

The Pukon Legislative Assembly

Number 20

3rd Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Thursday, April 28, 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 Old Crow

Kathie Nukon Andy Philipsen

Whitehorse Porter Creek West

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett

Whitehorse West

Leader of the Official Opposition

Maurice Byblow

Faro

Margaret Joe Roger Kimmeriy Whitehorse North Centre Whitehorse South Centre

Piers McDonald No Dave Porter C

Mayo

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 Whitehorse, Yukon
Thursday, April 28, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: Are there any returns or documents for tabling? Reports of committees? Petitions?

PETITIONS

Mr. Kimmerly: I have two petitions; one is briefly stated and is as follows:...

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure the petition can be read until it is a decision of the House that the petition be read. Perhaps the member can refer generally to it and the Clerk will determine whether or not it is in order.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is a petition about *The Children's Act* and asks for a select committee.

It has 61 signatures. I have, for tabling, an additional petition on the same subject; it has 26 signatures.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further petitions? Introduction of bills?
Notices of motion for the production of papers?
Notices of motion?
Are there any statements by ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am pleased to inform the Legislature that the Yukon government has implemented an amendment to the Territorial Land Regulations, to enable those individuals who purchased properties in the Pilot Mountain subdivision, to secure mortgages for building purposes while, at the same time, incurring the lowest possible cash outlay for the land.

⁰² As all members know, the government priced the lots of the Pilot Mountain subdivision at market value to protect the value of privately held lands of the same size and type. In keeping with the government's policy of selling residential land at development costs, this market value sales price consisted of a development cost component, payable over five years, and a market value component, forgiveable over ten years.

This recent amendment to the land regulations, which was formulated with the cooperation and input of the local lending institutions, will now allow Pilot Mountain lot owners to register a mortgage by paying out the development cost component only. Previously, it had been necessary for a purchaser to pay out development costs and market value component in order to raise title. Now the market value component will be registered as a second charge against the title and need only be paid off if the property is subsequently sold to a new owner and then only that portion which remains unearned at that time.

Therefore, the benefits of the amendment are twofold: rural residental land values are protected against artificial deflation and individual lot owners can secure mortgages without incurring onerous financial penalties.

Mr. Porter: In a brief response to the minister's statement, I want to say that I have not yet fully worked out the implications of the regulation change; however, any questions that I may have I will probably direct to him through the Question Period.

As the minister describes the change, it would appear that a distinct benefit is granted to an original purchaser of the property, in that the market value component is not any sort of burden to him. The fear I have, and I express this cautiously, is that the factor of land speculation is introduced because, upon sale of the property, the original owner is not met with the need to pay off the market

value component. He can assign this to the purchaser and, at the same time, reap additional value in the resale. Perhaps the minister can address this concern in his reply and, as well, address the concern of having different regulations for different land sales.

We appreciate any benefit to the individuals who are purchasing the land and who are met with serious financial burdens because of land disposal policy. We would want to be very certain that we are not creating special privileges that are not available to all people.

13 Hon. Mr. Lang: Just to clarify for the member opposite that if he reads it closely it is very clear that the land initially is sold at market value over a period of ten years. The actual costs that would be paid out are the development costs over that five year period, but at the same time we did not want to affect private land holders prior to the implementation of the policy two years ago. This allows people to get mortgages which, up until now, they have not been able to secure.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further statements by ministers?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I rise to inform the House that the government will not be proceeding with *The Children's Act* during the course of the current session.

Applaus

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There has been, I am sure all members are aware, considerable public concern expressed with certain sections of this act. It is because this government feels that many of these concerns stem from an imperfect understanding of the proposed legislation, and its intent, that we have decided to allow more time for the public to review the bill and to present their concerns in an organized and orderly way.

I want to emphasize that this government takes very seriously its responsibility to listen to and respond to the wishes and concerns of the people. We are listening and we are responding. Between now and the fall session we will be arranging meetings with concerned groups and accepting written submissions from all those who feel they have useful information to contribute. In this regard I must point out that the bill, as it presently stands, was not drafted without the solicitation of public input; indeed we advertised for it as long ago as last August and incorporated much of what we heard into the the present draft.

⁶⁴ By delaying the passage of this legislation we are not conceding that this bill is wrong, either in philosophy or intent. Neither are we saying that it cannot be susceptible to amendment. What we are saying is that it is obvious to us that the public needs more time to understand it.

At this point, I would like to suggest to everyone who will be perusing and discussing this bill during the forthcoming summer to continually bear in mind that it is a children's act, not a parent's act or a guardian's act or an adult's act; it is for the protection of children — children who cannot protect themselves.

During the last few days, much of the criticism we have heard has centred on the perception that the Director of Child Welfare is given too much power. One of the most unhappy and dismal facts of life is that child abuse does exist here in Yukon, as well as everywhere else. I know many doctors, nurses, clergy and welfare workers, who have seen the results of child battering, would be pleased to testify that there are occasions when these powers can be completely necessay and can be the difference between a child's life or death.

Mr. Kimmerly: We, on this side, are pleased that there is some more time to digest this very important act. In the past few days, there has been considerable public misunderstanding and I hope that, over the next months, that will be clarified. There has been considerable misunderstanding because the very laudable aim of this act, that is, to protect children, is so badly carried out in the act that, in fact, it interferes and abrogates children's rights by denying the rights of children to be safely and properly looked after by their parents.

There are seriously conflicting interpretations of the...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: On a point of order. I understand by our rules, that we give the opposition five minutes to respond to the

ministerial statement, not to debate the bill. If the member wants to debate, he should be in the House when we are debating. He was not here last night when we were debating, he had an opportunity to debate then. This is not the proper time for debate.

⁶⁵ Mr. Speaker: The Chair will not permit debate on the bill itself; however, we will allow general remarks in relation to the ministerial statement.

Mr. Kimmerly: With regard to the promise of the minister to allow more time for public input, I say this: the way to do that is to refer the bill to a select committee so that parliamentary debate can occur. The way it is proposed to receive the public input is to use an administrative or executive method, as opposed to a legislative method. It is another symptom of the increasing tendency of this government to go to a one-party system and we will not stand for it.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I suggest that the member across the floor will stand for whatever the people of this territory want to happen in this territory.

As far as referring it to a select committe of the Legislature, there is only one reason why the opposition wants a select committee; they want to be able to inject their political philosophy into it. What I am interested in and what my side of the House is interested in is the public input, not the input from the members across the floor.

I would further like to point out that the sections of this bill which have aroused so much misunderstanding and concern are comparatively few. The current legislation which, incidently, confers more power on the director than does the new bill, is, in this government's view, completely outmoded in many other respects. The bill now before the House is an honest and sincere attempt to update it. In many respects, such as the provision for adoption and the non-confrontation resolution of family conflicts, it is as enlightened and as progressive as any legislation anywhere in Canada.

The delay in the passage of this legislation may mean that we shall not be in a position to fully comply with the federal Young Offenders Act when it comes into effect October 1st. However, in the interim period, my department will be taking measures to prepare for the setting up of those mechanisms which will be required by the federal legislation.

However, it is clearly the wish of the people that they can be given more time to study, understand and discuss the proposed legislation. This government is pleased to afford them this opportunity and to assure them that their views, comments and concerns will be carefully listened to and heeded.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: The Children's Act

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask a question to the minister responsible for *The Children's Act*. There were questions yesterday about copies of the act. Is it the government's present intention to supply every Yukon citizen who requests it with a copy of this act free of charge?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We have presently produced, I believe it is, about 350 or 400 copies of the act, which cost this government approximately \$8 per copy. Considering the short time that we had to deal with the act, we were trying to make these available to the public. But now that we are going to put this legislation off until next fall to allow public input, I believe, considering the cost to the taxpayer, that interested people should pay the government for the cost of producing this paper. So we will be charging for the bill from now on.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the minister now aware of what the fee will be?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would think that it will probably be in the neighbourhood of about \$10 because of the 108 pages. It is costly to produce and will be in the \$10 range.

Mr. Kimmerly: For those parents who may be unemployed or on social assistance, will the minister consider the \$10 fee as a budget item so that they, too, can afford it?

Mr. Speaker: I take it that in fact the member is wanting to ask

a question rather than make a representation?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think it is possible for anyone, whether on social assistance or otherwise, to obtain a copy of the bill. I believe that it is best and most economical and the easiest for this government that we have one policy: that we charge for all of the bills from now on.

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Porter: My question is directed to the government leader. A recent news article has indicated that the impasse surrounding the YTG's boycott of the land claims process may be resolved by the end of the week. Can the government leader confirm this story as fact?

or Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would suggest that the member would have to go to the source of the news article in order to find that out.

Mr. Porter: Is the government leader planning to issue a ministerial statement on the land claims negotiations in this Legislature on the next sitting day?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: At the present time I am not planning to make any ministerial statements on the next sitting day. However, I would not want that to preclude me from making one should I determine by that time that I should make one.

Mr. Porter: Is it the position of the territorial government that it would like to allow a conclusion of negotiations between this government's negotiator and the federal negotiator prior to the CYI making a decision on the one government issue. Has he communicated his position on the issue to the chairman of the CYI?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have discussed, with the chairman of the CYI, the issue of our problem with the Government of Canada. The problem is with the Government of Canada. The chairman of the CYI has not found it necessary to ask me about our position since we initially discussed it.

Question re: Canadian Human Rights Act

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

I understand that the federal government is proposing amendments that would remove the Northwest Territories and Yukon from the jurisdiction of the *Canadian Human Rights Act*. Has this government had any input into these proposed changes?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think there is a misunderstanding on the part of the member opposite. What has happened is that, in fact, with amendments that have been made and passed, the Public Service of the Yukon Territory is no longer covered by the Human Rights Act in respect to their employment by this government.

Mrs. Joe: I was referring to some information I had just received today, and since any amendments seriously affect many Yukoners, would the minister report to the House during this session if, in fact, that information is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Again, is the hon. member making a representation or asking a question?

Mrs. Joe: I was asking a question.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps members would, instead of giving direction, please ask questions. We will consider that as a question.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I will undertake that, if we find out what information the member opposite is talking about. I will get back to the House on that.

⁰⁸ Mrs. Joe: I will certainly pass on the information that I have to him. Can the minister tell us when the Yukon human rights legislation will be introduced in this House?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: No, I cannot tell the members opposite at this moment. When we do table it, you will certainly know.

Question re: Highway signing policy

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the minister responsible for tourism. In a press release some months ago, the government stated that a review of highway signing policy for businesses within communities would be completed by the end of April. As the tourist season is practically upon us, can the minister tell the House when this policy will be in place?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It will not be much longer before the policy will be in place. We still have some consultation to complete with

the communities and with the highways department. As soon as it is in place, we will making an announcement to that effect.

Mr. McDonald: As mentioned numerous times before in this House, there exist special problems for communities outside the existing tourist corridors. Will there be a policy in place this summer that will encompass highway junction signing?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: There will be a policy in place that encompasses all highway signs.

Mr. McDonald: Is the minister aware that there may be substantial confusion regarding the legislative authority to regulate this area and will the department be preparing amendments to the act as a result?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We are aware of every aspect that has to be taken into account and we will be dealing with them.

Question re: Cyprus Anvil aid package

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the government leader.

As the government leader is aware, there has been some considerable criticism by his federal Conservative colleagues about the Cyprus Anvil aid package, especially on the allegation that it was announced too soon. I would like to ask the government leader if this government shares the point of view that the aid package should not have been announced when it was and that we should have continued the period of uncertainty that we have faced for the past ten months.

