



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 13

4th Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, April 15, 1981 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake
DEPUTY SPEAKER — Grafton Njootli, MLA, Old Crow

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Finance, Public Service Commission, Pipeline, Land Claims, Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, Tourism and Economic Development, Government Services, Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Workers' Compensation Board.
Hon. Geoffrey Lattin	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for Highways and Public Works, Municipal and Community Affairs, Yukon Housing Corporation and Yukon Liquor Corporation.
Hon. Meg McCall	Klondike	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Education and Information Resources.

Government Members

(Progressive Conservative)

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

Opposition Members

(Liberal)

Ron Veale	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

(New Democratic Party)

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

(Independent)

Maurice J. Byblow	Faro
Robert Fleming	Campbell

Clerk of Assembly	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Deputy Sergeants-at-Arms	Frank Ursich & Jack MacDonald
Editor of Hansard	Lois Cameron

**Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, April 15, 1981**

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

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed to the Order Paper under Daily Routine.

DAILY ROUTINE

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

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a copy of the Community Services Improvement Program for 1981 to 1985. I also have for tabling the reply to a question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition on April 6, concerning the Watson Lake sewage treatment lagoon.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Reports of Special or Standing Committees?

Petitions?

Reading or Receiving of Petitions?

Are there any Introduction of Bills?

Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Food Prices

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regarding food prices.

On the 26th of March, during this sitting, the Minister indicated that he would be making public the answers to questions that were put to Kelly Douglas officials during the course of a meeting that the Minister had with those officials. Will the Minister advise when he is going to make those answers available to the public?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as soon as possible.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, my assistant has been asking for those questions and they have not been forthcoming; I trust that the Minister will make them available as soon as possible, as he has indicated.

My question, Mr. Speaker, relates to the researcher into these food prices. Would the Minister indicate whether the contract of the researcher has been renewed, and, if so, for how long?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the contract is coming to an end here fairly soon. I will be discussing with the Committee that has been formed through the House whether or not they want to avail of his services, because I think he would be an ideal individual to serve as the research staff for the Committee that was formed the other day; however that is a decision they would have to make.

Mr. Veale: If I understand the Minister correctly then, he is making the researcher on food prices available to the Food Prices Committee, and will extend the researcher's contract. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Speaker, you are asking me an administrative question. I believe that the contract will be renewed, probably through the Legislative offices, as opposed to Consumer and Corporate Affairs, if that were the decision of the Committee.

Question re: Automobile Insurance

Mr. Penikett: Last week I asked the Minister a question concerning a constituent of mine who was involved in a car accident last fall, and whose car was damaged by an unemployed young man driving an unregistered and uninsured vehicle. The Minister promised me an answer within twenty-six

hours, but I have not yet received it. Could the Minister at this date give me some report?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not state the day. I should indicate to the Member that I have talked to the department about it, and a letter is being prepared for my signature to the Member so that he can inform the constituent. If he prefers it done differently, and he is prepared to give me the name of the individual in question, I would be more than prepared to correspond with him or her directly.

Mr. Penikett: I am quite happy to correspond with my constituents, even when the Minister is giving them bad news.

I would like to ask the Minister, though, since the matter has obviously now been researched and a reply has been drafted for him, whether he can indicate if the problem from his research lies with some failing of my constituent's insurance company, or with the law as it now exists, or possibly a problem on both counts?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit confused. I know I have a number of letters from the Member on fairly similar situations. If the letter he is referring to concerns the insurance company, that is one aspect I am trying to clear up, as to just exactly where the problem is.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a new question?

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We will allow one further supplementary to the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you. It is a very easy supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask the Minister when I will be getting the reply.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will not go so far as to commit myself to within the next 26 hours, but I would say that it would be over the course of the next week at the latest.

Question re: Medical Evacuation

Mr. Byblow: I have a question that I will direct to the Minister responsible for Government Services. In order to lay to rest the abounding rumours on the subject of "Chris's airplane", could the Minister tell the House whether or not officials of Government Services have been examining airplanes for purchase by Government, and were in fact at the airport yesterday viewing such an airplane?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there was an airplane here over the course of the last number of days, the idea being that the Government could look at it. I should, perhaps, give some background to this.

You will recall that it was two years ago now, I believe, when we were discussing the medivac situation in the Budget; some thought was to be given to leasing, with a private entrepreneur, the services for medivac purposes. We have investigated that further, and this is just an ongoing investigation into costs and effectiveness, as compared with the situation as it exists today.

Mr. Byblow: Inasmuch as my constituents report that a test flight was made to Faro yesterday by a plane, can the Minister confirm whether or not purchasing, or leasing, is contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it is not even at that stage at the present time. We are just looking at all options that could be available to the Government, and then we will have to look at them at that time.

The major concern to us at the present, as I have indicated, with the medivac services, is the costs. I do not have the figure here with me, but if one looks at that particular aspect of the Budget, we are well exceeding half a million dollars a year now. Whether or not it is effective remains to be seen, and we are getting the necessary documentation to see whether or not it is. At that point, depending on that information, a decision would be made down the road as to whether or not we would even go into a situation of the kind that the Member indicated, unless it was really economically feasible and in the best interest of the taxpayers of Yukon.

Mr. Byblow: My final supplementary would then be whether or not the Government is contemplating strictly medivac purposes for the plane, or if it would be also used for

executive transportation, as well?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, all these things would have to be taken into consideration; it is a question of cost-effectiveness, and there is no other reason that we are even looking into the situation at the present time.

Mr. Veale: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and my question is to the Government Leader: would the Government Leader confirm, then, that the Government is looking at the use of an executive jet for both medivac purposes and for the purposes of Executive Council or Ministers of this Government?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Minister had made it clear.

Although the transportation study centers primarily on medical evacuations, because that is such an outstanding amount of money in this Government, the study, in fact, encompasses all travel by everyone in this Government.

Mr. Veale: Will the Government Leader give his undertaking to this Assembly that a proposed aircraft that will be purchased in the future will never be used for the use of Members of the Executive Council in their travels about the Territory and the country?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, not at all.

Mr. Veale: Would the Government Leader then confirm whether Government Ministers were in fact travelling on an executive jet today, and if that is one of the executive jets that they are considering purchasing?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a point of privilege here, I think that the Member is misleading the House. I made it very clear that the

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the Honourable Member is making a very serious accusation, and I have heard, from the Chair, this phrase mentioned on several occasions during this Session; I take it from the Chair that the Members do not realize the seriousness of that particular phrase.

That phrase, as you will find in your *Beauchesne*, in many instances, has been deemed to be a very unparliamentary comment and the implications behind such a statement are very serious. The Chair must accept the fact that it is not intended that any insults or unparliamentary words were to be used at this time, but I would caution all Members on the use of this term.

On the point of privilege, the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify for the House that there is no proposal for us to purchase an airplane. As I indicated, all we are doing is looking at all the options, with respect to the cost of transportation to Government, to see whether or not we can make a savings on behalf of the taxpayer; that is as far as it has gone.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, on the same subject and in light of the questions I asked during the Budget, I wonder if the Government Leader could indicate, since some small aircraft operators have, I understand, only just recently obtained a share of this medivac work, which I understand has previously gone to one large company — is it still the policy of the Government, as illustrated during the Budget Session, that small private carriers should have the medivac work, even though the study may show it marginally cheaper to do it in-house?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Members are virtually in a Budget debate here. I would be happy to debate the issue with them, if you will allow us to do it. Now, we undertook, as part of good management, to do a transportation study. We have done that, we are doing that, we are in the process of doing that. I hear these wild accusations of "executive jets". Mr. Speaker, I have not been in an "executive jet" since my last association with this Government. I want to make that very, very clear. We are not looking at executive jets. We have nothing to do whatever with executive jets. That just must be made clear to everyone in this Territory.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of looking at our transportation requirements and those transportation costs. We are also in very close consultation with those private entrepreneurs that now provide us with transportation — by whatever means — and we are dealing with them.

I would like also to make it very very clear that there has never been a suggestion by anyone from this side, it has only come from the other side, that this Government should consider buying an airplane. We have not ever considered that; the only place I have ever heard that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is from the other side.

Mr. Penikett: The Government Leader is quite correct, and I did not mention executive jets. My only comment would be that if they bought one, I would hope they would not just use it for medivacs; that would not be cost-efficient.

My question, however, to the Government Leader is about Government policy in this regard; and it is not just budget policy, government policy, because we did have a statement during the Budget debate on this question. The Minister of Highways and Public Works indicated that they considered privatizing the ambulance service. Can the Government Leader indicate to the House: if there were only marginal benefits in doing it in-house, what would the policy of the Government be, vis-a-vis maintaining private carriers doing it, or going in-house?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it is a really hypothetical question; it is very difficult to answer, but if I can answer hypothetically, knowing the people on this side of the House as I do, I would respectfully suggest that the cost benefits would have to be much more than marginal before we would go away from private enterprise.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Government Leader for answering my question.

If the Minister of Municipal Affairs could answer this supplementary: could he tell us, in the case of, not the air ambulance service, but the other ambulance service, if, in fact, he has made a decision yet on the privatization of that service?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not. I think I indicated we were talking about it. We are always reviewing the policy of the Government; I believe that is one of the functions of good government, but, at this time, we have not come up with any policy what so ever.

Question re: YTG Employee Moving Expenses

Mr. Fleming: I have to sympathize a little, too, with the NDP Member, if the Government happened to ride in a jet and he was riding his bicycle.

I have a question this afternoon for the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission — the Government Leader, I presume. Could the Minister tell the House if the Public Service Commission is reviewing its guidelines for paying the removal expenses of YTG employees, upon their termination of employment with the Government?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not sure that we are reviewing them at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, but I would be interested in knowing whether the Honourable Member can tell me, in a supplementary question, whether he thinks that we should.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will be telling the Government Leader what he should do. However, a supplementary: could the Minister tell the House if the Public Service Commission has established a special policy with respect to the payment of removal expenses for Deputy Ministers and, if so, what that policy is?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that that policy is any different for their removal expenses. I believe we pay the same removal expenses for everyone. Now, I am aware of a particular problem that we have concerning removal expenses, and possibly that is the issue that the Honourable Member is trying to get to.

We did have a Federal employee seconded to this Government for a period of, I believe it was, two years. Part of that

contract, part of that secondment with the Government of Canada, indicated that we would pay that employee's expenses into the Territory and his removal expenses when he left. We have received the bill for those removal expenses now that he has left, and, frankly Mr. Speaker, we are quite upset with the amount of the bill, and are questioning it very severely with the Government of Canada at this point. That may be the issue that the Honourable Member is speaking of. All I can say to that is that we are in the process of dealing with that matter.

