



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 22

3rd Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, May 3, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Andy Philipsen, MLA, Whitehorse Porter Creek West

CABINET MINISTERS

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

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

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

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

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

(Independent)

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

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

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

⁰¹ **Whitehorse, Yukon**

Tuesday, May 3, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have for tabling answers to some written questions.

Mr. Speaker: Reports of committees?
Petitions?

Introduction of bills?

Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers?

Notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would like to give notice of motion respecting the membership of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further notices of motion?
Are there any statements by ministers?
This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Agricultural land applications

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. Last night, the minister suggested that the only applications for agricultural land the Agriculture Development Council and his own department would review would be those where there was agricultural production for sale to the public. Is that an accurate statement of government policy?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, and I did not say that. What I said was that agriculture in the territory would be, in my opinion, — and I was not speaking for the minister responsible for the Agriculture Development Council — regarding land in the territory is that the reason they want the agricultural land is to operate an agricultural-type business. If we are talking about 20-acre hobby farms for their own personal use, it is a different situation, altogether. We were talking about the use of agricultural land and I said that as far as I was concerned that was land to run a business.

⁰² **Mr. McDonald:** The minister suggested that his department reviewed farm land where farming was a business and not "a little 20 acre section of land somewhere". Does his department review applications for intensive parcels of agricultural land and is the analysis similar to that used for extensive parcels of land?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, the same analogy would apply there. If there was an application for agricultural land out in the middle of the boondocks somewhere, and it was to go to the Agriculture Development Council, it would be referred to my department and my department would make a recommendation on it.

Mr. McDonald: My final supplementary is to the Minister of Agriculture. Given that the minister has himself suggested that lands of a certain size may be used only for the containment of a horse or two, what definition would qualify this horse owner to receive any sized parcel of land?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am not too sure what the member is driving at. We have, by policy, said that there are various minimum sizes that land will be released, in order to have some order in the release of properties.

As to whether or not one owns a horse, that is his decision. I guess what the member is maybe getting at is the question of

grazing and it is an area of concern to us and it is one that we intend to look at over the forthcoming year, to see whether we can come to a resolution to the problem.

Question re: Contracting out government services

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

In the Throne Speech and, subsequently, the government leader indicated that the government was conducting a program by program self-evaluation with consideration being given to the contracting out of public service jobs. Has this review been completed.

⁰³ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I seem to recall an answer to another question on the same topic indicating that I do not anticipate that the program will be completed for some number of months.

Mr. Penikett: Could I ask the government leader if, in considering the contracting out of public service jobs, the government has considered such factors as additional costs or inconveniences to the public, or does it look only at the possible internal savings for the government and the peripheral or consequent benefit to private business?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The task force will of course be looking at the ramifications and the impact to the internal workings of this government. It will be our responsibility, once we have those recommendations, to assess them and assess what the impact will be to the public. There is no doubt about it that that will be one of the major criteria that is used in making a final decision.

Mr. Penikett: On April 28 the government leader promised the House a statement on the question of contracting out public service jobs. Is the government leader now in a position to make that statement.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, I will not be in a position to make such a statement until we have received the reports from our task force and until we have made some major decisions. At that time, I am confident I will have something to say to the House in respect to the decisions that we have made. Either we are going to go ahead and do some contracting out, or we have made the considerations, we have done the studies and we have found it is not feasible. At this point in time, I have nothing at all that I can say about it.

⁰⁴ **Question re: Government assistance programs**

Mr. Byblow: My question is also to the government leader. The federal industry minister recently announced his intention to institute a comprehensive restructuring of government assistance programs to industry, and he proposed to reassess the wealth and need of each area of the country in order to determine the eligibility for government funded programs. Has this government investigated or studied these new developments and, if so, what is being done to ensure that Yukon receives as high as possible an eligibility rating for programs such as under DREE?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The member is aware that I spent some considerable length of time in the minister's office when I was last in Ottawa and we did discuss in detail the territory and our economic aspects and outlook for the next few years. We also made it very, very clear to the minister that, in fact, the federal government has to be a major actor in the recovery of the territory. The minister is very cognizant of what is happening here and why it is happening, and I am confident that, given the right set of circumstances, his particular department will be most anxious to participate with us in the recovery of the territory.

Mr. Byblow: In the intended restructuring of the federal government assistance programs, do these initiatives have any bearing on the general development agreement currently under discussion?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I honestly could not answer, because I do not know what the general restructuring of the federal department is going to be.

Mr. Byblow: It is my understanding that the current federal programs, some 80 in number, are going to be streamlined into a smaller number of general programs, and funds granted from regional offices. Could I ask the government leader if he is taking steps to ensure that a regional office is located in Yukon, and if so, what specifically can he do?

⁰⁵ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** They do have a regional office here in

Yukon already.

Question re: Comprehensive energy policy

Mr. Kimmerly: Again, to the government leader: the Throne Speech talked about a comprehensive energy policy within the next few months. Is there now a firmer target date for this policy announcement?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No.

Mr. Kimmerly: The Throne Speech also talked about an open public discussion. What process will this follow?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not certain what process that will follow yet. We have been very busy in this House since giving the Throne Speech. This work is being done and it will be announced when it is ready to be announced.

Mr. Kimmerly: When the policy is announced, will it deal with the problem of wood smoke in Riverdale in order that that problem may be addressed before next winter?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: As the member who represents Riverdale North, and I am confident I can speak for my colleague who represents Riverdale South, we are both very thankful that the member for Whitehorse South Centre is so concerned about the smoke problem in Riverdale. The energy policy will be one, I hope, that will cover all aspects of energy in the territory. It is our hope that we are going to be able to put together a comprehensive energy policy.

Question re: Federal-provincial meetings

Mr. Porter: I have a question as well for the government leader. I understand that the government leader is leaving to participate in a meeting of federal-provincial ministers with regard to discussing the mining industry and the meeting is commencing on May 6 in Ottawa. As well, on May 17, there is an additional meeting being convened in the nation's capital on the same subject. Will the government leader be attending this meeting as well?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know and I will not know until after I have talked to the federal Minister of State responsible for mines, Mrs. Erola. It has been a mystery to me for some weeks as to exactly why this second meeting was called two weeks from this one and I have, by letter, registered my dismay at the calling of this meeting on May 17. Until I speak to the minister, I do not know whether it will be necessary for me, or someone else from this government, to be at that meeting.

Mr. Porter: In the government's Throne Speech tabled before this Legislature, there was a statement that this government is working toward developing a mining policy for Yukon. Has that policy been developed; if so, will the government leader be tabling before this Legislature the contents of that policy?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, to both questions. No, to the first one because it has not been developed and, no, to the second one because I cannot.

Mr. Porter: If the government has not completed the mining policy, what positions on the Yukon mining industry will the government be discussing at the mining meetings?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is a series of on-going meetings held by mines ministers across Canada; it has been going on for years. They are annual meetings and one of the major topics, at the present time, is the role of the junior mining companies in Canada's economy.

Question re: Recreation Department reorganization

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the minister responsible for recreation.

The minister has told this House that some re-organization has occurred in the Recreation Department, based upon direction and recommendations given by YRAC and a green paper committee. Since the green paper on recreation will not be tabled during this Session, could the minister tell us if further re-organization and implementation of recommendations by the green paper committee will occur before it is tabled in this House?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No.

Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell us if a final decision has been made on the restructuring of YRAC, based on the recommendation

by the green paper committee?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The green paper committee has not come to me with its final recommendation yet.

Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell us when a formal decision has been made and what that decision is?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: When a decision is made, I am sure the members opposite will be quite aware of it.

Question re: Farming areas

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Last evening, the Minister of Renewable Resources stated that the traditional farming areas in Yukon would be the only areas considered favourably by the government for new agricultural settlements. Can the minister reconcile this with the fact that the Agriculture Development Council is soliciting and entertaining applications for land anywhere in the territory which meet basic technical qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think the member opposite is putting inferences on the debate that was held last evening. I think we have made it very clear that one can apply for land in the territory that fits the criteria — the technical aspects — and also meets the question of the conflict of land use with the Department of Renewable Resources; the applications will then be seriously considered and, in most cases, accepted.

I do not know what more I can add in respect to our policy. I think it is very clear that we have left it mainly up to the individual and we are trying to get some assistance for individuals. For example, we have a soil pedologist on staff, through Agriculture Canada, which is paying his salary. We have also reclassified a position in the Department of Municipal Affairs with the idea of getting somebody on staff who can provide certain expertise. Whether it be on a position basis or a contract basis remains to be seen.

Mr. McDonald: As the minister agreed with the Minister of Renewable Resources last evening, regarding the attempt to settle traditional areas and "expand from those areas in an orderly manner", can the minister, for the first time, identify those areas the government will consider favourably for agricultural pursuits?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not know what is wrong with the member opposite. First of all, it was indicated to him last evening and it has been indicated consistently through Question Period, as well as through Committee of the Whole, that the land that we have to allocate is very small in comparison to the rest of the territory — I am talking about territorial land. We have to get the consent of the Government of Canada for the transfer of land to this government in order to implement our particular policy for the purposes of agriculture on other areas within the territory. We are working on that aspect of it with the Government of Canada as soon as they are prepared to do that. Further to that, the criteria and the steps that I outlined earlier are the ones that will have to be taken forward by an individual interested in applying for land.

Mr. McDonald: I would say there is nothing consistent about the minister's replies to the questions. Will the minister undertake to make public a map of traditional farming areas and, further, a map of those areas considered to be sensitive to wildlife habitat in order that prospective farmers may know which areas are considered to be off-limits for agricultural pursuits?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a representation or is this intended to be a question?

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I asked for a map or maps.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would be more than happy to offer the member an atlas if he so chooses to have one. With respect to the land that is being applied for, I have outlined the steps that are going to be taken. I will not ask the administration to go to all the work the member has asked to be done to solve his misunderstanding with respect to the policy that we have in place. As far as I am concerned we have a policy that is in place that meets the concerns of the people who are involved or would like to become involved in the industry. The member opposite should check with them. I think he is going on a wild goose chase which is not necessary.

Question re: Decentralization of services

Mr. Penikett: My colleague for Mayo's problem is, of course, that he is logical.

I have a question for the government leader. During the last territorial election the government leader, and his party, reasserted their commitment to decentralization of the services provided by the government. Can the government leader indicate exactly what steps his government has taken to achieve this end, if any, since the last election?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have completed the construction of an administration building in Mayo. That is going to assure that there is government administration in that community. As we can put the wherewithal together, we are continuing our decentralization throughout the territory. Eventually, it is our hope that we will be able to have a government presence in the form of a building in all of the communities in Yukon. We also have embarked upon a program of getting our vocational and technical training facilities out to the communities by means of mobile training units. There are a number of things. It may well be that we will get further recommendations from the task force with respect to decentralization as well, because they know that that is one of our desires.

Mr. Penikett: Given that the Mayo administration building, for example, only accommodates existing officials in that community and given that the relative numbers of rural employees in departments like highways is, in fact, declining, can the government leader explain how the employment trends in rural Yukon relate to the state of a policy of decentralization?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. Mainly no, because I am not prepared to accept that our number of rural employees is declining. That seems to be an assumption that the leader of the opposition has at the moment. I do not know that to be a fact at all.

Mr. Penikett: My problem is I have to rely on unreliable sources like the estimates. Let me ask the government leader a question relating to this problem between different levels in government. Given that the federal ministers are presently fanning out across the country to dispense Ottawa's largesse, and given the government leader's absence, can I ask him which minister, during the next few days, will be present here to host and receive any federal beneficiaries who may arrive here?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: A most extraordinary question. It has always been a matter of policy that one of the ministers is always in Whitehorse. There may be a few days in June when there will be no ministers in Whitehorse; they may well all be gone at that point in time. However, it is my anticipation that, if the rumours are true, and if the nightrider, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, should happen to arrive here sometime towards the end of the week, I am confident that Mr. Lang, who will be the acting government leader in my absence, would be most pleased to accept any largesse that he might wish to bestow upon us.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation/chemical inventory

Mr. Byblow: History had a Paul Revere; modern day has John Munro. I have a question for the minister responsible for Yukon Housing. As the minister is aware — and, I believe, so are we all — the Yukon Housing Corporation has procured a large inventory of chemicals. Last week, the minister outlined the administrative control procedures that were being put in place to eliminate a reoccurrence. What steps has the minister, or his corporation, taken to sell, to use up or recover the costs associated with the \$50,000 worth of chemical inventory currently on hand?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am open for suggestions. If the member opposite wants to speak to me privately, and is prepared to purchase some, I understand that there is some on the shelves. I should point out that we have been in contact with the company in question and we are seeing whether or not they are prepared to take at least a portion, if not all of it, back. We have not had a firm answer back from that particular corporation. Once again, if the member is indicating that he is prepared to consider purchasing any, or all of it, we are definitely open to offers.