Mr. Speaker: I think I would rule that question out of order. The question would appear to ask the opinion of the minister about something. I wonder if the hon. member could be a little more precise in what he is looking for, because if he is looking for an opinion, that would be out of order.

Mr. Byblow: My question then can be rephrased in this manner: does this government leader agree that the Cyprus Anvil aid package should not have been announced?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know what difference it makes whether we agree or not. He is getting mighty thin-skinned if he considered that to be criticism. What happened was that a member of the House of Commons, in committee, questioned the propriety of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to come to Yukon to make an announcement prematurely. I do not know whether he did or not. It is not something that we are involved in at all, in any way, shape or form. I did not even know he was coming.

Mr. Byblow: Yes, we do understand the latter statement.

The president of Cyprus Anvil and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have both been quoted as clearly stating that the announcement of the package will help resolve the banking problems related to Cyprus Anvil. In light of that, will this government restate its position of support to the announcement as having been favourable and correct, in light of the circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know what the member is asking me to do. I told him yesterday that I have corresponded with the president of Cyprus Anvil, reiterating this government's support for the program that has been put in place and our anticipated support when they eventually go back into operation.

Mr. Byblow: Further to that, since both leaders of the opposition in the federal House of Commons clearly committed support to the package, should it materialize — and I was personally a witness to that — and now the Conservative leader is breaking that commitment, will the government leader do what he can to restore adherence to that commitment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a representation; however, I will consider that as being intended as a question.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The fact of the matter is that the member for Faro would like me to make representation on his behalf to the leader of the opposition. I told him yesterday, if he has got the moxie, he can do it himself.

I keep telling you that there has been no criticism of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for the aid package; certainly not from the Tories in Ottawa. The criticism is clear for everyone to see; it is simply a case of procedure. Did he or did he not announce the package prematurely? Maybe it had something to do with the fact that I was not going to be in Whitehorse that day.

Question re: The Children's Act

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question for the minister responsible for *The Children's Act*.

Exactly one week ago, the minister stated there were no policy reasons except for the October 1st deadline to not send the bill to a select committee. Is the minister now intending to send the bill to a select committee?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No.

¹⁰ Mr. Kimmerly: The minister stated today he is interested in listening to public concerns in an organized and orderly way. What method does he intend to follow?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member has my ministerial statement there which says what method will be followed. We will be arranging public meetings and also accepting presentations from any concerned person in the territory.

Mr. Kimmerly: What are the reasons why the minister will not send the bill to a select committee?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is fairly obvious why the opposition want to have a select committee, as I have already stated. They are not interested in public input; what they are interested in is NDP input. And they have that opportunity in Committee of the Whole.

Question re: Country residential lots

Mr. Porter: I thought this was Question Period, not Debating Period. This question is to the minister for municipal and community affairs. Is it the intention of this government to develop, then offer for sale, new country residential lots when it has not yet sold existing lots such as those at Hillcrest?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We work with the communities in developing land. There has been some question raised by the Municipality of Whitehorse for further country residential properties to be developed; we are presently discussing it with the municipality. Depending on whether or not finances are available, we could conceivably go forward next spring with some developments. I should point out to the member that there is a big difference between a country residential lot and a residential lot.

Mr. Porter: In order to develop new country residential lots, what debt burden does the government expect to assume?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I see the member opposite read the newspaper last night. If he had read it closely, we are just in the discussion stages with the City of Whitehorse; we would have to ascertain that once we took a cost analysis of what development was going to take place. Then we would have a rough cost of the development and the people purchasing the property would pay that price.

Mr. Porter: From what sources does this government intend to obtain financing for the development of these lots?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The member opposite obviously was not here when we were discussing the budget. It is fairly clear. When you look at the budget, there is a line item for the purposes of borrowing money and that is the procedure that would be followed, as we always have done in the past.

Question re: Heritage legislation

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources. Earlier this session, the minister indicated that she was considering making available to opposition members a policy paper regarding heritage legislation. Could the minister inform the House if she intends to make the paper available in the near future, or will she be considering the matter for some weeks longer?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will be making it available in the near future.

II Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell the House if this policy paper has been circulated outside government departments for review and comment by interested and concerned groups, and if so, why has the opposition not been provided a copy?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The paper has not been circulated outside of government departments. I believe the only place that it has been is to the deputy ministers' meeting. The opposition will be given the papers as soon as other people are given them.

Mrs. Joe: I have twice directed the minister's attention to a site

in Riverdale where artifacts have been found. Could the minister now inform us if her department has taken any action to protect this site from further damage?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, I just happen to have a note here. It is funny; I anticipated that question.

Jeff Hunston, I believe, is going to be excavating the site this summer. We have approval from the city and we have an archaeological permit and I believe and archaeological student will be assisting Jeff Hunston with the excavation. We will be erecting a temporary fence while the work is underway and, hopefully, after we have completed the work we will not need any further physical protection. It is in good hands.

Question re: Mayo administration building

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for either the Minister of Public Works or Labour Services.

The Edmonton contractor which did not complete the Mayo administration building still owes \$12,000 in retroactive pay to Yukon carpenters who worked on the project. Can the minister state whether his department has reviewed the situation, and can he also tell us what actions his department is taking?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Edmonton contractor that did not complete the work on the Mayo administration building was covered by a bonding company in Ontario, and the bonding company has to accept all the responsibility of Parkins Construction, who did not complete the facility. The wages concerned have to be covered by the bonding company, if anyone covers them. It is now before Labour Canada, and also it is before the courts in Yukon, I believe. If it has not been to court it will go to court unless the bonding company does pay. That is my understanding, anyway.

Mr. McDonald: One initial question: when the contract for the Mayo administration building was put up for bid, a Yukon company was turned down in favour of the Edmonton contractor. Can the minister tell the House how much more the Mayo administration building will cost than that which the outside contractor bid?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Unless there were change orders and additions to the building, it will cost exactly what the contract stated.

Question re: NEED Projects

Mr. Byblow: According to the NEED program application forms, and guidelines that go with it, \$400 per worker per work week is available to project sponsors to cover the costs of the wages, the benefits, expenses for approved projects; consisting of \$325 in federal monies and, I believe, \$75 in YTG money. Can the minister advise the House if, and why, the Yukon contribution to the program is not available to non-profit or community organizations who are sponsors of these NEED projects?

12 Hon. Mrs. Firth: I am not exactly sure what the member is getting at, but if that guideline or rule was set down it would be because it was the outline of the federal government, and that we had to abide by the guidelines that the federal government has established.

Mr. Byblow: I assume the minister is saying that the federal government has set the rules for that stipulation.

I have been informed by officials of the minister's department and representatives of Canada Manpower that YTG's contributions to the NEED program cannot be applied to wages for workers, but it can be applied to the costs...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the hon. member is now embarking on a speech.

Mr. Byblow: I would like to ask the minister why the stipulation has been put in place to prevent YTG portions of money going to the workers in the project?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not believe the member is entirely accurate; I do not think that is a correct statement. I believe our portion is applied to wages, also.

Mr. Byblow: No, because this was brought to my attention and was well researched; I believe the minister is incorrect.

Could then, in a clarification way, the minister advise how many projects, approximately, is this government currently involved with under the NEED Program and, perhaps, some approximation of the number of individuals involved?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I cannot give the member those figures right now, because the NEED committee, locally, has only met a few times — I am not sure how many, between one and three, I believe — and they have started to identify projects and identify funds. However, I do not have the exact numbers and if the member would have questions like this in future, I would prefer that he either give me a written question or some advance notice and I can get the numbers for him.

Question re: The Children's Act

Mr. Kimmerly: Again about the procedures under *The Childrens' Act*: will the new process include public meetings, advertised in advance, with unrestricted access?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It may; it depends on what my department and I feel are the best methods to get the public input and what the public would like to see.

Mr. Kimmerly: What sort of information or public input is the minister thinking about in order to decide this particular question?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: One thing I will say is that it will not be a Progressive Conservative meeting set up in opposition to the bill, or to gather up petitions, and things like that. If we were to have a public meeting, it would be to get input from the public into exactly what they thought of the bill and where changes should be made. We will do whatever is necessary in order to get that information.

Mr. Kimmerly: When the draft proposals or possible changes in the bill are known and become public policy, what will be the procedure to publicize those?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: They will be tabled in the House next session.

Question re: Skagway road expenses

Mr. Porter: A question to the Minister of Highways: is it the intention of this government to cost-share the total expenses of the Skagway Road reopening between the Governments of BC, Yukon and Alaska or will each government have a responsibility for that portion of the road that passes through its jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Lang: In both cases it is no. We have a responsibility for the Yukon-BC section. Alaska has responsibility through the State of Alaska for their maintenance costs. Subsequently, if the member sticks around and is prepared to discuss the Department of Highways budget, he will see that there are dollars in there for the costs of operation and maintenance.

Mr. Porter: Is there any upgrading planned for the Skagway Road this summer in view of the higher traffic load it might be expected to bear with the railway being shut down?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If the member opposite had been in the House last session, during the discussion on the capital mains, I indicated that there was going to be 13 kilometers of highway, between here and Carcross, upgraded and, also, some railing will be put into place along that particular corridor. I am hopeful that, perhaps, there is going to be some money available from the Government of Canada to do further work over the course of the summer. However, that remains to be seen.

Mr. Porter: Has the minister, or anyone in his department, conducted an investigation into the avalanche conditions on the Skagway road and, if so, does he deem that highway, at the present time, to be safe for public use?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No. There have been no concerns brought to my attention in that respect. It is not our intention to maintain that highway over the winter months, in any case. My understanding is that both highway departments feel it is adequate. I am sure the member opposite could take full advantage of going over to Skagway this week. In fact, I believe the road may be open later on today for the purpose of passage because I understand custom officials will be there. Perhaps the member opposite, if he does not want to stay in the House, can go for a drive.

Question re: The Children's Act

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the minister responsible for *The Children's Act*. Since the government has gone to great expense to

supply copies of the land claims package free of charge to anyone who requested a copy, how can he now justify charging interested Yukoners a fee for such an important document as *The Children's*

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The land claims package was produced for a very specific reason; it was to get the government's position to everyone in the territory. There are certain people who may be interested in *The Children's Act*, or a great many people who have picked up that act and, obviously, they have not read it or, if they have read it, they have not comprehended what it says, in a great many instances. That is one of the reasons why we are putting off passage of the bill. Anyone who is seriously interested in *The Children's Act* should not be demanding of the people of the territory that we supply, at \$10 a copy, unlimited copies for everyone in the territory. It is only right and proper that they pay for it; they should not expect everybody else to.

Question re: Wolf Creek campground

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the minister responsible for renewable resources. I previously raised with the minister the question of privatization of campgrounds, specifically with respect to the Wolf Creek campground. What is the intended policy for this coming season on that facility?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Wolf Creek campground will be open totally. We have given the opportunity to each of the three campground operators to collect the fees and receive the percentage of the fees for that collection. So, we have tried to make it as fair as possible to everyone who perhaps feels that they are in competition with our campground or ours is in competition with theirs. We are giving them the opportunity to gain some revenue from the campground; however, we feel that it is almost mandatory for us to open the campground, considering the complaints that we had last year because we kept half of it closed.