Question re: Executive Council Code of Conduct

Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government Leader. With regard to the Executive Code of Conduct regarding the conflicts of interest, which are a guideline and rules for the Ministers and the Government Leader — will the Government Leader tell the House when this new Code of Conduct will be enforced by Commissioner's Orders?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Never, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Gyrfalcons

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the "high-flying Government". This is about Gyrfalcons. The Minister has indicated that his Department of Renewable Resources will be continuing their inventory of the Gyrfalcon population. The Minister is well aware, I am sure, of what has been described by an official in his department as a multi-million dollar industry involving the poaching of Gyrfalcon eggs. What specific efforts will be made by the Minister's department to control this illegal activity, which takes place every spring in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there is some question whether or not the poaching that the Member referred to in his high-flying remark — the possibility exists that the Gyrfalcon or the Peregrines could be under some pressure from people outside the Territory.

There have been a number of things done: undercover work, I believe, by the department, to attempt to see whether or not this is really happening. To my knowledge, we have not got any solid evidence that this is taking place. There is a policy in place that if one wishes to have a Gyrfalcon or a Peregrine, one must go through the Game Branch. The Game Branch is the one involved in capturing, and there is so much paid to the Government for the services rendered. So there is a legal method, if there are enough birds to warrant a harvest of the kind that the Member is speaking of.

Mr. Veale: My question does not really relate to the policy of how to acquire a Gyrfalcon legally. The question is what the Government is doing to prevent the illegal harvest of Gyrfalcon eggs. It was recently stated in the *Globe and Mail* by an official from the Minister's department that Alaska, Northwest Territories, and Yukon were joining forces in some method of enforcing or preventing such illegal poaching. Will the Minister provide the details of that joint effort that is taking place?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish the official had come to me prior to going to the *Toronto Globe and Mail* so I could be in a position to answer the questions that the Member is raising. I will be discussing it with the department, and the obvious spokesman, whoever he or she may be, hopefully will give me the necessary information, if the Member does not already have it.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I have only the information in the *Globe and Mail*. I am sure that the Minister has had that for some time, as it was placed in March 28, 1981. Does the evidence to date indicate that the poaching has had a bad effect on the Gyrfalcon population of the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to emphasize to the Member opposite that he is one step ahead of me. He has that copy of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, and I do not, so I have not read the article that the Member is referring to. I will, as soon as he or someone else makes it available to me.

With respect to the numbers of Gyrfalcon in the Territory, I do not believe — and I am just speaking from the limited knowledge that I have at the present time — that they are

"endangered" by the poaching that the Member is indicating. I will double check on that, and I will get back to my high-flying friend and give him an answer that he can consider.

Question re: Games of Chance

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Government Leader. Our community, I have heard, Mr. Speaker, is the home to a number of bingos, and one also hears rumours of other kinds of games of chance; yet, Mr. Speaker, other than lotteries, these are all unregulated. Is the Government Leader aware of guidelines for legitimizing all games of chance, which are now being developed in a number of the provinces?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that comes under Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Yes, it is an area of concern, and we have inquired of a number of provinces as to just exactly what the situation is. I do have some concerns with respect to putting more regulations in and various other things that might have to come forward, with respect to games of chance, in view of the present federal law; that is where the provinces do get their authority.

We are discussing it with the various provinces, and at the present time, I am somewhat reluctant to act.

Mr. Penikett: I apologize for directing it to the wrong Minister; I thought it might be Justice instead of Consumer Affairs.

Given that the Conservative Government of Newfoundland has had developed for some time now guidelines on all kinds of games of chance, which guidelines protect those organizations when the proceeds of the games go to some registered or acceptable charity, I wonder if the Minister could say whether he is aware of these guidelines, or if he is considering something similar?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of guidelines in the western provinces; I do not believe I have seen the ones from Newfoundland. I am glad to see that the Member opposite is getting his advice and information from a good Conservative Government, and I will get in contact with them, as well, and find out exactly what they are.

Question re: Ombudsman

Mr. Byblow: I have a question that I believe I will direct to the Government Leader. It has been brought to my attention that there may be some consideration being given by this Government to create the position of an ombudsman; recognizing that such a position was not mentioned anywhere in the Budget addresses or discussions, I would like to query the Government Leader as to whether or not such a position is being contemplated sometime this year.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member should know; it is obvious. If it was not mentioned in the Budget, it is not being contemplated at this point.

Mr. Byblow: Then, on that, I would ask the Government Leader: since the Government's position of open government would be facilitated by such a position, would his Government investigate such an avenue of public recourse, in areas where dealings with governments are posing problems?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I really question the need for or the advisability of an ombudsman. My door is open always. Anyone can get in to see me and it is my experience that all of the other Ministers are available at any time. I also know that the MLAs, on this side, at least, are available to their constituents at any time. So, Mr. Speaker, I hardly see the need for an ombudsman.

Mr. Byblow: For the information of the Government Leader, my office has no door.

Based on what the Government Leader has said, I would then ask him if he is aware that several years ago a commissioned report by the then Government revealed that such an office would in fact be advisable?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware of it, but I might point out that this in fact is a different Government, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Medicare Premiums

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was known as the

Chamberlist Report.

I have a question for the Government Leader as Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Medicare, whoever chooses to respond. The Government Leader told the House a few days ago that the Government has a policy to raise 11.5 percent of the revenue required for education through school taxes on property. Given that Medicare premiums are being increased to help pay for the health care system, can the Government Leader indicate if the same practice is being followed in the health care system as in the education system? That is, is there a specific percentage of the health care budget that the Government is raising for Medicare premiums, and if so, could he indicate what the percentage is?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a specific percentage of the health care budget. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have two sources of revenue to pay for our Medicare Plan. One of those sources of revenue is the Federal Government, and they make that payment through what is called an EPF Block Transfer. Now, we get X number of dollars from them, and that is a negotiated number. The rest of the money we must raise ourselves, but we can take that money from any source in the Territory that we wish.

It has been our philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that we should raise the rest of that money for Medicare through premiums, and that is what we have done. In fact, that increase in the cost reflects what we anticipate our increase in the cost of Medicare — not the entire health budget, just Medicare only — is going to be in the next year.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of asking a Budget question, is the Government Leader saying that in fact the cost of Medicare over and above the EPF is totally recovered from Medicare premiums?

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

Mr. Penikett: Outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

May I ask a supplementary to the Minister of Health? Given the Minister's answer to my question last week regarding a new emphasis on prevention rather than curative health care, can the Minister say if there have been any cost benefit or financial studies done by her department, about the positive financial implications of a new emphasis such as that?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, Mr. Speaker, there have not been any particular studies done. Also there is a question about the definition of preventive medicine. The old definition meant public health and so on; the new definition, as I understood the Member to mean, is the new method of preventing disease before it happened by way of certain therapies. Perhaps he could clear that up.

Question re: Physiotherapy under Health Care Insurance

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, just following up with the Minister of Health and Human Resources: in the fall the Minister indicated she was having discussions with the independent physiotherapists about the possibility of including them in the Health Insurance Plan. What decision has the Government reached regarding that possibility?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, those discussions have been long-standing, and there has been no conclusion. I think we are awaiting word from the private physiotherapists at this moment.

Mr. Veale: Well, is the Minister prepared to take initiatives on her own in this regard, or is she waiting for several months for something that does not seem to be coming? It appears to me that the Minister could make her own enquiries, as to what the practices are in the various provincial jurisdictions.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, there were many things to discuss with the private physiotherapists: the need in the first place. This department would look very favourably, I think, on adding a physiotherapist if it were shown that there was a need, but I think we have not had enough of a lobby at this point. We expect to hear back from them, to see whether they perceive it as a need.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further questions, we will

proceed to Orders of the Day: Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

ORDERS OF THE DAY**ADDRESS IN REPLY TO SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**

Mr. Clerk: Adjourned debate, Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Penikett: I previously had adjourned debate on this question, in order to gather my thoughts, because my brain was teeming with a number of contradictory and conflicting ideas. One side of my brain was inclined to compliment the Government for its responsiveness and for those areas where they had been pressed to act and on which they had acted. The other side of me was inclined, as has been my habit in the past, to spend a lot of time denouncing them for their continued failures.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Government knows that it is not perfect or anything close to it yet. Last night, I was talking to my mother, who always used to tell me, "If you cannot say anything nice, do not say anything at all." So out of respect for my mother today, I am going to sit down and let other Members have their chance.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I will speak for my friend across the floor. It is the first time I have known him to be at a loss for words, I think. He does not want to agree, but he does agree. He is what you call a left-wing Tory, I guess. However, he is saving his best for England, when he meets with the socialists over there. They can all get together.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about my community a little bit, because the Member for Faro does not seem to know the history of the Mayo community, particularly the mining community, and what we have contributed to Yukon since minerals were first found in the area. In five short years, it will be a hundred years since the first mineral was taken out of the Mayo area. Faro was not thought of at that time.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Member for Campbell were not here at that time, and neither was I.

Mr. Speaker, in the year 1886-87 there was \$100,000 worth of gold taken from the mouth of the McQuesten River; that was the first written history of mining in the Mayo district. Since then, up until probably the early 1920s, there was no history kept of the mining activity that went on in the district; however, we do know, in checking into the claims, that gold mining went on many years prior to the 1900s.

The particular mine at Elsa, now, has been operating, for 35 years. Previous to that, it operated on the other side of the valley from about 1921 to 1943. At the time they operated, the price of silver was 31 cents an ounce and gold was at \$15 an ounce. At the world market price today, the amount of money made in that community would be a little different today.

So, Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, the Mayo area has been considered as a third class community. In fact, the road leading into it is a third class road; however, this Government now is working on upgrading the facilities in the Mayo district, for the first time in a great number of years. Prior to this Government's being in power, there was no work done there for over 15 years, except when they necessarily had to.

So, the Member for Faro's objections to the building of an administration building for Mayo, or even grading the highway and putting the salt on it, kind of angered a lot of people in the community, but he will be coming up there to visit shortly and he will hear from them personally.

Mr. Speaker, under this Government, Mayo is starting to get a little recognition; there were years of neglect when we did not have any recognition. In fact, one of the former Ministers of a former Government at one time said that Mayo had the lowest priority. One of the reasons that I am in this House today is because of that Minister.

Mr. Speaker, another point of issue that I would like to raise is the Yukon's embassy in Ottawa. I think that if this Government ever made a positive step, it is the opening of an office in

Ottawa, for it is impossible to phone from here to Ottawa and get an answer. If it is at the Minister to Minister level, he has to confer with his deputy, and his deputy has to confer with his assistant deputy, and it goes on down the line. Besides that, it is a Liberal Government in Ottawa and that explains it a lot; they do not understand English too well. Most of them do not even know where Yukon is.

However, Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Government for opening a so-called embassy in Ottawa, and I think it is a fine move. I think we should be very concerned about the person who we put in that office to represent us down there: that we get the utmost out of them. We have friends in Ottawa in all three political parties down there. We want to make our case available to all three, instead of their getting it through the newspapers and through the news media.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the building. I am thankful that my community is now getting something from the Government, and I would like to see the Elsa camp getting something out of this Government, too. As I say, the mine has been running now for 35 years. In that 35 years, the Governments of the Yukon has done nothing for the people at Elsa. This community, at Elsa, where the company pays all the taxes, the property, and schools as well as Faro - the company pays the highest school tax - 20 percent of the cost of operating that school - higher than any other community in Yukon. This is because of an agreement that was reached years ago. I understand that. But, Mr. Speaker, nothing has been done for us. The miners there have been paying personal income taxes for 35 years. I think this Government should look closely at doing something for the mining community of Elsa, even though it is a company town.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Applause

Mr. Fleming: I do not know whether the Government was clapping for my getting up or for the Member sitting down. As usual, I am not one to make a very big speech in answer to the Speech from the Throne. In fact I did not really intend to get up and say very much at all. However, in response to the Honourable Member's comments about the two Independents here, as if maybe they were trying to steal his administration building from him or something, I would like to say that I realize that there have got to be priorities in a government and I am very happy to see that the Member did get that. My constituents are hoping that the Government, in the future, sees that there is a need for an administration building in Teslin, and in all of the little towns that need one.

— Yes, Old Crow, okay, we will mention Old Crow, too. I said all the other communities.

Mr. Graham: And Faro.

Mr. Fleming: Faro is quite capable of looking after itself, however, I feel the same about that, too.

I would like to commend the Government on what they have actually been doing since the last time in this House, in this last year, because I think they have shown that they are a fairly responsible government; as a person who is sitting at the side — and politics means nothing — I think they are doing a fairly good job.

I just do not know how to put it, but if any of them need a push from this side and if they need to be hounded or anything, they will get it, but, so far, they have been doing very well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development that the Address in Reply to the Speech From the Throne be engrossed and presented to the Commissioner, in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that the Address in Reply to the Speech From the Throne be engrossed and presented to the Commissioner, in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed on the Order Paper to Motions other than Government Motions.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 1, standing in the name of Mr. Veale.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item 1?

Mr. Veale: Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 9

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane, that the Assembly urge the Government of Yukon to introduce legislation which would amend the definition of "crime" in subsection 2(1) of the *Compensation for Victims of Crime Ordinance* to include the failure by an owner of a motor vehicle to maintain public liability and property damage insurance.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, the reason for presenting this Motion to the Assembly is to determine whether or not something can be done about a very serious problem in this Territory. The problem, I simply state, is this: although the *Motor Vehicles Ordinance* makes it an offence not to be insured for driving a motor vehicle, and although when a person picks up their licence plates each year, they are required to produce insurance, or at least evidence of insurance, the problem is that after that time, many people in the Territory are in fact without insurance, either because they failed to pay their premiums, if they were paying in installments, or because they have cancelled their insurance for some reason.

The problem this creates — and I would not suggest for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that it was simply a problem of Yukoners not insuring themselves, it is also a problem of having a great number of people from other jurisdictions travel through the Territory and those people, in some cases, are not insured. The problem that occurs is that when an accident results, and a Yukon citizen, or anybody else for that matter, is seriously injured, the problem is that they can go to court, they can get a judgment against the owner of the vehicle or the driver of the vehicle, but in many cases there will be no one in a position to pay that judgment. Normally there is an insurance company behind every driver, and the insurance company will see that judgments are paid.

My information is that there are a lot of people in the Territory who do obtain a judgment, but they are unable to obtain any satisfaction from that judgment at all. It just becomes a piece of paper, and does not in any way compensate them for the injuries they received as a result of the negligence of the other driver.

The problem arises, Mr. Speaker, to consider how the Territory should best deal with that particular problem. There are a number of things in the provinces. The practice is to have an unsatisfied judgment fund, or an uninsured motorist fund. What happens in those cases then is that the person with the judgment makes an application to the fund, and they are compensated. In this Territory of course, there is no unsatisfied judgment fund or uninsured motorist fund, so there is no place to seek that kind of compensation.

Instead of creating a separate fund which would probably require another civil servant to administer it, and take a great deal of time, the proposal in this motion suggests that we use a mechanism that is already legislated; that is the *Compensation for Victims of Crime Ordinance*. That, of course, is where the Workers' Compensation Board now deals with applications, and we have, in effect, a board or a body in place to deal with this serious problem.

The only drawback to using the *Compensation for Victims of Crime Ordinance* is that the definition of "crime" in that ordinance only deals with crimes under the *Criminal Code*. It does not deal with any offence that may be committed under Territorial legislation.

Now I have discussed this with the Government Leader, and he has indicated that one of the difficulties is that the *Compensation for Victims of Crime Ordinance* is one that is funded 75 percent, I believe, by the Federal Government. The concern would be that perhaps the Federal Government would not accept this amendment, or perhaps they would not want to pay for any claims that arose as a result of a person not having insurance.

Now my suggestion is that the Government could, firstly, negotiate that with the Federal Government to determine their position. If their position is clear that they do not want to put forward any monies on that, it would seem to me the possibility exists that the *Insurance Premium Tax Ordinance* could be used. By an increase in the *Insurance Premium Tax Ordinance*, the Territory could start to develop a fund which could be used for these purposes. So, basically then, we would be in a position to start working on a fund which would be available for people who have suffered very serious injuries, and have not been able to obtain any compensation from the person who caused their injuries due to the person who caused their injuries not having insurance. It seems to me that it would be something in the interests of every Member of this House, and certainly of every citizen of the Territory, to have a fund that they could go to to obtain compensation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from across the floor has raised a very valid argument: we should have some form of compensation for these people; however, as the Honourable Member also stated, there is a problem with the Federal Government. The Federal Government does not want to enforce the Territorial law that we would have to add on to the *Compensation for the Victims of Crime Ordinance*. I therefore propose an amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker, which will allow us to develop our own legislation to handle this matter.

So I would propose, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Motion Number 9 be amended by deleting the words immediately following the word "to" in the second line of the motion, up to and including the word "the" in the fifth line of the motion, and substituting the following words therefor:

"consider introducing legislation to establish a system of compensating persons injured by negligence of an owner of a motor vehicle in cases involving the..."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Motion Number 9 be amended by deleting the words immediately following the word "to" in the second line of the motion, up to and including the word "the" in the fifth line of the motion, and substituting the following words therefor:

"consider introducing legislation to establish a system of compensating persons injured by the negligence of an owner of a motor vehicle in cases involving the..."

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to what I consider to be this very constructive motion from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this has been of personal concern to me for a number of years because, at one time in my varied and checkered career in this Government, I was the Deputy Registrar of Motor Vehicles. I was also the Deputy Registrar of Insurance, and the lack of an unsatisfied judgment fund, even in those far bygone days, was a matter of great concern to us, as administrators, at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Tatchun has stated a valid point, in that the Government of Canada will not, nor do I think we should expect them to, participate in a program of this type, which is strictly a local matter. They participate, Mr. Speaker, in the compensation for victims of crime on the basis of 75/25, strictly because it is the *Criminal Code* that is involved and that is their legislation, and they are very specific

about that.

I am reluctant to muddy that specific piece of legislation, or the deal that we have with the Federal Government, by trying to put anything else into it. I would much prefer, Mr. Speaker, that we take a very serious look at alternative means. There must be alternative means for us to do this. We are one of only two jurisdictions in Canada which do not have an unsatisfied judgment fund. Every other jurisdiction does have one, except the Northwest Territories and Yukon.

It has proven to be, Mr. Speaker, a very, very expensive proposition in all of the other jurisdictions. The two major ways of paying for it that I have been able to ascertain are, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned, a premium or a surcharge on insurance premiums, or, again, a surcharge on licence plates. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is going to take us some time and some serious consideration before we will be in a position to really come forward with anything definitive. If we feel, in the final analysis, that we cannot, I will undertake to advise the House as to exactly why we cannot.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member of the Opposition speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Veale: I accept the amendment. I think either way of going about it, whether it is through compensation for victims of crime, or through a separate piece of legislation, is certain satisfactory to me. I would urge that the Government consider the Workers' Compensation Board, however, as the Board to administer the fund, due to the fact that they are in place now, and are probably developing some expertise in the area.

I am not aware of the cost, but I accept the Government Leader's statement that they are expensive in other jurisdictions. My feeling would be that that kind of tax added to licence plates or insurance premiums, which was laid out specifically to be for the purpose of establishing a fund which is going to enhance the safety of everybody in the Territory, is something that every individual at some point in time will probably take advantage of in some way or another, or at least have the possibility exist.

I certainly accept the amendment, and I hope that the Government will have some legislation for us in the next sitting of this Session.

Amendment agreed to

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 2, standing in the name of Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item 2?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 17

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Campbell, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that this Government give consideration to the advisability of paying interest to construction contractors on their security deposits, where these deposits are in cash or in cash equivalents.

Mr. Fleming: I think this motion has been more or less in the wind for quite some years, but has never been brought forth. It possibly had something to do with what the Government brought forth in changing the bonding system for the construction contractors. Because of the fact that they did this, and that this was also one of the other objections the contractors had in the last few years, that is the reason I am bringing the motion forth.

In some cases, especially with the smaller contractors where cash is not so easy to obtain, and they bid a \$100,000 contract, sometimes it is a problem even to get the money to put up for the bid bond in the first place. Then after they get the contract, that bid bond is usually kept for security, plus they must then try to get a bond for the rest of it, or possibly put up another ten percent cash. All in all it amounts to about 20 percent of what a contract may be.

Consequently I would feel, and I hope the Government

agrees with me, that there is not a very definite figure that contracts can be bid at, other than adding something to them, to help pay their way around.

In other words, for a \$100,000 contract, a person has to put up \$20,000 that is going to lie there for the next year. That money is lost to that person, as far as making any interest on it or putting it to use anywhere — other than, of course, security for the contract which he has.

However, morally, I would say that that money still belongs to the company or the individual, and any monies that could be obtained by interest rates or anything should really be given back to that person. Maybe not all of it; there is a small percentage of it that, possibly, the Government should get for the problems they have in looking after it, but most of it — if it can make a dollar, I think it should be returned to the person who holds the contracts, in interest.

I am not going to belabour the subject, because I think it is fairly simple, but I do believe it will help. I am sure it would help in the bidding of the contracts and knowing just what a contract is actually worth, rather than having a contractor sit down and say, "Well, I have got to bid \$100,000." I know if I was doing it myself today, being in business a while, I would say, "Well, they are going to tie up \$20,000 of my money. I am not going to do it for that \$100,000, I am going to add on another \$15,000 and maybe I am going to get some of my interest back that is going to be lost."