Mr. Byblow: I value my furnaces to remain in a good state and my question will explain why. Can the minister confirm whether the

use of the chemical in cleaning furnaces actually contributed to a more rapid corrosion of furnaces and, in fact, was the cause for the policy of replacement of a number of furnaces in Yukon Housing and other government heating systems?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, I cannot confirm that.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps he understands why I may not want any. Can the minister confirm, or does he know, whether or not a criminal investigation is presently going on with respect to the original acquisition of those chemicals?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I know that there is an investigation underway. To what extent, I am not sure.

Question re: Food prices

Mr. Kimmerly: A question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs about food prices: the minister said, some time ago, that a list of achievements was being prepared and it would be ready probably tomorrow or next week. The statement was made on the 30th of March. Is the minister now able to give a firmer date?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I intend to give that tomorrow.

Mr. Kimmerly: Aside from only speaking about achievements, will the list also speak about the course of action the government intends to follow through the summer?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: It will be in the form of a ministerial statement, so the members opposite will have a chance to comment.

Mr. Kimmerly: I also questioned about the minister's talks or negotiations with other ministers concerning the implementation of the Food Prices Report. Have any of these talks now occurred?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: Yes, as the member will see tomorrow.

Question re: Land for agricultural purposes

Mr. Porter: This question is for the Minister of Renewable Resources.

The Minister of Agriculture has stated that there is an implicit arrangement with the federal government to transfer lands to the territory for agricultural purposes. On the other hand, the minister responsible for renewable resources stated only last night that wildlife grazing applications and fur farming has nothing to do with the Agriculture Development Council. What arrangements has the government made to facilitate the transfer of federal lands for the purpose of fur farming and wildlife grazing applications?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: They would be dealt with in the same manner as we apply for any other land from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Porter: I suspect that as a prerequisite for any transfer of land to take place, the federal government would insist that the necessary policies be developed and implemented. I would like to ask the minister: has the federal government stated such a position and, if so, what has this government done to comply?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In regards to land for wildlife farming, which is a hypothetical question, we have developed no policy. As I said, if there was an application that was put to me or my department we would consider it at that time. We would take that proposal, if we felt it was worthy, and apply for the land. Until that situation arises, I see no need to put a policy in place.

Mr. Porter: During the last session, this government passed the *Land Planning Act*, which was supposed to help pave the way for land transfers to this government. Why has that act not yet been proclaimed and when will it be proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There is a very good reason why it has not been proclaimed. We are in the process, at the present time, of trying to settle a last issue on our dispute with the federal government, so, there is no sense waving another red flag in front of the bull. When we settle our six issues that will be the time we will be dealing with the *Land Planning Act*.

Question re: Women's Bureau

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

Just before the election was called last year, this House sent a report of the Select Committee on Labour Standards back to the committee so that it could consider an amendment adding a recommendation that male and female workers receive equal pay for

work of equal value. Is it the intention of this government to include the principle of equal pay for work of equal value in the proposed labour standards legislation?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I believe we are already complying with that in the way we pay our employees.

11 Mrs. Joe: Will the minister be directing his officials to consult with the Yukon Status of Women's Council regarding the recommendations for *The Labour Standards Act*? If so, how will that consultation be done?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have made representation to the Status of Women Council since November 23rd, I believe it was, and I have not ever heard back from it on what they would like to see or what kind of discussions they would like. I have requested three or four times since.

Mrs. Joe: I understand that a brief has been presented to the labour standards committee. I understand that the most recent policy of this government on labour standards does not include a number of important recommendations made by the Status of Women. When will this government release details of its newest labour standards policy so that these concerns can be checked?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The member opposite will see it when it becomes available.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will recess until 2:20 p.m.

Recess

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

On Resource Planning and Management

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We were dealing with the general debate, and I have not any more to add.

On Resource Management Administration

Mr. Porter: I wonder if the minister would give an indication as to the reasons for the increase in this figure?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Will the member repeat that question, I did not hear it.

Mr. Chairman: The reasons for the increases, Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Almost every one of these questions they have asked on almost every department. It is the 10-day fortnight. If you will all remember the last budget was a nine-day fortnight; we are now on a 10-day fortnight, which increases the cost significantly.

Mr. Kimmerly: In light of that answer, would the minister elucidate on the seeming contradiction that the personnel costs increased only seven percent and the costs under the other categories almost 40 percent?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Various different programs under the department have people working for them. There are five man-years in administration, which, if you consider the 10-day fortnight, you are certainly going to come up with \$30,000 extra over the period of a year.

Resource Management Administration in the amount of \$253,000 agreed to

On Planning and Evaluation

Mr. Porter: In respect to this particular area I would like to ask the minister if under planning and evaluation there are any funds for the area of research and planning that could, for instance, be used by residents of the Yukon to develop the commercial production of country foods. For example, they would have to determine market conditions, harvest methods and packaging of the final product. Is there any funding within this area to promote or encourage this development?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, in this area we are dealing mostly with land planning, habitat planning and plans such as the Ibex Pass, northern Yukon and Mac Pass; and also for departmental representation on certain environmental panels and whatever participation we would have with other groups.

13 Planning and Evaluation in the amount of \$253,000 agreed to On Small Game Management

Mr. Porter: I am sure that the increase here is not directly attributable to the 10-day fortnight. Why do we see such a large increase in this particular department? The rabbits are all gone.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In this area we have management of all the furbearer populations within the territory and we are getting into studies regarding breeding areas for lynx and studies such as the marten study that has just been completed. We are also dealing with the trappers association and making representations to them to try to get their opinions as to what we should be considering in areas regarding small game. Really, there is a general increase in the budget in order to do a more adequate job of managing small game. You will find the same in big game management; there is about a \$100,000 increase in both.

It is because we are focusing more attention and more money on these areas. There are also man-years involved, which do take up part of it. In this whole branch there are 23 man-years. I can give you the numbers broken down: there are three man-years in the parks and outdoor recreation function and there are four man-years in small game management, which we are dealing with now. The 10-day fortnight amounts to probably \$25,000 to \$30,000. In big game management there are six man-years. There are man-years allocated to each one of these programs.

Mr. Porter: With respect to the minister's answer, in terms of the level of expenditure last year, I am sure in the last year's operation they were expected to do the very same kinds of things that they are now mandated to do. I am just wondering why such a large increase in terms of the overall figure. If you look at both those departments, we are talking about \$214,000 in increase. Is the minister able to delineate the area of expenditure to have received the lion's share of the increase? In other words, we are dramatically increasing the expenditure in these areas; and in one area, 55 percent. Can he tell us where the money has gone?

14 Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not have those specific figures of exactly which part of this program the money has gone into. That is something that I cannot give you an answer to.

Most of the money here is for contracted structure, research, professional services, aircraft rentals and food and beverages for our staff out in the field; this area amounts to about \$73,000. There are other professional and aircraft rentals for bird management. The amount for the endangered non-game program in the wildlife management's small game is \$5,000; for biometrics there is about a \$36,000 expenditure. However, I cannot give you a detail of where the increase is, at this time.

Mr. Porter: I would like to request that the minister, at some later date, rather than searching through his records now, undertake to give me in writing a breakdown of this particular area and indicate the area that has received the increase in financing.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I would do that.

Small Game Management in the amount of \$322,000 agreed to On Big Game Management

Mr. Porter: Yesterday, when we were discussing in general debate, the minister stated that when we got to this section he would have available specific figures as to the cost of the wolf control program. Has he those figures available now?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I gave the members the figure last night: it is approximately \$120,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: Would the minister be kind enough to catego-

rize the various kinds of expenditures in that figure and give us the dollar amounts by category, if that is possible?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In Big Game Management, we have eight species of animals that we manage: the sheep, the mountain goat, the moose, the caribou, the grizzly bear, black bear, wolverine and wolf. For the sheep and goat management component, the amount is about \$39,000; for moose management it is approximately \$150,000; for caribou it is about \$56,000; bear management is about \$47,000; and laboratory functions about \$3,000.

Mr. Porter: Yesterday, and previous to that, on March 28th, to be specific, I raised the question with the minister with respect to the poisoned animals found in Kluan Lake; and, in re-reading *Hansard*, I understand the minister to have stated that he finds it a questionable fact as to whether or not the carcass of the second dead wolf that was found should be analyzed to see whether or not it was poisoned. Can the minister further elaborate on this statement?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No. As I stated earlier, that has been under investigation and it has been considered by the department and also, I believe, the RCMP are involved. It has been considered and, to the best knowledge of the department, it would not be of no benefit at this time to send that carcass out for examination. It is costly, but that is not the only reason; the other reason is because they do not feel it would be beneficial to a prosecution at this time, even if they were able to lay charges.

Mr. Porter: In the eventuality that charges may be laid, is the evidence — the dead wolf carcass — presently frozen?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I believe it is in storage.

Mr. Porter: In respect to the general overall investigation surrounding the deaths of these animals, can the minister indicate to us what stage the investigation is at? Are they hopeful as to there being enough evidence, or is there simply not enough evidence to lay charges? Are they going to continue their investigation, or are they going to discontinue it?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: At this stage, they are still continuing investigation; however, it does not look hopeful for laying charges. We are not sure whether we will be able to obtain enough evidence to lay charges.

Big Game Management in the amount of \$625,000 agreed to On Parks and Outdoors Recreation

Mr. Porter: I would like to begin by asking the minister for an explanation of the \$89,000 increase from last year's expenditure.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If the member across the floor recalls, we put quite a bit of money this year into capital projects — into parks and campgrounds in the territory — and this is the program department which looks after that. We are working on about five or six territorial parks this year, which I think would answer the question. There are two park planners and one park planning technician involved in this department and we are working on Moose Creek, Yukon River, Dawson City, Tungsten Road, North Canol Road, South Canol Road, Mayo and Dempster Highways, and we are also working on Squanga Lake and Otter Falls and other areas like that, plus some preliminary work on Coal River springs and Frenchman-Tatchun Lake park.

Mr. Porter: I believe the minister has responsibility for the development and restoration of certain buildings within the Fort Selkirk area, specifically in the site of Fort Selkirk. I would like to ask the minister: does he still operate as a sole owner or a part owner of a river touring company that utilizes the Yukon River?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I do, as the member across the floor can find out any time he wants to check with the clerk.

Mr. Porter: In the operation of the minister's tour company, is the site of Fort Selkirk used to facilitate the entertainment of the tourists or, more appropriately, the education of the tourist?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If we were to take any tourist down the river, we would use Fort Selkirk the same as any other organization would utilize Fort Selkirk. It is there for the benefit of the public and we would utilize that.

I should also state to the members across the floor that I also have a campground area in the vicinity of Fort Selkirk park that we would utilize for our own use.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister indicate to us at what stage the development of an international proposal that was talked about to

accommodate the theme of an international gold rush now rests?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We have done some work on that. I have, for example, signed an agreement for the Yukon River to be called a heritage river under the Heritage Rivers Program. That historic park aspect comes under that function.

However, if the members across the floor are asking me whether we are going to declare the Yukon River a territorial park or a national park from one end to the other, no, that is not the proposal. Our position has been stated in this House on more than one occasion. We believe that we should try to protect the river and we should try to protect the historic sites along it, but, to call the whole river a park is not our concept of what would be best for the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Porter: Is the minister or anyone in his department — possibly, as he stated, not looking at the entire river to be designated park status — looking at a combination of designations, so that a portion of the river could be given park status and other portions of the river designated as a wild and scenic river?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Under the Heritage Rivers Program, that is what it is: it is a scenic river, a heritage river. All of these concepts are involved in the negotiation. Through joint agreement among us, DIAND and, I believe, the Department of Environment, we would have a joint agreement which we, as the territorial government, would manage the same as the provinces would manage a heritage river.

So, we have that agreement in place and we feel that this will be beneficial to the territory and to the tourism industry in the territory. As far as declaring a certain section of the river a territorial park, that is not the concept. The whole river is a heritage waterway and the heritage areas in it will be protected.

17

Short power outage, during which recess was called

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. For the record in *Hansard*, it should be noted that we have just had a short power outage and we will therefore go back to Mr. Porter so he can repeat his question.