Mr. Byblow: The minister does listen to public response. I understand that it is the intention of the department to reduce or close a number of campgrounds elsewhere in the territory this year. Could the minister give an indication of the extent to which this is going to occur and what the principal reason for closure is?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, we are going to close some campgrounds this year; some small, antiquated campgrounds that are mostly in gravel pits and places such as that. We have developed a territorial parks system with campgrounds in them throughout the territory and they are very nice. We do not feel it justifies keeping the smaller, old campgrounds in use. We have to maintain them and it is very costly. We have spaced our campgrounds throughout the territory so that these old campgrounds, the smaller ones, are now a detriment to us, rather than a benefit.

Mr. Byblow: Could the minister indicate what consultation he has had with the tourism industry respecting the selected campgrounds that are identified for closure and, perhaps, what monitoring of usage he has given to those campgrounds that he has selected?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I did have consultation with the industry. I had the YVA into my office and I gave them our proposal on campgrounds; they agree with the closures. I do not think we are going to close the one in Faro, so the member should not be too concerned.

Question re: The Children's Act

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question for the minister responsible for *The Children's Act*. Sometime before the next session, will the minister debate the principle of *The Children's Act* with me in a public open forum?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The forum for debate on *The Children's Act* is right here and I will do it anytime.

Question re: Charges for public information

Mr. Porter: I have a question for the Minister of Human Resources.

Is it the position of the minister that this government will not charge individuals for costs for producing legislative materials that, in content, support this government's position and, in instances where the public position is needed, they will, indeed, charge the public for the publication of those materials?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think the member is out to lunch; he is usually out to lunch, anyway.

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the interest of both sides of the House, it would seem that the whole matter is argumentative and I will rule the question and the answer both out of order.

Ouestion re: Education programs

Mr. Byblow: I have a supplementary to a previous set of questions I asked the Minister of Education.

I would like to ask the minister if she is prepared to give a commitment to the House to provide a periodic update of the various programs that are being put in place through her department?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We just went through a budget debate — a very extensive budget debate, I believe — on the Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower. The members opposite had ample opportunity to ask me for an update. I was asked nothing about the employment programs; for a status report, how many jobs we had created, how much money we had spent.

I am not prepared to give a commitment. The member may feel free to ask this question, and I will respond to him in the House.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further questions, we will proceed to the order paper, under Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Lang: 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 hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs 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 have a short break.

Recess

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

Bill No. 5: Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84 — continued Department of Highways and Transportation — continued Highways Branch Maintenance — continued

Hon. Mr. Lang: I have just a couple of notes. On highways 4 and 10, you will see a reduction in expenditures. In 1981-82 the actual expenditures were down; in 1982-83 our forecast figures were for catching up on maintenance of these particular highways; the 1983-84 figure represents some escalation in costs with the expection of a minor reduction in traffic. Highways 6, 7 and 8: an increase in expenditures. On Highway 6, the decrease last year was because of cuts that we had to make in the budget last fall and we are now intending to bring it back up to the Jorgensen standard. The same applies to highway 7. Highway 8: in 1981-82 and partially 1982-83, the cost increase was because of the bridge that went out; and in 83-84 we are going to be increasing that to the Jorgensen standard.

In other roads, the increase in expenditures results from the inclusion of territorial airstrips, the transfer from the Department of Municipal Affairs for responsibility for roads outside communities; the improvement to standards, and also maintenance of rural developments, such as Pilot Mountain.

Mr. McDonald: In my list of questions, which I provided to the minister, there was also the query whether or not there were any significant changes in winter conditions, ferry operation and bridges. I noticed in the last budget, on page 168, the minister of the department saw fit to include these as line items, and I do think that they provide some valuable information. Perhaps the minister could just briefly suggest whether any significant changes have taken place in any of these old line items?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I should have raised that. As far as ferry operations and bridges are concerned, there are no real changes. I indicated in the general debate of the department that we had hoped to get an engineer or a number of engineers to look at our bridges, from federal DPW. Unfortunately, that has not come to pass, and we will probably have to wait until next year. There is some work that will have to be done.

On Alaska Highway

Alaska Highway in the amount of \$8,700,000 agreed to On Whitehorse Access Roads

Mr. Porter: In this section, specifically what is meant by the Whitehorse access roads? Is this access roads that are constructed within the city boundaries of Whitehorse that may extend outside of the city proper?

Hon. Mr. Lang: For the most part, that is correct.

Whitehorse Access Roads in the amount of \$170,000 agreed to On Klondike Highway

Klondike Highway in the amount of \$4,704,000 agreed to 17 On Haines Road

Haines Road in the amount of \$1,501,000 agreed to On Campbell Highway

Mr. Porter: Why are we seeing this type of decrease on the Campbell Highway?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just went through the list, if the member had been listening. The underexpenditure on highway four, which we are referring to, is a result of the lack of traffic and, subsequently, our maintenance costs will be less.

Mr. Porter: By what process has the minister determined the amount of traffic that traverses the highway and has he any information that is written that indicates that there, indeed, has been a decrease in traffic on the highway?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If the member has not been out to his riding recently, if he drives either route, he will note that there is a major decrease in traffic because the trucking that has been a major vehicle count on those particular roads no longer exists, at least at the present time. Subsequently, our roads are less prone to disruptions, as far as maintenance is concerned.

Mr. Porter: Aside from the minister continuously driving along the Campbell Highway and counting vehicles, is there, in the department, a process that is set up that can prove, by way of a study, that there has been a decrease in traffic on the Campbell Highway?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We have counters on all the highways. Each vehicle goes over and then we divide by four. Subsequently, we get the number of vehicles at the end of the day. I suspect that the estimate that is given gives a clear indication that there is going to be less traffic there. I think the member opposite would have to agree, unless he knows something that I do not.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister make a statement to the effect that the decrease in expenditure to the Campbell Highway in no way will cause serious technical problems to the highway; to affect the condition as it exists now?

Hon. Mr. Lang: To the best of my knowledge, no, of course it is not. We have monies to go ahead and maintain the particular corridor in question and that would be our intention, unless something comes up that we have no knowledge of.

Mr. Porter: So, the minister is, in fact, stating that the condition of the Campbell Highway will not be affected as a result of the cutbacks we see reflected here in the budget; that the highway will be maintained at the standard of the last few years?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The member opposite should go for a drive. I have asked people who have driven that particular corridor, and they have told me that it is in excellent shape. I have no reason to disagree with them.

Mr. Porter: So, the minister does not disagree with the statements that I have issued.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would be the last one to agree or disagree. I just want to put a point of view across.

Campbell Highway in the amount of \$2,685,000 agreed to On Dempster Highway

Mr. McDonald: Does the minister anticipate increased traffic on this highway this year?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I understand there is some increased traffic this spring. I would have to take notice with respect to any major trucking traffic going up to that particular corridor. I hope that we will have a significant increase over last year. I will get back to the member on that question.

¹⁸ Mr. Porter: Do the figures that are shown here reflect the contractural obligations that this government has to the Eagle Plains Lodge?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes.

Dempster Highway in the amount of \$3,326,000 agreed to On Canol Road

Mr. Porter: Does this include both South and North Canol? Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes.

Mr. Porter: In a recent Question Period, I raised the issue with the minister as to his knowledge of any reconstruction that may occur on the North Canol Highway. Can he give us an update as to the progress on discussions with the Department of Public Works, federally.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The way I understand it is that that particular project would come under the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. My understanding is that there may be some engineering work, but that is about as far as it will be going this year. Of course, that is a federal decision, so I have to wait to find out what exactly the ultimate decision is.

Mr. Porter: In the discussions that his department officials have had with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, has there been discussions around the issue of continuation of the survey program on the North Canol?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If they were going to go ahead further with their engineering, I would suggest that that would probably be one aspect of it.

Mr. Porter: Has there been any discussion as to surveying being undertaken on that highway with respect to the possibility of an energy corridor that could accommodate a gas or oil pipeline?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not to my knowledge.

Canol Road in the amount of \$1,216,000 agreed to On Atlin Road

Atlin Road in the amount of \$283,000 agreed to On Tagish Road

Tagish Road in the amount of \$374,000 agreed to On Dawson-Boundary Road

Dawson-Boundary Road in the amount of \$421,000 agreed to On Nahanni Range Road

Nahanni Range Road in the amount of \$408,000 agreed to On Stewart-Keno Road

Stewart-Keno Road in the amount of \$822,000 agreed to On Other Roads

Mr. Byblow: I just want to get some clarification from the minister, before we clear this item, with respect to this government's intention — and I am not making a representation but I guess that does not matter at this point — of commitment regarding the Faro access road maintenance to the mine. As I recall, this government has made a commitment to do the maintenance of that access road on a cost recovery basis with the mine. It is identified that there will be some cost saving to the company for doing that. I have several questions relating to that.

I paused to ensure that the minister heard my questions. In the first instance, there is some concern raised from within the community. I should advise the minister with respect to something this government has gone on record as in fact opposing; that is the assumption, by government, of a job that could be in fact contracted out. Now, perhaps just for the record, the minister could respond to that, because it has been brought to my attention what the government is really doing here is using its equipment for a job that could be done by private enterprise. I do not disagree with that. I want to make it quite clear that I think what the government has

done there is a very legitimate and very correct negotiation with the company to help off-set certain costs. Could the minister just respond to that?

In the second question, I would be curious how this government would set up those arrangements to ensure that it has the equipment in the region to do the required maintenance of that road because it would be required on a daily basis. I suppose I raise this with a view to questioning whether or not the government has any intention to institute some kind of facility within Faro to house or facilitate that kind of maintenance. I suppose in the same breath it would go hand in hand with the maintenance of the existing access road to the highway. I call to the attention of the minister that the nearest highways camp for this kind of service, at the moment, is approximately 40 miles on either side, essentially amounting to a 50 mile drive to service that particular road.

¹⁰ Perhaps I could leave it there and the minister could respond to those two concerns brought to my attention.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Our offer at the present time is subject to the mine going into production. I have not done anything to that end, in view of the decision we have made. It is my understanding that Cyprus Anvil is going to be getting in touch with me to discuss whether or not we are prepared to do it sooner. I will have to wait to see what the outcome of those discussions are before I recommend anything to my colleagues. Our position now is that we are not prepared to maintain that highway until the mine goes into production.

In respect to what exactly has to be taking place, if we decide that we are going maintain that highway after the mine goes into production, we would have to sit down with Cyprus Anvil and figure out just exactly what we are going to do, because it would be cost, plus six percent.

Mr. Byblow: I recall the minister, in some various and previous discussions, making the point that the government could maintain that road cheaper than it is maintained now. Having just said that there would be a six percent administrative cost to any charge, based on cost-recovery, I would be curious how the minister feels that he can do that job cheaper than private enterprise contracts or cheaper than the current arrangement where the mine does it themselves.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to clarify one thing. I have to check if it is either cost plus six percent or plus ten percent; it is one or the other.

It should be pointed out to the member opposite that Cyprus Anvil came to us, we did not go to them; that is number one. We estimated our costs, and whatever those costs would be, they would have to pay. It is a question of the equipment we have and the ability to do the job.

Now, whether that is true remains to be seen, only we would have to have experience in taking over that particular responsibility until we actually see what the costs are. The costs, the way I understand them, as presented to me, were 50 percent less because of the fact that the government equipment is already in relatively close proximity, could be serviced in relatively close proximity, and so on.

I do not have the exact figures in front of me. If the member opposite had given me notice, I would have, perhaps, been able to give him a little bit more detail.