So, I think it would, in that light even, realizing also that it will not cost the Government more, but they may lose a little because now they would have the money in the bank and probably get the interest, but in the long term, I really believe that this would help.

I would like to hear from the other side.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say a few words on this motion. I thank the Member for bringing this motion forward. I think he will realize, as far as this side of the House is concerned, that the announcement that we have brought forward in regards to a bond would indicate that this side of the House feels that anything we can do for our small contractors we are going to do.

This motion follows that vein of thought, and we will certainly consider his recommendations; if we feel they can be implemented, I am sure that we will go forth and do so.

On this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, it has always been our policy to try to make life a little bit easier, a little bit more competitive, for these small contractors; we realize the problems that they have. As I indicated when I was mentioning the bonding that we brought forward, we said that there were other aspects of contract proposals and contracting that we were looking into, and this is just another indication of another area we can look into. This side of the House, I am sure, will give it very careful consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Clerk: Second Reading, Bill Number 101, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item 1?

Mr. Penikett: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Mr. Clerk: Second Reading, Bill Number 102, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the intention of the Honourable Member to proceed with this Bill?

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Bill Number 102: Second Reading

Mr. Penikett: I move, seconded by the Member for Faro,

that Bill Number 102 be given second reading.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that Bill Number 102 be now read a second time.

Mr. Penikett: I just want to say a couple of brief words about this bill. I think the reasons for it are self-evident.

The minimum wage in this Territory is not only obviously far too low, but I think the formula on which it is based is seriously flawed. The fact that it is tied to the Federal minimum wage, and the Yukon premium on it becomes a smaller fraction of it every year because of that formula, is obviously a problem.

The second part of the bill, which deals more particularly with the occupational health and safety issue in the labour standards area, is something very close to my heart, and what the bill simply states is what I feel ought to be the fundamental principle in that field.

I understand from the Government that it is intending to bring forward at the fall sitting of this Legislature a new *Labour Standards Ordinance*, which I am given to understand will cover both these subject areas. Given that understanding, I am prepared to let my bill stand on the Order Paper right now. The Minister will, of course, understand that if the promised legislation is not forthcoming, I will be more than happy to proceed with the subject matter at that time, and argue forcibly for the passage of this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I just hope that the Member opposite was not indicating that he was prepared to threaten me with undue cause and effect if I do not bring forward the legislation that was indicated a number of months ago as being in the process of being prepared. We are considering all aspects of the Labour Standards legislation. It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, to bring the legislation forward in the fall, time permitting. If it is possible, it will be tabled for Members' consideration at that time. I think we can then look at a total and comprehensive review of the legislation, as opposed to a piecemeal approach to certain sections. It is a very important piece of legislation as far as the Territory is concerned, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the situation and the comments made by the Member, I would move that we adjourn debate on Bill Number 102.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that debate be now adjourned on Bill Number 102.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 103, standing in the name of Mr. Veale.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with item 3?

Bill Number 103: Second Reading

Mr. Veale: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane, that Bill Number 103 entitled *Court Order Interest Ordinance* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane, that Bill Number 103 be now read a second time.

Mr. Veale: I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the Members have not been given a great deal of time to peruse this ordinance to determine precisely what its intention is. I might say at this time that it is really designed to assist people who are, for example, injured in a motor vehicle accident two years ago and get a court judgment on today's date. In the passage of two years' time from the date they were injured to the present date, there is no authority for the court to add interest to the judgment that it is going to make, whatever the damages are. If it is \$10,000, there is no authority for the court to say, "We will add interest at 10, 15 or 20 percent for the two year time period from the date of the accident." Interestingly enough, there is legislation — the *Judicature Ordinance* — that does provide for interest on a contract. In other words, if a contract is breached, the court can fill that gap and add interest to the damages

awarded.

It is clearly a gap in the legislation of the Territory and it has been adopted in most other jurisdictions. As a matter of fact, the ordinance I am proposing is one that has been adopted from British Columbia. The advantage, of course, when this is passed, is to the citizen of the Territory. At the present time, with the legislative gap, the advantage is to the insurance companies of the Territory, because the longer they can push things between the time of the accident and the time that a person obtains a judgment, the better it is for them, because they are earning 20 percent on the money that they are holding back at that time.

It think it has to be made clear that it is really a tremendous hardship, in these inflationary times, to an individual who has to wait a year or two. If you think of a judgment for \$100,000, if you have had a serious injury; at 20 percent that is a substantial amount of money that people in the Yukon Territory are now foregoing due to the gap in our legislation.

Although I understand the Government may wish to adjourn debate, I hope that it looks at the legislation carefully and that we can deal with it again at the next Sitting.

Mr. Hanson: I move we adjourn debate.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Some Member: I will second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that debate be now adjourned on Bill Number 103.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Government Motions.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Clerk: Item No.3, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Lang.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item No.3?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 16

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, seconded by the Honourable Government Leader, that this House recommends to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development the acceptance of the resignation of Mr. Terry Boylan from the Yukon Territorial Water Board and the appointment of Ms. Diane Grainger to complete the three year term of Mr. Boylan on the said Board.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that Mr. Terry Boylan, who has served approximately a year on the Board, has put forward his resignation. I would just like to acknowledge the work that he has done on behalf of all of the people in the Territory in representing the Yukon interests on this particular Board, which is a very important board as far as the running of our major industries in the Territory is concerned.

Mr. Boylan has found that he has just not got the time to put forward to serving on the Board, as well as serving his own private interests, and has therefore submitted his tentative resignation to the Government. Subsequently, we have before the Legislature a recommendation for Ms. Grainger to be appointed to the Board. She has indicated she is prepared to serve. She is a Yukoner of long standing. She has been here almost 20 years. She has some indirect involvement in the mining industry as well. Her appointment would also go to further the philosophy of this Government that we would like to get more women involved in the various Boards that are set up by the Territorial Government, or on Boards with which we have involvement. I have no doubt that Ms. Grainger will serve very well on behalf of the Territory, and, just as importantly, she has the time to put forward. This Board is becoming more and more involved in the various things that are happening in the Territory, and an individual is required who is prepared to put forward both the time and the effort, which Ms. Grainger

will be able to do.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to have heard from the mover of the motion, in addition to citing the appointee's qualifications, some further indication of the total interest area being represented by the Board. I say that because, in each of the three previous Spring Sessions new members or reappointments have been made to this Board. In each of those appointments and surrounding discussions, there was an appeal made by this side of the House for insurance as to a proper, and a broad enough, interest, to be represented by the Board. It, of course, led on logically that it would facilitate very simply a much more responsible, a much more confident, and a much more knowledgeable set of recommendations which would emanate from the Board, on water use and water-use related decisions. I think, specifically, there was the question raised as to whether there were adequate conservation interests on that Board. There was note made that there was no representation from the Native Community.

Some Member: There is now.

Mr. Byblow: There was also — I believe it was my suggestion that there ought to be some representation that could adequately represent my riding, and, now, the area north, because of the tremendous environmental changes that are going on there and particularly the magnitude of what is happening there.

I would hope that the Minister who introduced the motion would perhaps comment on this area of concern, previously expressed, and now brought to his attention again: as to whether or not he feels that the board adequately represents this broad range of interest which would facilitate the work that the Board has to do. I reserve judgment on support of the motion until I hear that.

Mr. Penikett: I have a very short speech to make. It consists of a question. I just wonder if the Minister can confirm for us if the lady in question is the extremely nice person who was the campaign manager for Mr. Nielsen in the last general election?

Mr. Veale: I would certainly be interested in the answer to that question, because it would certainly set out the political qualifications for the person. I was wondering if the Minister could in fact give more about this woman's qualifications. It certainly is a good thing to see women being put to these boards, but what about the specific qualifications of this lady with respect to — just while, I will wait for the Minister to be listening — the mining industry. And also the specific qualifications or interest that she has in water-use and planning for the Territory.

Hon. Mr. Lang: There seems to be a difference of views on the side opposite. I think this is one of the problems that we have with this legislation to begin with — discussing an individual's credentials in a forum of this kind. I find it very distasteful, for or against any individual. The Government has to make these appointments and stand or fall by them, and I understand that.

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that, yes, the individual we are recommending here did run the campaign of one Mr. Erik Nielsen in the last election, and quite obviously quite successfully. So subsequently it would appear to me that certain organizational skills are fairly evident, with respect to that particular venture that she was involved in.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, she has had experience, as I indicated, in the mining field. She and her husband have had some placer claims that she has worked on herself, and has some knowledge in that respect. I think she represents a good cross-section of the population, answering the question for the Member for Faro, and in my estimation will serve all of us very well in hearing any applications that have to go before the Board.

The cross-section of the membership of the Board I believe is fairly representative of the Territory. With respect to the expertise, I do not believe she has a degree in hydrology, or in water monitoring or anything of this type. This is why the

Government of Canada is supposed to be providing the necessary expertise in this field to be considered with any application, as far as the technical aspect is concerned, and as far as the well-being of the Territory is concerned. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any problem with any Member not supporting this particular resolution.

Motion agreed to

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Mr. Clerk: Second Reading, Bill Number 22, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Bill Number 22: Second Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 22, *An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 22 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, all Members should be aware of the fact that I am presenting this bill to the House on behalf, in fact, of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges, because it is a Money Bill, and one that should be dealt with as a Government bill. The other reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is because I agree, wholeheartedly, and wish to commend the Standing Committee for their recommendations. I am most anxious to see a system in place whereby we can refer legislation to Standing Committees of this House — albeit we are going to call these special committees, or select committees — which will be able to hear from expert witnesses, which will be able to hear from concerned citizens, from the general public and from interest groups. They will have the capability of hearing objections. They will have the capability of hearing the good points and I am sure that they will; they will be able to, on the basis of what they hear, make recommendations back to this House with respect to that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that what we are doing is putting a system in place whereby we, as Government, are going to have to be very careful as to how we program our legislation.

This is another factor into the mill, and I anticipate that for a lot of legislation it is going to mean that it is going to take an awful lot longer for it to get through this House.

I can foresee, Mr. Speaker, that virtually all of the legislation would be referred to these committees — except for finance bills, the money bills, the Budget, this type of thing, because I feel very strongly as well, that the Budget of this Government should in fact, for as long at least as we are of this size, or even maybe a little bigger, but certainly as long as we are this size, the Budget should be discussed and considered in Committee of the Whole. I think that that system with respect to our Budget is the best.

I am very anxious to see this system of committees in place. I think it is a tremendous step forward. I believe that it will give another dimension to our MLAs and it will make them all — will make all of us, not them, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, because I am one as well — it will make us all that much more responsive to the public.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I was not part of the negotiations that took place to set the new salaries. I think the timing for the salary increases is very unfortunate, but I am certainly not going to stand in the way of all-party consensus on that matter.

