so the answer is yes to that question.

**Mr. McDonald:** I gather that there are no restrictions on the occupational health and safety officers' travel. Perhaps the minister, as I did give notice of this question and I do not think it is a very difficult question, can give the House an indication of how he decides that meetings should be conducted with employers; whether it is upon request of the employer or whether it is on the officer's own initiative. The same sort of question is for speaking engagements and for workers' contact.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I thought I answered the question about the injury and hazard frequency rates. They are based on statistics from all the Workers' Compensation Boards from across the country; it is what they have compiled. That is what sets the frequency rate by which the occupational health and safety officer does his inspections. I think that answers that question.

Sometimes an employer will ask for the officer to come and have a session with himself and his employees. Other times, it depends on what else is happening and what other things are going on, as to what the occupational health and safety officer does, as far as education goes. It depends on what is happening in the economy and what is happening all over.

**Mr. McDonald:** Perhaps the minister could be a little more specific on the extent to which the officer takes it upon himself, on behalf of the department, to conduct these meetings with employers and with workers. The safety meetings with employers, for example, I see rose dramatically in the 1982-83 year and yet drops again as dramatically in the estimates for 1983-84. I would just like to know what sort of rhyme and reason there is to these figures. Is there any policy whereby the safety officer takes the initiative to conduct meetings with employers, to conduct meetings with workers, and to make special speaking engagements?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** One of the reasons that the officer would go to a company or to an employer and speak with the employer and employees is if they had an unusual number of injuries. That would cause the officer to go there and give some talks on safety. He keeps an ongoing file on a company; he keeps tabs on the number of accidents, and that is what he bases it on. The sites that he would visit are construction sites, especially, perhaps once a month. If they were short of first aid and other things, he may even go out more often than once a month, if there was a problem with a certain outfit, and then he would give an order; if that order was not carried out, then the operation would be shut down. I think you asked about education again; I am sorry, I am going to have to have that part of the question again.

**Mr. McDonald:** I think that the minister generally answered the question that I was asking. I have no way of knowing how comprehensive the answer is, and I will have to depend on my experience in the future to be able to ask the proper questions; the right questions at the right time.

I have a couple of general questions which emanate from my opening remarks. To what extent does the department feel that they should be enforcing the *Labour Standards Act*? How vigorous is the enforcement of the *Labour Standards Act*? What policy, if any, is there regarding the laying of charges under the *Labour Standards Act*? Are there any restrictions made in recognition of the inadequacies of the legislation?

For example, because of the inadequacy of the present piece of legislation, the hours of work provisions are not as rigorously dealt with as could be the case should the department wish. Perhaps the minister could comment on that aspect, and from there we can go onto a few other things.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** On a call, the investigator goes out. It is on a complaint or from a call. There are certain times that the officer will take a trip around the territory, such as, in winter, to visit garages and check for monoxide levels. It would be something that he would just go and do. It could be very highly hazardous. It is one of the highest hazards. The officer has a lot of testing equipment that he uses. He is out constantly checking across Yukon with these.

**Mr. McDonald:** I appreciate the minister's answer regarding the enforcement procedures for the occupational health and safety officer. Regarding the enforcement procedures for labour standards, and they would be conducted by the two labour services officers, I would expect, how vigorous are these labour services officers in enforcing the legislation? How vigorous are their enforcement procedures? What is the policy regarding the laying of charges under labour standards? As I said before, there is, to my understanding, a number of provisions which are considered to be inadequate to present work environment circumstances, such as hours of work, which was reputed to be inadequate, and was even recognized to be inadequate in the green paper, which was handed down by the minister's predecessor.

I understand that the department does not enforce certain provisions like the hours of work as rigorously as they could possibly enforce them because they recognize in some cases the provisions are unrealistic. Could the minister state what sort of policy there is regarding the enforcement of labour standards legislation in these areas?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The labour services officers inspect when there is a complaint and enforce the legislation then. The process is that if there is a complaint, they will check it out. If it is a valid complaint, then it may very well go to a labour services officer who will have a hearing of both parties, where both parties can cross-examine each other, and then he will give a ruling. At that point, it can only be challenged in court.

**Mr. McDonald:** Is the minister saying that all provisions of the current legislation are enforced upon notice of complaint as rigorously as is allowed in the legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The legislation is a policy, but common sense also has to prevail.

**Mr. McDonald:** I am looking for the bounds of common sense, or what the government considers to be common sense, in these circumstances. Realizing that the current legislation is somewhat



deficient in certain areas, such as hours of work, does the government have a policy or has the minister enunciated a policy which would clearly define the distance a labour services officer could go to enforce legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I have just advised the member opposite that the law is what they enforce. If there is a complaint, they check it out. If they find it is justifiable, it will go before an officer who is the adjudicator and who will hear both sides of it, where both sides have a chance to cross-examine. There will be a ruling. From that ruling it can be appealed to a court of law, but that is the only place.