Mr. Byblow: I was not so much seeking specific dollar values or specific percentages. I was looking at the policy that is obviously going into some changing pattern where government is assuming a road maintenance that was previously done under private contract. If the minister is advising me that government can do that cheaper, then I can understand that as being an important factor for the change in the intended policy.

I do not wish to pursue this any further, unless the minister has some closing remark. It is something we are going to be addressing, obviously, in the next year or so, because, as optimistic as I am, I am sure we will see some milling production within that time.

Hon. Mr. Lang: We have done a number of access roads on a third-party basis and have had a fair amount of experience with them. I would suggest this would be no different.

Mr. Porter: Last fall, also, in this budget, the minister spoke

of monies being appropriated for use in constructing new, and upgrading present, roads into new and existing woodlots. Do the funds, that we see here today, that are appropriated for other roads include those roads into the woodlot areas?

²⁰ Hon. Mr. Lang: No. If the member opposite had been in debate during the discussion last fall, or perhaps he has forgotten, it is under municipal affairs.

On Campbell Highway — continued

Mr. Porter: With respect of the discussion on this line item, Mr. Chairman, with the permission of yourself and providing the minister is willing to answer, I would like to go back to the Campbell Highway discussion and simply put a question to the minister as to the details of the decrease in funding that will be allocated to that particular highway. Will the cut in funding be cuts in areas of person-years, equipment or in areas of purchase of highway and related construction materials?

Mr. Chairman: Before you answer that, Mr. Lang, is the committee agreed that they will go back to the Campbell Highway discussion?

Some Members: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is going to be overall reduction with respect to the total cost of the highway. I do not expect a reduction in staff but probably a reduction with respect to the application of calcium chloride, the number of passes that are necessary as opposed to when it was being very heavily travelled.

Mr. Porter: Continuing on with the other roads discussion ... Hon. Mr. Lang: A point of order. We have gone to the Campbell Highway. He has now moved on to other roads, so I presume that this particular section should be cleared once again since it has been reopened at his request and then we would move on to other roads.

Campbell Highway agreed to

On Other Roads

Mr. Porter: With respect to the cottage lot subdivisions, the dollars that will be expended on the upkeep of those roads, will it fall strictly within the purview of municipal affairs funds, or are there going to be situations arising where funds will be allocated from this particular section of the budget?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If the member opposite was listening to my opening remarks, this comes under other roads now. We have transferred it as policy from municipal affairs to highways. We have, for the sum operation and maintenance costs, in the neighbourhood of approximately \$40,000 plus, out of that particular sum of money that we are looking at.

Mr. Porter: There was a problem with the cottage lots in and around the community of Teslin on Teslin Lake, this winter on the question of ploughing of the main arteries of that particular cottage lot subdivision. Will that be taken care of with monies allotted under this line item?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes.

Other Roads in the amount of \$1,508,000 agreed to

Highways Branch Maintenance in the amount of \$26,118,000 agreed to

On Airports Branch Administration

Hon. Mr. Lang: This area of the budget is totally funded by the Department of Transport, and reflects an increase of \$13,000 to return to the 10-day fortnight and provisional operational costs. I should add that we find the cooperation we get from the DOT very encouraging and it is working out very well for everybody. For the member for Mayo's edification, we are working with MOT with respect to the question of the Mayo apron. A decision has yet to be made with respect to that particular project.

²¹ Mr. McDonald: The minister mentioned that the increase in personnel costs was as a result of the return to the 10-day fortnight. That, it would seem to me, would represent at least a 10 percent change in the estimates. Can the minister explain the balance of the increase?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is because of the 10-day fortnight and also the fact that there is a fair requirement for travel with respect to this particular area of the department in order to work with the department of transportation. A number of meetings are required in Ottawa or Edmonton to work out the various arrangements on cost

recoveries that we get from that particular federal department.

Mr. Byblow: On a current and local matter, the minister knows about the appeal by the Faro Chamber of Commerce to assemble some proposal to present to the federal government in order to attempt some procurement of funds related to the Faro airport as well as the access road. Can the minister now indicate to me whether he has cleared the information requested to, in fact, come from his department and flow through to the Chamber?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We are in the process of gathering it.

Airports Branch Administration in the amount of \$67,000 agreed to

On Airports Branch Operations and Maintenance

Hon. Mr. Lang: There is a significant increase in this area, largely due to the full year of an observer communication services by contract in Teslin and Ross River. Last year covered only a part of a year, as these airports were taken over in the middle of the year. There is also provision for a proposed new contract for an observer communicator service in Beaver Creek, which I am sure the member for Kluane will be pleased to see. The is cost of the operations and maintenance of additional facilities. We have new buildings in Ross River, Beaver Creek and Teslin. It should be pointed out that it includes the cost of a heavy equipment operator in Old Crow and portions of the wages of various heavy equipment operators in highway maintenance camps, as well as doing occasional work at our territorial airstrips along the highway.

It also includes the cost of contract employees for the observer communications services in Old Crow. It should be pointed out that there is shown here approximately one-half a person-year for a heavy equipment operator in Old Crow. The reduction of .5 person-years merely reflects all the other heavy equipment operators who occasionally work on the airports and are now under highway maintenance.

Mr. Porter: On the question of this particular area of the budget, I would like to ask the minister if the situation in Teslin is one where the contracting out for services is done between the LID and a local individual?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am going on memory, but I believe it is between the local improvement district and the contractor. The reason it was done that way was so that the LID could assume the responsibility at the end of the year. They make some money on that particular project; it helps them.

Mr. Porter: Is it correct to state that the relationship there is simply between the government and an individual?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is my understanding.

22 With respect to the nature of the contents of the contract, what is the provision for the length of the contract? Is it a yearly contract?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will have to take notice on that question. Mr. Porter: When the minister does take notice, would he also address the question as to the procedure by which the contract is let and awarded?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think I can answer that. It is by public tender in the area and people come forward and the bids are opened.

Mr. Porter: Was that done in the initial allotment of the contract?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will have to check that.

Mr. McDonald: I gave notice of a question regarding the expenditure recoveries in both airport administration and operation and maintenance. The total costs incurred in both of these areas was \$961,000, I believe. The airport recovery shows, I believe, \$1,016,000, a difference of \$55,000. Could the minister explain what this \$55,000 represents and whether or not it is an administration charge?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Correct.

Mr. Byblow: As I understand, the arrangements that are in place between this government and federal MOT regarding the maintenance of airports, this government is essentially the provider of the service and charges back to the federal government. In some communities there is a step further that this process goes, where the local municipal or LID undertakes, on behalf of the territorial government, the maintenance of these airports who, in turn, chargeback to YTG who, in turn, charge back to MOT.

What input can this government provide to upgrading that level of

services for the Arctic B and C program airports? Should communities require improved navigational aids, should they require improved fueling facilities, what input can this government provide in dealing with MOT? Ultimately, the responsibility of airports is MOT's and this government is simply an intermediary, at the moment, handling the funds and looking after the administrative end of the job.

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is the importance of this particular branch, to work closely with MOT, making sure our representations are forwarded. It goes to a western regional committee, the way I understand it, and decisions are made. I should point out we have been quite successful and I think the member would agree. Even in his community or any of the communities throughout the territory, our airports are being upgraded on a continuous basis and we are getting a very good network around the territory that provides convenience and safety to the public travelling by aircraft.

Mr. Byblow: In the arrangement that this government has for its chargeback of costs of maintenance of the airports to MOT, is this an open-ended agreement from the dollar point of view? As the maintenance costs, perhaps, increase beyond any projected budget, does MOT unquestionably pick up the difference? I ask this with an allusion to the possibility of using the opportunity to do a level of improvement, through the O&M budget, to the facilities.

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, you have to justify those expenditures. It is not our intention to abuse the working relationship we have with the government. If the member opposite is inferring that we go ahead and do a project and then bill MOT, I just do not think that is playing fair ball.

Mr. Byblow: No, I am not suggesting that, but I am suggesting that built into an O&M budget we could see the negotiation take place that would increase the level of O&M to include improvements of a larger nature to be included in an operation. There gets to be fairly grey lines between capital improvements and maintenance when you are looking at some of the older line airports and improvement of navigational aids in the current state of the art, as it were.

Hon. Mr. Lang: There is no question that there is a firm understanding between both levels of government as to what is capital and what is O&M, and we proceed accordingly. I do not have the list in front of me.

Airports Branch Operations and Maintenance in the amount of \$894,000 agreed to

On Recoverable Services

Hon. Mr. Lang: The main vote of \$290,000 was increased by \$126,000 to \$416,000 in 1982-83. That reflected the recoverable services for improving the Town of Faro and the mine access road reconstruction. The provision of the \$290,000 is strictly a general provision and it depends on demand.

On Third Party Services

Third Party Services in the amount of \$290,000 agreed to

On Garage Operations

Hon. Mr. Lang: There should be some changes in the figures shown: under 1983-84, for Whitehorse it should read 2,654; under Dawson City, 317; and under Internal Chargebacks, (2,971). Under establishment, person-years should be 67 rather than 66.

This is straightforward. It is strictly garage services and internal chargebacks.

Department of Highways and Transportation in the amount of \$28,425,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will now leave the budget and go to Bill No. 13, Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2).

On Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2)

24 Hon. Mr. Pearson: As the explanatory note says, this bill will appropriate interim supply for operations and maintenance during the month of May 1983. Of course, it is necessary that we pass this bill through committee today so that it can, in fact, get third reading and assent tonight, prior to us rising so that we can carry on the business of government during next month.

Mr. Byblow: I do not have anything of a major general response

except one query. What would take place should this bill not get passed? I say that with no allusions to the future. I am curious what happens when this government does not have the legislative authority to spend money as provided for the month of May by this bill. What does it do?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: If, in fact, we did not pass the bill, then we would be out of business. If we are responsible at all, we should not allow our employees to come to work on Monday morning because we do not have the authority to pay them. That is really the bottom line. The government would be shut down. This is dealt with in the provinces and in the federal government. This is done, as I am sure the members realize, by Governor-in-Council warrants. Until we have a new Financial Administration Act in place, this is the only alternative we have. We cannot issue the warrants at this point.

Mr. Byblow: The government leader says the bottom line is that we could not call our employees back to work. But the practical interpretation that I would have of the situation is that, with pay day not coming for a couple more weeks, there is no requirement for this government to forward any money to employees on a payroll basis. Now, I would think that the government, more properly, come Monday morning would not be able to legitimately authorize any payment of bills, employee payroll being something that it does not materialize for a couple of weeks.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, the Commissioner and, through the Commissioner, we are prohibited from making a commitment — never mind spending the money — but making a commitment to spend money that has not been authorized by a line item in this House. That is why we have some line items, so that we can in fact make commitments — not necessarily spend the money, but make the commitment. If we allow an employee to come to work, you have made a commitment at that point to pay them. We cannot even make the commitment.

Mr. Byblow: I am puzzled because of the situation that evolved last year. We went into an election without having passed a budget, yet, the government that formed, functioned for several months without an approved expenditure, if you will. Perhaps the government leader could explain to me what was different then than is taking place now should this not be passed.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The difference is that the Legislature is sitting now and it was not sitting then. If the Legislature was not sitting, then the Commissioner could issue warrants and we could carry on, on a monthly basis, with respect to all Commissioner's warrants. But we cannot do that if the Legislature is in session. We must come to the Legislature and get appropriations. I notice, if the member is still confused, his partner sitting directly behind him understands what it is all about.