The other matter deals with the committees to be set up pursuant to the Report. Having recently been removed from a Committee by the apparent political whim of the Government Members, I would indicate that I will be speaking to the Government Leader to ensure that the committee system is a committee system that is going to operate in the manner that committees operate elsewhere in this country, in a democratic parliamentary method: that is that the composition of the

committees is a matter that is negotiated by the Opposition and by the Government of the day.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if you could not use your good offices to make it clear to the Honourable Member that I, as Government Leader, do not have anything at all to say about the make-up of these committees. These are committees of this House, and those committees will be established by this House, not by the Government at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member is quite correct.

Mr. Veale: I suppose what I was asking the Government Leader is to use his whip to deal with the Members on his side, because the importance of a committee system is that it is a system that is developed between the Government and the Opposition, and if the committee system does not get off to a good start, it is not going to be a committee system that will be to the good of this Territory.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fleming: I will rise in support of this bill, of course.

As the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has said, there are some slight things I think we should be talking about, as to the build-up of the committees and just how they would be formed, but I do not think there is any problem. I do not know whether we could get into it in the bill or not, because there is really nothing in the bill, so I presume we would possibly have to speak about it now.

I would say also that the Government should take a very close look at just how the five member committees are going to be set up, so that the Government has input into both of these committees, definitely, and that the Opposition Members are used, and used to the best of the Government's advantage as well as to the best of the constituents' advantage, and be sure that they do earn what they are going to make extra, possibly, in the next little while.

That is the only area that I would be concerned about at all, and I am sure that the Government will take a good look at it and come up with something fair enough for everybody, I hope.

Mr. Penikett: I want to deal, in my comments, with both parts of the Committee Report and the legislation.

As most Members will know, the committee system is a new innovation, which I am very pleased to see, because, while it is not exactly what I have been proposing for the last couple of years, I think it is an extremely positive development. I think there is a very good reason — and let me say good conservative reason, in the best sense of that word — for referring certain kinds of legislation to committees like these, which can hear from the public and can allow for lengthy and relaxed discussion. I think those reasons become very obvious when we see the frequency with which we often have to amend legislation that has been passed only a year or two previous.

I think the chance for all of us, away from the daily pressure of the legislative agenda, to take off our coats and sit down and argue about the particulars of legislation without feeling that we are wasting all Members' of the House time or spending a great deal of time and money on minor points, is an extremely useful device.

The main reason for which I am enthusiastic about it is perhaps one that is more democratic than conservative — and I use the words, in both cases, of small "d" and small "c" — and that is that I am one of those people on the left — and I do not know whether I am a minority or not — who believe that there is a real danger of growth in bureaucracy in the modern world. I do not mean just government bureaucracies, but I mean private bureaucracies, too. Anyone who has had the pleasure of dealing with the bureaucracy involved in a large insurance company, or the bureaucracy and the computers involved in a credit card company, will know that the problem of bureaucracy is not confined to government.

I believe that, because we have lacked the will and imagination, we have, over the years in the Territory, adopted a number of structures, offices and procedures from provinces to the south and other places in the world. We have borrowed these

practices and forms from jurisdictions very much larger than ourselves. We have quite unnecessarily handed over to officials the power to make quite significant policy decisions, and handed over the power to officials to make regulations which, in many cases, have much more impact than the laws which we debate.

I think one of the most important movements in legislatures in this century is the effort to recover for elected officials some of that power which legislators have surrendered to their employees.

I believe that in a community this small it is not only possible but essential that we take the time and the effort to really get to know the Government and its operations, and get a handle, as the elected representatives of the people, on what is happening. What this committee system that is being proposed will in the end do, if it flourishes and develops to its full potential, is recover power from the bureaucracies for the people of the community. I think that is an extremely important and profound development. I also believe, incidentally, that it would be ultimately much cheaper for a community to have 16 full-time legislators dealing with even minor matters of policy, than it is in the end to hire a similar or greater number of officials to carry out the same work.

I think the agreement that was reached by the Standing Committee on these difficult questions was, in some ways, a minor miracle. I do not think anyone will mind my mentioning the fact that the committee had to call up a reserve army of MLAs in order to reach an agreement, and that the original five were not sufficiently flexible, malleable, whatever, to accomplish the work by themselves. I think that should be said.

The question of our indemnities is perhaps the most difficult and awkward subject for us to ever have to deal with, and I had frankly hoped that when we dealt with it, whenever it was, two years ago, that it would have been the last time I would have to do it, certainly in this legislature, and hopefully in my time in politics. Having had some experience in collective bargaining, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, since you are not personally involved, that I have never seen anything like the kind of negotiations that went on here a few days ago.

Let me say something about my thinking on this subject because I feel bound to be clear about it, because I think inevitably there will be, from people in the community less fortunate than us, some criticism of what we are doing today. I am constantly in the process, in my own mind, of trying to think out what would be a just income policy, in the kind of society that I would like to see.

While I cannot come to any firm arithmetic conclusions about the relationship between the salary of, say, a physician and someone who does the laundry at the hospital; or between a miner and, perhaps, a clerk in a mining company; I have, I think, some preliminary observations which I would like to put on record.

At the very least, it seems to me, in a democratic society, governments and legislatures — especially if they share my philosophy — ought to be trying to reduce the spread between the very rich and the very poor — not to reduce the wealth of the rich for some punitive purpose, but to provide the means to alleviate the suffering of those less fortunate in the community. I think that, in my perfect world, I would be inclined to pay those people who do the dirty, rotten, dangerous and unpleasant work of this world, perhaps more than those people who spend their lives having good clean fun — like the work of an MLA, for example. But life, as has been observed by a number of people, is not entirely fair. It think it is quite obvious that a great many people in society who become enormously wealthy, do so without fulfilling any socially useful purpose or doing any socially useful work. There are a great number of other people, a good many more of them, who spend their lives doing dreary, necessary and very unpleasant work, and receive very little for it.

My views, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of an incomes policy, are not yet, unfortunately, those of the major-

ity in this community. I accept that. Having said what I have said, though, about the committee system, and having remarked on previous occasions that if this Legislature is, some day, to accommodate itself to the aspirations of the Indian minority in this community, it should adopt or borrow from the aboriginal community some of its political traditions, one of the best of these is the process of consensus decision-making in small groups.

I think that the possibility of consensus by committees on some difficult issues is one of the most hopeful ideas or events to come out of this Legislature. I think, in fact, that the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee, has, on a number of issues, reached decisions this way. I think the decision on the question of salaries was a compromise on a large number of points.

I think, having said what I have said about reducing the gap between rich and poor in society, that perhaps it is not inappropriate that MLAs are now to be paid something very close to the average industrial wage in Yukon.

We must recognize that we are responsible, to some extent, for the economic conditions in our society. Theoretically, the index to which we are tied could go down, and if we perform badly, it is possible that we could be responsible for that, which is not such a bad thing. One might ask: why are we tying ourselves so close to what appears to be an average income? I guess there is no brilliant answer to that, other than it seems to me that we are no more deserving and no less deserving than perhaps anybody else in the community. The fact of the matter is that the job, the work we do, has changed considerably even in the two or three years that we have been here.

I have come to recognize that it is probably not possible for any Member of this Legislature to carry out another full-time occupation. That is not to say that it may not be possible for some to find part-time work, but that is not the issue. It appears that we are now approaching, or have come to the point, where the majority of members are finding that this work is becoming close to a full-time job, or at least has made it impossible for them to have another full-time job. The salaries, of course, ought to recognize that fact.

I believe that the chairpersons of these new select committees will become very busy people. I think that a number of other office-holders within the House will find that their workload will increase. I think that is a good thing, and I think it is good that we should be accountable for that. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am pleased, because I think this development will advance the cause of legislative authority, rather than administrative authority, in this Territory.

I think that is particularly appropriate in small communities. I think it is something that we can achieve here, and, if we succeed, we can be a model for many other communities.

As I have said, I think there is the possibility, at the very least, that we could even save money by doing this, by taking work upon ourselves that I think has been inappropriately, up to now, done by some boards and some officials.

I think a consensus was necessary to reach this decision; it would have been impossible any other way. I think while philosophers in my movement have set themselves an ideal, from time to time, of "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need" — well, perhaps my ability is not that great or my needs are not that great, but I can certainly more than manage on what we are providing for ourselves today.

I had a constituent, I should say, Mr. Speaker, say to me just the other day that, "Surely to God, if a Cabinet Minister could not manage on what we are paying him now, we should not let him manage a million dollar budget." I thought that was a somewhat unfair remark, in view of what I know about that particular constituent's finances.

This will no doubt be a controversial decision, Mr. Speaker. Our employers will have a lot to say about it but, ultimately, our employers will decide whether they want to continue to have us in their service. That is as it should be, and ever more, I hope, will be.

Thank you.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges, it has been my observation, in the almost three years that this House has been established, that this Committee has had the privilege of considering what probably will become the most contentious issues in this Legislature, maybe not to the Members in the Legislature, but to the general public, as well.

Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member who spoke previous to me said, it is extremely difficult to discuss an item such as a Member's salary with any amount of objectivity. We found that there were a great many different opinions when the Committee first met. We found, as the Member opposite has said, that it was necessary to substitute new Members, at one point in our discussions, because of the hard and fast positions that had been taken by some Members.

It was my privilege to chair both sets of Members in this Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to take the opportunity now to indicate that I appreciate very much the cooperation of all eight Members in coming up with this Report. I think the Report, and the resulting committee structure and salary structure that we have recommended, is a very good compromise of the positions that all Members initially took.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that this committee structure will bring government closer to the people. I meant that in two different ways: the first is simply by virtue of the fact that these committees will be able to take their meetings to the public; they will be able to hear from members of the public; they will be able to take input back to this Legislature; they will be able to call expert witnesses, if the need arises. They will be able to do many things in a public forum that Members are not always willing to do here, in a very regimented Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the second method of taking government to the people, in my view, is one that I have just gained a certain amount of respect for in the last three months. I spent enough time in the Cabinet that it came as quite a shock to me when I moved back here to the upper row, as it were — that I was not really involved as much as I would like to be in many of the decisions that, of necessity, are made on a day-to-day basis. I felt that I would like to — as an MLA, as a backbencher in this Government — become involved much much more in the policy decisions, and in the legislation that is brought before this Legislature.

By virtue of the fact that we were not full-time MLAs, we were not necessarily perhaps spending as much time as we should here in the Government building, but in view of these things, I found that I was not involved, as I would like to be, in policy decisions and legislation coming before this House. Not only was I not involved, but I found I did not really understand some of the things that were coming to this Legislature.

I think that this committee system should alleviate many of my concerns. I feel that, with the advent of the committee system, MLAs will become much much more involved in discussion of policy items, in discussion of legislation that must come before the House, and I think we will all be much more aware of the ramifications of the decisions that we make here in this Legislature.