**Mr. McDonald:** Without regard to the minister's remarks about common sense, can he state now that the provisions of labour services legislation are enforced rigorously upon notice of complaint by a member of the public; that they are always, in all cases, enforced to the letter of the legislation with no exceptions?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** It seems that the member opposite must have a specific complaint and I would certainly like to hear it.

**Mr. McDonald:** I suggested that there is a body of legislation that has been proven somewhat deficient; that is, the hours of work. I do not have the details of the complaints in front of me. I am not suggesting either that the complainant would necessarily want to make an issue of the enforcement of this legislation but, at the same time, hours of work provisions in the legislation are commonly breached in certain industries in the territory.

The government leader asked me to be specific. I just told the House that I do not have these complaints in front of me. I would like to know what general policy there is regarding the enforcement of complaints. It is quite simple: do they rigorously enforce all complaints at all times, or do they not?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I do not know how many times you want me to answer this question, but I have answered it a few times. If there is a problem I have told you the process it will go through. It will be looked at, and if it is deemed that is in fact a breach of the legislation then, yes, it will go through the appropriate steps. I do not know what else I should tell the member opposite, except that I intend to, if possible, table legislation in the fall. I cannot guarantee that because of circumstances but I certainly will be pushing towards it.

**Mr. McDonald:** I can take from that, that should there be a complaint, and should it breach labour standards legislation, there will be charges laid. I think I can assume that if there is a complaint which breaches labour standards legislation, as I said, there will be enforcement.

The minister suggested that the absence of the labour services director could delay the implementation or the development of, I assume, two pieces of legislation, both occupational health and safety and employment standards. Does the figure of \$188,000 listed under this line item include the full cost of the director for a person-year?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I am glad to see we are back on the figures in the budget debate. I will break down the \$188,000 for the member opposite: personnel is in the neighbourhood of \$167,000; transportation and communication is in the area of \$9,000; rental of equipment - \$67,000; library office supplies and testing equipment is in the neighbourhood of \$4,000. The administrator for labour services has been seconded to the Department of Education, as I told the member opposite many times. That leaves the department extremely short, so we are short-staffed and we will get done as much as we can get done. That is why I cannot give a guarantee that that legislation will be ready.

**Mr. McDonald:** I am not looking for a guarantee about the legislation. All I am asking, specifically, is if this figure represents the full cost of one labour services director for a full year, in light of the remarks made by the minister regarding the removal of this labour services director to education to administer these manpower programs.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I misunderstood the member opposite. Yes, the labour services administrator is in this cost of \$167,000. He has been seconded, without charge, to the Department of Education, so we are still paying for his salary out of this department.

**Mr. McDonald:** The minister gave the House to believe at one

point that the work would proceed on the various pieces of legislation when Mr. Dornian returned to labour services or when the position was filled by somebody else. Is the minister aware of how long the labour services director will be seconded to education, and if it is a long period of time, is the minister considering filling that position with someone else and if so when will the position be filled?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** His position may be vacant for quite a while, depending on what these NEED programs are; he is running them. I cannot fill a position because I do not have any other dollars to fill a position with, so we are going to attempt the legislation without him being there. That is why I cannot give you a guarantee, as I have been saying, as to whether we will get it done or not. But we are going to attempt to.

*Labour Services in the amount of \$188,000 agreed to*  
*Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$1,043,000 agreed to*

#### *On Medical Profession Act*

**Mr. Penikett:** I was a participant, as the minister was not, during the discussions of the creation of the medical council, and I would be curious to hear about the minister's experience with that body. I would be particularly interested in any comments he has about how well it is working. I am particularly curious about the role of the lay appointees to that body. I recall the debate in this House quite well. I remember that high hopes were held out for those lay people. It was the view of some members of the House that these people would be able to represent the views and concerns and the apprehensions of ordinary citizens in questions of discipline and, if you like, professional ethics for local doctors. I would be interested in knowing from the minister whether experience has fulfilled those expectations, whether the council has performed as it was hoped, or whether there has been anything in the history of this body which is causing the government to consider changes in the manner of its operation.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Because it is in the budget and it is still a committee, the answer is no. I am not anticipating changing it. As far as I have been informed, it works very well. If a complaint comes in front of it, it is dealt with. I do not recall any instance, since I have been a minister. In answer to the member, no, I have not received any problems from the committee or from the department with regard to this.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand, in the last few years, the council has dealt with some complaints and there have been some ethical issues placed before it. Could the minister give an undertaking to report back to the House on the success, or otherwise, of the operation of the medical council and particularly, indicate to the House whether he and the government is satisfied with the role of the lay appointees to that body? It does not necessarily have to be during the consideration of these estimates.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Yes, I will certainly undertake to do that.  
*Medical Profession Act in the amount of \$1 agreed to*  
*On Legal Profession Act*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I asked a question in November on this line and I am simply asking for an update of the same question. It is my understanding that the target date to table a new *Legal Profession Act* is in the fall session of the Legislature. Is the minister able to confirm that the target date remains the fall session?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Yes, that is the target date. It is going to be an awfully heavy legislative calendar; I hope I can get it all done.  
*Legal Profession Act in the amount of \$1 agreed to*  
*On Public Boards*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I asked a number of questions last November and I promised the minister I would ask the same questions. I will probably ask them every year until the problem ceases to be a problem. The general problem I was asking about was about the parity between the BC truckers and Yukon truckers.