Mr. Porter: I believe that, prior to the power interruption, I was asking the minister if he could provide for this side of the House a compilation of all the areas in the Yukon that this government has designated as possible park sites?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Well, I suppose I could, yes. I do not have any problem with that. The members across the floor must recognize, though, that a lot of these are tentative proposals; there has not been detailed work done on them, they are just areas that we have identified.

Mr. Byblow: The minister must be able to put on the record which campgrounds are being closed in the developing of parks policy.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is already there; it is written in your book.

Parks and Outdoors Recreation in the amount of \$210,000 agreed to

Resource Planning and Management in the amount of \$1,663,000 agreed to On Wildlife and Park Services

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In this branch, there is a staff of 23 employees: five administrative and 18 field personnel. They educate the public on management of renewable resources, enforce the *Wildlife Act* and *Parks Act*, the regulations and other related statutes; maintain in excess of 50 campgrounds, and construct numerous recreational facilities each year. During the peak season, 12 casual man-years exist for operational maintenance and secretarial work. This branch provides the majority of resource educational programs and publications for the department. The budget in this area has been increased to enhance the public awareness of our programs through new audio-visual presentations, public information bulletins and publications. Additional monies have also been provided to this branch to contract the maintenance of a number of campgrounds this year, which should effectively take up the slack where additional manpower would have been required to maintain new campgrounds which were constructed last year, such as Watson Lake. They will also continue to act as a contractor for various

programs sponsored by the departments, such as the Yukon River stabilization of historic sites and construction of the information centres at Carcross, et cetera. This branch also continues on an ongoing basis to revise and update all related resources statutes and provides various interpretive synopses of those statutes to make the understanding of the law that much easier for the public.

Mr. Porter: In the area of general debate, I would like to address the area of campgrounds. In the information that is provided for us within these figures, there is a statement that the closure of the campgrounds are for policy and reasons of economics. Can the minister be a little more specific in that area? What other criteria were used to make the decision to close some campgrounds and why do we have these specific sites closed and not others? What factors did he use to determine which sites to close and which to keep open?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: All of that information has already been provided to the members in Question Period and in the general debate that preceded this whole thing with all the questions that were fired at me one after the other as if I was in court. I will state again, as I have stated before, the reasons why we have closed these campgrounds is because most of them are in gravel pits; they are not really camp areas. All it was was that the tourists were parking there and so we took them over and put the facilities in there. We have developed new campground facilities, scattered throughout the territory that are very good facilities, probably second to none anywhere.

There is no necessity to have the smaller campgrounds; all they are is a burden to us because we have to maintain them, pick up the garbage in them, replace the tables and the campstoves and things like that that are not beneficial to us. We have enough space in the campgrounds that we have constructed to handle the travelling public. It is not beneficial and it is not cost-effective for us to handle these areas. There are other areas that we will be considering for future years to close down. These sites that are mentioned are of absolutely no use to us to have them.

For example, Mendenhall, we had the big campground at Kusawa. We are now building a new campground at Pine Lake, just this side of Haines Junction. We have a campground here at Wolf Creek. There is no need to have Mendenhall campground and it is the same with all the other camp sites.

Mr. Porter: Another area that has been initiated here, in terms of policy, is the privatization of campgrounds. Can the minister give us an idea as to what criteria is used to determine as to whether or not a campground should be privatized?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Last year, I said that we would look at privatization of campgrounds. We have looked at privatization of campgrounds. We have talked to various groups of people, such as the YVA. It has been recommended to us that we do not privatize campgrounds. Rather that what we do is allow the operators in the vicinity, if they are in competition, the access to our campgrounds to the collection of fees with a good portion of it going to them. We expect to give about 40 percent of the fees in the Wolf Creek campground to the operators on a rotational basis.

In other major campgrounds, such as Watson Lake and Dawson City, we will be putting it out to tender so that anyone in the area who wants to bid on it and give us a proposal, we will consider that. Up until this time, at any rate, we have decided that we would not be privatizing the campgrounds.

Mr. Porter: I believe the minister stated that policy is two-pronged in that, in some areas, the government will rely on operators of private campgrounds to do the collection for them in the area of fees, and turn over to the government a certain percentage of those fees. In other areas, they will call for a specific tendering process to be undertaken in which they will, I assume, ask individuals to take on the management on behalf of the government.

Could the minister tell us as to how this will affect the level of service for the campgrounds in terms of its effect on the people who will utilize this. I am thinking specifically of Yukon residents who will be using the campgrounds in the future. In answering the question, could he additionally look at the whole question of the fee structure in terms of the campgrounds? Will the government be

regulating the fees that will be charged through the campground system, even under this policy area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There is no change in fees, they are not increased this year. We are not contracting-out the maintenance of the campgrounds. All we will be tendering is the collection of fees. As I stated earlier, we will be giving 40 percent commission for campground fees in certain areas of the territory, but in highly competitive areas such as Watson Lake and Dawson City it will go out to tender because it would be unfair to the balance of the public to give it to the only campground operator in that community.

In other areas, such as up and down the highways, where there is a local entrepreneur who wants to take it on, we would consider it. That would reduce our necessity for the campground fee collection staff. We would still have our maintenance staff, and we would maintain the campgrounds.

Mr. Porter: One of the things the minister has just brought up is the whole area of development of new campgrounds. In areas such as Mayo the present campground is being eroded by the action of the river. I believe the people up in Keno have expressed a desire to develop a campground but their problem there is acquisition of the land. Can the minister give us an indication as to, when the government looks toward the development of a new campground, what kind of conditions they are looking at as a prerequisite to establishing a campground. I am thinking specifically of soil and water conditions. What are the favourable conditions under which the government will proceed to construct a campground?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think the member across the floor has almost answered his own question. We would look at the water and soil conditions, the chance of erosion such as Mayo. Number one would be the traffic that is on the road. As far as the campground at Keno, if those people are interested in a campground at Keno I would suggest that they do not deal with my department, they should go to Mr. Lang's department, Municipal and Community Affairs, and apply for some land. The Department of Municipal and Community Affairs would take it from there. It is not a function of my department, although my department might be requested to give some comments on it to municipal and community affairs.

Mr. Porter: In many of the existing campgrounds in the Yukon there is no provision for a receptacle to handle the dumping of human and other wastes that the tourists bring with them. Is the minister planning to upgrade the campgrounds that they intend to designate on heavily used areas and upgrade it to the standard so that they can handle this function?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, in some of those areas that facility is already there. Under a territorial park-type of operation, that is what we are doing. That is another reason why we are discontinuing the use of the smaller camp sites, because it is not economical to do those types of operations there as well.

*Administration in the amount of \$142,000 agreed to
On Conservation Officer Services
Conservation Officer Services in the amount of \$967,000 agreed to*

*On Parks Operations
Parks Operations in the amount of \$406,000 agreed to
On Special Services
Special Services in the amount of \$67,000 agreed to
On Information and Education
Information and Education in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to
Wildlife and Park Services in the amount of \$1,682,000 agreed to*

On Subsidiary Agreement

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I have stated earlier, the Subsidiary Agreement has run out, effective March 31. There are a couple of residual portions of it that we are trying to clean up now. The only one that is on-going is on the next page, the Yukon River Basin Study.

While I am up, I might as well address that. The Yukon River Basin Study is in conjunction with the federal government and it collects all of the resource data on the drainage system of the Yukon River. Our contribution to it is five percent. So you will see \$292,000 there and all but five percent of it is recoverable.

Mr. Porter: I have just a general comment and question, if you will. I understand that these programs were a spin-off of the General Development Agreement that had existed in the past. With the move toward the renegotiation of a similar agreement, which has now been called the EDA, can we expect a revival of expenditure under this particular heading in next year's budget.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I certainly hope so. In fact, I am hopeful that we can get an EDA in and a sub-agreement in for renewable resources sometime this year. I am very hopeful, as everyone else here in the government is, to get a renewable resources sub-agreement, as well as a tourism one and an economic development one. The Yukon River Basin Study is a separate entity altogether. It has nothing to do with the EDA.

Subsidiary Agreement agreed to

On Resource Corps

Resource Corps agreed to

On Yukon River Basin Studies

Mr. Porter: Under this particular program, I understand that the majority of the money is being spent on the studies in the southern Yukon area, studying the moose population in an attempt to find a specific reason as to the high mortality of the calf population. What other studies are covered by this agreement?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The studies covered under this area are not only to do with moose or to do with any resources in the Yukon River Basin; it is a study being done, actually for the federal government, in order to apprise them of the resources that are within the river basin area, and the moose study is only part of it. There are various fish studies, flora and fauna studies and other studies done under this. This is our portion of the project and it is administered by a committee, chaired by, I believe, Mr. Whitley, from the federal government. We budget it. The money is spent, then we recover 100 percent of it and pay out five percent. The cost to us is five percent of this \$92,000.

Mr. Porter: In a sense, what is being said here is that both governments are involved in a program toward the establishment of almost what you would call a resource atlas of the Yukon. Can I ask the minister if, upon completion of the study, will this government be served with all the materials that have gone into the study and the subsequent findings, and will the government be using this for public education?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. All of the information is ours. That is where we gathered our information on moose; it was done through this project. If you will look on page 243, you will see that the whole project is \$796,000. This is where the money has come to do a great deal of those studies which have been very beneficial to us and we have already utilized the information from them. All of the information is available to us.

Yukon River Basin Studies in the amount of \$292,000 agreed to

On Special Projects

Special Projects in the amount of zero dollars agreed to

On Revenue and Recoveries

Revenue and Recoveries in the amount of a recovery of \$458,000 agreed to

Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$4,250,000 agreed to

On Department of Government Services

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The 1983-84 budget estimates are structured similarly to those tabled in the 1982-83 budget. The major changes affecting the estimates are the transfer of the government's insurance program from the department of finance; funds have been allocated to cover the operation and maintenance of pool cars, eliminating charge-backs to departments. There are some errors in this: the overall total of \$7,949,000, as shown on the printed estimates, is incorrect. It should be \$7,959,000. There was a \$10,000 addition error made by the Department of Finance when this was printed. The total of \$453,000 shown for administration is incorrect for two reasons: \$20,000 plus one person-year were requested for administration and were inadvertently added to public works rather than administration. On page 250, supply services is listed as \$2,600,000 but should read \$2,610,000; and the

\$7,949,000 total should read \$7,959,000. On page 256, there is another \$122,000; it should be \$132,000. The \$2,600,000 should be \$2,610,000. There are a couple of errors in administration, but they balance one another out and it comes out to \$10,000. It changes the total from \$7,949,000 to \$7,959,000. If you add all the pages up, the figure comes out to \$7,959,000.

²¹ I guess we will have to leave the total the way it is: \$7,949,000. However, you will find there will be errors in your figures on those pages that I have identified for you of \$10,000. Basically, there is very little change from what has gone on in previous years except for the move of insurance to this department and the taking away of the internal chargebacks to various other departments; all of the computing services, pool cars and all the rest of it. Everything else has carried on the same as it has in the past.

Mr. Byblow: To correctly understand the information the minister was giving about changes in the figures, just in the event that the record may not be perfectly clear, as I understand it now, the figures are standing as they are in the book and they are also correct as addition goes, to arrive at the totals. In short, the budget figures as presented are standing. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. They will stand because we are not going to amend the bill.

Mr. Byblow: I have several general questions and I will draw some attention to the Public Accounts Committee, which reviewed this department in the past year. As the minister noted in his remarks, this department has undergone some transferred responsibilities from other areas. Some of these have been done over the past two years. The minister cited one that occurred since the last budget presentation.

²² One of the items I mentioned in a previous set of remarks, and I think the minister misunderstood me, had to do with the nature of statistics. The committee felt that the statistics were not detailed enough and that they were not relevant to comparisons. It is one thing to say that a piece of equipment is utilized to a certain percentage of something, but it is another thing to ask what that percentage is a portion of. I think when we get into some of the statistics I will have a couple of questions there.

I think the minister interpreted what I had said one time previously that the statistics were adequate here, and I simply noted, and the record shows it, that the statistics are improved but there will be, from the commitment that we have had from the department, improvements even yet to detail exactly the utilization factors.