26 Mr. Byblow: I can understand what the government leader is saying, but in what he is saying there is a distinct contradiction. Is it only because the House is sitting that we are required to give this legislative authority to spend money come Sunday morning, the 1st of May being Sunday. If the House should not be sitting, then the Commissioner has the authority to permit this government to spend money through warrant? Hon. Mr. Pearson: Those warrants have to ratified by the medium of interim appropriation acts once the House is sitting. If the member will recall, that is what we did.

Mr. Byblow: Yes, I recall last year that is in fact what we did. We ratified money that was already spent. Do we have this sitting somewhere in a legislative mandate that says this government, when the House is sitting and runs through the end of a period, is required to utilize the House for the expenditure of money for the subsequent period? Is this down in some legislative mandate or in some administrative handbook, or is just the protocol of approving money simply because the House is sitting? Again, because of the situation that happened last year I would be curious to know: if the House adjourned today, this government would not be in trouble but yet if the House was going to be sitting Monday it seems like it would be in trouble?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We are never in trouble. Yes, actually it is a combination of the *Yukon Act* and the *Financial Administration Act*. The rules are really strict. They are quite well-delineated.

Mr. Byblow: Contrary to the out-and-out loud thoughts of the member for Campbell, I am not filibustering, I am trying to

understand procedure and requirements of financial appropriations. Perhaps it will be a useful exercise to go back through *Hansard* on this discussion to understand the possibilities of what the government leader tells me can be done.

Having had that fairly well cleared up, it would appear that this government could not have its employees come to work Monday morning, should this interim measure not be passed today. If that is the legal status that we are in, that is all I was seeking.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is what I have been trying to tell him. Mr. Chairman: I will direct attention to Schedule A.

On Yukon Legislative Assembly

Yukon Legislative Assembly in the amount of \$104,000 agreed to On Executive Council Office

Executive Council Office in the amount of \$132,000 agreed to On Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower in the

amount of \$2,452,000 agreed to

On Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the amount of
\$101,000 agreed to

On Department of Health and Human Resources

Department of Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$2,220,000 agreed to

On Department of Municipal and Community Affairs

Department of Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of \$1,590,000 agreed to

On Department of Economic Development and IntergovernmentalRelations

Department of Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations in the amount of \$156,000 agreed to

On Department of Justice

Department of Justice in the amount of \$877,000 agreed to On Department of Highways and Transportation

Department of Highways and Transportation in the amount of \$2,371,000 agreed to

On Public Service Commission

Public Service Commission in the amount of \$99,000 agreed to 27 On Department of Finance

Department of Finance in the amount of \$310,000 agreed to On Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources in the amount of \$230,000 agreed to

On Department of Renewable Resources

Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$459,000 agreed to

On Department of Government Services

Department of Government Services in the amount of \$574,000 agreed to

On Yukon Housing Corporation

Yukon Housing Corporation in the amount of \$124,000 agreed to Mr. Porter: Just before we clear these items, I would like to ask a question. We have gone through the list of expenditures; we see that in most areas the funds that are allocated are relatively small, inasmuch that I believe that they are funds that have to be expended for the normal O&M costs that are involved in government.

However, in the case of human resources and highways, we see funds that are in excess of \$2,000,000. Why is there such a discrepancy?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Education and human resources and highways, I guess, are the two real big ones. It is an anticipation of how much money it is going to cost us to operate those specific departments for the month. It is not one-twelth of the budget amount, but it is close to it. In some cases it is higher because the month may be the month, traditionally, that they spend more money than they do in any other month. In other cases it might be lower but, generally, the rule of thumb is one-twelfth of the budget.

Total in the amount of \$11,799,000 agreed to

On Clause 2 Clause 2 agreed to On Clause 3 Clause 3 agreed to On Clause 1

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 13, Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2).

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will now return to Bill No. 5, Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84.

Bill No. 5 — continued

On Public Service Commission

Mr. Chairman: We will continue with the Public Service Commission, on page 184.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This department's objectives are to provide for the recruitment of public servants. They do the job evaluations; they are responsible for the pay and benefit administration; they are responsible for negotiations and the administration of the collective agreements; they are responsible for staff establishment control, organization analysis, employee training and development, appraisal and the employee documentation and records administration for all of the departments of the government.

Mr. McDonald: I thank the government leader for reading the departmental objectives on page 183.

I have a number of questions which are rather interesting. The first area I would like to get into is the area of isolation allowance. I believe the government leader prefers to call it, in the government's case, Yukon Bonus, in recognition of higher costs of living in Yukon. Has the government established the cost to the employees of the new federal taxation regime of isolation allowances and have they planned any sort of remedial action in the interim?

Further to that, to make this question as succinct as possible, the government leader has suggested that they have been meeting with the NWT to prepare a joint position to present to the federal government. I was wondering who engages in those meetings, and how is the position being worked out?

²⁸ Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yukon bonuses are something that are negotiated in the collective agreements and they will continue to be, I assume, in the future. If there is any change, that is where it is going to show up. Our position as a government in respect to what we consider to be a northern allowance is well-known. It is public knowledge. We have made it clear. We have enunciated it in this House a number of times. We have not changed from that position. As far as I am aware, the position is one that is compatible with the Northwest Territories and at the present time people in both territories are working together on an administrative level trying to put together a package that we are all hopeful will be one that the federal government, in particular Mr. Lalonde, will be prepared to look at.

Mr. McDonald: One part of the question I asked was whether or not the government had established the cost to the government employees of the new taxation regime.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, the Public Service Commission may well have done so. I do not know that they have, because it does not come into effect for some time yet. As I said, it is a factor of negotiation in collective bargaining.

Mr. McDonald: Perhaps the government leader could, in that case, find out if the Public Service Commission has, in fact, established a cost of the taxation regime on existing benefits or benefits already negotiated and established. I feel that would be a significant factor in defending our case as a territory in the face of the new regime.

There are other areas I would like to explore briefly. The first is the area of internal promotions and transfers. I would like to know briefly what the government's record is on both the promoting and transferring of its employees internally, whether or not they are establishing a program or a scheme of training programs to assist in promotions from within the public service.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Certainly, we are involved in quite a heavy training program for our employees. The training issue is addressed on page 192. We anticipate expenditures of \$104,000 during the forthcoming year. If the member likes, I can give him the detailed

information right now. We have 26 course titles and 44 various offerings of these courses, to a total of 625 participants during the past year. The class sizes range from six to twelve; the average size of the classes was 14. Two hundred and ninety-one employees successfully completed 58 of the sponsored courses. In addition, we have granted educational leave to four of five employees who are now on educational leave during 1982-83, and they will complete their studies in September of 1983. A revised educational leave policy is being developed for implementation this summer and, in respect to employee assistance programs, we have 120 supervisory personnel trained, 12 departmental consultations, 23 referrals, since August of 1982. On-the-job training, for instance, we are involved in the HOST program. We have six employees who have accepted internal training in assignments; and in on-the-job training for the handicapped, we have seven Yukoners with a variety of handicaps who have received up to six months of carefully selected training. So our training program is quite extensive.

²⁹ Mr. Byblow: Just on the subject of the training program, can the government leader say that clearly there are more programs being delivered this year than a year ago? I recall the discussion last year. In fact I recall being quite impressed with the 17 courses, or whatever number it was, that were in place. I would like the government leader to respond with respect to the nature of improvement to the numbers of courses.

The second part addresses the question of the training coordinator. We had a training coordinator on staff a year ago, and I am curious as to whether or not this has expanded in line with the program expansion. Of course, the third part to the question would be the question of on-the-job programs. The majority of these, I assume, are on-the-job improvement courses. Could the government leader elaborate whether that aspect is fully utilized?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think there were about four questions; I will try to remember all of them. I think probably I can answer two or three of them by saying that this year we offered 26 courses, instead of 17. The statistics, I think, indicate the number of people involved. 625 people took advantage of these 26 courses. Some of the courses were offered more than once. We had 44 different times that courses were run during the year. As I said, the class size ranged from six to 22 and averaged 14. The majority of these are, in fact, on-the-job training; virtually all of them are. Some of them, of course, are upgrading courses, as well.

Mr. Byblow: I am asking about the recognition level given to the employee for having taken the course. Quite often, in the normal procedure of personnel development, it is in the interests of the company — in this case, the government — to have an employee take a particular course in order to improve the competence for that job, or to pave the way for some promotion. Then, of course, we run into the problems related to the Peter Principle; that is not the question. The question is: how are the training programs that are offered recognized, within the public service, in a meritous way either for advancement or for improved efficiency and competence?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think the member has used the magic word, "meritous". In fact, promotions are made on the basis of merit. We hire people on the basis of merit, and we promote people on the basis of merit in this government. That is the basic underlying principle of the system that is in place. We also pay people on the basis of merit in this government. Having successfully completed one or more of these courses, of course, adds to the merit capability of a person making application for an upgraded job. Certainly if there is the potential requirement for first-aid and a person has taken an advanced first-aid course with this government, that is going to be something that they are going to be able to claim as something that has to be considered with respect to their capabilities of doing their future jobs.

Mr. McDonald: Last session, I believe, we discussed the merit system very briefly. The government leader suggested that the merit system was in effect for the employees who are not members of the bargaining unit, but, was only for those people other than the bargaining unit. However, any increases would have to be negotiated by the union for the union members. I would appreciate it if the government leader could elaborate.

method with the bargaining unit — custodians — there is a merit system that prevails. As I was trying to explain to the member in the House the other day, with respect to giving percentage increases as opposed to across-the-board increases, the moment that you give across-the-board increases, you destroy the very basis of a merit system pay plan. This government has had a merit system pay plan in place since the mid-1960s; it has always been there. People do not only get the negotiated salary increase, they also get a merit increase if they are entitled to such an increase in that particular year.

Mr. McDonald: I am still somewhat at a loss to understand how a merit system, any particular merit system in general, would necessarily be incompatible with a base line, across-the-board increase. As I understand it, any remuneration on the basis of merit could be granted as part of the compensation package which could be considered to be separate from an across-the-board increase should there be an allowance made, while bargaining, for a lump sum to handle that specific instance of pay. Perhaps the government leader could discuss that.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is obvious we could get into a philosophical discussion here that will last for a week and I am confident that the member for Mayo and I will never, ever see eye-to-eye on this. I am of the firm opinion that in giving across-the-board increases as opposed to percentage increases, you destroy the very basis and the fundamental under-pinning of any merit system. It just goes right out the window, because a merit system is based on the fact that there are differences in the jobs and each job classification is entitled to a difference relative to the other position. The only way that those can be fairly and equitably increased or decreased is on a percentage basis, or else you change the relativity immediately.

Mr. McDonald: I did not think I was going to be getting involved in a discussion of this sort. As the government leader is surely aware, some employers and the bargaining agent quite often negotiate across-the-board increases and increment increases when the rates between job classes remain relatively the same. Not only does this allow for an across-the-board increase, but it also allows that the gap between the lowest paid worker and the highest paid worker remain comparatively the same. It will only close the gap if you have across the board increases alone, but if you have increment increases for the job class, along with the across-the-board increase, you maintain the ratio between the highest paid and the lowest paid worker.

I recognize that this has been of some concern to both unions and employers for years. In many cases, unions which have negotiated only across-the-board increases have been faced with the untenable situation where the difference between the highest and lowest paid workers, in a particular operation, is quite small indeed. It does not represent the difference in skills or abilities which different job classes have to bear. However, at the same time, percentage increases alone merely increase the difference between the lowest and the highest paid worker at an unacceptable rate, so that, at one point, the gap between the highest and lowest paid worker becomes so untenable that you have labour unrest.

