



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 19

4th Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Thursday, April 19, 1984 — 1:30 p.m.**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Bill Brewster, MLA, Kluane

## CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government House Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office (including Land Claims Secretariat and Intergovernmental Relations); Public Service Commission; and, Finance.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs; and, Economic Development.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources; Highways and Transportation; and, Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Hon. Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South	Minister responsible for Education; Tourism, Recreation and Culture
Hon. Clarke Ashley	Klondike	Minister responsible for Justice; Yukon Liquor Corporation; Yukon Housing Corporation; and, Workers' Compensation Board
Hon. Andy Philipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources; and, Government Services

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

### (Progressive Conservative)

Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow

## OPPOSITION MEMBERS

### (New Democratic Party)

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

### (Independent)

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

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

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

**Whitehorse, Yukon**  
**Thursday, April 19, 1984 - 1:30 p.m.**

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

*Prayers*

#### DAILY ROUTINE

**Mr. Speaker:** We will proceed at this time to daily routine. Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

#### TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have for tabling a response for Petitions 3, 4 and 5.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further documents for tabling?  
 Reports of committees?  
 Petitions?  
 Introduction of bills?

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill No. 9: First Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill No. 9, entitled *Financial Agreement Act, 1984*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that a bill, entitled *Financial Agreement Act, 1984*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

##### Bill No. 25: First Reading

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill No. 25, entitled *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1984-85 (No. 2)*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that a bill, entitled *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1984-85 (No. 2)*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

Are there any further bills?  
 Notices of motion for the production of papers?  
 Notices of motion?  
 Are there any statements by ministers?  
 This brings us to oral questions.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

##### Question re: Travel agency government business

**Mr. Penikett:** For a change, I have a question for the minister of government services. I would like to pursue a matter that first came to my attention a couple of months ago, and it concerns the possibility that a national chain travel agency namely, Bay Travel, would open up in this city. I would like to ask the government if it would be its policy, or if it is its policy, to continue sharing the travel agency business of the government among all the local travel agencies on an equal basis?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** I was not aware that there was another travel agency, or another area of Canada, moving into Yukon.

**Mr. Penikett:** Let me be precise to the minister. Is it the government's present policy to share the travel agency business among locally owned and operated travel agencies, or is it the government's policy to share the business among all travel agencies operating in the local market?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** The policy of the government would be the former; that it would share the business among travel agencies owned and operated in Yukon.

**Mr. Penikett:** With respect to the government's travel business, or who shares the government's travel business, some concern was expressed by travel agents a while back in this city of the

installation in this government of the Pegasus-type computer with a ticket printing capacity. Could the minister indicate if he has heard directly from any of the travel agencies and what assurances he has been able to provide them that this government will not be into writing airline tickets, itself?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** Since I have been involved in this portfolio, I have never heard any area of concern being expressed by a travel agent in the territory.

##### Question re: Cyprus Anvil ore haul

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is to the government leader. As the government leader is no doubt aware, Cyprus Anvil has called for tenders on its ore haul, by road, to either Skagway or Haines. Does the government leader have any new information respecting the road/rail option that is currently under study that would have prompted this move by Cyprus Anvil?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I do not. I was speaking to Mr. Forgues on the phone as late as last week. At that time, he confirmed that he would be in Whitehorse on April 25 to meet with me then. I have not heard anything further, other than, I assume, the same newscast, as the member for Faro has just heard.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am surprised that Mr. Forgues is not meeting with the government leader today. Did the government make a new submission to CTC since the interim report issued in December and, if so, did its position in support of rail change at all?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We made a further submission. I am not exactly sure of the date, and I do not believe that our position has changed in any way. The crux of the matter is that the CTC is to report to us; that is what it is all about. They are to make recommendations to this government.

**Mr. Byblow:** Does the government leader know how the American decision to chip-seal its side of the Skagway Road, budgeted, I believe, for this year, will affect the load limits for that road?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No.

##### Question re: Yukon Liquor Corporation

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the minister responsible for the liquor corporation and alcohol abuse in the territory: routinely and regularly, in some Whitehorse bars, there are underage drinkers with false identifications abusing alcohol. Has the minister considered a government policy to address this issue?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** First, I would like to set the record straight, again. I am not the minister responsible for alcohol abuse.

Now, there is a policy set by the board of directors of the Yukon Liquor Corporation that its inspectors do inspect that; the regulations set down are that that is not allowed. If somebody is breaking the law, it is up to the authorities to do something about it. The licensee can lose his licence over it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Has the minister reviewed the capability of the liquor corporation to police underage drinking in Whitehorse bars?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** As I stated, it is a policy of the corporation that the licensee is responsible for. If the liquor inspector comes in and finds it happening — or the RCMP, for that matter — that licensee can lose his licence. That should be enough policing in itself.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The minister is ultimately responsible. Has the minister reviewed the capability of the board, as it relates to its ability to police the bars? Has the minister reviewed the capability of the board to police this problem?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** As I have already stated, the board has the capability. It has the power to pull a licence. The person is out of business if he does not go along with what the act says and what the board regulations state.

##### Question re: Land claims

**Mr. Porter:** A question for the government leader: now that the Yukon land claims have moved a step closer to fruition, implementation of the settlement must be considered a priority with the negotiating parties. Have the negotiating bodies set up an implementation structure to put the eventual settlement in place?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We, as a government, have been working

for a number of months in respect to implementation. Of course, one of the things that we had to do, pursuant to one of the agreements that is signed, is identify costs of implementation. We are very actively working on that project at the present time.

There is still a way to go before we actually have the signing of the official ratification of the agreement in principle. There are still a number of the community bands that have to ratify. I am most anxious that that happen at the earliest possible date so that we can all get on with the implementation of the agreement-in-principle.

**Mr. Porter:** I understand that both the federal and territorial governments did, in fact, put in place this fall a bilateral process of subcommittees to review the issue of costs associated with the implementation of the settlement. Why did the governments exclude the CYI from participation in those subcommittees?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We did not.

**Mr. Porter:** The federal cabinet has now endorsed the agreement-in-principle and in doing so has granted the Yukon Indian people ownership of subsurface rights to the lands that were selected. In view of the fact that the lands selected were not selected for their subsurface potential, will this government support the CYI to negotiate for additional subsurface rights or a resource revenue sharing agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Certainly, that is negotiations in public, and we are not in any position to conduct negotiations in this House with respect to the CYI land claims settlement.

#### Question re: French language services

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I wish to correct an answer that I gave in *Hansard* yesterday, April 18, 1984, regarding french language services. The answer was given to a question by the hon. member for Faro. The hon. member asked: "I want to ask the minister now whether she has identified, or her department has identified, to the federal minister what additional funds may be needed to develop the french language education program in Yukon." My response was: "Yes, we have."

However, we have not, really. We are in the process of doing this. From the letter that the member had asked about previously — where the federal minister had given us a commitment to assist with funding — it was only to assist with the funding. It was not a commitment that there would be a lot of additional funding or any specific commitment as to what the funding would be for. The correspondence we are presently in the process of developing to send to the minister is correspondence that will get some more specific information as to the level of funding; whether there are any guarantees attached, for how long, and so on. We have always known that the federal government would give assistance for a french school, but we have never been given any guarantee or commitment as to how much assistance would be provided. So, we are presently in the process of doing those negotiations.

#### Question re: Legal aid services

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the Minister of Justice. During a public accounts committee public hearing the acting deputy minister for justice said at that time that the legal aid committee would have to look at the advisability or feasibility of combining legal aid services with the courtworker program. Can I ask the minister if the legal aid committee did consult with the native courtworkers' board of directors regarding this matter?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I have no idea. I will have to take the question on notice. It is not something I have been committed to.

**Mrs. Joe:** I had already asked the question previously. This is another question on notice. I would like to ask the minister then, if the final report from the legal aid committee does recommend that they combine the legal aid and courtworker program?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** That question I do not have to take on notice, mainly because I have already answered it. If the member opposite reads *Hansard* she will find the answer. What the answer is I might as well tell the House again, and perhaps the member opposite will listen this time.

<sup>107</sup> As I have stated, this study is for legislation purposes only. This committee reviewed our needs of the legislation. It did not discuss

courtworkers, and that sort of thing, whatsoever.

**Mrs. Joe:** Has the report been completed by the legal aid committee?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I have answered that question a number of times, as well: yes, the report has been completed. The legislation, at this moment, is sitting in Ottawa, mainly because of the fact that there is joint funding by both the federal government and ourselves.

#### Question re: Court reporting positions

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the same minister.

We all know that it has been announced that the government will be eliminating the three court reporting positions, presumably to save money, and the service is to be contracted out. When must be the reporters be out and the contractors in?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** That is being worked on right now.

**Mr. McDonald:** Can the minister say what has led the government to believe that the contracting out of this service will improve efficiency? Does it mean the government expects greater productivity from the contractor?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** A number of things have led to that: there was one court case, in particular, that showed that the service was not adequate. So, we have addressed that need, as I know the member for Whitehorse South Centre knows.

Also, we have a court reporting service in the Supreme Court that is privatized now and that is working very well, very efficiently. So, those are some of the reasons for doing it.

**Mr. McDonald:** Will the government institute a fair wage schedule into its contract to ensure that reduced costs anticipated by the government will not be affected through wage slashing?

#### Speaker's Ruling

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do believe that the hon. member is making a representation. Did the hon. member wish to rephrase that so it would be a question?

**Mr. McDonald:** I have made my point. I can ask again: will the government institute fair wage scale into the contract?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, I will have to rule that question out of order, as being the making of a representation.

#### Question re: House business

**Mr. Penikett:** I was waiting for my colleague to get his question in.

I have a question to the government House leader, concerning the House business, next week. I guess I could put the question directly: what is the House business next week?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** The business next week is that the Interim Supply bill will be dealt with, because it would appear, in view of the ability of members to speak on certain subjects, that we may be here for some time.

Secondly, as we know, today we are doing second reading on the budget. That puts *The Children's Act* and the budget into committee, but it would be our intention to proceed with *The Children's Act*, and, hopefully, get on with constructive debate in that area. It is unfortunate, but I understand the member opposite is going to miss a certain amount of the debate.

**Mr. Penikett:** With great regret, I might say.

<sup>108</sup> I want to also say that the *Interim Supply Bill*, I am sure, will not be necessary.

Could the government House leader indicate to the House, with respect to his intention about referring matters to Committee, which shall have priority, *The Children's Act* or the estimates?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Initially, *The Children's Act*.

**Mr. Penikett:** As a final question on House business, has the government House leader yet scheduled a day for the second reading debate on the *Employment Standards Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Not as yet. As per always my method of operating, I would inform the leader of the opposition ahead of time, in any case.

#### Question re: French language education program

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is to the Minister of Education and her attempt to clarify an apparent contradiction a moment ago, has

taken some impact away from my question.

However, I do want to draw attention to the minister's statement yesterday and clarify today that her department is identifying additional funds for the French language education program. Are these additional funds that the minister has identified for a grades K to nine French language program as requested by the Franco Yukonais Association?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It is difficult to explain it to the member because we, as a government, have not made the decision as to whether we are prepared to proceed with the program that has been requested by the Association Franco Yukonais. We are making a representation to the federal minister to get a more specific idea from him of exactly what the federal government is prepared to fund. I believe I gave some examples yesterday: if anglophone children are included in the French program, will the Secretary of State still fund that?

Say, in the long term, we wanted to build a building, would they fund that, and how long would the funding go on? Would they fund salaries? We are looking for more clarification and some commitments, as opposed to a reassurance that they are prepared to assist us.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister will agree that there has been some form of commitment.

On the subject of the proposed French language education program, has the minister accepted the estimated 67 students identified by the Franco Yukonais Association as an accurate number of potential French students who would attend such a program?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, we have. I believe I have indicated that to the member opposite when he questioned me regarding the homework that the association had done and if it was satisfactory. I said that it was satisfactory.