One of the matters raised by the committee had to do with objectives and with respect to the handibus that was introduced into this department. I believe the minister indicated, in a response, that he did not feel that the entry of the handibus service into this department changed the objectives substantially. I do not understand that. It seems to me that as the objectives go, providing a centralized service to government agencies, and the use of a handibus is another matter, it deals with transportation. I wonder if the minister could respond on that point.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: When the handibus was set up, it was set up jointly between Government Services and the Department of Health and Human Resources. It was a service to the old folks. The reason it is handled in Government Services is because Government Services has all the facilities to deal with transportation so the function remains in Government Services. That does not change the fact that it is doing that function on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Resources as a service to the elderly and handicapped.

Mr. Byblow: I think perhaps where the question arose is not so much that it is not providing that service but that it was in fact paying for it. The service was provided under Health and Human Resources and ought to have been covered under the expenditure of that department as opposed to the expenditure of this branch, which is a supply service not a social service as described.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It could be done that way and then it would be an internal chargeback from Government Services to Health and Human Resources. We have dispensed with chargebacks so we are running that service in the Department of Government Services for the Department of Health and Human Resources, but it is not an

internal chargeback. That is the only change that we made in it.

Mr. Byblow: The third point I want to raise deals with the public works aspect of the department. There was considerable concern in the past relative to project management and procedures within that branch. I understood that there was a lack of prescribed procedures within the authority of the department that they would normally follow. It was our understanding, as well, that these procedures were going to be put into writing in a more formalized process. I would want the minister to respond to that.

As I recall, these procedures were going to be in writing by the spring of this year; in other words, at some current point in time now. I raise this with respect to a couple of the projects that, over the past, seemed to have brought some question of accountability. Certainly one of the projects is in my riding and it relates to the Faro school.

I guess the problem originates with where the Public Works Department undertakes a project from another client department. In the process of examining the needs for the project, such as assessing the cost of the project and preparation of tenders, the actual construction to completion ends up, in many instances, without a set pattern of either documentation or authorities for decision-making relative to development of that project.

» Certainly, in the instance of the Faro school, there was some question raised about decision-making relative to foundation. Certainly, the net result of the deficiency creates a taxpayer cost because the deficiencies have to be corrected. So, in that way, I would be curious to hear from the minister whether we now have progress on developing a much more formalized set of procedures in project management?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This function of public works is just new in government services and a great deal of work has been done on it already. It was only a month and a half, two months ago, when Public Accounts was sitting down and, at that time, the deputy minister told the Public Accounts Committee that, yes, those procedures were being worked on.

In the meantime, we were also to have been working on a budget. We have been working on a great deal of other things and one of the things that we are working on is the written policies and procedures of how the public works department will function. I am hopeful, by mid-summer or early fall, that whole process will be laid out so we do not run into a situation like we had at the Faro school.

I cannot answer for what happened at the Faro school. There were some problems there and there were carry-overs from the old days where people in the departments were kind of making decisions on their own that should never have happened. We will make sure that that does not happen again in that department, but it takes time to develop all of those policies and get them written and down in the policy and procedures for the department.

Mr. Byblow: I can appreciate what the minister is saying and I guess we are getting the assurance that this is developing and this is being put into a formalized process so that reoccurrences of on-the-job decision-making has an accountability process.

At the same time, the question inter-relates with spending authority because in any project you often are required to make a decision that may incur additional costs. Given a known additional cost, certainly the decision-makers have to have clear what limits they have. I assume that the minister will, in the same context that he is assuring the House that these procedures are being put into place, is also looking at the spending authorities within those procedures.

Just extending from that, it has been brought to my attention recently that this government may not have the expertise to evaluate tenders and I want to touch on that for a minute. I guess there has been some question arising out of the Mayo Administration Building. It was a case of where a tender was awarded and the project never did get completed by that contractor, but went into a bonding process.

Now, there has been some question of whether or not the tender was valid in the first place, that the government may have been able to predetermine that that contractor never would have been able to finish. I am on very unclear ground from the point of view of facts

and accuracy, but the general question is what I am seeking. The policy of the government generally is to take the lowest tender, but, there can arise instances where the lowest tender is not necessarily the tender that will do the job. I am wondering how the government mitigates against this. What process do they have for evaluating tenders to ensure that they are credible and can be accomplished?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am surprised at the member across the floor, very surprised. He states that we do not have the capability to evaluate tenders and that is totally inaccurate. In fact, the contract administrator is an engineer. Also, that particular tender and that particular contract was covered by a bond so, obviously, the bonding company also thought that the company was capable of doing the job or they would not have the bond. We were well protected; we were 100 percent protected on that building, so we have nothing to worry about. The bonding company is now completing the project.

However, for myself, now, today, to evaluate some company and say whether it is going to go broke nine months from now would be totally unfeasible for me. Obviously, the bonding company did not think so and we did not think so, and that tender was allocated to that contractor. As long as we protected the public and the territory through a bonding process, I cannot understand your argument.

Mr. Byblow: It is not so much an argument as bringing to the minister's attention a concern that has been raised regarding the ability of this government to evaluate tenders to ensure that they can be delivered in terms of the job they are doing. The minister is saying that this government protects itself adequately, and that may very well be the case; however, I suppose the concern still remains that a tender can be accepted which does not have a hope of completing the job. I suppose that is a risk that government or anyone faces at any time. Certainly, in any kind of business you would have the same situation of deciding whether or not to accept someone to do a job or not.

Extending again from that, there was some concern within the Public Accounts Committee about a study that was to have been done on the Dawson City sewer and water project. There was some confusion within the committee — perhaps the minister will even recall, because he was observing the hearings for the most part — relative to who was doing an investigation. At one time, it seemed to have been the commitment of municipal and community affairs. Then it was the commitment of public works and then finance. There was no final resolution of who is actually doing any type of a study that was committed in a previous public accounts hearing. Is the minister, through public works, conducting any type of hearing on that project and, if not, who is?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I can tell you right now that the Department of Public Works is not doing it. When the Department of Public Works was transferred to Government Services, the municipal engineering branch was split off and given to the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs. If the investigation is being done, it would have been done by those municipal engineers in the first instance and, if there is any investigation being done, it would have to be done by the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs because the Dawson water and sewer system is now the responsibility of public works.

Mr. Byblow: I think the interesting thing was that municipal and community affairs knew nothing of the project when they were questioned about it. So, it is something that perhaps ought to be pursued with the government leader in the appropriate forum.

Another area of concern from this minister's department, and which has been a subject of considerable debate in the past, relates to the travel agency.

» The minister and I have debated this at length and I do not wish to enter into that debate again. One of the commitments undertaken by the minister's administration was that there would be some type of cost benefit analysis within a year of its operation to determine if, in fact, what the government has undertaken to do by setting up this particular agency or service was saving this government money. My question is more basic. Did this government do any kind of a cost benefit analysis to determine what saving they would be capable of achieving by setting up this agency? In the controversy surrounding it, I guess the question arises as to whether it was a rash decision or not, and I guess I am simply calling on the minister to defend it in terms of its inception.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, there was a detailed cost benefit analysis

done when I took this proposal to Cabinet; I cannot recall the exact figure now, but I think what we felt we would save was in the forty thousand dollar a year range; not by taking it away from the travel agency, but by being able to utilize excursion fares, for one thing. There were other considerations. By centralizing the travel agency in the department of Government Services and all the travel in the department, what we took away from the government as a whole was the possibility that someone in this government could, through an illegal act, recover some money or cancel tickets and pocket the money. We took away all of that possibility happening as well. Or someone buying a full-priced ticket, for example, then cashing it in and buying excursion fare and pocketing the difference. All of those possibilities were taken away, so we have not only saved the government money but we have also made it impossible for any of those actions to take place, which was also considered to be of great benefit to the government.

My department has also committed itself to the Public Accounts Committee to give you a detailed breakdown. It is working on it and is prepared to give it to you.

Mr. Byblow: Yes, I am aware of the commitment to the committee and that is why I did not raise that question. I was curious about the level of investigation this government did when it first set up the agency, as I will call it for lack of another term. I am very curious about this reference the minister makes to the fraudulent nature of ticketing that may have taken place. He alluded that this may have taken place — he did not say that it did — when an employee travelling on behalf of government gets a ticket paid for by government, by his department, at full price, cashes it in and buys an excursion fare or cheaper fare and pockets the difference. I recognize it is possible. Let me put the question bluntly. Was it happening? Was it taking place?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It may have. I am not aware that it did take place, but what I am aware of is that we have now made it impossible for it to take place.

Mr. Byblow: I would be very concerned if it was taking place. I gather that the government had some suspicions, perhaps had some evidence, but not enough for convincing proof. My question would consider the area of saving the government money. One aspect the minister mentions that saves this government money is that it has the opportunity through its own agency now to take advantage of excursion rates. As I understand excursion rates, they are rates that you can get only if you book in advance. It seems to me that you can book in advance and save that kind of money whether or not you are doing it internally. If you know you are travelling next week you can book through a travel agency or internally. The fact is that excursion rates are a saving because of advance booking. How does having your own internal agency save that? Why was the advantage not taken of that kind of rate setting in the past?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: You must recognize that before we formed the internal travel function in the Department of Government Services every department was making its own arrangements; not just one person in the department, it might have been anybody in the department, practically, who was making his own arrangements. What we would run into would be the fact that someone in Finance might be travelling next week, booking and getting an excursion fare. Someone else in another department books and they take all the excursion fares. What we are doing is to utilize all the excursion fares. In order to stop that from happening and taking away the use of those excursion fares from the general public, which are a limited number of seats, the decision in past years was made that we would not utilize excursion fares at all. We would leave them all for the general public. We were flying full fare, a more costly fare, and sometimes there were excursion seats that were not being utilized. By centralizing the travel we were able, last year for an example, to save \$19,000 just on excursion fares alone. We would utilize the excursion fares and we would cancel them if the general public wanted to use them, and we would pay the full fare. We did save \$19,000 just in being able to utilize the excursion fares.

Mr. Byblow: I think I understand what the minister is saying. He is saying that this government took advantage of excursion fares

only when they were available, and not interfering with public traffic. The saving of the \$19,000, it would seem to me, could also probably have been saved if that excursion fare rate were pursued with the private travel agencies. However, it is not a matter of tremendous concern because, I believe, the travel agencies are still doing the bookings and receiving the commissions. There does not seem to be the type of interference it was thought the government's intentions were, originally. I think probably the value of coordinating travel services, in a general way, is a much greater benefit than just having to do with the air travel. Coordinating cars and trips to areas of the territory and elsewhere in the country is distinctly an advantage to be gained by that kind of coordination. I think that is probably the greatest advantage of an internal travel agency.

One other question I raise with the minister relates to the moving of the Queen's Printer into the Marwell area.

Mr. Byblow: It has been brought to my attention that this has created some delays in printing and I am wondering if the minister can respond to that and advise whether that move has created longer periods to get work done? At the same time, what was the great advantage of going to the Marwell area? This is sort of a double-barrelled question: are we having delays, to the minister's knowledge, and what efficiency has been created by the move?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Any delays cause by the Queen's Printer moving to the Marwell area is minimal. The only advantage here was that people could run downstairs and grab copies that were already printed. Actually, in the production of items for each department there is no change at all. The only advantage was that we had it right here.

It was a great saving in the fact that we did not have to go out and purchase or lease expensive office space in the private sector when we had excellent office space here. All we had to do was take the Queen's Printer out and convert it, the same as we moved out the storage of paper into cheap storage areas and utilized our space for offices. We had the space available in the Marwell area, but we now have the supply services department all together in one building over there. The Queen's Printer is over there, as well, so it has been a benefit rather than a detriment to the government.

On Administration

Mr. Byblow: Is the item \$289,000, under Other, composed of the premium payments for insurance, as identified on page 253?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, Other is the insurance. It has been moved from the Department of Finance to us and that is what the line item is for.

Mr. Byblow: On the statistics relating to the line item, I thought that in previous discussions there was no insurance in education facilities, yet there is at least one \$350,000 premium payment identified. I am confused now.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If there was no insurance on educational facilities, how did we replace the Old Crow school? Certainly we have insurance on them.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in the insurance coverage under Property Insurance. Are the buildings and land owned by the Yukon Housing Corporation in that line or is it separately dealt with under that Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I may stand to be corrected on this but I believe the Yukon Housing Corporation is a separate corporation and has its own insurance. I do not believe it is insured under our policy.

Mr. Byblow: Could I ask whether or not that premium identified for education fire insurance covers all school buildings in the territory, or is it the contents within? I recall in a discussion a couple of years ago that, in fact, it was not worth paying the insurance on all of the school structures because the premium was in excess of the replacement cost of any one school that could burn down.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, the schools are covered under the property insurance of \$50,000,000. The education fire insurance must be for some other function of education; for equipment, or whatnot. I do not have it here. It is not the actual buildings.