The solution, as I understand it, has been in the past that the difference between the job classes remains the same throughout the wage schedule, but that the two parties to the negotiation agree on an across-the-board increase, plus an increment increase to maintain the ratio between the highest and lowest paid workers, so that it does not get out of hand.

31 Now, if the government leader could explain why he feels this solution to be incompatible with his merit system, I would appreciate hearing it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think I have. I do not think the member asked me a question. He expressed an opinion. I happen to disagree with that opinion, that is all. We function on the merit system in this government. It is our perception, from where we sit at the present time, that any deviation from that merit system is not advantageous to a majority of the people working for this government.

Mr. McDonald: The government leader has made his position

as clear as it could possibly be. I guess I have not explained my position clearly enough. The government leader suggests — and he is bouncing in his chair — that I have explained my position clearly; I am not so sure that I have. In any case, perhaps we can go on to another area of concern. That is the concern that I have with the hire of casual employees. I am interested to know how this government maintains its control. Currently, I understand that the control of casual employees is maintained within departments themselves and not within the Public Service Commission. How does the Public Service Commission maintain control of the hiring practices of casual employees?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Good question. I am very pleased to advise the member for Mayo that, with the advent of a new Public Service Commissioner, a decision has been taken to take over, once again, the control with respect to casuals, by the Public Service Commission. It was an experiment. We have found that, for two years, the experiment has not worked as well as we thought it should. We are in the process now of regaining control of the casuals in the Public Service Commission.

While I am on my feet, because I have trouble getting on my feet when the member opposite is standing up, I want to assure him that I understand fully what he was saying about the pros and cons of the merit type of across-the-board increases as opposed to percentage increases. I recognize the problem as he perceives it. What he has to recognize is that there is another problem as I perceive it and never the twain will meet, by the way. It is a difference in philosophies with respect to this particular issue.

Getting back to the casuals, we also recognize that we have a problem. We are working at resolving it. The one thing that must be understood is that we cannot function in this government without casuals. We must have casuals. I feel very strongly that any position that is required in excess of six months, a casual should, in fact, be made a permanent man-year. We sometimes have problems with that, too, because of most times, if we go over the six months, it is for a very short period of time; one or two weeks, just because of the season. We are also faced with our legislation which is the same as the federal legislation. We use the same board. The Territorial Public Service Staff Relations Act, which is administered by the territorial staff relations board which is the federal staff relations board, administers our act and the provisions are the same in both. That is, that casual employees are not part of the bargaining unit, they are not considered to be part of the permanent employees of the government and they are treated as such by us. We make available to the casuals the same salaries as what the people in the permanent positions are getting in those particular positions.

³² Mr. McDonald: Without being too long-winded, perhaps I can relate a couple of stories that I have, which I believe are fairly well substantiated, on the fate of certain casual employees.

In one case, a casual employee working as an apprentice mechanic in the highways garage in Whitehorse was hired as a casual employee last spring. He maintained his employment for six months, was laid-off and rehired within a day or two and as an apprentice, upon the call to school in Vancouver, it was required that he be laid-off in order to collect unemployment during that period with the understanding that he would be rehired upon his return to Yukon. When he returned to Yukon, he was not rehired because there apparently was a rule that once a person had been laid-off twice, that job would be made a permanent job and, in his case, he was not permitted to return. However, because the department wanted to maintain this position as casual, another casual was put into this position.

I have also heard that, in some cases, employees have been hired as casuals and have been rehired, through the department over and over again, being laid off after one day. In one case, an employee went through this process, as a casual employee, for three years. Steady employment, but as a casual. I am wondering if the government leader can comment on this sort of practice, because it seems to me to be rather incompatible with the statements that the government leader suggested about the nature of permanent jobs versus casual jobs?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I believe I am now aware of most of the

times and the issues that have gone beyond what is, in fact, the policy and the parameters of the government with respect to casuals. That is the very reason why the decision has been taken to transfer back, to the Public Service Commission, the responsibility for these casuals. It is one of these cases where the departments have been able to take advantage of the situation and they have done so; I am sure, with no malicious intent at all. It is just something that they have done. It has been wrong and we are going to make it right. We have to rectify the situation. We are going to be doing it as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. McDonald: I am very pleased to hear that answer. I had thought that some departments might be attempting to maintain a small buffer of employees which they could deal with at will. It is nice to see that that problem will be rectified. I have one other constituent case which I would like to bring up at the moment. It is actually a rather recent case — in fact, this afternoon.

A casual employee, who had been hired on regularly every year to work in the highway crews, was promised a job again this year on the bituminous surface treatment crew and was given every indication that he would be rehired again this summer. His work record was, in his words, good. He was, however, picked up on a drug charge very, very recently with a court date to be set at the end of the summer. He was told that it was government policy that he could not be rehired, as a result of this drug charge, even though he had not had his day in court and he had not been convicted of the charge. Does the government leader know of such a policy or could he explain such a policy?

33 Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. I do not know of such a policy and I am convinced that no such policy exists.

Mr. Porter: I understood the government leader to state that in the instance where a casual is employed for a period of in excess of six months, the policy is then to make that position a full-time permanent position. Where there has been a demonstration of a need for a particular service, is it also the policy of the government to institute a full-time person? I say this with respect to an actual case in Ross River where an individual was employed, by the government, for a two-year period working in the area of municipal services and driving water trucks, et cetera. The individual has recently suffered a lay-off as a result of an apparent crackdown in this area by the government.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think we will have to be a little careful; that might have been a contract. It was not a contractual arrangement; it was a casual. The policy of the government is, as the member for Campbell has stated — when the legislation was passed it was felt that if a department did not know whether they needed a full-time permanent position, they would be given the latitude to be able to hire someone on a casual basis for a maximum of six months.

In that six months, a determination is supposed to be made as to whether or not that position is going to be filled permanently or whether it is going to be abandoned. It requires that a hard decision be made. There has been a tendency, we cannot deny it, in some of the departments to procrastinate on that hard decision by laying these people off for one day, because they are required by law to do that, and then rehiring them and then had them on for another six months. I am cognizant of the case where it went for three years. Frankly, I was appalled by it because I was not aware that that kind of thing was happening in this government. I probably should have been. I am confident that I will be aware of it in the future, with the responsibility being where it is because we will have control of it then.

The policy is that if a position can be substantiated in that six months, then it is made permanent. If not, the department does without it. With respect to specific instance in Ross River, I am sorry I cannot answer. My first inclination was that it was, in fact, a contract. Normally that type of thing is done on a contractual basis or, in some instances, is done on a contractual basis. I am surprised it was not used in this case.

Mr. Porter: Should there be a decision to establish the position as a permanent position, would the individual who has filled the position on a casual basis, be given preference over anyone else as to the filling of that permanent position?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes. I think it has been proven in the past that this is one of the ways to get a permanent job with the Government of Yukon — to get a job as a casual. I do not think there is any doubt about it. That person has an inside track with respect to the job when it becomes permanent.

Mr. Chairman: We will now take a break until 4:10 p.m.

Recess

³⁴ Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order.

We will continue with the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Kimmerly: In November of last year, for the 1982-83 year, I asked a number of questions about affirmative action. To avoid asking the same questions again, I would ask the minister if any progress was made on those issues since November?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: As I have indicated in Question Period, we do not have an affirmative action program, per se, in place in this government; that is not the object of the exercise as far as we are concerned. What we are concerned with and what we are trying to do is actually make sure that people are getting jobs, the right people are getting jobs, the right people are being promoted and that the things that an affirmative action program does are getting done.

We submit that we are able to do those things without having in place an affirmative action program, per se. We cooperate with the various groups in the territory that are interested in having employees get to work for this government; we have a number of programs, ourselves, in place; we have an extensive training program, but affirmative action, per se, no. We are no further ahead now than we ever were, other than in trying to increase our actions to a point where we do not need affirmative action.

Mr. Kimmerly: The two majors issues in this area involve women and Indians. I would ask the minister about Indians first.

In the Public Service Commission, — I realize there are no affirmative action programs, as such — are there any plans or any programs or discussions specifically around the training of native people? I am interested in the issue of the delivery of services, or the expected delivery of services, after a successful land claim negotiation. It is my understanding, from public documents, that some of the agreements already signed contain training provisions.

Now, I am not asking the question: is the government leader prepared to implement some of the agreements before a final agreement is signed. Are there any plans or negotiations concerning training programs designed primarily for native people in order to prepare native people for jobs in the public service?

35 Hon. Mr. Pearson: Of course we are well aware of the agreements that have been signed. We will be most anxious to meet the requirements of those agreements when they are implemented. We have had in the past and will continue to have, I hope, in the future, Indian people come to work for this government — not as Indian people but as people. We have a number of employees in this government now who are, in fact, of Indian descent. I anticipate that we will have for years to come. Some of the highways maintenance crews are predominately Indian. I do not anticipate that that is going to change. It is true, if you walk through this building, you do not see that many Indian people. It is not because they cannot get a job; I respectfully suggest, it is because they can probably make more money working for the Council for Yukon Indians and they would rather work there. I do not fault them nor blame them for that one little bit.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in the same line of questioning but concerning women. I am aware of the efforts that were taken, I guess, approximately two years ago now, by the Women's Bureau. I am also aware of the motion passed in the last Assembly, approximately three or three and one-half years ago, with regard to women in the public service and with specific regard to the promotion of women into the managerial and better paying positions. Is there any program designed to take up the program left off by the Women's Bureau approximately a year ago concerning promoting the interests of women in the public service?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Women's Bureau still functions and is

quite active and I am confident that it is in virtually constant contact with the Public Service Commission. I am not aware of any specific program. A majority of the people, without a doubt, who work in this building are, in fact, women. We have an awful lot of women working for us. Also we have them at all grades and classifications and salaries except one, I guess. We do not have a woman deputy minister any longer. The one we did have terminated her employment and moved to Hawaii. It is pretty tough the way we treat some of the women in this government. Women are promoted, just like there are men promoted. As I stated in the House in Question Period, I do not know of one instance, and in fact I am prepared to state categorically that no one has been denied a promotion or a job in this government for the sole reason of their sex.

Mr. Porter: Earlier the government leader, I think, unintentionally made an inference that the CYI paid better than the Yukon government. I was involved in a process that investigated the level of salaries that this government undertook with private industry downtown, in relation to the establishment of the salary scale for the CYI. I tell you that the CYI is in no way competitive to the rates paid by this government.

In respect to the whole question of the policy of involving aboriginal people in the employment of the government: this was an issue that was taken on by the federal government some years ago. The resulting reports were very critical of the government's policy in the hiring of native people.

38 As a consequence of those reports, the federal Public Service Commission issued specific programs and policies to increase the level of employment of indigenous aboriginal people in the employment of the federal government departments. There are some departments where you saw a greater emphasis on this, such as the Department of Manpower and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I would like to ask this government that, given the fact that aboriginal people constitute a very significant portion of the population of the Yukon, will this government be undertaking policy initiatives to increase the participation of native people in the employment of this government by bringing in the necessary programs?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: As I have said on a number of occasions, the Indian people in this territory — the aboriginal peoples, if you will in this territory — have the same opportunity as anyone else with respect to employment with this government. We neither deny them the chance for a job, nor do we enhance their chance for a job. Because we are the government, we represent all the people and we have to be fair to everyone. It is not fair to ask us to make an undertaking to hire 25 percent of our people from aboriginal peoples, not if we cannot get them to come to work.