The minister promised a policy some time in the future, but could not give a target date. Is the board or the minister closer to a policy and is there now a target date for a policy in this area?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The board is certainly working on it. They had two meetings last month dealing with just policy in this area. I

have not seen the report to date so I cannot tell how far along it is yet, but I hope by the end of this summer I am going to have it. That is what my target is to date and that is what I will be pushing everyone for.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I thank the minister for his statement of his goal, or his present target date, and I will look forward to discussing the policy in the area some time after the summer, and will raise it again, of course, if the resolution does not come about.

I would also ask, in the general sense, about the electrical question. I am quite aware of the deliberations of the board and I would ask: is there a projected date for a new government policy on the question of electrical rates?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I understand the member opposite is talking about rate equalization throughout the Yukon, about the hearing that was just held by the board. The board was meeting today and they shall make some kind of a recommendation to me, I would expect, within the next month. It may even be tonight.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The Throne Speech talked about an energy policy, and it is interesting that previous Throne Speeches talked about an energy policy, are we looking towards an announcement in this session of a statement of the government policy as a result of the various studies and deliberations which are ongoing?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** In respect to an energy policy, we are dealing with the federal government and dealing around with a number of federal energy policies. What we have to do, primarily, is get the Government of Canada to recognize that we really are a region of Canada, and that what they consider to be a break for Vancouver is not necessarily a break for Yukon. We have to convince the federal government that it really does cost something to transport energy, particularly petroleum products, to this territory from Vancouver. At the present time, they consider us to be part of the Vancouver distribution system and that is the break that we get. We, of course, feel very strongly that that is not fair, and we are going to continue that argument with them. That will, of necessity, form an integral part of an energy policy.

*25 On Labour Standards Advisory*

**Mr. McDonald:** Can the minister state how often the labour standards advisory board meets? Can he also state if there is a preset number of meetings and are the meetings called at the call of the chair, the minister, or whom?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The labour standards advisory board meets when there is a complaint; as required.

*Labour Standards Advisory in the amount of \$2,000 agreed to*

*On Medical Review*

*Medical Review in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to*

*On Driver Appeal*

*Driver Appeal in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to*

*On Insurance Licensing Appeal*

*Insurance Licensing Appeal in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to*

*On Medical Council*

*Medical Council in the amount of \$7,000 agreed to*

*On Transport Public Utilities Board*

*Transport Public Utilities Board in the amount of \$35,000 agreed to*

*On Electrical Public Utilities Board*

*Electrical Public Utilities Board in the amount of \$71,000 agreed to*

*Public Boards in the amount of \$118,000 agreed to*

*On Whitehorse Credit Union*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Could the minister explain what this is for? I know in the general sense but, specifically, what remaining detail would this item clear up?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** This \$13,000 is budgeted to sell off the one remaining asset, which is a house. We expect to lose on that sale because of current market conditions, so we are budgeting. Last year, we budgeted \$13,000. We did not sell the house and it cost us \$1,000. This year, we are budgeting \$13,000; we expect it may take a loss of \$11,000. With \$2,000 for administration it wraps-up everything with the credit union. That will wipe it off, if it sells. Otherwise, we will be doing it again next year.

*Whitehorse Credit Union in the amount of \$13,000 agreed to*

*Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$1,174,000 agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I have some lengthy opening remarks on the Department of Health and Human Resources, I would move that you report progress on Bill No. 5 and ask leave to sit again.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

**Mr. Speaker:** I will now call the House to order.

May we have a report from the chairman of committees.

**Mr. Philipsen:** The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, and directed me to report progress on same.

**Mr. Speaker:** You have heard the report of the chairman of committees. Are you agreed?

*Some Hon. Members: Agreed*

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

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I move that the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that we do now adjourn.

*Motion agreed to*

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

*The House adjourned at 9:28 p.m.*

**The following sessional papers were tabled April 18, 1983:**  
**83-3-11**

**Report on Regulations: October 25, 1982 - March 17, 1983 (Ashley)**

**83-3-12**

**Yukon Housing Corporation 81/82 Annual Report (Lang)**