Mr. Byblow: Just to clear it in my own mind: all school facilities, structure and equipment, are insured in the territory, and probably insured under two different programs: one for equipment

and one for the physical structure. I say under two programs because, under property insurance, the building would be insured; and probably under education fire insurance the facilities within the school would be insured. Would that be a correct reading?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No. The school insurance covers all of the buildings. The education equipment insurance, I believe, is for some education equipment; I do not have the information with me. I can give it to the member at some other time.

Mr. Byblow: I will accept that undertaking simply because it still is a bit confusing.

**Administration in the amount of \$453,000 agreed to
On Systems and Computing Services**

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The major change in the 1983-84 estimates is totally in the area of personnel costs. The 1982-83 estimates reflected a large vacancy factor throughout the year and that was an average agreed vacancy; we have now filled almost all of those vacancies and we have gone back to the 10-day fortnight, so the 10-day fortnight and the vacancy areas covered an increase of about \$300,000.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$145,000 agreed to

On Processing Services

Processing Services in the amount of \$754,000 agreed to

On Systems Development

Systems Development in the amount of \$457,000 agreed to
On Service Centre

Mr. Byblow: Before we clear this, I want to call the attention of the minister to the statistics on page 255. My earlier reference to statistics as being inadequate is substantiated by these. When processing services, for example, it is identified as being utilized for 90 percent of the time, I would be curious: what is that 90 percent of? Is it of an eight-hour operational shift, is it a 24-hour period? It is a bit unclear as to the detail of utilization and I believe that is what the committee brought to the attention of the administration, and that is the kind of improvement that will still be forthcoming, although this is an improvement over last year's estimates.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This government works on a seven-and-a-half hour day; it does not work on a three-shift basis. It works on a seven-and-a-half hour day, 37½ hour week, not on a three-shift basis. If processing services are utilized 90 percent of the time, it is utilized 90 percent of that seven-and-a-half hour day. There is 10 percent available for future growth.

Mr. Byblow: The minister has clarified that and it ought to be made clear in the statistics because I could argue and say that, in fact, constitutes approximately 30 percent utilization of available time of equipment if you were running for 24 hours.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If we wanted to go on the three-shift basis, yes, you could make that point but we do not run on a three-shift basis.

Mr. Byblow: Clear.

Service Centre in the amount of \$96,000 agreed to

Systems and Computing Services in the amount of \$1,452,000 agreed to

On Supply Services

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The major changes in the estimates this year are a result of the decision to discontinue the chargebacks to departments for pool vehicles. Funds have been removed from the department budgets and credited to supply services' budget. The other major increases in records management is for personnel costs. The 1982-83 budget reflected a large vacancy factor for personnel, which has not been done this year; we budgeted the full amount.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$122,000 agreed to

On Purchasing

Purchasing in the amount of \$202,000 agreed to

On Queen's Printer

Mr. Byblow: We have the reduced cost identified in the Queen's Printer. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I cannot give you that answer. All I can tell you is what the department is doing for the money. There are seven employees: print room staff and design staff. The allotment for

professional and special services is to cover printing costs for *Hansard* and the *Yukon Gazette*. Equipment rental charges are for various photocopying equipment and supplies cover all the photocopy paper and paper required for printing services. That comes to a total of \$600,500, rounded out to \$600,000. I cannot give you a reason why it would decrease by \$7,000 as I do not have that information with me here.

Mr. Byblow: Does the Queen's Printer line item include the photocopying equipment, such as photocopiers, within the departments of government in this building?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, the photocopiers are in supply services.

Mr. Byblow: Does the minister know if they are included in the Queen's Printer line item?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, they would be in the general supply services; equipment rentals.

Mr. Byblow: I am wondering then if the Queen's Printer reduction in cost is not the reflection of the increased use of the photocopiers within the departments. Because the Queen's Printer has moved to the Marwell Area, lot of the printing that normally was done by the Queen's Printer is now being run through other equipment. Maybe that is a reflection of the cost. That also relates to something I said earlier, because it is taking longer for some of the print requirements to go over there and come back, people are utilizing equipment here. Of course, it has a number of other consequences in terms of what it is the the maximum point at which it is more economic to use a larger piece of equipment like at the print shop rather than a photocopying machine. I suppose, in quick summary, my curiosity would only lead me to think that the Queen's Printer reduction is a reflection of the increased use of other photocopying equipment within departments.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I do not believe that is the answer. It is a thought of the member opposite but I do not believe that is the answer. It is only a \$7,000 reduction, under any circumstances.

Queen's Printer in the amount of \$600,000 agreed to

On Asset Control

Asset Control in the amount of \$59,000 agreed to

On Transportation and Communication

Mr. Byblow: I could not let this one quite slip through. The minister made some reference to coordinating the transportation services. We talked about it to some extent in general debate. Could the minister now break out some of the transportation and communication major items and, in the process, reflect how there is an improved efficiency in the transportation requirements of government in general, through the coordination exercise that they have put in place

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think it is fairly elementary. A good example would be when the Department of Education had to go to Old Crow to inspect a school and, at the same time, some other person in another government department was going to Old Crow, say Municipal and Community Affairs, in regards to something going on in the community, or Highways and Transportation in regards to the airport; if those three requests were to go into the transportation department they would all be coordinated and one plane, for example, would be chartered to handle the whole situation rather than two or three planes going up there. There is a significant saving just in the coordination of air travel.

The same could be said for the coordination of vehicles. We now have quite a few vehicles in the vehicle pool and if a couple of departments are wanting a specific vehicle to go to a specific area we might request that they travel together. We save in that; in fact we reduce the pool fleet by about 30 vehicles.

There is another area where we can save a significant amount of money — we have not totally done it as of yet — is in telephones in this government. It has been suggested to me that by coordinating all of the telephones in this government we could save ourselves in excess of \$100,000 a year. There is going to be a great deal more work done on that. That will probably come forward to Cabinet some time in the future. Almost everyone in this government has a single party line; it is not necessary. There are a great many things that we can save money on by centralizing them into one department and having a little bit of control over them.

We can also have some control over rental of equipment because the department knows, when the budget process comes into place, what the requirements are of the departments. Once it is centralized, you can gain a lot of savings by volume purchases, or by buying specific vehicles that you know are going to be required. There are a great deal of areas where we can save money by centralizing.

Mr. Byblow: The minister presented arguments in favour of centralization of the transportation and communication services. If he would make note, I did ask to have some breakout of the major portions of that three-quarters of a million dollars. The minister made reference to having reduced the car fleet by 30; my question on that is: do we rent the cars in the car pool, do we own them or is it a mix of the two?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is a mix of the two. We lease some, we own some and some we lease to purchase; at the end of the lease period, we purchase the vehicles, depending on the mileage that is on them. A great number of them are leased. I will give you the breakdown: personnel costs for the staff is \$202,000; other costs, such as travel, are \$24,000; telephone and communications are \$44,000; professional and special services \$3,500; rental of equipment, just about \$100,000; repairs and maintenance \$411,000; and, supplies and materials \$2,500.

Mr. Byblow: The \$100,000 under rental of equipment would, I assume, reflect a number of vehicles that are on rental to the car pool. Does the minister know how many vehicles are in the pool and do those vehicles include all vehicles that are used by all departments within government? I suppose I am just trying to understand the administration of those vehicles. Do we in fact have a car pool and then separate cars for some departments or individuals that do not belong to the pool? A couple of questions may result from the minister's answer.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If you consult page 257, you will see 'Number of pool cars - 152'; that is the number of vehicles we have in the pool. Now, there are departments that have their own vehicles; the reason being because they have a regular demand on them; they are utilized continually in the departments, so it would be senseless for the pool to have those cars. The pool cars that we have are cars that are assigned to departments for certain periods of time, but there are a couple of areas where the cars are actually in the department. For example, Yukon Housing Corporation has some cars; Workers' Compensation Board has a car; Yukon Liquor Corporation has cars. Those are actually purchased through the transportation and supply services section, but they are assigned to those departments.

Mr. Byblow: If I am understanding this correctly, we have 152 cars in the pool and, in addition to those 152, we have a staggered number through a number of other departments? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The 152 vehicles in the pool are almost all of the vehicles; there are a couple, such as the Liquor Corporation and the Housing Corporation, that I believe are in the departments themselves. Most of the cars are in the pool, but some of them are assigned to the departments. The transportation section does not have anything to do with the day-to-day operation of them.

Mr. Byblow: The minister said earlier that they reduced the car pool fleet by approximately 30. Looking at the line item of information on page 257, there was an increase from \$127,000 in the estimates of last year to \$152,000 this year. That, to me, reflects rather a \$24,000 increase in cars. How can the minister reconcile that with the 30 cars that they presumably got rid of?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The reason for that is because the Department of Highways and Public Works had their own vehicles and, when public works was transferred to government services, those cars that were in public works came over to government services and, subsequently, were added to the pool. The Department of Highways is one department that has its own vehicles that are not part of the pool.

Mr. Byblow: That Department of Highways is a pretty expensive crew. They must have brought with them about 55 cars because, if the fleet was reduced by 30 and we have an increase from last year to this year of 25, there must have been quite a transfer of vehicles.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I said the centralization of transportation reduced the number of cars in this government by approximately 30. I did not say it happened this year, but that is what happened with the centralization. The increase that you see here is because those vehicles came over with public works.

Mr. Byblow: The minister can be very general on this answer because he may not have the figures there, though he should have. What is the mix of cars we own and cars we rent? Is the \$100,000 that we identified earlier as equipment rental, the car rental? What number of vehicles would that constitute rental for? How many do we own and how many do we rent of that \$152,000.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not have that information with me, but there are more things involved in that \$99,000 than car rentals. We have communications in there. We also rent all of the telephones. It is things like that that are rented by this government. It is more than just vehicles in there. I do not want you to think that the \$99,000 is just for cars.

Mr. Byblow: Can the minister indicate, by percentage approximation, the proportion of owned cars versus rented cars? That is what I am after.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I could only guess because I do not have the figures with me, so it would not give you an accurate figure. I would guess that probably we own maybe 15 or 20 percent of the vehicles and we lease the others. When the cars get a little older, we would purchase them. I may be wrong there. We may own a larger percentage of them, so I cannot give you an accurate figure. I can bring it back to you, but to give you a figure now would be probably totally inaccurate.

Mr. Byblow: I guess what I was seeking was primarily policy with respect to the car fleet, whether the vehicles are rented and then acquired, that is by purchase. When does this government start getting rid of its cars? When is the point at which they are too old and start moving out and where might I be able to find, in the budget, a reflection of the asset in terms of ownership of the cars? Anyway, if the minister could give me an undertaking to provide something of that sort, I would be pleased with that.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I have already given that.

Mr. Byblow: Do the Executive Council vehicles belong to the pool or are they outside of the pool?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: They are part of the pool.

Transportation and Communication in the amount of \$783,000 agreed to

On Warehouse

Warehouse in the amount of \$170,000 agreed to

On Record Services

Mr. Byblow: There is a substantial increase in this of 70 percent. Could the minister explain?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The personnel costs are \$477,000 in this management of record services. That is for 19 employees, the mail room staff of three person-years. They were previously under transportation and communications and they have been transferred to the records management section. Other expenditures include rental of postage meters, postage costs, micrographic supplies and files.

I will give you a run-down of what the costs are. As I stated, \$477,000 of this is personnel; \$144,000 is cartage and postage, the postage increased significantly to this government; telephone and communications is about \$3,000; about \$9,500 is for rental of equipment such as the postage meters and micrographic material; repairs and maintenance is \$1,500; and supplies and materials is \$8,400.

Record Services in the amount of \$664,000 agreed to

Supply Services in the amount of \$2,600,000 agreed to

On Public Works

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There are no major changes within this program; however, under allotments for personnel there appears to be a large increase. This is due to the change in budgeting format for building maintenance. Labour charges in previous years were shown under Other. This year, we have put salaries under personnel costs where they more correctly belong.

On Property Management

Mr. Byblow: The line item that we are talking about is

obviously going to be, to a large extent, a personnel component. Property management, by definition, would be that responsibility of government to plan, engineer and do all the preparatory work of construction jobs that government would be undertaking. When the line item property management is identified for \$1,700,000, is that largely personnel on that particular item?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, the personnel costs are about \$380,000. The major cost in this area is the rental of buildings, \$788,000.