It will also give us a great deal more time to discuss, not only with our constituents, but with all concerned persons and groups in the Territory, their concerns as well on a particular piece of legislation.

In those areas, I think that this committee system is essential.

Mr. Speaker, we also, as a Committee, decided that the position of an MLA in the Yukon Legislative Assembly still does not fulfill the criteria of what we would call a full-time MLA. But we also felt that the Legislature has developed to such an extent that, as the Member for Whitehorse West indicated, it is impossible for a conscientious MLA to carry on employment over and above the employment as an MLA. We feel that the salaries that we have recommended will allow an MLA to

spend the vast majority of his time in the service of his constituents, but we do not expect him to be here from 8:00 to 5:00, five days a week, 52 weeks of the year. We see the job of an MLA being a job that runs almost 24 hours a day, some days, especially during the Session, and we felt that an MLA should receive compensation which reflects his duties and responsibilities. As other Members have said, the salaries that we have recommended are tied fairly closely to the average industrial composite wage of people residing in the Yukon Territory. We feel that this is a fair wage, and, for that wage, MLAs should be doing the job that we see MLAs doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think that the Report was a very good Report. It was a Report that we spent something in the neighbourhood of five meetings preparing. I feel that the Government has acted extremely responsibly in accepting our recommendations, and we think that they are to be congratulated for doing so — at least I think they are to be congratulated for doing so. I look forward to serving on one of these committees, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that they will be extremely important in the development of policy and legislation for the Yukon Territory, and I hope that all Members will be involved in the committee structure as much as we hope that they will.

Again, I must congratulate all eight Members who served over this last two weeks on the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges. I must congratulate them for the extremely good job I feel they have done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member who just spoke feels that he is being neglected in decision-making, he ought to trade places with me.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the substitute Members drawn into the Committee discussions and debates on this particular bill. I know that it is, indeed, a product of many hours of discussion. It is the product of a lot of compromise, and I know that a different package could not have been put together.

Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the previous speakers: the workload for a conscientious Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly can be a full-time position. At least for one Member, in addition to the Ministers, it is. I make the observation that the workload for all Members, since they were elected in 1978, has increased considerably. If, as outlined, the House divides into two standing committees involving Members in a more rigid and accountable scrutiny of legislation and policy, there is no doubt that the workload of Members will, by circumstance, become almost, if not totally, full-time positions. If this is, in part, some of the justification for salary increase, I can go along with it.

Now, whether or not Members will justifiably earn the remuneration afforded them is something the public and the electorate will clearly advise us.

If, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I could digress and speak personally: I knew full well what the remuneration would be when I ran for office. I gave up a reasonably comfortable income to do so. I subsequently became involved in business to provide a second income, simply because I could not survive on the salary provided. I made that adjustment out of necessity, but it has lessened the time that I could work for my constituents. I was fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in that my type of business affords me the time to meet my constituents to discuss constituency problems while at my second job. I do not suggest for a minute that my office is in the bar of my hotel, but certainly there is a lot of activity that does go on there.

The point I want to make is that I am somewhat uncomfortable about changing the remuneration package at this time, because I am going to have to disassociate myself from my business, and by conscience I will do that. I would have preferred, however, that this take place a year from now, perhaps going into an election, so that it would not even appear that we may be benefiting. But the facts remain, Mr. Speaker, an MLA in Yukon is becoming a full-time position. It must be reasonably compensating to attract and retain competent people.

The House is changing. It is changing in its format, which

will require a greater devotion by its Members. While the compensation package may appear high, it is still some \$6,000 below the industrial wage composite index. I suppose, then, I would simply conclude by noting that, having gone through the committee discussions on the preparation of this bill, I know that a different package was unattainable. I am going to be supporting it.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Third Reading, Bill Number 15, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Bill Number 15: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 15, *School Trespass Ordinance* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 15 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 15 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 15 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I will declare that Bill Number 15 has passed this House.

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill Number 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Mrs. McCall.

Bill Number 18: Third Reading

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 18, *An Ordinance to Amend the Pioneer Utility Grant Ordinance* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 18 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 18 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 18 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, 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 call the Committee of the Whole to order. I would like to inform Honourable Members that Committee will consider Bill Numbers 19, 21 and 22.

At this time I would like to call a short recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee of the Whole to order at this time.

Before I refer Committee to the clause at hand, I would like to introduce Mr. McWilliam as the witness. Welcome back to the Committee, Mr. McWilliam.

I refer Committee to Bill Number 19. We are on Page 7, and at the bottom of Page 7 you will find Clause 15.

Bill Number 19: Municipal Finance Ordinance

On Clause 15

Mr. Byblow: I think in some circles they call section 15 a "catch-all" clause.

Nevertheless, I would be curious to hear what the rationale was, behind setting out those areas of municipal service which qualify under the original basic operating grant, and which now qualify under special service grants. What is the rationale? Because when I look at the White Paper, there is the list and the various categories and, within that list, there are, in some cases, provisions for separate funding; in some cases provisions for conditional funding; in some cases they are cited as user-pay services.

To repeat the question, what was the criterion used to establish the grouping of services, that applied on the one hand to operating grants, and that now apply to special service grants, and later, in some cases, to miscellaneous?

Mr. McWilliam: The municipal service grants, which are conditional funding that is provided to a community, reflect basically those items which are already contained in the *Community Assistance Ordinance*. Essentially what we are doing is following along with the established pattern of providing direct assistance for these services.

The only additional one is piped water and sewage utilities. The reason that that was added to the list was essentially that we are providing that already, in Dawson and all of the L.I.D.s; we are just recognizing the reality of the situation.

Mr. Byblow: Regarding the two categories that have now been introduced, which are over and above the categories established under the old system, the witness mentioned piped water and sewage utilities. Now he says they included these under special financing, because of the realities of the situation. Could he elaborate on that?

Mr. McWilliam: Mr. Chairman, as was indicated in the White Paper, water and sewer utilities, as far as the operating costs are concerned, are normally borne by the users. At least, that is the model in the South. What we have recognized is that, in Yukon, with the higher costs of operating such systems in the North from frost conditions, et cetera, that there are costs over and above those which the users of the system should, realistically, be expected to pay. That is why this program identifies that we would provide deficit funding — in those situations where there were extra costs.

Mr. Byblow: Okay, thank you. I guess then that the practical application of this is Dawson, where, I would take it from the witness's comments, that Dawson was incapable of meeting the expenditure costs of operating that system, so therefore the conditional funding was inserted. It boils down to simply that.

Mr. McWilliam: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is fair to single out Dawson in that respect. Dawson is the only one of the three existing municipalities which will be receiving conditional funding this year. However, all five of the L.I.D.s, through the L.I.D. operating grants, are receiving funding for the operation of water and sewer systems.

Mr. Byblow: With respect to the five L.I.D.s, would they now be fitting into the category of special financing for the operation of their water system, as well as the operating grant under the formula?

Mr. McWilliam: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the L.I.D.s which become municipalities would be eligible for this conditional funding.

Mr. Byblow: Will the expenditures of the operation of the water system be applied in the basic operating grant as well?

Mr. McWilliam: No, Mr. Chairman. The basic operating grant, which is arrived at by calculating standard expenditures, excludes —

Mr. Byblow: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Clause 15 clear?

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I have just one question; I am not sure whether it has been touched on or not. With respect to subsection (5), the two conditions are placed on the municipal services grant. One is the approval of the fee to be charged — and I assume the Minister is referring there to the concept of the universal water and sewer charge that was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne — and secondly, the approval of the method by which the facility or service is operated by the municipality. I can foresee problems in that area, over the method to be used. Could the Minister give us some indication as to what types of conditions the Commissioner would be putting on the methods of using a service?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: On the first question, Mr. Chairman: as I have stated before, we feel that if we are going to pick up the cost for these facilities, the communities should be responsible for paying a fair portion of it. Now in the water and sewer, we took as an example Whitehorse, which is a large well-run system; we established their rates, and we felt that every other place should be able; that should be the rate that they should pay. Now, the deficit over that, we were willing to pick up.

Now in regards to how the operation was run, we feel that because we are picking up that cost, we have a responsibility to the taxpayer of the Territory to see that they are running that system efficiently, that they are not buying equipment that we feel that they do not need. The other thing I should point out is that in our Department of Municipal Affairs, we have expertise that can give them guidance. The small communities do not have this expertise, and we want to be sure they are running that system as efficiently as possible. Because we are picking up the deficit, that is one responsibility that we have to insist upon.

Mr. Byblow: My questions pertain to sections 3 and 6, because of the reference to regulations. In any expenditure under Part II for special services grants, is that appropriated by regulation, and how does that pertain to being a money matter? If I could understand this, the money is built into a specific total amount as discussed last day, for the special services funding that is going to be applied in these circumstances where an instance comes up that you have to expend some money; is it simply by regulation that you can expend it to that community where it is going to be used?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman. I think, if you remember when we went through the Budget, you will have noticed in the Budget a deficit, and I do remember one particular thing, for a transit deficit in Whitehorse. It seems to me it was \$190,000 or something. You will notice that we have to come here for that money.

Mr. Byblow: So this "Grants for Specific Purposes" does not come out of that initial fund for municipalities that we are talking about?

Mr. McWilliam: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. The municipal services grants, which are conditional funds, would be reflected through the department's budget. As the Minister has indicated, there are already some of those items appearing. They are like the transit deficit, the Dawson water and sewer deficit, et cetera.

Mr. Byblow: Okay, fair enough.

Clause 15 agreed to

On Clause 16

Mr. Byblow: Could I have an example of what may be considered an "extraordinary financial difficulty"?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I can think of one, Mr. Chairman. Say, in a small municipality, one of their major buildings burned down; probably a great portion of their local taxes were coming from that — or, say, a whole block of buildings. We would conceive of that situation's creating problems for that municipality, and that was one of the things that I would think would be an extraordinary circumstance. There are probably others, but that is one that I can think of right now.

Clause 16 agreed to

On Clause 17

Clause 17 agreed to

On Clause 18

Clause 18 agreed to

On Clause 19

Clause 19 agreed to

On Clause 20

Clause 20 agreed to

On Clause 21

Clause 21 agreed to

On Clause 22

Clause 22 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the title carried.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report Bill Number 19, *Municipal Finance Ordinance* without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Lattin that the Chairman do now report Bill Number 19 without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: I would like at this time to excuse the witness.

I refer the Committee to Bill Number 21, *An Ordinance to Amend the Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance*.

Bill Number 21: An Ordinance to Amend the Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance

On Clause 1

Mr. Veale: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if we might just deal with the White Paper as opposed to the bill itself, which really does not warrant too much discussion.