Mr. Porter: So, I take it that the government leader's position is that there will be no programs instituted by this government that are aimed specifically at the recruitment of native people for employment in this government.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am saying there are none now, and I am not aware of any planned for the foreseeable future.

Mrs. Joe: I would just like to follow up on some information that I was trying to get from the government leader during Question Period this week. It was in relation to some statistics that I was trying to get; up-to-date statistics. I had some from, I believe, 1978, and I did not have any since then. I understand that those figures are available through some computer. At least, in 1978 they were available that way; if that is not the case any more, when did they stop, and why?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have a very, very expensive computer in this government. The Public Service Commissioner has advised me that these statistics are no longer available to us; that we do not keep statistics specifically on women as opposed to men. We just do not do those kinds of counts.

Mrs. Joe: I understand that the Human Rights Commission is trying to encourage the federal government and private departments to do exactly that, and in fact some departments are doing it and some are not, but it is one of the things that they are trying to have happen. I just wondered if, in fact, the Yukon government is not going to bother with anything like that at all. Most people keep

statistics on whatever it is that the government does, and I cannot see any reason why this cannot be done in the territory.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have two daughters and a son. I want to assure the hon. member that I do not keep statistics on whether it costs more money to raise a son or a daughter, because they are equal, as far as I am concerned. It would serve no useful purpose that I can think of to keep those kinds of statistics. Why should the government bother with those kind of statistics? What useful purpose would they serve?

³⁷ Mrs. Joe: I cannot believe what the government leader is saying. I also have children, but I was not asking for statistics on how much it cost to raise a child. The statistics that I was asking for were up-to-date information on the percentage of women working for the government, percentage of men, the percentage of women who make a certain wage and the percentage of men who make a certain wage. Now, that is not asking too much; most people do that

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, I did not say that I had children, I said that I had two daughters and a son. I made that specific distinction because that is the distinction that the hon. member is asking us to make.

All I would like to know is, as someone who is responsible for spending the taxpayers' money, what possible benefits there would be to anyone for such statistics to be kept? I honestly cannot see any.

Mrs. Joe: I think that statistics like those would certainly make people aware of how effective any affirmative action program or any other program was, whether it was successful or whether it was not.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, I respectfully submit, and I have said it before, I have said it a lot of times, you can make statistics prove anything you want. The statistics are a terrible trap and they are very expensive to keep.

Mrs. Joe: I give up, for now.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to talk about, perhaps, the same general issue, but with a different attack, or a different approach.

I am interested in local hire — local hire, first of all, not referring to Yukon hire, but to community local hire. For example, when hiring teachers in Old Crow or Pelly Crossing, is there any consideration or any plan underway, to attempt to get Old Crow people for those jobs or Pelly Crossing people, and the same for all the other communities? I would also refer to social workers and especially those government employees who directly deliver services to people.

There was some effort, in the Department of Justice, started four or five years ago, about the probation officers in Mayo and Dawson, which I still believe was a very good initiative in the department. There, the job description was slightly changed in order to make it more practically feasible for local people to have a decent chance at the jobs. I would especially ask about social workers and teachers, but also other government employees in the community. Is there now a policy about encouraging local community hire?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, we have always been trying to advocate this policy very strongly. Two issues come to mind, which the member has mentioned. We have radically changed the job classifications, the job descriptions and the qualifications for social workers in this territory to try to make it possible to hire locally as much as we can. In respect to teachers, this government instituted a plan of teacher assistants in the classroom and those teacher assistants are all local people, locally trained.

³⁸ Mr. McDonald: I am interested in the policy of zero hiring, or freeze on hiring. The government has made allusions to their efforts in this area and I am wondering what the experience of the government has been to date. What problems have resulted in this area? Specifically, how does the government reorganize to fill essential positions?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is obvious, now, that it is being done with some difficulty. I submit that the problem we talked about prior to coffee break in respect to casuals has been exacerbated to a degree by our policy of not hiring anyone else; in other words, trying to keep our person-year component to the same level. On the

whole though, notwithstanding the casual problem which we are going to have to resolve, I would suggest that we have been quite successful because we have increased our services; we have been increasing our services over the years, but we have slowed down and literally, now, brought the growth of the public service to a stop. It is a very difficult thing to do because the public demands for service do not stop. We are now faced with a real serious problem, in that our population is actually decreasing and what that does to us, because of the economic times we are in now, is actually increase the workload in some departments, particularly in a department like health and human resources. Their workload is increasing and we are saying to the department, look, our population overall is decreasing; therefore, the size of this government should decrease by a like amount. It is not true, and it does not happen. I submit to you that, if we were totally efficient, probably the size of the population could double and we should be able to keep the government at the same size; then, maybe we would be getting somewhere. But when it comes to shrinking, it becomes very difficult to make the government get smaller at the same ratio or at the same speed as the population is actually going down. We are working at it. We have a policy of zero hiring. We are trying to maintain that. That means that when there are vacancies through attrition, we are sometimes not filling those positions. We are transferring people from one department to another. This is all done through competition, sometimes through persuasion, in order to get the thing started, but it is done the legitimate way, through competition, if it is going to be done at all.

On the Office of the Public Service Commissioner

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This covers the salaries for two people, the Public Service Commissioner and his secretary, and such incidental expenses as telephone and stationery. The Public Service Commissioner attends the annual meeting of the Civil Service Commission Chairmen of Canada.

Mr. McDonald: A valuable office, a valuable encumbent. I wonder if the government leader could explain the drop in person-years from three to two, yet the drop in personnel costs is only \$2,000?

» Hon. Mr. Pearson: One of the changes, of course, is the 10-day fortnight. The one person-year was transferred to the compensation branch. The quarter casual person-year has been transferred to the records and pension branch. They are still in the department but it is just a case of the department being set up a bit differently.

Mr. McDonald: Is the government leader saying that the drop of a person-year is almost fully made up, apart from \$2,000, in a return to the 10-day fortnight?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, apart from the incremental increases to the people involved as well.

On Operation

Operation in the amount of \$98,000 agreed to

Office of the Public Service Commissioner in the amount of \$98,000 agreed to

On Recruitment and Labour Relations

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Despite the economic slow down, recruitment has fallen off only slightly. At the present time we have 23 competitions advertised, plus a number of vacancies at the Canada Employment Centre. We continue to experience problems in attempting to fill vacancies in certain occupational groups, specifically the the senior positions in data processing and social work. This is due, primarily, to a continued demand for these professionals all across Canada and the reluctance of people to move from the job that they presently hold to one in another part of the country. Labour relations volume has increased significantly. We cannot pinpoint the reason for this but we speculate that it is due to the union playing a more active role.

Mr. McDonald: I guess "a more active role" is about as impartial as you can get when you are stating a case. Perhaps we can explore that in a few minutes.

I would like to just briefly comment on casuals, once again, now that we have some statistics in front of us. The number of casuals has not decreased; it has increased somewhat. I wonder if the government is making any efforts to develop a classification system that would reduce the number of employees classed as casuals. To my knowledge, we are not embarking on a work sharing program, yet the number of casuals, including contract, is increasing. I am wondering if the government leader could just elaborate a little bit more on that point?

The other point I would like to ask the government leader is the method by which the Public Service Commission intends to take control of the casual workers from the departments.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have a work sharing program in place, in some cases. Some of the teachers work under work sharing program and there are others in government as well.

In respect to casuals, the Public Service Commission will be taking back the administration — not the actual hiring of the casuals — and the files, and will be keeping track of those casuals. They will know when a casual is hired and when they must be let go in order to meet the requirements of the act. I indicated earlier, in the general discussion, that we are in the process of doing this now. We are very aware of the problem that we have. We intend to clean it up, to get rid of the problem, at the earliest possible date. It is going to be painful for some of the departments. I am confident that it is going to be painful for some of the members on the front benches, but we are going to have to do it.

40 Mr. McDonald: The government leader said that the Public Service Commission will be keeping track of the casuals and the times which casuals would have to be let go in order to fulfill the requirements of the definition. Will the Public Service Commission also keep track of the work involved to ensure that the jobs themselves are not on-going jobs which are merely filled by casual workers?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is one of the parameters, one of the things that this department is directly charged with.

On Operations

Operations in the amount of \$595,000 agreed to

On Long Service Awards

Long Service Awards in the amount of \$17,000 agreed to On YTPSA

Mr. McDonald: Could the government leader explain to me what this is and what the YTA monies are for?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: These are negotiating costs that we incur in respect to grievances, the coordination of the collective bargaining process and so on. These are the costs that we attribute to the specific groups during the course of the year. The YTA, of course, is small because we do not anticipate any negotiations.

YTPSA in the amount of \$23,000 agreed to On YTA

Mr. McDonald: Perhaps now is the time to just explore a little bit of the supplementary information on page 189. I notice that the meetings held with union representatives, the joint consultation meetings, are expected to increase again over last year. That is obviously a good thing.

The puzzling thing for my mind is the formal hearings before an adjudicator or arbitrator. The statistics suggest a doubling of these hearings. As the year has not even begun, can the government leader suggest why they anticipate a doubling of these hearings?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is a new contract; there are likely to be grievances. Some of them, we can anticipate, will go to adjudication.

This is simply a guess. We have past experience statistics to base this on, but it is an estimate and that is all it is. We do not know anything for sure. It does not indicate anything positive, we just anticipate that this is what might happen.

Mr. McDonald: I notice that the official complaints are expected to rise by another 15 this year. Are these complaints and are these arbitrations anticipated as a result of problem areas that the Public Service Commissioner or the government sees in the contract?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. As I stated, it is anticipated, just because of the obvious increase in the role that the YTPSA is playing with the employees in the territory. It is obvious that that is going to create more grievances, too. They are going to be more active; they have told us they are going to be more active and that

we can anticipate them being more active in the future, so that is what we are doing.

41 Mr. McDonald: There is one area that I would like to briefly touch upon and I realize that we could be here all evening on this one particular area. Although it is not my wish to engage in that kind of discussion at the moment, I would like to enquire about one aspect of the proposed legislation and the effect it will have on employee relations in the future. It is the determination, within the legislation, to limit pay increases to individual employees.

I understand that the government and the union have spoken about this for years. This has been an object of negotiations for years, to determine whether or not there would be percentage increase or whether or not, in the government leader's words, they would maintain their merit system. I am wondering why the government would want to use legislation to establish their traditional bargaining position.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The reason that we made it clear in this particular act was because they asked a specific question. The fact of the matter is that negotiations were going on at the time and the specific question was asked. They requested that we make it clear in the legislation; we did so.

Mr. McDonald: Is it not sufficient, in the government leader's mind, to answer questions, which have traditionally been put at the bargaining table, at the bargaining table rather than put it into legislation? It seems to me that the government and its union had a reasonably good relationship for many years and the fact that the government would revert from old workable practices in the past seems somewhat surprising to me, considering the public reaction to the proposed bill in which union representatives, at least, had criticized the use of the legislation as bargaining leverage. I am a little bit surprised to hear, from the government leader, that the union had, in fact, asked the government to put this into legislation.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It asked us to clarify it.