Mr. Byblow: I suppose I should ask for a break-out because, if we have \$700,000 and \$300,000 is for personnel, what is the other \$7,000?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The other major ones are: utilities, for \$513,000; supplies and materials, \$39,000; repairs and maintenance, at least \$20,000; and the others are just small incidentals.

Property Management in the amount of \$1,745,000 agreed to On Property Management Chargebacks

Property Management Chargebacks in the amount of \$53,000 agreed to

On Safety and Security

Safety and Security in the amount of \$170,000 agreed to On Emergency Measures Organization

Emergency Measures Organization in the amount of \$26,000 agreed to

On Building Maintenance

Mr. Byblow: Could the minister break this down a bit?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The main changes in this is the transfer of the three person-years from property management to building maintenance. The personnel costs in this area are \$1,077,000, which is the major part of this. The other costs are: travel \$44,000; repairs and maintenance, \$200,000; building materials, \$300,000; plus some small incidentals such as freight and telephone.

Mr. Byblow: A large part of this was personnel? Is this maintenance personnel who do repair work on government buildings? I am puzzled by the personnel aspect.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Building maintenance has all the custodial workers in it as well.

Mr. Byblow: Does this item include in it the repair of government buildings and schools as well?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, that is education.

Mr. Byblow: However, public works in many instances do repair work on school facilities. Is that handled as a chargeback then?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We do very little on schools; however, when it is done, we have tried to eliminate as much chargeback as possible. The internal chargebacks in the department, or in any department in the government, are really a waste of time; they are very costly. Just to process the paperwork costs as much as doing the work and forgetting about it.

Mr. Byblow: So, in the work schedule of public works where they may enter another department's or a client department's facility, they may very well often do the repair and just leave it within the cost of this department?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes.

Building Maintenance in the amount of \$1,661,000 agreed to On Building Maintenance Chargebacks

Building Maintenance Chargebacks in the amount of \$246,000 agreed to

On Project Administration

Mr. Byblow: This relates to some comments I made in general debate. Because the aspect of project administration was one area of considerable concern, could the minister identify, under project administration, what provisions there are in that line item to ensure that projects are adequately administered and looked after, whether for client or within this branch?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I just answered that when we were talking about public accounts. What we are doing right now is putting together the policy for the Department of Public Works and project administration, so that decisions are not made that should not be made. Meanwhile, while these policies are being worked on and developed, the director of the department has very strict instructions that for any decisions which are significant he will consult with the deputy minister. He will not make any decision that could, under

any circumstances, reflect an increase over his capability agreed to.

Project Administration in the amount of \$141,000 agreed to On Construction

Construction in the amount of \$226,000 agreed to On Construction Chargeback

Construction Chargeback in the amount of a recovery of \$226,000 agreed to

Public Works in the amount of \$3,444,000 agreed to Department of Government Services in the amount of \$7,949,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will go next to the Yukon Housing Corporation, on page 266.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Prior to that, I would like to move a motion. I move that the Committee of the Whole and the Assembly continue to sit beyond 5:30 p.m. for the purpose of considering those bills which are now in the Committee of the Whole and for considering Motion Number 18 on the Order Paper, and Motions 19 and 21, for which the hon. government leader has given notice this day.

Motion agreed to

On Yukon Housing Corporation

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will try to be brief on the Yukon Housing Corporation. As you can see, there is no major significant increase as far as the financial situation is concerned. We have laid out our budget trying to give an idea of what our programs are and what the costs of units are respecting the Housing Corporation, and what the costs incurred by the taxpayer are.

It should be pointed out that the administration increased by 10 percent as a result of going back to the 10-day fortnight. Further to that, there was an increase in community housing of seven percent, which is primarily because of the cost of utilities for units in the community housing area, as well as the cost of labour and material to perform maintenance tasks. There will be significant maintenance work undertaken on the low rent family units in Whitehorse over the course of this year.

In staff housing, there has been a four percent increase and this is due to the increase of the costs of goods and services. The number of staff units, as of March 31st, 1983, is 127, which is a reduction of six from March 31st, 1982, which has resulted from a combination of units that have been sold to staff or areas where we have cancelled leases because they are no longer necessary.

On the recovery side of things, we have a nine percent decrease in respect to recoveries from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This is due to the number of housing starts that appear to be starting between DIAND and CYI, which will mean less status Indians involved with our housing. We are projecting that they will be successful in getting other housing units.

CMHC has had an 11 percent increase for recoveries and that was primarily because of the operating deficit of the community housing program. As that deficit increases, so does CMHC's contributions. In rent and utilities, we have had a 33 percent increase. We are looking at our whole method of charging and recovering rent and utility costs. There are a number of proposals coming forward to Cabinet over the course of the next week or so to see what could be altered to enable us to do two things: cut down on the abuses that have occurred — and I think all members have heard various stories of what can occur in some units, depending on the tenant that we have — and to ensure that we are collecting our utility charges.

For example, we carried a deficit this past year of approximately, I believe, \$13,000 or \$14,000 in staff housing alone. The present method is that the Yukon Housing Corporation is billed and then we go back and bill the tenants. What happens is that sometimes we are maybe three or four months late in reversing the bill and, sometimes, the tenant has left. Subsequently, the taxpayer is held responsible for that particular bill and so what we are trying to do is put more accountability and responsibility into the system.

As I indicated, there are a number of options that are going to be discussed by Cabinet over the course of the next week or two, in conjunction with the Yukon Housing Corporation.

An area of concern that was voiced by the Public Accounts Committee was the maintenance dollar allocation. Just to give an idea: in preventative maintenance this year, it is roughly \$150,000 that will be spent; for scheduled maintenance, \$252,000; and, in emergency maintenance, it will be roughly \$42,000, almost \$43,000.

³⁷ The total maintenance budget is \$445,940. The scheduled maintenance by communities includes: Faro staff accommodation, the levelling of units and floor covering; Mayo, the public housing will be painting of exterior and interior of dwellings as well as new floor coverings; in staff housing in Mayo there will be some painting and floor covering, and some skirting and insulation; Ross River, there will be floor coverings, interior renovations, painting and repair of septic systems; Pelly Crossing, there will be interior upgrading as well as foundation repair; Dawson public housing, there is going to be some floor covering done as well as painting the exteriors; Dawson staff housing, there will be floor coverings as well as repainting of the Korbo apartments, levelling, and exterior painting; Beaver Creek, there is going to be some chimney repairs as well as exterior painting; Haines Junction public housing, there will be floor covering, roof repairs; Haines Junction staff housing, there will also be floor covering and landscaping; Carcross public housing, there will be repair of septic systems as well as floor coverings; Carcross staff, there will be floor covering; Teslin, there will be energy retrofit of the teacherage, floor coverings, exterior paintings; Teslin public housing, there will be some floor coverings; Swift River staff, there is going to be replacement of the septic system. Also, in deference to the coroner's report that the member for Campbell has raised a number of times, there is going to be an installation of a smoke and fire alarm system in that particular area; Watson Lake staff, there is going to be repair of heat tape, landscaping; Watson Lake public housing, there is going to be exterior painting, repair of heat tape.

Mr. Kimmerly: I intend to be very general and to ask perhaps all of the questions, I have, in general debate.

First of all, a question which is certainly out of order, but I would ask the minister's indulgence to answer concerns regarding a general issue that I want to raise about the accountability of these kinds of corporations. It is a major issue in the federal government. Concerning the Liquor Corporation, which is a similar kind of government corporation, is there any plan or any initiative to include a line item in the budget on the Liquor Corporation in order to bring the kind of accountability, in a public sense, that exists on this department for the Liquor Corporation as well?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not at the present time. I would be prepared to consider it. We do table the Liquor Corporation's annual report, which is a method of reporting to the House and if there are questions, there are methods to bring it forward for the purposes of discussing any outstanding issue in that area. I have never really had any representations made to me that we would want to go through the Liquor Corporation in the same way we do with the Housing Corporation, since the Housing Corporation is basically asking for monies for the purposes of an operating deficit. That is not the case of the Liquor Corporation, other than with capital assets; those are voted in the capital mains. That is primarily the reason why we have not brought forward anything within the context of the budget at the present time. I would say, no, but I would be prepared to hear his representations.

³⁸ **Mr. Kimmerly:** I realize there exists the possibility of motions and the information in the annual report is useful, but it is an issue which the minister might consider in the future.

On to a more relevant question — I was interested in the most recent annual report, which is 1981-82. Is there any progress being made in speeding up the annual report process so that the last year's annual report, 1982-83, could be available at the time the 1983-84 estimates are debated?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We run into the problem of the ability of the auditors to do their necessary work for the annual report. It is a question of timing in respect to that particular work being done. All I can say to the member opposite is that I table it as soon as I receive it, as quickly as I possibly can, in the session that is most immediate. The question is more one of mechanics and administra-

tion and it is not really up to us, because it is a federal audit; they come in at certain times of the year and these people are put to our disposal, the way I understand it. I cannot give you a definitive answer but I will bring a reply, perhaps this coming fall, in respect to whether or not it can be speeded up, but I understand it is an administrative problem.

Mr. Kimmerly: I thank the minister for that. I am not going to go into the recommendations contained in the Public Accounts Committee about the reporting or the restructuring of the presentation of information as it is thoroughly covered in public accounts and would perhaps be relevant next year as opposed to this year. As the minister is well aware, there are some policy differences between the Conservatives and the NDP as to the way the corporation could be used. I will not go into those at great length at this time, but I would like to ask about the possibility that the corporation may be divesting itself of surplus units, especially in rural areas. Is any divesting policy at all planned in 1983-84?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Units other than those we need for staff or for a social pool in a community are available for sale. We are wrestling with this question and how it affects the various communities concerned, the market, and various other elements that come into play. I think it is safe to say we have over 500 units throughout the territory; we are by far the largest landlord in the territory. In many of our small communities it has caused some problems, socially, between the various factions, if you like, within the community. I think we should be encouraging those people who want to have a permanent home in a community to purchase, if possible, the unit with the idea of the responsibility of the unit being theirs, and it is their home, rather than a kind of transient home that one moves in and out of. Philosophically, we differ on that, but it would seem to me to be a very rational approach to trying to ensure that we have the permanency we would like to see in our small communities.

³⁹ **Mr. Kimmerly:** I am not sure if I got a clear answer; I do not think I did. However, I will simply make a representation to the minister about any divestiture which may be more than a unit or two, or which may be, in the future, more than what usually occurs based on the last five years or so. Any divesting policy, of course, must concern itself with the marketability of these units and especially in smaller communities. That is going to be a very thorny issue, I am absolutely sure. I see the minister nodding. He is obviously well aware of the problem.

I would also make a representation to the minister that, if any divestiture policy occurs in the future, substantial publicity or a clear policy announcement precede it in order to avoid any possibility of any scandal or anything like that. I simply raise the question as a representation to the minister.

I would like to go to the question of seniors. What is now being done in the old Bishop's residence attached to Greenwood Place? Substantial construction is now occurring and I wonder if the plans could be made known?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I know there was a great deal of discussion with the residents of the particular seniors' residence in question. I do know that there is some major work, interior as well as exterior, being done. If the member opposite would like some access to what actually is being done, if he contacts my office, I will be sure to arrange for the plans to be available for his perusal. I do not have them with me and I do not have an exact breakdown on the actual renovations.

If I recall correctly, that money was voted in the capital estimates and I think it was in the neighbourhood of about \$45,000. I am just checking to see how good my memory is; I will have to check the capital mains. That work, I understand, is proceeding, and if he wants access to the plans, I have no objections.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question about the policies concerning the payment of rent by staff members or YTG employees. There appears to be a problem in some cases — I know the teachers raised it in the past — about rental payments coming off the bank notice of the bimonthly salary cheques. A problem arises if there is a disagreement between the landlord and the tenant. Are clearly delineated policies in this regard being written or improved upon and are they being discussed with the unions involved, the teachers

and the public servants?