**Mr. Byblow:** Has the minister communicated her acceptance of these potential numbers identified by the association to the association?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I cannot remember if I have or not. I have not, in writing. The member is shaking his head. I may not have verbally. We will probably be meeting with them shortly, when we make the decision regarding the program; however, I could certainly extend to them that feeling on behalf of the government — if the member is indicating, to me, a representation on their behalf — if they have not had that extension made to them.

**Question re: Alcohol legislation**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the minister who refuses to acknowledge his responsibility for alcohol abuse: has the minister responsible for alcohol abuse legislation considered changing the legislation to add a policy concerning availability of liquor in Yukon's communities?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** *(Inaudible)*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the minister responsible for the liquor board and, therefore, responsible for alcohol abuse in the territory: has the minister considered the question of the desires of local communities in regulating the availability of liquor in their communities?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** I would like to address the questions of the member opposite, here, on hours of sale, which he has been asking lately.

This legislature set and established the hours of sale in 1971. Since that legislation was passed, bootlegging in Yukon has been curbed substantially. Maybe the member for Whitehorse South Centre would like to go back to the old days when bootleggers determined the price and availability of alcohol?

Regardless, the Department of Health and Human Resources recently had an alcohol worker in Fort Simpson, Northwest Territories, do a study on the results of alcohol restrictions being imposed in that community. Briefly, this is what the results were: the immediate effect within the first year was that incarceration rates and hospital admissions related to alcohol increased dramatically. Incarceration rates doubled, primarily due to increased bootlegging. Alcohol sale restrictions significantly changed the drinking pattern in the community and, within one year, despite restrictions, consumption was back to normal at pre-restriction

levels.

This particular alcohol worker said that, while restrictions still apply, the hoped for effects, i.e. the reduced levels of alcohol consumption, do not exist today. It was this individual's assessment that rationing and restrictions can only work effectively in remote, isolated communities, where there is neither road access nor frequent air access.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the minister responsible for bootlegging, then: has the government any policy on the availability of alcohol, as it relates to alcohol abuse, or does it simply accept the word of one individual in Fort Simpson, or the uninformed, self-interested view of the liquor corporation?

"

**Speaker's Ruling**

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. That question is completely out of order as being frivolous and argumentative.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** On a point of order.

It is my understanding that it is very clear in the rules that the members of this House should be addressed in such a manner as per their responsibilities. I submit that the member opposite is taking the rules of this House very lightly and bringing disrespect to all members of this House, including the Legislature as an organization.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid that however members address themselves to the House — and of course all members are expected to be very parliamentary in their remarks — it is up to each individual member what he chooses to do and it is only up to the Chair to attempt to assist members to be parliamentary in their debate, and, hopefully, morally so, as well.

**Question re: Elk hunt**

**Mr. Porter:** To the minister responsible for renewable resources: last fall, in conjunction with the fish and game association, the government announced that two successful lottery winners were going to be permitted to take two elk in Yukon. Due to weather conditions, that hunt was not successful. Is the hunt going to proceed this spring or next fall?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** It will be proceeding during the hunting season, and not at any other time.

**Mr. Porter:** Under the existing wildlife ordinance, specially protected wildlife includes elk. As well, in the regulatory section, the Commissioner in Executive Council may make regulation providing for the issuance of special guiding license to residents of the territory. When the minister allowed the elk hunt to proceed, did he issue a special guiding license?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, it is not necessary for the government to issue a special guiding license to itself.

**Question re: Yukon Advisory Council on women's issues**

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau. In April, 1982, the Yukon Advisory Council on Women's Issues was established by this government and never used. Can I ask the government if it is the intention of his department to activate this very important council?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** Not at this time, as I have said many times in this House.

**Mrs. Joe:** The Women's Bureau had a policy to appoint women in equal numbers with men wherever possible to territorial boards and commissions. Can I ask the minister when that policy changed?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** The Women's Bureau does not appoint any members to any boards, but we do a review of such things and we have been, and this Cabinet is, very cognizant of the fact of putting females on boards.

**Mrs. Joe:** Since the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau has not lived up to his responsibilities in that department, can I ask on behalf of Yukon women, who are concerned about women's issues if he will resign?

**Hon. Mr. Ashley:** No.

"

**Question re: Custodial workers**

**Mr. McDonald:** I was expecting a stock answer from the

minister, that he was pursuing it on an ongoing basis.

For the minister responsible for Government Services: it has been officially announced only recently that custodial services will be contracted by September 1 of this year and people are expected to be laid off. What exactly does the government anticipate saving by laying these people off and contracting the services out?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** In the interests of having private enterprise do any function that is possible to do for government, the custodial services in this building will be contracted out to private enterprise. I do not know what more needs to be said about it.

**Mr. McDonald:** The minister could start by providing an answer to my question.

There were suggestions that the government would make an effort to find alternative employment with government for these persons who will be laid off. To what extent will an effort be made? Where does the government anticipate these people will be going, and will they be bumping people from other jobs?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Obviously, the answer to the previous question is costs. The answer to the second question is: for any individual who is presently working for government as a permanent person, we will do everything in our power to find employment for them in other positions in government if they are available. They will be kept at the top of the list for any positions that become available in the ensuing year and will have preference on hiring in those positions at that time.

**Mr. McDonald:** For the record, I asked, firstly, how much?

I am not going to ask "will the government pursue it", I am going to ask: does the government plan to institute a fair wage schedule in the contract for janitorial services to ensure that wage slashing does not occur?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** When we contract to private enterprise, private enterprise then writes the contract with the individuals it hires.

#### Question re: Contract bonding requirements

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is also to the Minister of Government Services. It is similar, but on a slightly different subject. I had a complaint from a local contractor who had difficulty bidding against local outlets of national firms, because of the YTG bonding requirements which are much more easily met by a larger firm. Has the minister had any concerns of this nature brought to his attention recently?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Any local company that wants bonding should approach the local insurance companies. I have asked local insurance companies, and they have assured me that it is not impossible to get bonding, and if the person approaches them, bonding is available.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am sure the minister is sensitive to the cash requirement problem of small firms in bonding. Has the minister considered relaxing the cash performance bond requirements for smaller Yukon owned and operated companies that are bidding on YTG contracts?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Over the years, this has always been a concern with this government. In the time that we have been in office, we have changed a considerable number of the bonding requirements, primarily to meet local requirements.

I am confident that, if there is a local supplier who is running into a problem with respect to bonding, that person should make representation to the Minister of Government Services. As far as I know, there is just absolutely no reason for anyone to run into any kind of a road block, anymore, with respect to bonding. I am confident our regulations are such that virtually any supplier can meet them.

**Mr. Byblow:** I will relay the government leader's assurances to the contractor who raised the question.

To clarify what the government leader was saying, is he saying that the current government policy and regulations in no way discriminate against small Yukon-owned businesses bidding on contracts that require a cash performance bond to submit with their tender?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not know all of the details, anymore. I cannot remember them; I have not seen them for a long time. But I

do know one thing: they do not discriminate against local suppliers or contractors. In fact, just the opposite prevails.

#### Question re: Elk hunt

**Mr. Porter:** I have a question, again, to the Minister of Renewable Resources.

If the government did not issue a special guiding licence, with regard to the elk hunt, did the government, in fact, issue a special hunting permit to the two successful elk hunt lottery winners?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, a special permit was drawn by the government and we had a lottery for someone to win those two hunts. Actually, when it gets down to legalities, there is no requirement for a special permit: the government is doing it and the government is supervising it from one end to the other.

**Mr. Porter:** I find it difficult to understand why this government would designate species of game such as elk as specially protected wildlife and then allow the harvesting of such animals. Is it the policy of this government that specially protected wildlife can be hunted on a lottery basis?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member across the floor knows full well why we instituted the hunt. We need some biological information and we felt that, in conjunction with the Fish and Game Association, someone would be interested in hunting the elk and it could generate some revenue for the territory, and that is exactly what we have done.

We are shooting two elk in order to get us the biological information that is required. It is of benefit to the general public of the territory.

#### Question re: Government level of employment

**Mr. Porter:** I have a new question to the minister responsible for the public service, the government leader.

Why has the number of people this government employs increased from 1,400, in 1983-84, to 1,507, in 1984-85? Why is it, during these hard economic times, that the government has added 107 additional employees to its payroll?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, it is not 107; I believe it is 101. We have been explaining all year, at each session of the legislature, that we are trying to create employment in this territory. We are doing everything we can to create employment. We are trying to keep people at work; we are trying not to lay people off.

We announced, in the fall, a \$10 million spending program that necessitated the hiring of quite a number of people. Also, we announced, during the course of the year, that because of the regulations that we work under, and because of the legislation we work under — and, I might say, it was an issue that was raised by one of the members opposite and brought to our attention — a considerable number of those 101 people had been on our payroll for a long time as casual employees. We have a legal requirement to either pay those people off or give them permanent employment. We choose, with the approbation of this House, I might add, to give those people permanent employment.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to orders of the day, under government bills.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

##### Bill Number 12: Second Reading

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill Number 12, adjourned debate, Mr. Penikett.

**Mr. Penikett:** It is a great pleasure for me to join the budget debate and to reply to the budget speech from the government leader.

Last year, a Yukon government official told a CBC radio audience that Yukon had a leaky economy. That was a good enough description, I thought, at the time. It is true, no matter how much money is poured into the territory much of it seems to trickle down south in no time at all. Recently, as we all know, we have been losing resources and taxes and profits and wages like they were going out of style. We have been watching our economy drain away, a lot of it in the last couple of years.

However, to admit that we have a leaky economy does nothing in itself to suggest a solution. The only thing that occurred to me, when I heard the remark, were the words of the old song, "There's a hole in the bucket". You know the one, it begins, "There's a hole in the bucket, dear Liza, dear Liza," then the next line goes on: "Then fix it dear Henry, dear Henry, then fix it".

Well, imagine the people of Yukon in the role of Liza, with the leader of the government taking Henry's part. With some small editorial changes the round would continue like this: "With what should I fix it, dear people, dear people?" and the people would reply, "With jobs, dear leader, dear leader, with jobs".

The original version of the song says straw, but let the straw for a moment represent jobs. Those poets among us might ask if straw is an appropriate symbol or image for jobs. Well, you will remember that the three little pigs built a house of straw, but that did not last, did it? So let's see. We talk about drawing straws; we talk about a strawman — that is kind of weak argument often favoured by politicians — and then of course, there is the straw that broke the camel's back.

Perhaps, having given these examples, on second thought, maybe the straw should stand for make-work, rather than real jobs. If you buy that, then the leader can sing the next line of the song this way: "But there is too much make-work, dear people, dear people: there is too much make-work".

Now how would the people respond to a line like that. With resignation, I expect. Or, perhaps restraint is the right word. Restraint perhaps fits because they are only half listening to what goes on here at this point.

If they would have replied they would probably say: "Then cut it, cut it".

It is real jobs, you see, they want, not make-work; the kind of jobs you get with both Cyprus Anvil and White Pass back at work.  
<sup>14</sup> We do not seem to be getting a lot of action on that front at the moment.

The government leader, properly, might respond to that point, "How shall I cut it, dear people, dear people? How shall I cut it", he pleads. To make the make-work work, cuts in other programs may be required. Do people care if these program reductions are made with care? Well, I think they will scream if we hit the schools program or the health services. I think you will hear some screaming today and in the coming weeks about some of the cuts made in the programs announced in this budget, even though they are small ones.