Mr. McDonald: However, the government leader said that they asked the government to clarify it. Surely, the time-honoured practice of clarifying this over the bargaining table would, as it had worked before, be pursued once again. I am really very, very puzzled why the government would use legislation in this House as leverage at the bargaining table when the whole point of the "six-and-five" legislation originally was to limit the size of the compensation package so that it would not prove, in the very worst-case scenario, to be a burden on the taxpayer. If the government leader would like to elaborate a little bit more, I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not sure how many times I am going to have to say this. I know that I am going to have to say it one more time because, eventually, we are going to get to this point in discussing the legislation and the member is going to ask me the same question all over again. In November, when we passed the legislation, I made it clear that I did not want to interfere with the bargaining process. I was quite confident that we could probably reach agreement on most issues with the bargaining unit. I think that probably the City of Edmonton felt the same way about their firefighters and what happened to the City of Edmonton was that their contract went to compulsory arbitration. They were awarded, by an arbitrator, 38 percent. I stood in this House then, and I stand in this House now, and I am saying to you, very clearly, that that would be grossly unfair to everybody in the territory. We could not allow that to happen; not in the next two years.

What we are doing is elminating the possibility of arbitration awards exceeding "six-and-five" percent. That is the only reason that territorial employees are included because they could have gone to arbitration on any one of a hundred other issues, quite legitimately. They chose not to and I am very thankful that they did. Had they gone, then the arbitrator's capabilities are limited and that is what that legislation does. With respect to whether the six percent should be a lump sum or whether it should be allowed to be jiggery-pokeried so that it can apply to all the employees, or some of the employees, once again, as I have said to the member, this is an issue that the union has negotiated year after year after year and one that this government has turned down year after year after year, at the risk of arbitration, because of the very fact that we have a

merit pay system. It gets destroyed if we do not stay with the percentage increases.

that we will be discussing this again and again and again and obviously the vehicle, the act itself, will provide us with plenty of manoeuvring space to deal with these issues at great depth. I admit that free collective bargaining, when one side makes the rules, is an alien experience to me; I am trying to come to terms with it. Never before have I seen the assumption of unreasonableness made on a union with the record of the YTPSA. The government suggests it is not the union. I would agree it is not the union. The charges of bad faith bargaining were not made against the union; the union has not broken its collective agreements and it has not limited the rights of collective bargaining. I agree, it is not the union. In any case, unless the government leader would like to continue this, we will leave that to the "six and five" legislation.

I would like to ask the government leader what the rate of turnover is in the government now. This was an issue once before and I believe it was mentioned in the November estimates as perhaps a reason why the number of grievances had increased. The connection was that the people were sticking around with their jobs and ensuring that justice was done, or going through with grievances rather than quitting. I am very interested in the context of those remarks to know what the rate of turnover within the government is today.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry — I should have anticipated that question. I, too, am interested in that particular statistic and I do not believe I have it with me. I will undertake to get that for the hon. member when we next sit.

Mr. McDonald: One other interesting statistic, and I do not expect that the government leader has it in front of him — perhaps he can come back with that as well — is the average costs of recruiting employees from outside the Yukon. Perhaps he does. If he does have that, perhaps he also has the breakdown costs of interviewing, advertising and paying moving expenses of employees. That would be quite interesting.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Again, I do not have those statistics with me, but I will get them and give the member what statistics we do have. I believe that our average cost of recruiting a person from outside the territory is something in the magnitude of between \$5,000 and \$8,000.

YTA in the amount of \$2,000 agreed to

Recruitment and Labour Relations in the amount of \$637,000 agreed to

On Employee Records and Pensions

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This department is showing normal growth. Our work has not slacked off in any way. Things remain pretty well the same. We have had a significant workload added over the course of the last few months. What we have done in the department of finance — or in computer services, actually — is converted the payroll system onto the computer; that has caused some additional work at the immediate time in this particular branch.

43 On Operations

Operations in the amount of \$155,000 agreed to

Employee Records and Pensions

On Training and Development

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have had pretty well a detailed discussion, in respect to training and development, in the general remarks. I do not know what else I can add unless there are some specific questions.

Mr. McDonald: I have one specific question. There is no person-year allotted for this program. I wonder if the government leader could state what a coordinator for the program is now; under what line item of the budget he or she is being paid?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, he is on contract, at the present time, because he was one of these people who was on casual status and his casual time had terminated. At the present time, we have him on a contract and it will be one of the issues that I hope to resolve in the very near future.

Mr. Kimmerly: As a follow-up question, where is the money for this contract person and what is the amount of the contract?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is \$18,000, plus "other". Some of the other will be under Professional Special Services.

Mr. Byblow: Further to the discussion we had earlier about the training programs, I was inquiring of the government leader about whether or not meritous credit was given to each individual. More specifically, do the people who take the programs receive anything in the form of a diploma or a certificate or some type of legitimate credit, in documented form, towards a degree program, be it in business administration or whatever the program may be? Is there a document that follows the program?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: They are not academic-type courses. I will just run quickly down the list of courses, and there is no doubt about it. I know the person responsible for this and he is quite an artistic person himself. I am sure that he does not let anybody get out of his courses without some kind of a certificate.

These courses are advanced, per se: Allison transmission rebuilds, Cat truck engines, maintenance, counselling skills, crosscultural training, Cummins diesel maintenance, and so on. They are very much work-oriented types of programs, rather than academic types of programs.

Mr. Byblow: Just in trying to assess the success and value of the programs — and, for the record, I think this side is certainly pleased to see the improvement in the type of offerings that have increased this year over last — does the government leader have anything that would attest to the value of the programs, in terms of their recruitment needs? Have the programs clearly indicated that there is less of a need to, perhaps, go outside, less of a need to bring people from a distance to meet the qualification and needs of government?

u Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not have any statistics. I think it would be an impossible thing to substantiate in any event. There are so many variables taken into consideration when a person is either hired or gets a promotion. The only way that you can measure the success of the program is to consider the number of people who have participated in it. If they do not believe that they are getting something from it, they are not going to participate in it. We had 625 people participating in the training courses put on by this branch last year. I will submit to you that that is quite a significant number.

On Operations

Operations in the amount of \$97,000 agreed to

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$7,000 agreed to

Training and Development in the amount of \$104,000 agreed to

On Compensation

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This branch provides the classification standards. They are the people who work directly with the merit increases that we have been talking about considerably this afternoon. They develop the pay plans and benefits packages.

Mr. McDonald: On page 195 under Statistics, there are some interesting statistics; some I do not entirely understand. Perhaps the government leader could explain them.

On the positions reviewed — class regradings and reclassification requests — there is an anticipated increase of 56 percent. I would think that turnover would be down considerably under the present economic circumstances. Why would there be a 56 percent increase in this area, and what would be the success rate for the reclassification review?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have fallen behind in our reclassifications and regradings. We have an undertaking with our employees that when we do get around to doing these reclassifications and regradings, if they are reclassified and upgraded, then that reclassification will be retroactive to the time the application was made. The reason it fell behind was because we were short staffed in this particular area. It is a very highly technical area and requires skilled people. For about six months we were short staffed and we did fall behind. The requests can come from the employee, from the department, and sometimes it is via the union. There is a specified procedure laid out in the *Public Service Commission Act* in respect to reclassifications and regradings. It must be followed. As I say, it is quite complicated. Very definitely, these people are skilled at

doing this kind of reclassification work. Our staff complement is now full and we anticipate that we are going to be able to catch up in respect to the backlog. That is the reason for the inordinate number this year; some of them are for last year as well.

Mr. McDonald: Could the government leader suggest how many of these positions reviewed have resulted in a reclassification? Could he also explain the established changes in statistics and the class series reviewed statistic?

the reclassifications that are requested in fact pass, because a majority of them are initiated by the deputy minister of the department, who had a reorganization in his particular shop. Normally, reclassification is as a requirement of a job description changing and a person getting more responsibilities. The establishment changes are changes that we as a government make; cabinet has control over the establishment of the government and if we move a branch or a unit or a person from one department to another, that necessitates job descriptions and so on and so forth being written, changed, amended, and this type of thing. The class series are, I believe, mostly undertaken as a result of requests, particularly at the negotiating table, by the union.

Mr. McDonald: Major pay surveys shows an increase of 150 percent, from two to five. I am interested in knowing which departments are having pay surveys done and how these pay surveys are conducted. I am also interested in knowing what prompts pay surveys in a particular department. Is it the cabinet that conducts them, or is it something which happens as a matter of course, or as a matter of general policy on an ongoing basis?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Major pay surveys are done by the public service commission; certainly not by the cabinet. Recommendations are made to the cabinet and the final decision is made by cabinet; but the surveys are actually done by the public service commission. Alternatively, they may well hire consultants. This government has been known to do that in the past, particularly pay surveys at the managerial level. The last pay survey that was done at the managerial level was done about three years ago and it was done by a consulting firm from Alberta that made recommendations to the cabinet. The departmental pay surveys happen just in the normal course of events.

Mr. McDonald: One residual question to my last question, which was many-barrelled: which departments are projected to have a pay survey done and, in general, how would a pay survey affect the general compensation to which a department is entitled?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not sure which five departments are involved in this one, but one that I am quite confident will be involved is the computer services branch, because we are having a problem, and continue to have a problem, hiring people. Normally, pay surveys are done when we find we are no longer competitive, particularly for the professions, for the highly trained people who we have to hire, and when we have to compete with other governments outside. We have to be competitive in order to get the people to come to the territory. That sometimes requires major pay surveys to be done.

46 Mr. McDonald: I realize we would like to wrap up in just a couple of minutes. I have one question, which is, again, rather multi-barrelled. Under the departmental organization analysis, there is an estimate of six analyses to be done. I wonder if the government leader could state which departments are going to be analyzed and who initiates these analyses? More importantly, what are the objectives of these analyses?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The analyses are normally initiated by the deputy ministers themselves. They go to the Public Service Commissioner and they say, "I think that my department needs re-organization. I would like to have three people doing this, five people doing that and seven people doing something else". It is at that point necessary that the Public Service Commission come in and do an analysis of the jobs, assist with the writing of the job descriptions and so on and so forth. They do a study of the functions that are going to be carried out by each person and that is what it is all about.

The object of the exercise is to try to provide some expertise, some public service expertise, and some personnel expertise to the

deputy ministers.

Mr. McDonald: This will be my last question, then. Would these analyses have any relationship to this government's stated intention to look at possible ways to contract public service jobs to the private sector?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, not at all. That is an entirely different analysis; that is being done by a task force. The Public Service Commission will have one person on that task force, but that is being done by a task force of administrators in YTG. No, that one has nothing to do with the Public Service Commission.

Operations in the amount of \$245,000 agreed to

On Projects?

Project in the amount of \$5,000 agreed to

Compensation in the amount of \$250,000 agreed to Public Service Commission in the amount of \$1,244,000 agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report progress on Bill No. 5.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair.

47 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. 13, Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2), and directed me to report the same without amendment. Further, the committee 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 Members: Agreed

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 13, Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2), be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon, government leader that Bill No. 13 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt a title to the bill? Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 13 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon, government leader that Bill No. 13 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise the House that we are now prepared to receive Mr. Commissioner in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor to give assent to a certain bill which has passed this House.

Mr. Commissioner enters the Chambers

Mr. Speaker: Your honour, the Assembly has, at its current session, passed a certain bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the Assembly, I respectfully request your assent.

Mr. Clerk: Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2). Commissioner Bell: I hereby assent to the bill as enumerated by the Clerk.

Have a good weekend.

Mr. Commissioner leaves the Chamber

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

May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that we do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

The House adjourned at 5:18 p.m.