Mr. Chairman: The White Paper has not been referred to the Committee by the House, therefore the Committee is only obligated to study the clauses of the bill itself.

Mr. Penikett: On a point of order. With respect, Mr. Chairman, I think you are wrong. The White Paper is information in connection with the policy which is being legislated here, and I believe it would be entirely acceptable for the Minister to discuss the White Paper in the context of general debate under Clause 1. Therefore, with respect, sir, I submit that your ruling is incorrect.

Mr. Chairman: The ruling will be that if specific points of the White Paper are to be discussed by any Member of the House, it can be discussed, but the White Paper itself was not referred to the Committee so, therefore —

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that we begin to go through the clauses, and perhaps the Members of the House could ask me questions, referring to the White Paper as we go through it?

Mr. Chairman: I have already made the ruling, Mrs. McCall, that certain points on the White Paper can be referred to, but, at this point in time, there is general debate on Clause 1. Would you like to proceed?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, first of all, we are just going to add the pharmaceutical chemist's payment, so that the Health Care Insurance Plan can make payments. The money, I would like the House to understand, is quite separate, of course, from any premium payment. Monies will be added for the pharmacare program, particularly.

Mr. Veale: If I could, in general debate, seeing that the clause by clause will not produce very much, just ask a couple of questions of the Minister.

The reference has been made somewhere to a formulary; is a formulary a method by which the pharmaceutical chemist would be limited to a certain list of drugs, and is it a limitation that is designed to keep costs down?

If that is one of the purposes, I guess I question why it should be completely dispensed with, though I appreciate fully the flexibility that the Minister obviously wishes to put into the plan. My question is: is that something that is necessarily chipped in stone, and could not the Government be flexible,

perhaps, in establishing some guidelines?

If I could just deal with one other area that I think ties into this: there is going to be a negotiation with pharmacists, prior to the implementation of the plan, and it would seem to me that the Government should take some position on how that fee is going to be set, because it would be my submission that it should not have any relationship to the cost of the drug, but should rather be done on some other basis. I would just like to hear the Minister's response.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Now let me see. First of all the formulary: it is a comprehensive list of drugs that are accepted for payment by us, by a pharmacare measure. Now, many provinces have their own formulary. We could, in fact, adopt the formulary of another province. We would have to, sort of, buy it from another province, in fact, I believe. It is really not so much a cost control as a quality control, but we would go by the Health Protection Branch, the Food and Drug Act, so that as long as it was approved by that Act, relevant drug schedules issued by the Food and Drug Act would list drugs that we would use. We just found that formulary would require a whole committee to — it would be unnecessary administrative work as far as we are concerned, and unnecessary expense really. This is a fairly simple program and we think there is no need for a formulary.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, the Minister may wish to respond further to that, because the answer to the previous question was not complete. Yesterday I had a chance to ask the Minister informally about a problem that I am aware of in other pharmacare programs. I remember discussions with some of my partisan colleagues from the Province of Manitoba about their experiences there. They ran into a particular problem because the patents on drugs are in some cases extremely valuable. Sometimes there may be a new and very important drug of which the patent is held by one company, and the market is very restricted. That is not the case with a great number of other drugs. The generic drug, in many cases, is obtainable at very low cost, at very reasonable cost. However, for very good mercantile reasons, drug stores will often carry an expensive brand name, or they may have a relationship with a supplier which requires that they carry a very expensive brand name of the same drug. Where there is no difference in quality, what steps will the Minister be taking to ensure that, in those cases where the taxpayer is underwriting the cost of necessary drugs for senior citizens, it will be ensuring that it will be underwriting the cost of the generic drug, wherever possible, rather than the expensive brand-name alternative?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I did explain to the Member opposite yesterday, and I thank him for bringing it up. In every case it will be expected that the generic drug will be used. In the case where a doctor may specify a particular trade name, with permission, the pharmacist would consult with the doctor, and in every case it will be expected the generic drug will be used.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Minister for her answer, but I wonder if she could briefly explain, where she says the pharmacist will be "expected," could she indicate exactly how we will fulfill that expectation?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the negotiations that will take place when we come down to actually making the regulations, this will be a negotiated, written down, specified qualification for the pharmacist. I am not sure, but I think that in good pharmaceutical practice in the Yukon, a generic drug is expected to be used first of all.

Mr. Penikett: Just to finish the point, because it is not an inconsiderable one. As all Members will know you can buy acetylic acid at Super Valu for considerably less than you can buy the brand name Bayer Aspirin, when I would expect in most cases, the commodity, or the product, is indistinguishable except for the marking on the pill.

Mr. Veale: Just back to the question that the Minister did not answer, relating to the fees to be paid to the chemist. My question was how that was going to be based — whether it was going to be a fixed fee, a percentage fee, or what the nature of it

would be.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The retail price will be made up of the wholesale cost, freight, and I suppose the dispensing fee may be included in that, so the final cost, with all those accumulated costs, is the retail cost, and off that will be a negotiated percentage.

Mr. Veale: It seems to me that it is a mistake to follow that procedure — to have a negotiated percentage based on price — because where there is a choice between taking the generic drug and the brand name drug, why would the chemist not take the brand name drug, because then his payment is higher. It may be that he thinks it is justified in some fashion, but it seems to me the percentage route is not the route to take.

I also question whether the percentage is going to be added on to the transportation cost. I have great difficulty, if that is what the Minister said.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, no. The drugist's total cost is made up of all his costs to have the drug on his shelf. That is the retail cost. The negotiated percentage would be off the retail cost.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It seems that there is some kind of a credibility gap here.

Mr. Chairman, pharmacists are required to sell, at the present time, drugs, prescriptions, at retail cost. If the Honourable Member for Riverdale South walks in and buys a dozen pills, he is going to get a bill. It is going to be \$10.20. That is the retail cost of those drugs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that we should ask the pharmacists in Yukon to subsidize this program, any more than we ask the lawyers to subsidize legal aid. As a consequence, what we are suggesting is that this Government should be prepared to pay that retail cost for that specific prescription, less a negotiated discount. That negotiated discount is in recognition that: number one, the pharmacist only has to make one bill to this Government; number two, he is going to get paid for it, hopefully, within 30 days. That is a factor of doing business that I think that they should consider as being one that can be taken into account when billing this Government.

The other thing that I would like to express on behalf of the Minister of Health and Human Resources, Mr. Chairman, is we do not see this as a big deal at the moment. We are going to try and put this plan into effect with the least amount of regulation and in the quickest possible time. It is one of the reasons that the legislation is here this way.

Mr. Chairman, I think everyone should recognize that we are potentially dealing with about 1,000 beneficiaries under the plan, and we are dealing, in effect, with two drug stores, two pharmaceutical chemist outlets in the Territory — two firms. I do not believe that there are any more, at the best of times, than half a dozen pharmacists licensed to dispense drugs at any one time in the Yukon Territory. It is not a big deal in that sense.

I would also like to point out to Members that there is a piece of legislation called the *Pharmaceutical Chemist Ordinance* that is very very restrictive and very very strict, and which relies, to a large degree, on what is called good pharmaceutical practice.

These people, in order to stay in the business, must practise that all of the time. With respect to generic drugs, I think it is a true statement that, on the whole, generic drugs are used by all dispensers in Yukon. There are exceptions though, and if a doctor specifies in a prescription that a brand name must be used, and the pharmacist checks back, and the doctor for one reason or another says no, I want the patient to have that brand name, then it is necessary that it be done. The object of the exercise is to make these drugs available — whatever drugs are necessary for these people in this age bracket — the easiest possible way.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps we could just have it clarified. The Government is going to pay the retail price for these prescriptions, less a negotiated discount. I am not clear as to where

there is a percentage put in, as the Minister said, to each item. I am not sure how that fits in, if it is just the retail cost of the item as it is sold now.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There are no percentages put in, Mr. Chairman. There might be some confusion about what the Minister said. She said the retail cost is made up of the pharmaceutical chemists' cost to bring the drugs in, to land them on his shelf, and then he is going to mark them up, and part of that markup is in fact a dispensing fee. He must get paid for doing his work. The end result is the \$10.20, or whatever it might be, that you or I are going to have to pay for those drugs.

This is what we are going to go into negotiations with the pharmaceutical chemists about. We are going to suggest to them that this is a better way, a fairer way for them, and an easier way for everyone, than in fact going the route whereby we would have to establish some sort of an agreed upon price for every drug on the market. Mr. Chairman, I have done a little bit of looking into this, and I do know that in some of the provinces they do this now and these prices vary, province to province, a tremendous amount; because first, that price is agreed upon, and then on top of that they put another agreed upon figure which is called the dispensing fee. They are in negotiations continually and constantly and forever. I would like to think that the professionals involved in a plan like this are as concerned and as realistic about the plan as we in Government are.

They are not going to take advantage of it. They are going to make sure that they are dispensing these drugs in a fair and equitable manner to everyone involved, because, after all, they will always be subject to the regulations. If we have the power to make them — and we do have that power — they would always be subject to them, if we found that we had to do it.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I have just a very small point, but it arises from something the Government Leader said; it really refers to the *Pharmaceutical Chemist Ordinance* that you referred to. Because that may be important to the way in which this plan is administered, could the Government just briefly indicate to us how that ordinance is inspected? I must confess that I have never read it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is a case, Mr. Chairman, of the primary functions of the legislation being to licence pharmaceutical chemists. They must have certain qualifications in order to get the licence. It is inspected, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, primarily by the medical practitioners in the town who have to deal with the pharmaceutical chemists, and by the other pharmaceutical chemists in town. In other words, it is pretty well a self-inspecting piece of legislation.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, the reason for my question is obvious, of course. If there are only two or three practitioners, the method or the difficulty of establishing what is good pharmaceutical practice, or maintaining them from a public point of view might be very difficult. But if I am given to understand that the Government would act upon complaints of physicians in the case of the ordinance, then that would be somewhat reassuring.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, complaints that would be brought to the Government would be investigated.

Mr. Fleming: I have a little difference there. Although I agree totally with the bill and all the rest of it, however, in general discussion I still have the same problem I had with the Medicare, on charging \$18 for one, \$24 for two; and then in the Pioneer Grant I still have the same problem again, and I am coming to that same problem here. It is really, in my opinion, more or less a discriminating thing. I feel that it is. The program will include person 65 years of age and over, of course; that is very simple to understand, and the spouse is 60 years and over.

That is quite reasonable to understand, however, I do not know whether you are going to have a spouse who had a spouse before who was 20 years old, or one who was maybe over 65 and has passed away. This is where the problem lies with me.