When the people talk about cuts or they talk about cutbacks, I think they have something else in mind. They tend to see things in a much more dramatic way. I think the ordinary citizen tends to imagine things like cutting out Cabinet cars or aspirin or wine, because ordinary people who are hurting in these economic times tend to go around with a bit of blood in their eye. Anyway, the government leader can properly respond back to them, "How shall I cut it? How shall I cut it"? The people will quite likely respond, "With an ax, dear leader. With an ax".

Giving the government the chop sounds okay. Perhaps the members opposite have suggested something similar for other governments from time to time. But we know that our leader has been talking to his counterparts in Victoria and in Ottawa, and shortly, to his counterpart in Edmonton. Some of those people have tried to cut down government, but may I be permitted to say so; they cannot quite hack it.

The leader would then respond to the people with regard to these demands for cuts, "But the ax is too dull, dear people, dear people. The ax is too dull". Our leader would moan and complain about this, but the people, of course, would respond very quickly with the obvious, "Then sharpen it, dear leader, dear leader. Then sharpen it". The next line would go, "But the stone is too dry, dear people, dear people. The stone is too dry". The leader may be right about that.

Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it would be stretching things too much, for a moment, to let the stone represent our resources here in the territory. At the moment, they are, for the most part, just sitting there, in the ground and on the land. The ax, of course, could be a metaphor for all the tools and skills that we employ to convert raw

resources into commodities and to ship them to market. To state the obvious, if our skills and tools go rusty, if we are not sharp, or if we waste our resources, we are sunk. If the mine at Faro does not open, the railroad will die. If the railroad closes, the tourists will have another reason to stay away, and so on.

Naturally, we need money to lubricate the application of our skills to resources, so the old song continues with the people shouting, "Then wet it, dear leader, dear leader. Then wet it". But the leader is ready for them because he has heard this before. He will say, "With what shall I wet it, dear people, dear people? With what"? The people come right back with, "With water, dear leader, dear leader".

<sup>15</sup> Water, remember, is money, in this version of the song.

The hon. leader is then going to ask the next obvious question: "With what shall I fetch it, dear people, dear people, with what shall I fetch it?" It is a good question. He cannot go to investors for backing for an aluminum smelter, gas pipeline or a north coast port masquerading as a sandstone quarry, or to Ottawa for a grant or to the bank for a loan without an answer to this important question.

Every time we went to the well, before, for a handful of cash, it slipped right through our fingers. After all, it is a true statement about our history to say that big money comes north to make a killing, not to make a living like the rest of us. The developers are here, in the end, to create dividends, the banks have interest, and even the federal government grants with one hand and taxes with the other. What is more, the bigger the government, the more it taxes. Taxes, of course, pay for services. That is important to say. Also, as we know, taxes have a dampening effect on the economy.

Ours is a very small government and taxes that should be ours are siphoned off often, too often, to foreign and provincial capitals with the help of non-resident workers and businesses such as the ones who find themselves in Peachland or Miami, on December 31st, when the taxman calls the roll.

So, let us return to our symbolic song, for a second. When we left him, the leader was asking how we would carry out his duties: "With what shall I fetch the water," he wondered. "With a bucket", cheered the people, "with a bucket", and the leader replied, "there is a hole in the bucket, dear people, dear people, there is a hole in the bucket".

And so there is. Yukon does have a leaky economy. The Yukon economy is bleeding and we must find ways to close the wounds, to plug the holes, to stop the leaks, to reduce the drain on the territory to a dribble. Do not get me wrong. I do not object to sharing our good fortune with other Canadians. If our cup were overflowing, I would be the first to suggest that we come to the aid of our sister jurisdictions. I would be inclined to be more than generous.

But our cup is not overflowing. Our situation is not good, not even relative to the rest of the country. If we look at our history, for a second, there are some alarming facts about the history of this territory, which is very colourful and very valuable — in fact, in a tourist sense, we can be said to be not only living off our natural bounty, but also living off our past — but, in an economic sense, it is true to say that, after less than 100 years of settlement, we already have more ghost towns than living communities in this territory. When we have operating mines, what do we get out of them? The ore goes to Tokyo, the profits to Toronto, the taxes to Ottawa and most of the jobs, at least at the outset, to people from the south.

What we get left with is the hole in the ground, which, if the federal government will give us permission, we may be allowed to use as a garbage dump.

<sup>16</sup> We are at the point now where we have to make damn sure that we get a lot more out of the Yukon economy than the proverbial hole in the bucket. Members opposite, and I think, some members on this side, have argued in the past that provincial status is the answer to all the problems of resource development, that I have described. I do not think so. I do not think that is a complete answer, because political sovereignty would be relatively meaningless without the will to achieve economic sovereignty as well. Even if we were a province tomorrow, almost all the economic levers for this region are in the hands of outsiders. It is Dome, Federal Industries, Falconbridge, the federal government and the banks that

have their hands on the pump handle of the Yukon economy.

Now, that is the reality that we have to deal with. There are some people who argue that because there is very little we can do about the local economy here, we should not even bother trying. I disagree with that approach, and in fairness, I believe that members opposite would disagree with that approach. I believe that within the limits of the *Constitution* we could do more. Within the limits of the *Constitution* we have adopted some tentative local hire policies. But local hire is not enough. Without a well-planned, long-term career training program beginning in the early grades of our school system, we shall continue to educate our kids for export while we import all our experts.

We have a local purchase policy. It is sometimes a very costly scheme. But does it work? Does buying aluminum siding from local suppliers at a higher price than it might be available to us from someplace else do very much for our economy? It helps the local merchant's margin, but if we are going to be consistent about making arguments like that, then we must be clear and understand that that is the same argument for keeping services in house, rather than contracting them out.

To turn to the question of local suppliers, would it not make as much sense, or more, to have a local materials policy as well? That way, I believe, we would create many more local jobs; use more local resources; and stimulate more local industry. This is something that we have tentatively talked about, but I believe there are enormous possibilities here. Some of them have been suggested by the mayor of this town. There are possibilities here which beg exploration.

For a start, why could we not put more local materials into public works? The historic zone bylaw in Dawson has inspired a small renaissance in local building in that town. I think it has done a lot for that economy. It has created local sawmills and local contractors, and has done something for the economy and the character of that community, which I think is quite exciting. I think this government made a good start with the log construction of the Old Crow school, but for a while that idea seemed to go up in smoke when that building burned down.

<sup>17</sup> The new Alaska Highway Interpretation Centre at Watson Lake, which I asked the minister about the other day, was another thing which concerned me, because when I heard it had been designed to use rough spruce and we ended up using something else, I was concerned. I do not know what the problem is there, yet, and the minister has promised to tell me, but it may be that what we need is our own Yukon building code of some kind, if it is the Canadian standards or some other standards that are preventing us from using local materials in cases like this.

What I am saying is that as a purely practical strategy at this point, given our current situation, I believe that rather than chasing dreams, we should be making much better use of what we have. I believe we need a Yukon investment strategy. I believe we need a local capital policy, if you like. I believe that if the public is going to be asked to share the risks of new developments, it is appropriate that it should share in the rewards, if they pay off.

With the settlement of native land claims, joint ventures may become the fashion in the north and I strongly suggest that the Yukon government should create, not the Heritage Fund proposed by the government leader a while back, but an economic development corporation to assume equity in projects where large public investments have been called for in the form of roads, schools, health, recreation or municipal services.

Furthermore, we should arrange for some of the funds that are at this government's disposal, if we can get our hands on such things as pension funds in the next coming while, to be invested at home. I do not think there would be any disagreement about that, but I think there is some urgency about it now. Even funds that we have argued about before, such as the Workers' Compensation Fund can, I understand, within the existing Canadian law, be used, for example, to guarantee municipal bonds. That could be done locally.

Simply, I think we need more local control over our economy; not just control by local business interests, but a voice for workers, consumers and the community as well. We need an economic strategy, or plan, to give effect to these voices. I think we have

already waited too long for government action on such a plan. Nevertheless, if such a plan is to be viable, it should represent the best that the collective imagination of Yukoners can offer.

That is why I proposed, the other day, the formation of the Economic Advisory Council to this House. I think this body could play a useful role, along with the economic planning agencies within the government, in preparing the draft of such a strategy, and I would hope that it would be a strategy of recovery and that it would be widely debated, widely understood and widely supported in this community.

The budget before us is only a one-year plan, and that is what we are required to prepare every year. But, clearly, the timeframe of that plan is not enough when we are dealing with the magnitude of the economic problems that confront us. These times demand greater foresight and a broader vision than that.

<sup>18</sup> However, inasmuch as it describes this administration's plans for the next few months, I want to now add a few words about its particulars.

I was interested, yesterday, to hear the statement about the size of the increase in this budget, as compared with last year's, but I understand that if you compare the forecasted actual spending for this past year with that budgeted for next year, the increase is more in the neighbourhood of three percent than the figure I hear bandied around yesterday. The government leader said to us, today, that this government was trying to create employment; yesterday, he announced lay-offs and privatization. There is nothing in that strategy that will create any benefits, in terms of employment, and it will quite likely do the reverse.

I was thinking, today, that I might ask rhetorically, in the debate, for some documentation of the savings that would be achieved by this policy. Then, I decided I would not do that when I heard the Minister of Government Services say that the reasons for doing this were not the savings, but that they were ideological; in other words, that the government wanted to turn over services to the private sector, wherever possible, in which case, I would assume that this is just the first of many such steps to come and I expect that we will be debating such moves at great length.

There were other cuts. Some cuts — and I am not sure of the extent of them — in the budget year, were with respect to legal aid and a number of other programs. Taxes were up marginally. I am curious about the amount of money that is committed for tourism development and tourism marketing and I look forward to asking questions about that.

I think, in economic terms, that this is not a stimulative budget: it is largely a neutral budget. I think its effect on the economy of the territory will be neutral. Notwithstanding some of the internal changes within the budget and some administrative changes that will be affected by this budget, I do not believe that its effect on the territory will be profound. I do not believe that it will achieve the economic recovery that we would all desire to see.

I say this — not in a partisan way, or, I hope, in an offensive way — but I really do believe the need for us to start to talk about economics and economic planning for this government and for the community, on a much longer horizon, on a much longer term than the one your budget is urging. I would hope, if I may close by making that representation, that it is an idea that will be treated with great seriousness, on all sides of the House.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I was intrigued with the opening remarks of the leader of the opposition. I almost sang, myself, a number of refrains from the old song, "Home on the Range". In fact, it almost brought tears to my eyes, when I heard the member opposite attempt to burst into song. I hate to say it, but, as an observation from one member to the other, he has a voice like mine, so I would suggest he not try to join the choir.

<sup>19</sup> There are a couple of points that I think have to be highlighted in respect to the budget that we have before us. I think it is important, not only for members here, but also for the media to take very seriously the list of comparisons of the territorial and provincial tax rates as they affect the general public in Yukon, as opposed to the other provinces.

I notice the member opposite never made any comment in respect



to the budget that we brought down, and the fact that we are able to bring forward a budget which not only carries through for the forthcoming year the programs that have been instituted, whether it be last year or previous years, but also some new initiatives in a number of the departments.

I think it is important that the general public recognize that one of the major principles in the construction of this budget by the minister of finance, who expressed it very well yesterday, was to bring forward a budget that was not going to put further major taxation on the people of this territory. Recognizing that depending on where you are in respect to the general economy of the territory is concerned, is that if we can leave the dollars for the people to spend directly as opposed to governments spending on their behalf, it is a much more constructive manner as opposed to taxing for taxes' sake.

I think it is important when you take a look at this list on page 28, of the operation and maintenance budget address of 1984-85, if you discount Alberta, which I think we all agree is in a different situation than any other part of the country, that our taxes, as far as basic income tax, is one of the lowest in the country. You can compare 45 percent in Yukon to as much as 60 percent in Newfoundland. If you take a look at our gasoline tax, and you discount Alberta once again, you have Yukon and 4.2 cents per litre, and in the province of Quebec you have 30 cents per litre. When you go through and compare the taxes that are levied by this House in comparison to the other jurisdictions of this country, I believe that we have been very responsible in respect to taxation policy as far as our people are concerned.