“**Hon. Mr. Lang:** The only thing that I had any knowledge of was the publicity and I believe I saw a copy of a letter in respect to the teachers and the YTA representatives in correspondence with the housing corporation. To my knowledge, there have been no further discussions on that particular issue. If they wish to sit down and discuss it, that is fine. We are more than prepared to sit down and discuss it, but it would seem to me there is a fair amount of protection already built into the collective agreement, if you like, as far as housing is concerned, the way I understand it, and what we are prepared to provide. I guess it is a question of legal opinion as to exactly how we are going to provide it and how they are going to pay. It would seem to me that, with the comments I made earlier — the fact that we are going to be incurring a deficit over the course of this coming year because of the inability to charge back quickly enough prior to tenants leaving staff units — that this is the best of two worlds, both for the tenant as well as the employer, who are the taxpayers of the territory. Whether or not that should change, I am prepared to listen, but the point is, the corporation has to get its revenues in if I am going to be able to proceed with the maintenance programs that we are taken to task over at one time or another, along the highway or in a coffee shop. If we are going to subsidize the rental structure any more, we either have to ask the taxpayer for more dollars or the money comes out of maintenance, to offset any subsidy or lack of payment. I guess it is partially a policy question and partially a legal question in respect to *The Landlord and Tenant Act*. I know the department is looking at it; whether or not they have anything definitive, I do not know.

Mr. Kimmerly: I will raise one illustrative problem. I believe it was a teacher who spoke to me about a case where the utility payments were properly charged to the teacher but many months went by and no utility charges were taken off the teacher's salary cheque. In one month, a very large amount was taken off and, in the particular case, was almost the full amount of the salary cheque and the teacher was not expecting it and was financially embarrassed temporarily because of it. There was no disagreement, as it turned out, as to the total charges, only as to the method of payment. I raise it as a problem that probably could be solved if it were looked at carefully.

Concerning the utility payments, I will simply ask this very general question. I know it is a complex area. When the corporation is contemplating raising payments or charging tenants for utilities and various other charges as a matter of policy or as a matter of course, are those things discussed with the union prior to implementation?

“**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Where possible, there is an effort to consult with the representatives in question respecting any major departure and any major changes.

Respecting the issue that the member raised earlier, I concur with him. I know of one or two cases where that happened, as well, where the utilities were to be charged and they were not taken off on a monthly basis and, all of a sudden four months down the road, there was a fairly substantial bill for utilities. This one method, as I indicated earlier, that we are looking at, is to see whether or not the payment of utilities should be the responsibility of the tenant, not the Housing Corporation. That way, it would do two things. First of all, it would ensure that the person who had the unit would be conserving energy, which is supposed to be a national objective now. Secondly, it would relieve the Housing Corporation of the administrative headache of reverse billing, and the costs thereof, and the possibility of not getting paid.

So, I can sympathize with the case that the member raised. This is one of the areas that we are looking at in the review of how we are charging and how we should be collecting.

Yukon Housing in the amount of \$1,508,000 agreed to

On Loan Capital and Loan Amortization

On Loan Capital

On Loans to Third Parties

Loans to Third Parties in the amount of \$4,000,000 agreed to

On Land Development

Land Development in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to

Loan Capital in the amount of \$5,000,000 agreed to
On Loan Amortization

On Interest

Interest in the amount of \$2,687,000 agreed to

On Principal

Principal in the amount of \$3,341,000 agreed to

Loan Amortization in the amount of \$6,028,000 agreed to
Loan Capital and Loan Amortization in the amount of \$6,028,000 agreed to

On Schedule A

On Yukon Legislative Assembly

Yukon Legislative Assembly in the amount of \$1,045,000 agreed to

On Executive Council Office

Executive Council Office in the amount of \$1,650,000 agreed to

On Education, Recreation & Manpower

Education, Recreation & Manpower in the amount of \$28,254,000 agreed to

On Consumer and Corporate Affairs

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

On Health and Human Resources

Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$29,514,000 agreed to

On Municipal and Community Affairs

Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of \$6,597,000 agreed to

On Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations?

Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations in the amount of \$2,609,000 agreed to

On Justice

Justice in the amount of \$10,312,000 agreed to

On Highways and Transportation

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

On Public Service Commission

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

“***On Finance***

Finance in the amount of \$2,980,000 agreed to

On Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources

Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources in the amount of \$2,868,000 agreed to

On Renewable Resources

Renewable Resources in the amount of \$4,250,000 agreed to

On Government Services

Government Services in the amount of \$7,949,000 agreed to

On Yukon Housing Corporation

Yukon Housing Corporation in the amount of \$1,508,000 agreed to

On Loan Capital

Loan Capital in the amount of \$5,000,000 agreed to

On Loan Amortization

Loan Amortization in the amount of \$6,028,000 agreed to

On Total

Total in the amount of \$141,407,000 agreed to

On Clause 2(1)

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill Number 5, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84* be amended in clause 2, of page 1 by adding “and the sum of \$11,799,000, provided for in the *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1983-84 (No. 2)*” immediately after 1983-84 and before “from and out of”.

This is simply to reflect the interim supply that was passed some days ago.

Amendment agreed to

Clause 2 as amended agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 1

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, as amended.

Motion agreed to

Bill Number 6: An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: These amendments, as I stated at second reading, are necessary, in some cases, to bring our act into line with the federal legislation. We are required by our income tax agreement with the federal government to keep our act in line. This is the first time we have made amendments in three years. The major amendment, of course, to the bill — the one I believe is the most important to everyone — is the section that increases the Yukon personal tax by two points from 43 to 45 percent of the federal tax.

I recall that there was some question at second reading from, I believe, the leader of the opposition, in respect to the apparent changes in the filing regulations, or what is going to happen to people who do not file on time. These are standard; these are required by the federal act.

Mr. Penikett: I have a very general question for the government leader. The proposed increase in the tax rate represents a four-and-a-half percent increase in taxation for those people paying this tax. Could the government leader tell us if the Department of Finance obtained from the Department of Economic Development any assessment of the effect of this measure on consumer spending in the territory and, therefore, the revenues of the retail service sector and, consequently, their viability?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do have a schedule showing the effect of changes in the Yukon income tax rate. A single person whose net income is \$20,000 has personal exemptions of \$3,560 and a standard deduction of \$100, and will have a taxable income of \$16,340 or an increase in income tax payable of \$58.71.

Conversely, a single person who has a net income of \$40,000, will have a taxable income of \$36,340, or an increase in tax payable of \$162.44. A married person with two dependents, who makes \$25,000, has a taxable income of \$16,890; his increase in tax would be \$61.22. A married person making \$40,000 a year and has a taxable income of \$31,890 will have a tax increase of \$135.74. A senior citizen with no dependents, making \$20,000 a year, would have a taxable income of \$13,120 and an increase in taxes of \$45.34.

Mr. Penikett: For obvious reasons, I do not want to prolong debate on this measure. Our position is clear. I just want to tell the government leader, or indicate, on the evidence of his own figures and, perhaps, depending on how you analyze the make-up of the population, there is an average increase, depending on whether people are married and depending on the range of income, of about \$100 for those people working. If our workforce at the moment is something less than 10,000 people, then the reduction in purchasing power for the people in this community at the moment, in this tax year, would be approximately \$1,000,000.

The effect of \$1,000,000 reduction in retail trade in this community, at this point in time, may at least, I suspect, affect the marginal retail ventures to their disadvantage; therefore, conceivably having a greater negative effect on those businesses and on the consumers involved than, in fact, the tax benefits provided to those businesses in the same budget.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I realize, and I appreciate, that we are working under some time constraints. However, philosophically, the leader of the opposition and I are going to disagree on this kind of an item. We are not reducing the purchasing power of the people of Yukon by \$1,000,000; that is a very standard over-simplification of the facts. We have, in fact, increased our spending by like amounts.

Mr. Penikett: I am sure the government leader does not want to get into a debate with me about the level and volume of the social wage in Yukon at this point of our history. That is not my point. I simply made the point about the economic impact, not the financial impact, on this government. Those are, of course, two separate questions, and it was to the problem of the Yukon economy that I was addressing myself. I am fully cognizant of the financial

problems of this government and I suppose I am probably as knowledgeable about them as most citizens and am cognizant of the need to deal with them.

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5

Mr. Penikett: Can the government leader confirm my understanding that that simply adds to the list of taxable items for deductions and that it is simply an addition which is already in the federal act?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, it is in fact something that we are playing catch-up on with the federal government.

Clause 5 agreed to

On Clause 6

Mr. Penikett: A quick question: When I entered the debate at second reading, the government leader was looking puzzled at the numbers I was throwing out about the penalties here. Having checked with the old act, I was reading some numbers incorrectly, which the government leader indicated might not be accurate. Perhaps the government leader can correct any misinformation I may have put on the record at that point, and at the same time indicate to me the level of the problem in collections here by perhaps telling us what his officials anticipate the revenue from this penalty provision will be?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is a federal penalty, it is not a territorial penalty at all.

Mr. Penikett: So there is no revenue.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, this is one of the sections that we are required to change and amend, pursuant to the federal act. So, we are not cognizant of the problems that have been in existence. However, it does change the penalties, there is no doubt about it. The penalty now could be a maximum of 12 percent.

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Mr. Penikett: In Clause 7(2), in the section identified as (4.1)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Penikett, the time now being 5:30, we will recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. Penikett: If you could just not see the clock for a second, this may be my last question on the bill.

The question is simply, this one seems to be a new penalty added and it does seem to refer to a benefit derived by the Yukon Territory for the provision of this penalty. Can the government leader confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is my understanding, from the department, that these changes, in respect to election actions, are here as a direct result of instructions that we have received from the federal government.

Clause 7 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: If the Committee is prepared to finish the bill, we will do so.

Mr. Penikett: I would move, as opposition critic, that pages five and six clear.

Motion agreed to

On Clause 8

Clause 8 agreed to

On Clause 9

Clause 9 agreed to

On Clause 1

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 6, *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will now recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Recess

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

We will continue this evening with Bill No. 7, *Financial Agreement Act, 1983*

Bill No. 7 - Financial Agreement Act, 1983

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The *Financial Agreement Act, 1983* gives, to this House, virtually a *pro forma* bill in that it is one that we must pass at the spring sitting of our Legislature each year.

There are a couple of things a bit different about this bill in respect to this particular year, in the fact that it recognizes that we got, from the Government of Canada, a supplementary estimate, and it also amends the financial agreement for last year to reflect that supplementary estimate.

On Schedule

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is a rather unique situation that has developed. We anticipate that what is going to be transpiring is that for the taxation year, 1981, we are going to have a considerable debt to pay in respect to income tax that was paid to this government at that point in time. Yet, we anticipate for the following year that there is going to be a considerable deficit or payment that we could anticipate. Given those two, it is estimated by the Department of Finance, the federal government and ourselves, that the two will just about be equal. In order to help our cash flow position in the territory, this schedule and the amending section has been included in this bill that will allow us to offset the two in the forthcoming year.

02 *Schedule agreed to*

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5

Clause 5 agreed to

On Clause 6

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Clause 7 agreed to

On Clause 8

Clause 8 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 7, *Financial Agreement Act, 1983* be reported without amendments.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will now go to Bill No. 9, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*.

Bill No. 9 - An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, I recognize the philosophical differences that are going to prevail between the leader of the opposition and me in respect to this legislation. I want to say, once again, for the record, that it was a reluctant decision that we, on this side, made to have this legislation passed in November of last year. It is regrettable that we still feel that it is actually necessary that it stay in place. The amendments that are proposed here are primarily to clear up any doubts that may have been existing in respect to the legislation.

I am aware of the fact that there have been doubts raised once again, in some quarters, in respect to some of the wording. I believe that that wording is in reference, primarily, to 4(1)(2)(a) and 6(2)(a). I would like to assure all members that the word "or" is used advisedly, instead of the word "and". It is the opinion of our draftsman that the word "or" is the proper term to use in this context.

When we get to clause 7, I will be proposing an amendment in respect to the date of the signing of the bargaining agreement between the City of Whitehorse and the International Union of Operating Engineers.

03 **Mr. Penikett:** The government leader will understand that I, too, am reluctant to join in this dispute once again. I am, of course reluctant because it goes against my nature, being such an agreeable person. Nothing has happened in the last few days to resolve the philosophical dispute; however, I do want to ask the government leader about one of the questions he anticipated, and that is the question in respect to the Transit Commission. That is a practical matter, not a philosophical matter. I do not intend to ask questions about "ors" or "ands"; there is only one lawyer in this House and I suppose if he wants to advise us on the legal use of those words, I am sure he is in a position to do so.

What I want to ask is about another legal decision; that taken by the Ontario court in respect to the Outaouais Transit Commission, I believe it was, in the Ottawa region. The decision of the court was that employees of a bargaining unit who were federally certified — not certified under the Ontario labour legislation, but under the *Canada Labour Code* — were exempt from the provincial restraint law and had to be covered by a federal restraint law, not a provincial restraint law. The employees, in that case, appealed that decision to a court, and the court accepted the employees' point of view. I assume that this government must have taken legal advice on exactly the same point. If they did not, I am surprised.