Then you also have a person who is 60 years old, but because they did not have a spouse all their life, I feel they might be discriminated against in the Ordinance. I am wondering just how that worked, because that is the way it looked to me in the senior citizens grant, too. I would appreciate a little explanation from the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There is no discrimination, really. There is no more discrimination than than if the person is 59 or 22. You have to pick an arbitrary age. With respect to the spouse situation, what we are saying is that if a person is 65 years of age or over, he or she is entitled to pharmacare. I must impress upon the Honourable Member that it is pharmacare at no cost. There are no fees going to be charged to these people for this. There is no \$18 or \$25 or anything else; this is at no cost.

I recognize that the Member for Whitehorse West likes that very much, but the cost is going to be to the taxpayers of the Territory. We are going to pick up the costs. We do not know exactly what that cost is going to be, but if we can get the plan into place by the first of July, we are going to have a fairly good basis of experience for the budget next year, and we would very much like to be able to do that.

With respect to spouses, Mr. Chairman, if a person is 65 and their spouse is 60, then we feel that both of them should be entitled to pharmacare. Or, if a person is the spouse of a person over 65 who has died and is over 60, yes, they are entitled to pharmacare, no doubt about it. We intend it to be that way, but you have to have limits, and we have picked the two limits as 60 and 65, that is it.

You can pick any ages, but I respectfully suggest that they are all strictly arbitrary.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add something to that. The ages were chosen: 65 of course, and 60 and over, that is consistent with the existing Pioneer Utility Grant and those figures were arrived at because it seems that most spouses have that sort of age difference and there had to be a line drawn somewhere.

Also there is an age group of women, particularly, who are a very disadvantaged group, between 60 and 65, who do not have pension plans and so on — or 55 and 65. But it was given quite a lot of thought and this seemed to be a reasonable age group.

Mr. Fleming: With all respect, you are just missing my point. That is not my point; that is entirely away from my point. That is not the point at all. The actual point is the fact that because you are 65, I am going to put myself - I am always in the position of the person who happens to be one of these I am in there now - I cannot even vote for this, because really, I am in that position. I am not arguing that either and I would be a fool to do so. I am definitely ready to go along with this for the senior citizens.

However, I want to say this: I do not feel that I should be in that position if there is another person in the Yukon Territory who is 60 years old, and because they did not lose a spouse, or because they did not do this or they did not do that, that they are not eligible for this kind of thing. That is my point — not the other one. I do not think there is any difference between a person who has been married or whatever and there is of another person that has never been married but is 60 years old. That is my point — not the other thing we were talking about at all.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member has to face the facts: everybody, if they are lucky, get to be 65. He is at that lucky age now. We come back to that point again, Mr. Chairman. The spouse thing is a very very arbitrary thing, just like the age 65 is. It is just a number that we have picked because we think that that is a fair one. We cannot say anything else in defence of it.

We have not got any means test in this legislation. I think that is an unsavoury kind of legislation to have. Because the Honourable Member opposite feels that he can afford to buy his drugs, well, he is a beneficiary of the plan and will get them for nothing.

If we go to some sort of a means test and then extend the ages

downward, it will be a very very complicated situation.

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister. The Minister has indicated there is quite a discrepancy in the population statistics, in that there are 1,234 residents 65 years of age or over, apparently, in the Territory, and yet there are only 875 that are registered in the Health Care Insurance Plan. What conclusions does the Minister draw from that, in terms of whether or not the senior citizens of the Territory are receiving full health services? What is the conclusion that the Minister draws from that quite large discrepancy?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: It is something that puzzles us a certain amount, Mr. Chairman. We are looking forward to the 1981 census so that we may have some more reliable figures.

As far as whether the seniors in Yukon are receiving all the health benefits that they might receive, we know that the seniors in Yukon are less well off than seniors elsewhere, because we know that most of them receive the guaranteed income supplement; I think almost 90 percent of them as compared to 50 percent in the rest of Canada. Add to that the high cost of living. As far as we know, there is nobody that is falling through the crack, so to speak, as far as health benefits are concerned.

Mr. Veale: Just to follow that up, Mr. Chairman, is it possible that the registrations under the Health Care do not include spouses in the registration, or is it quite clear that both husband and wife would be included in those registrations?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, only one in a family; just one is registered, of course.

Mr. Penikett: I was listening to the debate begun by Mr. Fleming, and I began to think for a moment there that he was going to offer to buy drugs for some needy person, perhaps my research assistant or someone, but I hope he will not.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Hear, hear.

Mr. Penikett: The solution, of course, to the problem posed by Mr. Fleming, is to lower the general age of eligibility to 60, and perhaps Mr. Fleming may be so persuasive in the next few minutes that the Government will leap to endorse that idea, and we will have an even better program than we had when we started.

Clause 1 agreed to

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Clause 4 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Shall the title to the Bill carry?

Some Members: Agree.

Mr. Chairman: I declare title to the Bill carried.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Number 21 be move out of Committee without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Mrs. McCall that the Chairman do now report Bill Number 21, *An Ordinance to Amend the Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance*, without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it looks like we are coming to some kind of conclusion to this Sitting very shortly. Yesterday, since he is in the House, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs indicated he might be tabling some documents on health and safety this year during Committee stage and I wonder if he is prepared to do this at this time?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will go and get them right now. They are on my desk.

Mr. Chairman: There is one more bill to consider. It is Bill Number 22, and seeing as there are only two clauses in it and the Chairman is a little out of time, I would like to call a short recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to Order.
I refer Committee to Bill Number 22.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to formally give the information to the Member for Whitehorse West, who shall deemed to be present, and I trust that he reads it through very carefully. Perhaps we could have a very scintillating debate someday on the information I have provided.

Mr. Chairman: Going back to the Bill, it is Number 22, *An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance*.

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I heard a tremendous number of — I do not know if it was really debate, but philosophical talks — about this Bill at second reading, which were very interesting.

The real purpose of the bill, Mr. Chairman, is in fact to recognize and give effect to the recommendations of our Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges.

Mr. Byblow: Recognizing what the bill does, the discussions surrounding the structure of the committees, is a brief area I would like to pursue for a moment. Is the Government Leader prepared to elaborate, for the record, just what the anticipated plan is, with respect to the creation of those select committees, and whose responsibility it is and where we are in his mind headed?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought I made it clear, in relation to something the Leader of the Opposition was saying when the Speaker was in the Chair. It is not my place to determine how or when committees of this House will be established, but rather it is in fact the business of this House collectively. But, Mr. Chairman, I will say — because I think it will help to quell some of the fears of the Member opposite — we are governed by precedents. We have our own rules and if we do not have rules to cover specific things, then we are governed by the rules or the precedents of the House of Commons. Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to look at our rules. Our Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee is going to have to sit down and make recommendations to us on how these committees are going to be established. Precedence dictates that the membership on the committees normally has some relationship to the membership in the House. It is not our intention, in the present House, to suggest that anyone should be cut out from being a member of a committee because they happen to be in the Opposition; that is not what it is all about at all. I am sure that there is going to be ample opportunity for ample representation on both of these committees.

Mr. Fleming: I appreciate what the Government Leader has told us, and just to relate a little more on that, I feel of course that there was a mention of five on that committee. I think, myself, that possibly all of us here, including the Government, would probably be proposing some sort of situation when we sit again, as to how this might be done or as to how many there would be on it.

Possibly they might take a good look at that "five" and see that situation might not be so good; because of the numbers that might be on that side and because of the numbers on this side, maybe another figure would be better in some of those committees, so that everybody could be included in it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I recollect that one of the recommendations of the committee, in fact, was two select committees of five each. As the Honourable Member has said, it may be that when they get down to the actual serious consideration of the construction of these committees, five might not be a practical number.

In fact it could be something different, and, as a House, we have every flexibility. We have all of our options open. We can change that number to whatever we wish it to be.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate?

Mr. Byblow: Just on a matter of simple procedures and mechanics, it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges would have to be directed to come up with some series of recommendations to incorporate this changing format. At this point in time, they have not had that direction. Would it not require direction from the House to, in fact, come back to the House in the form of recommenda-

tions?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further general debate?

Clause 1(1) agreed to

On Clause 2(1)

Clause 2(1) agreed to

On Clause 3(1)

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that, as I was not a member of the Committee, I do not know this, but what is the actual total now received by a Cabinet Minister and by the Government Leader?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I have not totalled them up, but I am confident that the Honourable Member is just as capable of adding as I am, and he can also add up what the Leader of the Opposition gets as well.

Mr. Veale: It is a very sensitive issue.

Clause 3(1) agreed to

On Clause 4(1)

Clause 4(1) agreed to

On Clause 5(1)

Clause 5(1) agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Shall the title of the Bill carry?

Some Member: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the title of the Bill carried.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report Bill No.22, *An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance*, without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader that the Chairman do now report Bill No.22, *An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance*, without amendment. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

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

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Graham that the Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees

Mr. Njoodi: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 19, *Municipal Finance Ordinance*, Bill Number 21, *An Ordinance to Amend the Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance*, and Bill Number 22, *An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance*, and directed me to report the same without amendment and beg leave to sit again.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Bill Number 19: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 19, *Municipal Finance Ordinance*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 19 be now read a third time.

Mr. Veale: The only final comment I would wish to make on Bill Number 19 is the fact that the municipal grants and financing was to be tied to revenues. At least that was, I think, the perception that a lot of people had. It is now going to be tied to revenues and expenditures, and the lesser of, and my only feeling on that, Mr. Speaker, is I hope it works out, because the witness to the Committee indicated that it would be better in that fashion, going with the lesser of, than with one or the other.

I do hope that works out.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the bill?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 19 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 19 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill Number 19 has passed this House.

Bill Number 21: Third Reading

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 21, *An Ordinance to Amend the Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 21 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the bill?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 21 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 21 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill Number 21 has passed this House.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg the leave of the House to waive rules, to allow for the third reading and passage of Bill Number 22.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have unanimous consent?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Bill Number 22: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development that Bill Number 22, *An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 22 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 22 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 22 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I will declare that Bill Number 22 has passed this House.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that you now call Item Number 1, under Government Motions.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: Under Government Motions, Item 1, standing in the name of Mr. Pearson.

Motion Number 11

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until it appears to the satisfaction of the Speaker, after consultation with the Government Leader, that the public interest requires that the House shall meet;

that the Speaker give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it has been duly adjourned to that time; and that, if Mr. Speaker is unable to act, owing to illness or other causes, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for purposes of this order.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Now at this time, and prior to adjournment, on Wednesday March 25, as Members will recall, the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre rose on a point of personal privilege, to announce his intention to resign at the rising of this current sitting of this House. According to the stated wishes of the Honourable Member, I therefore declare that the Whitehorse South Centre seat is now vacant.

May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was tabled Wednesday, April 15, 1981:

81-4-21

Community Services Improvement Program, 1981-1985

The following Legislative Return was tabled Wednesday, April 15, 1981:

81-4-7

Watson Lake Sewage Treatment Lagoon (Oral, Page 128)