I think the point that has to be made and has to be expounded on as far as the budget is concerned and the transfer of payments from the Government of Canada, is that we have been fortunate in respect to establishing the Yukon office there for the perspective of negotiating transfer payments to this government.

<sup>20</sup> The side opposite was very skeptical, as they referred to the "Yukon Embassy". I think some members of the public asked, "What are you establishing an office in Ottawa for"? The point is that it was obvious to us that, in comparison to all other jurisdictions in Canada, we were not receiving the same dollars as the provinces for the programs that we were administering.

I think that when you examine this budget, you will see that we were successful in bringing forward the argument that this is part of Canada, and there is no reason to treat us any differently than any other part of the country. I think it is safe to say that we were successful with respect to the dollars we have received from the Government of Canada.

I should point out that I think the members opposite are almost taking the tact that we are the exception in the country. We are not an exception. We did not get any more dollars than any other jurisdiction for the programs that we were delivering. I just want to assure the member opposite that the Government of Canada has not used us as a special example. All we have done is make sure that, as a jurisdiction of this country, we get equal treatment.

I think it is important to realize that the budget before us will not only provide us the opportunity to take some economic initiatives in some areas, it has also continued to provide the base for the social programs that we have in place and are presently being delivered. I think that is an important perspective and I am sure the member for Whitehorse South Centre will stand up and commend this government for being able to continue those services during what the leader of the opposition has called a difficult period in our territory's economy.

I think that where we part company, philosophically, is when the member opposite talks about government doing everything. When we talk about economic development, I think the leader of the opposition was up-front when he said that it is an area where we need more responsibility. I do not argue that. I believe in that very, very strongly, in view of the fact that the Government of Canada does have that mandate presently.

I think it is easy for this House to be critical of the Government of Canada from that perspective, but, to play devil's advocate, if I was in its position and I was in charge of the economy of Ottawa and lived in Whitehorse, I do not think I would stay awake too many

nights worrying about it.

In looking at the areas where we could become more involved in as a government, I think we share that general principle, but I think where we philosophically part company, as I stated earlier, is who is going to be the actual implementer and, perhaps, in many cases, the initiator?

<sup>21</sup> I believe it should be people in the private sector and not government wherever possible. I think it is important, when looking into the future, that when we do have major possibilities of economic development in the territory, all sides of this House look at all aspects of it. Where there can be consensus, I think consensus should be found, because of our situation where the authority lies with the Government of Canada and the actual decision-making is with the Government of Canada and not this House.

In just one that I think about, the question of the Beaufort Sea and the possible development, as you know, the opposite side did not support it; this side did. I think that the result of that was the fact that, with that division represented in this House, the Government of Canada could say — which they did — we will do what we want. I see the member for Whitehorse South Centre shaking his head. Well, I think he should take my words very seriously because that is fact. I find it difficult for us to talk about jobs and various opportunities while, at the same time, there are possibilities of development and we are divided on the principle of whether or not they should be considered for the purposes of proceeding.

I think it has been too long since we looked at economic development from the point of view of either it proceeds or it does not proceed, as opposed to looking at it positively, and saying it should proceed but under what circumstances it should proceed. Incidentally, that just does not apply only in Yukon, I think it applies all across this country, in the confrontational politics that have evolved over the course of the last two decades.

I was surprised at the leader of the opposition. I think it is safe to say, from his comments on the budget — as limited as they were — that he recognizes that, overall for the times, it is a good budget to meet the needs in the forthcoming year. I think it is safe to say that it is our intention to be doing more consultation, primarily with industry, for the purpose of looking at what else can be initiated as far as the territory is concerned and create those jobs that not only will be jobs but jobs that are going to create wealth for the individual and for the country.

In conclusion, I hope that we get some cooperation in this area from the Government of Canada. It is essential, in many areas. I think it is safe to say that all members of this House would agree that the present amendment to the *Yukon Act* really is not a priority for members of this House: there are other pressing issues. Whether it applies to the Water Board, the question of the placer miners, the question of Cyprus Anvil or the question of the CTC, it is, in good part, going to be the Government of Canada's responsibility in some manner or another.

<sup>22</sup> All I can say is that we are prepared to work with those organizations in the Government of Canada, constructively, to try and resolve those problems and meet them with solutions. I hope the side opposite cooperates, as well, because I think it is in the best interests of the people of the territory that they do.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am not going to propose any tunes, this afternoon, nor am I going to carry a bucket, even though, according to my father, I would need one for the other, anyway.

In fact, I am going to begin by complimenting the budget address. It was a beautifully crafted document. In glowing terms, it cited national statistics about falling inflation, food prices and energy, as if these were also taking place in Yukon. The budget address, much like the Throne Speech, suggested, somehow, that the struggling mine operations at Elsa and Faro were the initiatives of this government. By reference in the budget address to skyrocketing building permits, this government somehow suggests that it has precipitated a building boom. Throughout the address, statements are made about increasing expenditure and various programs and initiatives, justifying the alleged 13 percent increase in expenditure from last year.

Now, if one were to believe all that about the budget address, one

would also have to believe that this government is doing a masterful job in maintaining services and prompting economy initiatives and creating jobs. However, the reality is quite the opposite.

We know just how much prompting this government needed to become involved in Cyprus Anvil, albeit with a million dollar package. We know how much participation it had in Elsa: it put the boots to that community. The building permits that are skyrocketing are the Whitehorse dam; we know that.

The reality, as the leader of the opposition has stated, is that it is not a 13 percent budget; it is, in fact, more about a three to a three-and-a-half percent budget. Last year — that is the fiscal year that just finished — we spent \$143 million and the supps that we passed, about two weeks ago confirm that. Today, we are proposing to spend \$148 million. That constitutes, in my calculations, about three-and-a-half to three-and-three-quarters percent — pushing it — of an increase.

I submit that this government, to have found a 13 percent increase, used an estimate figure of a year ago and called it the increase. Of course, they will say to us, as the Minister of Economic Development insists, that they are keeping up with inflation, that they are stimulating the economy, that we look good in comparison to the rest of the country and they are creating jobs.

I said I would not sing, nor play a violin like some members opposite, but I am reminded of a quartet told to me once. It goes something like: "What is good politics is bad economics, what is bad politics is good economics; what is good economics is bad politics, and what is bad economics is good politics."

The budget address was good politics. The budget itself is bad economics. When you combine the two, you have bad politics and bad economics. You cannot get any worse than that. The bottom line of this government's politics and its economics is expressed, I believe, in the prosaic line from the budget address: "It will be the private sector which will stabilize the economy and provide the impetus for economic rebound. It will also be the private sector which will savour the fruits of a strong and growing economy." That is really poetic. I suggest that the speech writer should be given a compliment.

We agree the private sector is important; in fact, it is critical to a strong economy, but it will not function in the vacuum of government initiative, in the vacuum of government policy, and a vacuum of leadership.

The minister says that he believes that government should not do anything about the economy, and that we do. He is correct. We differ in more than our philosophies. We believe that government's have a role in the economy. The minister talks about our objection to Beaufort development. He could not be further away from the reality and the truth of the matter. We spoke to Gulf. It did not like Kiewit's proposal, either, especially since there was not even a market for the rock. I think this government has really missed the boat in its economic policy.

The Minister of Economic Development chuckles. We have the mayor or Whitehorse providing the kind of leadership that should be precipitating from this government. We have said for years that we have to have local development, that we should encourage it, that we should stimulate our local economy, that we should be initiating local resources, and that includes people, to invest locally, to train locally and stay locally.

The leader of the opposition expounded on that, and I will not go into it in any detail. It seems to me that the mayor of Whitehorse is promoting the kind of thing that we should really be having in our economy.

I know, the minister will say that he was only directed, a couple of weeks ago, to set up a kind of council that would address those questions. But I say to him: where has he been since the economic conference called by the government leader in July, 1982?

I suggested yesterday that I might know what he has been doing, but I will not rub any salt into that. I want a ride to Watson Lake.

I also know that the government will say that there is a 24 percent increase in the Department of Economic Development. The 24 percent increase in economic development is supposed to reflect this government's initiatives and sense of importance about the economy, but I want to ask just what that 24 percent reflects. It is

mostly in energy programs, and we know, for the most part, those energy programs are federally recoverable. That is fine. A bit of it is in ERPU, and it seems there is a little more research going on. That is fine.

We see that project money in economic development is actually down. I would have thought, given the gravity of our economic situation now, that we would see more project money, more organizational money in the form of seed money and some clear message that this government is doing something more about the economy.

The Throne Speech says that there is \$82,000 to deliver a five component business development package. I remember the debate in last fall's capital budget about the half million dollar business development line item. The minister, at the time, said that he could not be sure that they would get the program. You will recall the history of that line item goes back some seven or eight years to another line item in the budget of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. It has to do with a funding package or funding agency to businesses for funding of a last resort.

Again, I will not go into any detail about how we have been attempting to get that money. We have heard about this business development program from this government every year since 1979, and we have yet to see some money materialize. I think we have passed at least three different acts to deliver the money over that time; but no money. Also, I guess I want to ask rhetorically: when are we going to stop deluding ourselves that this government has any kind of serious intentions about delivering a small business development program?

Oh, I nearly forgot. In the Department of Tourism, there is another half million dollar incentive program, again for small business and, again, a half million dollars from the capital budget of last fall. Here I suspect that the money will materialize, but it will materialize under provisions of federal cost-sharing and it was also identified in the capital budget. I suspect that when it actually materializes, we will have another grand announcement of new money.

So, I guess, I have some difficulty understanding what initiatives this government is really taking. What is it really doing to promote small business? What is it really doing to promote tourism? What is it really doing to promote the economy of our territory today?

I looked at the tourism budget and I saw marketing and development down by 33 and 30 percent, respectively. That, to me, does not constitute any major initiative. Sure, there is an interesting line item going along with it, called, I believe, "Community Industry", or, perhaps, "Industry Community". It is \$120,000. I suspect that, really, what is taking place there is, under the terms of the *Financial Administration Act*, this government is collecting, on behalf of the YVA, their normally collectable advertising money and plunking it into their budget. The result we have is a four percent reduction, overall, in tourism, even with the extra \$120,000, but we will clear that up in committee.

So, I do not see any major increase in the tourism budget, either. So, where are these initiatives? We call this the number one industry; it gets, almost, a number one cut.

The principle of economics demonstrated in this budget is hard to define. In fact, it is, in my opinion, something of a mystery. I would say that this budget has no principle of economics and, at best, it has poor economics, perhaps obscure economics, doctored up in fancy language. I think it is something of a juggling act, because it is cleverly deceptive.

Yes, we have service cuts, at the same time. We have, I note, some ambulance service cuts; I believe the leader of the opposition mentioned legal aid. I believe there is what appears to be cuts to the Women's Centre and who knows what else we will find when we go through the committee stage of the bill.

What is new and stimulating in this budget, especially in economic development, or in tourism? We have some modest tax hikes and the Minister of Economic Development argues that we have some of the lowest taxes in the country. I think he forgets that we do not have the same level of services. He forgets that the majority of our funding comes from Ottawa. He forgets that we have one of the highest unemployment rates in the territory.

I might call to his attention that the only province with a New Democratic government, that of Manitoba, has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country today, and so did Saskatchewan, when it was under the government of New Democrats. It is not anymore; it does not any longer have the lowest unemployment rate.

26 **Hon. Mr. Lang:** That is because everyone left.

**Mr. Byblow:** I wonder who would have chased the people of Saskatchewan out of their province; just who would have done that?

We have some encouraging signs in education, it would appear, and I will have a lot of questions to the minister about the programs and the initiatives in that department. I am sure that my colleagues will have many questions and many comments on various departments that I have not mentioned. As we get into committee stage, the specific issues and more refined principles, I am sure, will be debated at some length.

Before I sit down, however, I am compelled to say a few words on the janitorial cut, because I really fail to see how this government is expecting to save money by its proposed layoff. Even if it does, by some miraculous contractual arrangements, I ask: is it worth it? I say this very seriously. I spoke to over half of those janitors who were being laid off, because they are in this building. The reactions I got make this government's actions quite pathetic.

One of them said to me, "This is the thanks that I get for years of service". Another said to me, "What do I do know? I have a mortgage to meet". Another said, "I guess I have to go to welfare. I have two kids and my wife is not working". Another said, "How can we trust this government?" Another told me about how this government, over the years, has made it very difficult in this department, disallowing the joining to a union, eliminating shift differentials, cutbacks; and now the layoff.

The hypocrisy of it all, after yesterday's announcement that they have no job because this government is saving money, the government has the audacity to find the required overtime funds to direct these janitors to either work late tonight or tomorrow, to clean the place up, because there is an important visitor. This is sad; this is nearly tragic. Who, really, on that basis, wants to trust this government? Who is really prepared to believe what they are saying?

27 **Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I will have to cool off a little bit from the last member.

The leader of the opposition led off with his little tune and then he followed into speaking about make-work projects and what this government should be doing to create permanent jobs. I remember very vividly, during the last election campaign, when the leader of the opposition was standing up in front of everyone in this territory and saying that the government should be creating make-work projects. One of his number one lines in the last election was make-work projects.

We spent \$10,000,000 last year in make-work projects. We tried to slant those projects so that they were constructive projects. In fact, they were all constructive projects; projects that we would ordinarily do over a period of years, we concentrated into last fall and during the winter in order to provide work for the people of this territory. I am very surprised to hear the leader of the opposition condemning us somewhat for the fact that we made those jobs available for the people of the territory.

Another one of his statements, said on more than one occasion in this territory and out of this territory, regarding projects such as mines in this territory, is that what we end up with is a hole in the ground. He also went on to speak about political responsibility; that perhaps political responsibility may not be the end all and be all for this territory. Let's just take a few of the projects in this territory that did not go ahead because we did not have political responsibility. Let's take one that was raised by the member for Faro, Stokes Point. If it had been up to this government, and this government had the responsibility for our resources and for our environmental protection, and for a great many other things in this territory, Stokes Point would have gone ahead. Regardless of whether Gulf Oil wanted to use rock or not, Peter Kiewit was embarking on a multi-million dollar expansion project in this territory. Regardless

of whether it sold one pound of rock, we would have benefited from the money they would have expended on the North Slope of the territory.

He also raised the question of ideological layoffs; that the reason that we are contemplating laying the people off from this government is ideology. It is not a case of ideology; it is a case of economics. It is more beneficial for the people of this territory to lay those people off. I have heard the members from across the floor last fall ask why we did not lay some people off, why do we not do this, why do we not do that. When we do it, we are criticized for it.

28 I am sure the Minister of Government Services will talk more about the layoffs, but I would just like to comment about some of the remarks made about those members not having union membership. They do have union membership; they have been protected by the union. They have had more than a year's notice that we were considering layoffs and contracting out the janitorial services in this building. They have had in excess of a year. In fact, it was signed in the last union agreement that we would not lay them off for a year.

To say now that they did not have notice is absolute garbage. He says that they have no jobs. The Minister of Government Services said during Question Period that we were trying to protect their jobs, that we would try to provide jobs for them in other areas of the government, and we would try to ensure that some of them went to work for whomever was contracting. We are trying to protect their jobs. We do not want to see anyone go without a job. The economics of it all are that it is much cheaper for us to contract that service out. We can have the same level of service for less money.

The leader of the opposition also talks about long term planning. Let us do some long term planning for our budgets. I would like to go back to political development in this territory, and long term planning. If any member across the floor can tell us how to plan for years ahead, when we do not have the levers of government that are necessary in order to make those long term plans stick, I would like to know from their party how they are going to do it.

We could have planned for the pipeline to go through the territory if we had had more political responsibility. We could have planned and allowed the placer mining industry to operate instead of being potentially shut down by the federal government, which is another area of responsibility that we do not have.

We could have planned for energy development in this territory, if we had had the responsibility for water and environment. We do not have it. We do not even have the land in this territory. How are we supposed to be planning future development? We can say, "Yes, we would like to see the mines going in the Mac Pass. We would like to see this happen and that happen". We do not have the ultimate responsibility for making those decisions.

We might as well face the fact: until we have more political development, and until we have more control of our resources in the territory, we will never be able to make those planning decisions.

I would also like to go on to the member for Faro saying that this budget is only a three percent increase over last year. He says that we spent \$143,000,000 last year, and we budgeted \$148,000,000 for this year.

29 Last year, we budgeted \$131 million and we injected into that another \$12 million, in order to raise it to the \$143 million. We also have, in the bank, right now, over \$4 million that is budgeted for supplementaries and extra work and, if he adds that on to the \$148 million, he comes up with \$152 million. When that is spent, that is a nine percent increase, at the very minimum. That is a nine percent increase just to spend what we have prepared for supplementaries now.

If we are fortunate enough to convince the federal government that they are not treating us as we rightly should be, because we are still not getting the level of funding from the federal government that a province would get in the same situation, and if we can convince them that our funding should be equal to the provinces, we will have more money and, perhaps, we will make more than that 12 or 13 percent increase, this year.

I know the job of the opposition members is to criticize the government and constructive criticism would be beneficial to us.

There are things that, certainly, we could, perhaps, garner from them that would be beneficial to the territory. We do not hear any of those suggestions, we do not hear any constructive criticism. We hear criticism just for the sake of criticism.

Now, if the member for Faro or the opposition leader or any other one of the members from across the floor would give us some constructive criticism, we would probably act on it and spend some of the money that we have sitting in the bank for the benefit of the people of the territory.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I listened with interest to the budget speech and I went home and I wrote a response. I wrote for most of the night, but it was a long, boring speech. I have never given a long, boring speech and I do not want to get that reputation, so I threw it away. In any event, there is not much to say about the economic initiatives of the government. The sole achievement of the Minister of Economic Development is to make Don Branigan look good.

I would like to talk about the social policy, or the people policy, of the government. In the last couple of months, there was a news article about this government's social policy and welfare policy. The government probably did not read it because it was in a national anti-poverty association magazine, but it criticized the attitude of the establishment in Yukon for bus-ticket welfare; bus-ticket social policy.

I want to say, in just a few moments, that our leader has spoken about a leaky economy, in economic terms.

I wish to talk about a leaky social policy, the people policy of the territorial government. The people are our best resource, and ultimately, our only real resource. In the last couple of years, we have lost a lot of people. The population has declined.

There is an attitude here that the longer you have been here, the greater your social status. You acquire social status through longevity. It would be more constructive if we welcomed and supported the people who have not been here a generation or so. We need them, and us, to build our economy.

I was speaking to a person approximately two hours ago who has been unemployed for 18 months. He is eager to work. He is about to lose his home. He has already lost his family, and he is thinking of pulling up stakes and moving out. Too many Yukoners are in that situation. It is for those people that we need to seriously adapt our social policy, our people policy, to keep people here in order to keep the economy and the territory strong.

Thank you.

*Applause*

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** I am speechless. It will take me a moment to collect my thoughts. In anticipation of a long boring speech, I also stayed up most of the night writing a speech.

I anticipated that there would be some comment regarding the fact that little mention was made of the Department of Health and Human Resources in the budget speech last evening. This should not be misconstrued as a reduction in the level of importance with which our government views the programs delivered by this department. Rather, it should be seen as an indication of the satisfaction of the range of programs and the level of funding of these programs at present.

I would like to point out that the increases in the amounts budgeted for the programs of the Department of Health and Human Resources amount to 13 percent, overall. I would like to briefly outline a few of the initiatives that have resulted in this increase.

Mention has been made, in the last few days of debate, for the need of training for social workers. I am pleased to indicate that a social worker training officer position is included in the budget for this department.

I would also like to point out that in response to questions concerning alcohol abuse programs, that former contract community alcohol worker positions have, in the past year, been converted to permanent person years. This is, in part, responsible for an increase in salaries in this program area.

Other changes include a five percent increase in the rates for the special foster homes. The level of funding for social assistance has remained constant, reflecting a decreased demand on this program as a result of the improving economic climate, in part.

This budget reflects a significant increase in the vocational rehabilitation services area as well.

Another area of substantial increase in funding has been the grant to the Yukon Women's Transition Home, that amount having more than doubled what this government made available to the transition home society last year.

The amount budgeted for the daycare subsidy has as well, increased, reflecting an increase in the monthly maximum payment per child for full time daycare attendance.

Increases in the amounts budgeted for the Yukon Hospital Insurance Plan and the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan are based upon anticipated increases in utilization projected on the basis of the 1983-84 utilization of services.

Overall, I will keep my remarks brief today. I am pleased to note the position occupied in the overall government budget by the Department of Health and Human Resources. It has probably not escaped notice that this department's budget is the largest of any department in the government and should be taken as an indication of the importance we place on providing such services to the Yukon public.

There may, no doubt, be those who claim that what we are doing in this area is not enough. There will always be those who make such claims. However, for the size of the population in the territory and the expanse of the territory, I am confident that services that we provide in the Department of Health and Human Resources compare favourably with services provided for a similar size population elsewhere in Canada.

In answer to a problem that was raised just moments ago by the member for Whitehorse South Centre, of the gentleman, the Yukon resident, who has been unemployed for the past 18 months, the Department of Human Resources would be happy to speak to the gentleman. If he has been making an effort to find employment in the past 18 months, and is a Yukon resident, I am sure that he would get the full benefits of social assistance that are available through the Department of Human Resources.

In the area of government services, the layoffs that have been spoken of earlier should really come as no surprise to anyone. It has been talked about, I know, for at least three years. I know that in the contract it was written in that there would be no action in this regard for at least one year so that the employees that are being spoken of here are aware that there was thought of privatization in this area. Privatization is certainly not strictly an ideological move. There have been efforts made to find out what the difference between the job being done by government and the job being done by private industry would save. We do know that it costs \$350,000 presently to do this job. We have fairly good knowledge that a considerable saving would be realized by this government and ultimately the people and taxpayers of Yukon by this move. There was never a remark made in this announcement that these people were finished and done with, and no one was interested any longer in them.

Their jobs will remain until September. Any individual who is working in that department who is a permanent employee now will have every opportunity to fill any position that should come open that they are able to fill; and this government will make every effort to try to place the individuals affected either in other jobs in government or in the private sector with the individuals who contract the service out.

The deputy Minister of Government Services called the people who will be affected together, yesterday, and explained at great length the reasons for this move. He indicated to them, at that time, his willingness to help them, in any way possible, to find other employment. Anyone who is not able to find employment before September with this government will be placed on a list and for any employment that becomes available in the next year or longer these people will be the first people hired by this government to fill those positions, if they can fill them.

I would like to conclude on a more positive note on the Department of Health and Human Resources and say that I may sound like I am self-congratulatory to commend the Minister of Finance for having brought forward this budget, but I would like to do so, anyway. I believe this budget is a clear indication that we

take our fiscal responsibilities seriously and attempt to abide within it, while providing an adequate level of service to all Yukoners.

**Mr. McDonald:** I would like to begin by apologizing to both House leaders because I did not give notice that I would speak. I did, however, warn the opposition House leader that certain trigger words would bring me to my feet in an instant. One trigger word was Beaufort jobs, which I have heard a number of times and which was enough to warrant an immediate rising; the issue of layoffs, which we will have to delve into more deeply, obviously, in general discussion.

I, luckily, did not hear anything from the government ministers taking credit for the reopening of the United Keno Hill Mines, which was good. I did not hear anything about agriculture, which is bad; one of my favourite subjects, of course, is agriculture. The government talks about expanding the base of economy and that we should be prompting these industries to keep money in the communities, and for people to have greater ties to the land, et cetera. There was no mention whatsoever of that industry. So, we are going to have to delve into that more deeply in general discussion.

<sup>33</sup> The Minister of Economic Development made great hay of the government's magnificent initiative to leave dollars in the pockets of people for people, themselves, to spend. At the same time, within minutes, we start talking about laying off ten people. Those same ten people work for this government; those same ten people clean up after us. They are janitorial persons.

We hear that, after this artificial problem has been created, the government will do everything it can to try to protect their jobs. According to the Minister of Renewable Resources, they do not want to see anybody go without a job, so we have to try to reconcile those statements with actions that defy the imagination.

The Minister of Renewable Resources said these people knew a year ago that they could be laid off, and that they had, in some way, been given notice. Well, I think we should give the minister notice that notice that they will not be laid off for a year is not notice that they will be laid off in a year. I think the people who work in those positions should realize the value of their union, which has managed to protect them from this kind of arbitrary action by the government.

The Minister of Government Services has said this is not an ideological move; that they will save money. He is not sure, according to answers in Question Period, how much money it will be saving, but we can assume, from his answers in Question Period, that the money will be saved as a result of wage cuts, so these people who clean up our garbage every day are going to be told that in order for the government to save a little money, we are going to cut their wages or we are going to encourage private contractors to cut their wages. That is the whole intention behind this initiative. We make some grandiose statements about what we are prepared to do. We are willing to help these people in any way we can. Those are really empty words, after laying the people off.

We promise them that, where there are other jobs in government, or where other jobs come open in the next year, or perhaps longer, these people will be getting a break. We might be able to hire them if they are qualified. I am not sure how many janitorial services jobs come open in this government, but given the fact that there are 2,100 people registered with UIC right now, I would imagine that there are not very many jobs that come open because people cannot afford to leave their jobs. We have to recognize, at the same time, that these 10 people are going to be put out there to make the number of people registered with UIC rise from 2,100 to 2,110.

<sup>34</sup> Quite clearly, we are talking about saving money at their expense and we are far from leaving dollars in people's pockets for them to spend. The Minister of Economic Development said that we parted philosophically on that point, and we sure do.

The minister made the point that, where he differed from the members of the opposition, he believed that government should not have to do everything and the members on this side of the House believe that government should do everything. Besides being a gross simplification of his own political philosophy, it is entirely untrue. What the minister proceeds to do is to dredge up the issue of

megaprojects as being partly their initiative and partly private sector initiative.

I do not think there is an oil company in this country that would be in Beaufort now if it were not for Government of Canada help. That is a public initiative. These people, these daydream merchants over there, continue to dredge up projects such as Beaufort Sea and when initiatives such as those that are promoted by the Mayor of Whitehorse — which are real initiatives that deal with what we really can do, which are small in comparison to the big megabucks — the minister has some sort of personality problem with getting together with this mayor, to try to cooperate.

The Minister of Economic Development has to re-evaluate what he feels their responsibilities really are. You are going to have to recognize that he cannot always take direction from the opposition to begin initiatives such as economic advisory councils. He is going to have to take some of these others over or he will get burned.

The Minister of Economic Development says that we should be looking at discussing with industry our future possibilities. I assume he means business junkets to Calgary or something where the minister acts as figurehead and buys people drinks. What he is saying is that the government is still getting ready to get started in order to prepare to possibly do something. It seems that we are way off from actual action here.

Finally, he ends his speech by saying that he is prepared and is willing to work with the Government of Canada in a cooperative manner, which would be a massive change from current government policy. I am happy to hear it. Certainly, in my sphere of responsibility, that of agriculture, I am sure that that will be welcome news for farmers who feel that the Government of Yukon is not receiving land because of the bad relations between this government and the federal government.

<sup>35</sup> I would like to refer briefly to the Minister of Renewable Resources' comments. I say "briefly", because there is not a great deal to respond to. The minister, again, brought up the Kiewit and Beaufort Sea jobs. I believe it was he, or perhaps the Minister of Economic Development, who said that the opposition voted against Beaufort jobs. At the same time, the Minister of Economic Development says that Beaufort jobs are a great private sector initiative. Well, we all know that it is not a private sector initiative at all. It is a Government of Canada initiative.

The Minister of Renewable Resources says that we should do everything we can to benefit from Kiewit, even if they do not sell a pound of rock. That makes great economic sense, when the people of Canada are paying for Kiewit.

We did not vote against Beaufort jobs; we voted against the government's handling of that issue, which did not guarantee jobs, which did not guarantee any sort of business opportunities and did not even discuss resource revenue sharing. That is for the record.

The Minister of Renewable Resources also mentioned the issue of placer mining. I believe he was responding to the leader of the opposition's statement that we should be considering long term planning, which, for the minister's edification, long term planning would require, of course, a cooperative relationship with the federal government. That goes without question.

The minister said that the Government of Yukon could have planned for the placer industry before it was potentially shut down. That is a nonsensical statement, but nevertheless, what he was referring to was that had the Government of Yukon tackled the problem, it could have solved all those very complex problems itself, which include environmental problems and a variety of things. The Minister of Economic Development, who claims to have knowledge on a great many subjects, should know that the placer mining issue is extremely complex. There is good reason to believe that the Government of Yukon would not have been able to, even as expeditiously, handle the placer mining problem, as did the federal government. There is nothing to suggest it could have.

I do not have to worry about coming down too hard on the government, because I do not have to worry about taking part in the Watson Lake airborne junket.

We will be more involved with details in general debate, and I would love to have the opportunity for an informal give and take with the various ministers when we come to general discussion in

committee.

<sup>36</sup> **Mrs. Joe:** I also had no intention of making a speech at this point in time, however, after looking over the budget and finding out some of the things that I have seen this afternoon, I have to make a couple of comments, especially in regard to the Women's Bureau. We have been waiting for the minister of justice to make a speech and tell us all the great things that were happening in his department, however, he has not. I can see why. The Women's Bureau has an increase of \$1,000. Throughout this session I have continued to ask the minister questions in regard to the Women's Bureau pertaining to what priority the Women's Bureau was in his department. I now have the answer. It is low.

In light of the debate that we had yesterday, and in light of the concerns that the women of Yukon have, I want to go on record as saying that the women of Yukon will have to go through the same problems that they have in the last few years for another year. At this point in time, we are very disappointed.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I, like the member for Mayo, had no intention of speaking and did not tell the House leaders that I was going to but, after he spoke I felt that I had to. I feel that I have to correct the record, now that he put some things on it.

It must be understood by everyone that these 10 people who may be laid off because we are going to contract out this particular aspect of our work; and I say "may be" fairly advisedly, as we have, until the first of September, and we do have contrary to the notions left by the member for Mayo, we do have a lot of turnover during the course of the year. There are a lot of jobs in this government that those people are very highly qualified for. I know of one already who I am quite confident will be getting a job in a different sector because of the priority. That is in less than 24 hours. We have a lot of hours left before those people would be terminated. It must also be emphasized that not only does this preference prevail until the first of September, it prevails for 12 months after that. That is done by policy. That is part of our policy. These people have been told.

I do not know who the member for Faro might have been talking to, but I do know that representatives of this government spoke to those people yesterday afternoon as a courtesy. We are not required to give them notice until we are going to terminate them, or within three months of termination.

<sup>37</sup> As a courtesy, they were spoken to yesterday afternoon. They were told everything that we could possibly tell them. I was advised that each and every one of those people understands and knows full well what we are doing. They know why we are doing it.

I reported in that budget speech last night, that the cost of those 10 people is \$350,000. I do not know what the bid price of the contract is going to be, but we have put out feelers. We have done some research and we do know that it will be considerably less than that. It is impossible for me to say how much less, because according to our rules and regulations, it must go out to public tender. That is what will happen. It will go to public tender and then we will be able to tell the House exactly what it will cost.

I said last night to the media that, to some degree, yes, this is an experiment. It cannot be a surprise to anyone, and certainly not to the members opposite. They have known about it for a long, long time. I guess there is definitely a real philosophical difference between this side of the House and the other.

There is no denying that our concept of government and what government should do seems to be entirely different from that of the side opposite. If the member for Mayo is telling me now that the reason that they voted against Stoke's Point and Peter Kiewit was because these projects were going to be controlled by the Government of Canada, I simply do not buy it. That is not the reason that they voted against it. They voted against it because they were against employment in the territory. They must have been.

Now, we identified two initiatives. We wanted the approbation and we needed the support of every member in this House in order to push the federal government as hard as we possibly could to go with those two projects. That support was denied by the members opposite. They will never be able to live that down. That is a fact of

life. We came into this House humbly seeking that support, thinking that we were going to get it. It was denied us. I believe that that negative vote from that side of the House cost us both of those projects.

I am not misleading the House, I truly believe it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please, let's keep our remarks to the Chair.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I just want to reiterate that this budget does represent a 12.8 increase in spending over last year. That is a fact of life. You can play with numbers. Any number of accountants or any number of people who play with numbers can tell you whatever you want to hear.

<sup>38</sup> We have these numbers down here, and they are factual. I think it is a good budget. I think the majority of the people in the territory will think it is a good budget, as well, because it is supportive of private enterprise, it is supportive of labour and it is supportive of everyone in this territory.

If we just get a break or two during the course of this year, we should be well on the road to recovery again in this territory.

Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. government leader having twice spoken has closed debate.

*Motion agreed to*

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair*

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

I suppose it would be wishful thinking on the part of the chairman that everyone in this House wrote long speeches last night and threw them all away before they came to Committee of the Whole. I thought so.

We shall recess until 4:05, at which time we will come back and go on with Bill No. 19, *The Children's Act*.

*Recess*

<sup>39</sup> **Mr. Chairman:** I will now call the Committee of the Whole to order. We are now on Bill No. 19, *The Children's Act*. And still at general debate.

### **Bill 19: *The Children's Act* — continued**

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** Somewhere yesterday, towards the conclusion of our debate, I told the member for Mayo that I would be back with a better indication of how the section would apply, that he was speaking of earlier. On first glance at reading the information that I put in *Hansard* yesterday, it appears that I was very close to being accurate in my assessment of how the courts would view that particular item. I am still continuing to work on the issue. I still would assure the member for Mayo that when I do get a complete breakdown that I will bring it to him.

**Mr. McDonald:** I wonder if the minister could just elaborate on what he means by continuing to work. Is the minister collecting more information to substantiate a claim that the act does not need to be amended, or that the act already accounts positively for the problem that I mentioned a constituent had brought to me?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** The way I explained it at the end of debate yesterday, was indeed correct. What I mean by getting further knowledge to him, is when we have the time. We are extremely busy trying to compile information. When we do have the moment to get it together, I will have the facts written down in front of me and then I will substantiate, with those facts, what I



have already said.

<sup>40</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** I wish to introduce a new issue, or a new topic and it is about the bill, but especially about the process that we are following now. It strikes me that it might be very constructive and it might be very useful to spend a little bit of time, but not a lot of time, in discussing what procedure would be most constructive for next week.

The position, on our side, has pretty clearly been that there are major differences of policy or principle that we wish to debate and come to some sort of accommodation over, or, at least, communication over, before we go into clause-by-clause debate. The position, on the government side, has fairly clearly been, if I understand it correctly, and I believe I do, that the debate has gone on for long enough and if we go into clause-by-clause debate that may be more constructive.

I think it is useful, for two reasons, to review that now. First of all, because there is going to be a four-day weekend, obviously, and we all know that some people work during those breaks to prepare for the coming events, it may be useful to review what could be done constructively in the next little while, and maybe identify an issue that can probably not be addressed constructively and is, therefore, probably a waste of time.

<sup>41</sup> I would beg your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to consider for a short time, but not a long time, something like a review of major differences in policy in order to identify what might be fruitful discussions either over the weekend or in the near future. In going through the bill from start to finish, I have identified some areas that appear to be very controversial and that are debated at some length.

I would identify, first of all, the principle in clause 2. I would ask the minister this: it appears to me to be that the public statements in support of the best interests of the family are pretty consistent on both sides of the debate. What we are both saying is that it is important that the bill promote the best interests of families.

<sup>42</sup> The particular principle that I have identified as what I believe to be inconsistent with that principle is the wording in clause 2. The principle that I have stated, that we favour, is that the bill should state that the paramount interests are the interests of the family. We do recognize that, in the case of conflicts, where the rights or wishes of a parent conflict with the rights or interest of a child within a family, that the child's interests ought to be protected and weighted, in fact, more heavily than those of the parents. After the debate and consideration of the last week or so, is there room for a rewording, in order to accommodate the issue of the family there?

**Hon. Mr. Philippsen:** In this issue, *The Children's Act* states that the best interest of a child shall prevail.

<sup>43</sup> In matters arising under this act, I believe, it is the philosophical belief from members on this side of the floor that *The Children's Act* deals with children. We believe that if the child is placed in a position where this act comes into force, then the child who is placed in that position would have to have his best interests prevail. It is not inconsistent, though, with our policy and our philosophy that if it is in the best interest in the child to remain with his family, that is what we would like to see done.

It is not, however, inconceivable to me that there may come a point in time when it is not in the best interest of a child to remain with his family. If this section was reworded, to state otherwise than how it is stated now, we may find that we come to a point in time when it is not in the best interest of the child to remain with the family and we are placed in a position where we have stated in a piece of legislation that we must place the child with the family. I do not believe, if we examine all the facts, and if we examine what has gone in the past, and we think about what could happen in the future, that we would be able to change the wording of this section when you realize that it may not always be in the best interests of the child to remain in his family.

<sup>44</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** I will simply make a comment about wording, perhaps by way of notice. It, indeed, is a principle and a matter for generality, but extended debate is properly done under clause-by-clause debate. The minister — and I wrote it down — talked about the best interests of the child. Really, we have no disagreement with that, but if we read clause 2 carefully, it does not say, "best

interests of the child". It says "the interests of the child affected shall be of paramount consideration". The interests of the child is a different concept than the best interests of the child. The phrase, "best interests of the child" is a time-honoured, legal phrase in the child welfare area, but the word "best" is not in there. I would ask for a consideration of that in the days ahead.

In my view, it is appropriate, and there is substantial agreement that the best interests of the child should prevail. We do not argue with that phrase. Indeed, I believe that is the law now, and that that phrase would better accommodate the existing substantive law.

Another suggestion that I make about the principle in the most constructive way that I can think of is perhaps an idea or a principle concerning a presumption about the best interests of the child being in the child's family, or staying in the child's family; not as a requirement, or anything like that, but lawyers are familiar with presumptions. If it were stated that it should be presumed in the first instance that a child is better off with the family, and a later statement made about the paramountcy of the interests of the child over the interests of the parents to be resolved in the best interests of the child, we could probably come to an agreement about that. I would ask the minister to consider those kinds of ideas by way of principle.

<sup>45</sup> Another issue — going on — is in clause 3, where it talks about the laws of equity. The minister has stated that the principle in 3 does not really change the existing law. I really question that and I would ask for further consideration.

I want to make, I suppose, two statements. The first one is: if it does not change existing law, why do we not leave it out and go with the existing law? It does not add anything, in terms of the understanding of laypeople, I do not think, because it is confusing on its face, concerning subclause 1 and subclause 2, and the laws of equity are really not commonly understood, in any event. If it is the policy of the government to not change existing law, why not leave it out.

If there is a compelling reason to put it in, I would question the inclusion of "or any other act", because that appears to me to be very wide-reaching. That kind of issue might quite properly be raised in clause-by-clause debate, but I raise it, I hope, in a constructive spirit by way of notice.

I would like to go on — out of order, on the page numbers — to a debate that we had about inherent jurisdiction of the court. The minister commented he would get back to us about inherent jurisdiction. Is it better to postpone this discussion, or continue it now?

**Hon. Mr. Philippsen:** I thought, the other day, that I had answered, in part, my understanding of inherent jurisdiction. Obviously, if my answer, at that time, was not sufficient, I would then have to ask for the indulgence of the member for Whitehorse South Centre to allow me the opportunity to get more knowledge on the subject. I would ask that time to check that out.

On the area of equity, as the member for Whitehorse South Centre states, section 3(1) is existing law in Yukon and it is in paragraph 10(1)(k) of the *Judicature Act*. I will certainly discuss this matter and, if there is a way of reaching a comparable solution to it, I would be quite happy to do it; I am happy to. If, in fact, the people from whom I get advise instruct me otherwise, I will bring that back and we can debate that particular issue until we reach a resolution that we all can understand.

<sup>46</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** It may be useful to mention, for just a moment, at this stage that I had a discussion this morning, in fact, with a group of four other lawyers. We talked about that particular issue and the resolution in the group was that it was a common opinion that the jurisdiction to take away the inherent jurisdiction of the court did not lie with the legislature at all, and they put the case more forcefully than I did in the previous debate. They indicated that it would clearly be a matter for appeals and eventually *Charter* arguments. I raise that because it may be of assistance.<sup>49</sup> I would ask the minister, perhaps, a hypothetical question, but in a constructive spirit, and I will only ask one: would it be government policy, or can you say now — if you do not wish to, please take the question as notice — that if advice was received that this section was clearly questionable on constitutional grounds, would it be the

policy of the government to try to maintain the policy position in the bill and weather through the constitutional challenge, or would it be the position of government to try to avoid the constitutional challenge by being safe and perhaps either putting the jurisdiction for permanent wardships into the Supreme Court, or allowing an inherent jurisdiction in the territorial court for permanent wardships only, in light of the comments of Mr. Justice Cavanagh?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I have tried to find out a little bit about inherent jurisdiction and what Mr. Cavanagh has said in his report. I understand that what Mr. Cavanagh was saying in his report, in that instance, was related very specifically to the situation as it now is in Alberta. That being said, I would not wish to place anything in legislation that we knew, if it became a constitutional issue, would be unconstitutional; therefore, if we had overwhelming evidence that an area of this piece of legislation was unconstitutional, there is no doubt in my mind that we would seriously consider changing the wording or whatever is necessary to ensure that what we have in our legislation is constitutional.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Mr. Justice Cavanagh was speaking about child advocates, or legal representation of a child, in the specific section where he mentions the inherent jurisdiction. Indeed, clause 183 relates to the clauses about the official guardian and child advocates.

I would ask, on the question of a child advocate, if the position arose that a judge ordered a child advocate and the legal aid committee or the official guardian was of the opinion that the child was wrong, what would be the best way to resolve that without appeals and constitutional arguments? Could there be an accommodation for that potential problem?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Yes. On the issue of the child advocate, in reference to what the local media has reported, it seems to me that they were suggesting that what we were doing here was removing a right that existed, presently. I think I would like to correct the record, at this time, to say that, at the present time, a child advocate and separate representation for a child is not in any welfare act or anything that I have been able to find.

The issue of separate representation for a child, as I see it at the present time, would be that the official guardian, who is not a member or a part of the Department of Health and Human Resources and who functions, although for government, as a different arm of government, would take the request before the legal aid board. The legal aid board would then determine, with the recommendations of the official guardian, whether separate representation would, in fact be necessary if the judge and the court had approached the official guardian and said, "There is a problem here and separate representation is needed".

I think that by going through those steps we would ensure that there would neither be an abuse of the system, nor would there be a time when a person could not have the opportunity, at any time, to avail himself of legal aid.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to make three comments about that and then leave it, unless the minister is interested in answering my comments.

First of all, it is absolutely accurate to say that it is not in any act that there is a right to a child advocate. Except in what may have been an extremely rare case in the long-term past, child advocates are a modern development in the law. It is probably fair to say that the use of child advocates is experimental and the exact role of a child advocate is a matter of some question, in the legal community.

It is also accurate to say that both the territorial court and the Supreme Court have said, in written judgments on the public record, that, for matters involving a permanent wardship application, there should be a child advocate, as a matter of course.

<sup>47</sup> This bill would be a substantial change in that principle.

I say to the minister, perfectly honestly, that, as an individual, my mind is not made up on this issue, and I am not immediately convinced that, as a matter of policy, the judgments of the courts here need be followed by us. Frankly, Mr. Justice Cavanagh's comments appear, to me, to be more immediately sensible. I make that comment in the spirit of trying to reach an accommodation.

In the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, in criminal cases and in

cases involving confinement of a person which, arguably, wardship involves, there is a guaranteed right to representation and that involves the legal aid question. There is, indeed, substantial law in the United States on the question, but very little in Canada.

There is an apparent contradiction or confusion, because there is a constitutional guarantee of representation that nobody would seriously argue, for a long time, that child welfare matters are not included in those things.

On the other hand, there is a very legitimate concern on behalf of the government concerning expense and the duplication of services, which we are extremely reasonable and open about on this issue. There is an important principle concerning who represents the child in wardship proceedings, because it is frequently the case that the director, or the lawyer for the director, says, "We represent the child". The parents say, "We represent the best interests of the child. That is why we are here". The court is confused and the court, occasionally, appoints a lawyer to represent the child and sometimes the child advocate's position is the same as the director's and sometimes it is not; it is a different position.

The point of that description is that it is occasionally the case that it is apparent that the child's interest may not be exactly the same as the director's interest. The director may have other interests, for example, considering budgets, or whatever, but it frequently gets even more complex.

<sup>48</sup> The point is that the case does arise where separate representation of the child is in the best interests of the child. It is not necessarily a common occurrence. The courts are saying, it is our inherent jurisdiction to appoint a lawyer for the child in those circumstances. Mr. Justice Cavanagh clearly says that. The argument is made that the official guardian is not in a position to identify those cases as well as is the court. I would make those comments and ask if there is a response.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Once again, for the record, I am not a lawyer, but I am going to try.

It seems to me that if what we were dealing with here was a criminal matter, then the *Charter* would apply and we would not have a problem. What we are dealing with here is a civil matter. It would seem to me, as a layman, that the person who would be looking after the best interests of the child would in fact be the judge. It would seem to me that if we had separate representation for each child, in each case — and I know that is not what the member for Whitehorse South Centre is asking for, but hypothetically it could come to that — then the judge would not be doing what a judge is there to do. It would seem to me, and I believe, that the door is open for particularly bad cases where it is in the best interests of the child to have separate representation, that the avenue is open for the child to get that representation.

It seems to me that the way it is written now allows for that very set of circumstances to follow through in this piece of legislation. So saying, it does not shut my mind to the possibility that discussion on this may not strengthen my feeling on this and also I believe, the feeling of the member for Whitehorse South Centre. In making it easier to understand, if separate representation becomes necessary, there are no roadblocks to that separate representation through the official guardian and through the legal aid board.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I will go on to the next point after making a simple statement. I believe the expression of principle that the minister stated is the same principle that we would support here in opposition. The argument would probably be constructively directed at how best to word the law than to guarantee the case where separate representation is necessary, and I would say that the judge is the person best able to identify that.

<sup>49</sup> The roadblocks, if you will, are nil or an absolute minimum.

A very thorny and emotional issue has been the definition of a child and the rights of a fetus. The minister pointed out that there is a definition of a child; it is, I believe, in part 6. I may be wrong about the number, but it is in the act and it says "...in this part, a child means...". At the bottom of page 1, in section 5, there is a definition of a parent and it says, "...in this act, parent means...", and the definition follows.

It appears to me that it would be very useful to define parent and define child, for the purposes of the whole act. That would be a



service to children, in my view, and their parents.

It appears to me it would also be fruitful to define fetus. I believe it can be fairly easily done. A fetus describes a person who has been conceived but not born alive and a child is a person who is born alive until the age of 18. That appears, to me, to be a sensible definition and it would be commonly understood.

It would then be easy to refer to the rights of a child and not to confuse or interfere with the rights of a fetus and to make a policy statement about the rights of a fetus, as it might relate to fetal alcohol syndrome and the question of damage to a fetus in a civil suit, as is addressed in section 180, I believe, and 181. I mention that because I think, if that were done, we could clearly make a policy statement about what is the legislated intention about protection of a fetus.

If it was the intention of the legislature to not make any statement and to leave it to judicial interpretation, that would be clearer and there would not be lawyers and judges trying to interpret, from the other sections, something about the rights of a fetus, which would occur if we did not clarify it and spell it out. I make those comments and I would ask if there is a response.

<sup>51</sup> **Hon. Mr. Philipson:** After discussion on this matter, I have taken the time to look at the proposed legislation from Alberta, under the interpretations, to see what they did with the issue of "parent". They have not found it necessary to define "parent" in their interpretations either.

What I do find in their interpretations is "child". I find that "child" means a person under the age of 18 years, which is identical to what we have defined a "child" to be in this legislation.

In the area last under discussion by the member for Whitehorse South Centre, I think that you will find, if you read this piece of legislation from one end to the other, that the word "abortion" is not in it. I think you will find that the area and the reasons that we had the passionate discussions about in the last week are that we will comply with the *Criminal Code of Canada* in the area of therapeutic abortions.

The other area, which deals with fetal alcohol syndrome, is an area where, through education, we can help to have a child enter this world in a better state than may happen than if a person is not shown the problems that can arise, in pregnancy, through the over-use of alcohol. That is an area that we felt we could address, because it is not an area that is dealing with abortion; it is dealing with a child whom we wish to be born with the same possibility of a good, fruitful life that any of the rest of us would wish to have.

I am sure that there will be more discussion on this matter. I am sure, after reading and thinking about what the member for Whitehorse South Centre has had to say about this, as I have five days to consider it, and if there is going to be more discussion, I would have that time to digest what the member opposite has stated in his previous statement.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** It is probably constructive to say, at least in my opinion now, the constructive debate is probably exhausted about the general principle of the section on fetal alcohol syndrome. That is clause 180-something.

In the clause-by-clause debate, I will be very interested in, first of all, some scientific knowledge about the identification of the fetal alcohol syndrome and about at what stages it is most problematic and I will be interested in the question about what is the real implication of the section. It could be that a person would be counselled about fetal alcohol syndrome and that is enough. The problem is solved.

<sup>52</sup> In the vast majority of cases that will occur, I think, it could be that it is necessary to go to court to get a court order to force a person to take counselling. That is enough. What if it is not? What if there is a disobedience of the court order? Well, then it is contempt of court and there is the possibility of imprisonment, which leads one to speculate: are you going to imprison a pregnant woman until she has given birth in order to avoid alcohol abuse to the fetus. The nature of the clause and the real policy behind it is problematic in my view.

I will also be interested in information about the possibility of abuse of that particular clause and possibly a racial discrimination

in applying it; not on the basis of racial discrimination of individuals, but because there could be those overtones to the debate. I will be very interested in discussing the policy of the government on that issue in clause-by-clause debate.

On the abortion issue more generally, I have a couple of other comments.

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** I really do thank the member for Whitehorse South Centre for allowing me to answer one at a time. It is easier than trying to remember three questions and then speak to them all.

The member for Whitehorse South Centre may be interested to know that the effects of fetal alcohol syndrome are the worry at the worst stages in the first and third trimester of pregnancy. I will be happy to bring forward all the information that alcohol and drug services have at the present time about fetal alcohol syndrome, at any point in time, but if the member for Whitehorse South Centre would like it outside the Legislative Assembly, I would be happy to supply that information to him for his perusal.

The member for Whitehorse South Centre may be interested to hear that in the area of fetal alcohol syndrome, and this particular section in the legislation, while we went around the territory on our tour for input, I believe that at one particular meeting at a band meeting - I believe the member for Campbell was the chairman at that meeting - the suggestion was made that an individual who could be identified and who was placing herself in this position should be placed on an interdict list.

<sup>53</sup> The suggestion at that particular meeting was not the only time I had heard this. The suggestion went further to state that the person should be removed to protect the child because, as the member for Whitehorse South Centre has stated, it is a problem area that is identifiable.

The people who have seen the results of fetal alcohol syndrome realize that what that child is going to go through is for life. Those compassionate people, realizing that, asked us, at those meetings, to go to very extreme and great lengths to protect the unborn child from the effects of fetal alcohol syndrome.

I can do nothing but sympathize with those requests and I believe, if it were in my power to protect a child, at any length, that I would, indeed, try to remove the cause of the problem from the effect. However, I believe that, in this section, we have gone as far with our legislation as we could possibly go, without interfering with the rights of another person. If there is a way to strengthen this area and reduce the effects of fetal alcohol syndrome, then I would be extremely happy to hear it and, in fact, implement it and strengthen this piece of legislation and, perhaps, make the life of an individual who may be afflicted with this problem a little easier.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I thank the minister for that statement and, in response, I would say that I, too, have heard strong views, as the minister indicated he has heard. He has probably heard more than I have.

It is my opinion that a discussion of the scientific information for, perhaps, half an hour or an hour, during the clause-by-clause debate, would be constructive and would serve the people of the territory well. I believe I am aware of all of the information that the Department of Alcohol and Drug Services have — there may be new information that I am not aware of — not, primarily, for my edification, but to put on the record and to discuss the issue intelligently. The background information could be reviewed by all of us, I expect; it would be constructive.

<sup>54</sup> I believe the member for Campbell had a comment.

I am going to go on to the more general issue after he makes it.

**Mr. Porter:** Just prior to leaving this particular area of fetal alcohol syndrome, I would like to add to the minister's comments in order to bring about a greater understanding of why, in the first place, such an extreme suggestion as to prohibit individuals from consuming alcohol was made at that particular meeting. In that community, which I am quite familiar with, there are six known cases of severe fetal alcohol syndrome. It is a real concern to the people in the community who are charged with the responsibility of assisting the community generally.

They live with that problem on a daily basis. They interact with those children. They have taken the children out with them in

summer camps and have generally, as a community, attempted to look after some of those children. Other numbers of the children have been transferred, and two of them are now here in Whitehorse in a home.

It is a very serious issue, which I do not think governments have come to grips with yet. I do not think that governments really know the magnitude of the problem within the communities in Yukon. There are different degrees of fetal alcohol syndrome that exist throughout the communities. Some children have it more severely than others. There is some speculation and theory in the education system that children who are not performing well in school may be suffering from a mild symptom of fetal alcohol syndrome.

I would like to know if this government has any plans to be able to accurately assess the extent of the problem throughout Yukon. I understand the federal government, through a doctor who has done some work in this area in northern British Columbia, is doing some research work in this area. Is the government involved in those efforts, and once the information is compiled, will that information form the basis of a specific program that would be initiated by this government to combat this very serious problem?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** In the area of fetal alcohol syndrome, we have been doing a considerable amount of work. I believe the doctor of whom the member for Campbell speaks, is a doctor by the name of Dr. Asante. The doctor has been in Yukon and there is a film presently on the market, if you will, on the fetal alcohol syndrome that he has had a hand in producing.

I have seen the film. It is about 20 minutes long, and if there is a possibility of getting a copy of it, I would be very pleased to have it shown in this building, at a time when we are all able to watch it, to the members of this Legislative Assembly.

There are individuals from Yukon who are in the film. The film is being shown as far away as Australia, throughout the United States and is being picked up in other areas. It is a forerunner of what is to come, they feel. The program, "Love on the Rocks", was put out by the Alcohol and Drug Service. The pamphlets, the kit and the entire package is a package that is now being duplicated in other areas of North America.

<sup>55</sup> The costs to us, because we are a small government, and because we were instrumental in this type of program, were greater than what people wanted to pay for our program outside. They are able to duplicate it at a reduced price. Nevertheless, we feel that some of the ideas that they are coming out with originated at the alcohol and drug services in Yukon, through its program. I would be very happy to have someone who is knowledgeable in that area address this Assembly in an area of the building, after showing the film, if we get together at some time and take a look at it.

I feel that Yukon is, at least, on a par with other areas in North America in trying to identify this problem and it is my understanding that people have found that this is only a problem in the past 10 or 12 years, and have been able to identify it by certain physical traits, if you will. It is now becoming obvious that by these physical traits you can tell a child who has fetal alcohol syndrome.

I think I have seen the nod of heads on the other side, so I will take that as an indication that at the soonest opportunity possible that we can all gather in a room somewhere in the building and see the movie and listen to the experts; that we shall do it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** About the more general issue of the rights of a fetus as it relates to abortion. It is absolutely clear that the *Criminal Code* as it speaks about abortion would supersede any of our statements anyway. It is fitting and proper to not write anymore criminal law about abortion. There will certainly be an agreement on this side about the minister's statements about the criminal law concerning abortion. There are civil aspects to the question, especially as it relates to the right of fetus, whatever that may be. It is, I believe, appropriate for us to either state what our policy is or if we do not wish to state particular policy, that we identify a fetus in the bill by definition and separate out the definition of a child so that the statements that we make about children — and we intend to refer to children after their birth and only after their birth — will not be misinterpreted, if that is really our intention.

<sup>56</sup> I would make that as a comment in the spirit of constructive suggestion.

The minister has talked about opinion evidence and the test about the balance of probabilities and we are promised an amendment of some sort about this. Is the minister able to say, now, that the law of evidence will be made clear about the opinions of experts, or is the intention to make a policy statement in the law that people who are not qualified as experts should be allowed to give opinion evidence in the courts, as that would be a major change in the existing law? I would ask the minister for a statement of policy about that.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I will say, "I believe". I believe that the opinion evidence section would be it would be the opinion of the judge, who would be expert to give the opinion, that would be the expert opinion. I am not kidding — I hope whatever it is is not catchable. If it is, I need the weekend off.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I take that comment to mean that the policy of the government is that, whether or not a person is qualified as an expert and, therefore, able to give opinions, will continue to be a question for the court, as it is now. The intent of the section in the bill, or the amendment, as it will eventually come, is to clarify that experts can and should, indeed, give opinions, and even opinions about the ultimate issue.

If I am wrong, the minister can correct me, perhaps on Tuesday or at a later date.

<sup>57</sup> There is a section about the test that the court is to apply a definition of the test of the balance of probabilities. I would ask if the policy is now known, or if the amendment is not yet written. Is the policy going to be that the test is the balance of probabilities or is the policy going to be that the test presently used in the courts is going to be continued?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I am now going to run out the end of the lawyers part for this week. It is my understanding that the balance of probabilities would be the same as is in the *Legal Profession Act*, that we just took through this Legislative Assembly. Having said that, I have now expended all the lawyer knowledge that I have been able to get into my head for a week. I will have to go away for a weekend and charge up again, so that we can carry on with this debate. I would respectfully ask you to report progress on Bill No. 19.

**Mr. Chairman:** You have heard the motion, do you agree?  
*Motion agreed to*

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

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

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

**Mr. Brewster:** The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 19, *The Children's Act*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I move that this House be adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday next.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that the House do now adjourn.  
*Motion agreed to*

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

*The House adjourned at 5:24 p.m.*

**The following Sessional Paper was tabled April 19, 1984:**

84-4-20

Response to Petitions (Lang)