I would like to know from the government leader, what information he may have had that would cause them to present an amendment which flies in the face of the most recent court decision on a very similar case.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We, in fact, have had legal advice on this particular matter stating that we could pass legislation in this Legislature that would be workable, that would prevail upon employees of the City of Whitehorse, be they working for the Transit Commission or any other commission of the city. We have also had legal advice that tells us that we do not have the jurisdiction.

We were requested by a number of organizations to make it clear exactly what our intent was. It was our intent that all employees of the City of Whitehorse, of any municipality, of the Government of Yukon, be restricted to salary increases of six percent in this year and five percent next year. There is absolutely no doubt about it; that was our intent.

This legislation makes it clear. We have advised the city — and we advised them months ago — that it was our interpretation that the legislation prevails, and should the City of Whitehorse choose not to abide by our legislation, then we would, very arbitrarily, not give them the money to pay the additional salaries to their transit employees. We have done that by letter; that letter is still in effect, and that letter is a fact. If the City of Whitehorse does not want to abide by the legislation that is in place in this territory, that is fine and dandy — except, Mr. Chairman, our transfer payments, or grants, to them are going to reflect a deduction of the amount of the difference between what they pay their transit employees and what this legislation calls for.

04 **Mr. Penikett:** I can only say that the "six and five" is pretty divisive stuff. We not only now have the potential of Ottawa fighting with the provinces and the territories, but the territories fighting with their junior governments in their own jurisdictions.

Since the government leader said that the intent is quite clear, and I would agree that the intent has been clear in respect to this wage control measure, and the intent has been clear with respect to the process of collective bargaining, do either of the legal opinions sought by the government — and I recognize that he really said that they were two different opinions — cause the government any concern in this respect? I am not a lawyer, obviously. I would be concerned that if some section of the bill were to be declared unconstitutional or that the government did not have jurisdiction, what would be the fate of the whole bill? Did the government leader get legal advice on exactly that point?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The only place where there can be any question in any legal advisor's mind in respect to the legitimacy of

the bill is in the case of corporations in respect to the municipality. There is no question, for instance, about the employees of the municipality; there is no question, at all, about employees of the Government of Yukon — absolutely none. That issue has not been raised by anyone at all. The only question where there has been any legal controversy is whether it applies to employees of the Transit Commission of the City of Whitehorse.

We have made it clear that we think that it should and we have now left it up to the city.

Mr. Penikett: I have news for the government leader. There is another case before the courts in Ontario right now concerning legislation like this, which is attempting to have the freedom of association provision of the *Canadian Constitution* invoked as a defense against this kind of legislation. I am sure the government leader is bound to hear about it, depending upon the outcome of the case. If the case is rejected, I expect that life will go on. If the court finds otherwise, it may have implications here. However, I did not want to provoke any questions about that.

A number of people have mentioned to me about the timing of our legislation. Obviously, the "six and five" program in Yukon came into effect some time later than in many other jurisdictions: it came in later than the federal government's. I had understood, from questioning the government leader, that the nine-day fortnight program, for awhile, was deemed to be a restraint measure in some way acceptable to the federal government. The federal government's "six and five" program had a definite beginning period and a definite end. It occurs to me that a number of people in Yukon will still be under "six and five" for quite some time after the federal program is finished, and, conceivably, after the economic circumstances may have changed.

I recall, for example, — and I can cite, to the government leader if he wishes, plenty of speeches from the House of Commons — that this program was introduced as a restraint measure to deal with what the federal government perceived to be an inflation problem.

Their analyses was that it was an inflation problem; as to whether it was a wage-push inflation problem or not, there were plenty of dissenting opinions about that. Clearly, we do not have an inflation problem here; we do not have an inflation problem nationally and it is conceivable that the federal government may go a very different route at the end of their program. I am sure that the government leader has thought about this, and about the consequences of our employees being under a wage regime that does not apply elsewhere or does not apply to federal civil servants. He is responsible for the Public Service Commission, and no doubt he will know what effect that may have on attracting certain skills to this government. Can I ask if, at least in his mind, there is some contingency that might allow for this program to end earlier than is presently legislated, if the federal government — or whatever government appears after the next election — decides to take an entirely different course in terms of an incomes policy for public employees?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think it goes without saying that if the circumstances in Canada dictate that we should repeal this legislation at the end of one year, at the end of the six percent year, certainly, we would be most anxious to do that.

In respect to the timing, it is the very reason that we insisted then, and we insist now, that the teachers be rolled back, because if we did not insist that the teachers be rolled back, if we let their collective agreement — which, at the time, would have been the easiest thing for us to do — to go its normal course, and then impose "six and five", it would have meant that the teachers in the territory would have been subjected to restraint legislation for 17 months after the rest of Canada had been off of it.

I, and my colleagues, thought that that was completely unacceptable. We thought that it was honestly better for everyone involved — for the teachers, for the territory, for everyone — if we did roll them back, given their collective agreement now, so that they would at least be fairly close to in time with the rest of Canada. As it turns out, unavoidably, given the present circumstances, if the status quo remains, if this legislation stays in place for two years, and if it does prevail, the teachers will be subject to restraint legislation for five months more than anyone else in respect to the end of the program, but they came on to it five months later than

anyone else as well.

Mr. Penikett: I have one last very general question to the government leader. He indicated his own reluctance to introduce measures like this. He will know that some people feel very strongly about the obligation between gentlemen, if you like, to honour contracts which they have signed and freely entered into. I want to ask him if he is concerned at all about the social consequences or the social climate resulting from this kind of legislation? I do not mean in terms of employee-employer relations; I have more in mind the problem of respect for law; the problem of people losing respect for laws made by this Legislature or of public institutions when they see one party unilaterally change a contract that that party has entered into and signed on the basis of negotiations freely entered into and freely concluded.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have stated, time after time, that we were very reluctant to do it. I have also explained in detail the reasons why it was necessary to roll back the teachers. It is a fact of life: the very easiest way out at this point in time for this government would have been to say to the teachers, "Hey, we have a collective agreement with you; we are going to live up to that collective agreement; we are going to pay you the salary that you are entitled to during this fiscal year, but at the end of this fiscal year, we are here to tell you that you are going to live by 'six and five', irrevocably for two years, when the rest of Canada is off of and finished the recession".

I am sure that everyone hopes that we are going to be finished with this thing in two years. I do not think that anyone who thinks about it at all, and particularly not the teachers in this territory, are very upset that they got rolled back to six percent. After all, they saw their colleagues in some of the southern provinces sign agreements for this year, when they got six percent, at zero percent — in fact, in one province, for a maximum of 3.5 percent, anywhere in the province for the year.

I submit to you, respectfully, that the teachers have gotten as good a deal here as anywhere in respect to this legislation. It was for their benefit, and for the benefit of the whole territory, that we chose to take the hard route, to make the hard decision — not the easy one, but the hard one — and the one that the leader of the opposition, rightly or wrongly, has been most critical of.

It is one that I cannot defend in any other way. We did not bargain in bad faith; we did not use the legislation to break the contract. We have done it, in spite of the teachers, for their own good.

⁰⁶
On Clause 2
Clause 2 agreed to
On Clause 3
Clause 3 agreed to
On Clause 4
Clause 4 agreed to
On Clause 5
Clause 5 agreed to
On Clause 6
Clause 6 agreed to
On Clause 7
Amendment proposed

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 9 entitled, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act* be amended at Clause 7(2), on page 2, by substituting "March 31, 1983" for "March 23, 1983".

Mr. Penikett: I do not want to enter into lengthy debate on the substance of the amendment. Before we clear this in the committee, could the government leader indicate to me the reason why there were so many errors in the original bill. Did it have to do with the speed of drafting late last November, or was there some other reason?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I thought he was going to ask a substantive question such as why this section was here because there is a specific reason for it being here. No, there were not so many errors. There were questions of interpretation. There was never any question of intent with respect to the legislation. These amendments

have been suggested to us because they clear up questions that have been asked. This is the kind of legislation that affects people very immediately and very severely.

As a consequence, people have been super cognizant of what the legislation says. They have looked at every word. There was absolutely no way, I submit, that we could foresee the kind of questions that did arise; not all of them. I think we foresaw some, but I do not think that we could have ever foreseen all of them. The amendments are simply to make it very clear exactly what our intent for the legislation was.

Mr. Chairman: I would bring to the members' attention that we have an amendment to deal with and I think it would be easier and more expeditious if we were to clear the amendment before we carried on with the other debate.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry. With respect to the amendment, it is simply a case of a typographical error. The date of the signing of the agreement between the City of Whitehorse and the International Union of Operating Engineers was March 31 rather than March 23.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment substituting in 7(2), "March 31, 1983" for "March 23, 1983".

Amendment agreed to

Clause 7 agreed to as amended

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 9, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act* be reported with amendment.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 10 - An Act to Amend the School Act

Mr. Chairman: We will go on to Bill No. 10, *An Act to Amend the School Act*.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: This bill changes the Christmas holidays so they will always be at least two weeks long and will begin and end with a weekend. I believe my hon. shadow from Faro was going to have a question about Section 109 in the *School Act*. The present legislation does allow the department to alter the school calendar at any time for special circumstances. That means that even with these amendments, changes can be made, should circumstances dictate. I believe that was what your question would have involved.

Mr. Byblow: Essentially, that was my question. Under Section 109 of the *School Act*, the power exists for the Commissioner-in-Council to actually make changes to any vacation or any holiday, notwithstanding Section 109. I would extend that question to the amendment that was introduced and passed in 1980. It was an amendment that created a section 109(1)(1) which, in turn, permitted the Commissioner to fix a date for the termination of the school year, and, again, any vacation or any holiday. I suppose, just for the record, all I wanted to clear up was whether or not those sections are still, therefore, in force, even with this amendment. In spite of the amendment we are introducing today, the power still exists with the Commissioner to change the school year?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: That is correct.

On Clause 1

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that you report Bill No. 10, *An Act to Amend the School Act*.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 11 - Employment Expansion and Development Act, 1983

Mr. Chairman: We will now go to Bill No. 11, *Employment Expansion and Development Act, 1983*.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: This act will ratify employment expansion and development agreements and programs already signed and will authorize future agreements of a similar nature. For the NEED letter of understanding to be a legal agreement, it is required that an appropriate act authorizing the Commissioner to sign such an

agreement be established. Once the act is passed, the department will seek the requisite order-in-council from the federal cabinet. This act will then ratify the NEED agreement and will also authorize future agreements of similar nature between Canada and Yukon governments.

Mr. Byblow: Does this include agreements in general under the Canada-Yukon community recovery program, or is it solely restricted to NEED?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It encompasses all agreements where there was an entering-into-agreement and a common signing by the Government of Canada and Government of Yukon. There was no signing with the Government of Canada for the specific program the member is asking about; however, for future programs that require cosigning, this act will cover all of those.

Mr. Byblow: In effect, then, this is ratifying agreements which have been signed, whether they are section 38 agreements, NEED programs or special assistance for a certain project — participation — programs?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: That is correct, and the member should read the last clause, 4(1), "This act shall be deemed to have come into force on January 1, 1982."

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Clause 4 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

On title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report Bill No. 11, *Employment Expansion and Development Act, 1983*.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 12 - Third Appropriation Act, 1983-84

Mr. Chairman: We will now go to Bill No. 12, *Third Appropriation Act, 1983-84*.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is a supplementary estimate that I undertook to table, in anticipation of the federal government making a decision in respect to what was going to happen at Cyprus Anvil Mines. I am very pleased and personally very satisfied that we can table this bill at this session. For a long time I wondered whether we would get the opportunity but, given the fact that the federal government has indicated their willingness to enter into an agreement with Dome in respect to Cyprus Anvil Mines, we would like to enter into an agreement with them as well, in respect to the top-up of salaries and we anticipate that that agreement, under the NEED and section 38 program, will cost us in the neighbourhood of some \$650,000, give or take ten or twenty thousand dollars. We anticipate using the rest of the money in other programs, at Cyprus Anvil, specifically, to create employment during the course of the year.

Mr. Byblow: I am sure the government leader would think it more appropriate to pass this legislation at four in the morning. I said, in my second reading speech, when I complimented the government for bringing this forward as rapidly as it did, that I wanted a little more information relative to the split of the money. As I understand it, there is something in the order of \$600,000 that will be flowing under section 38 top-up, and then the remaining three hundred and some thousand would be, as I understand it, applied to apprenticeship programs. The government leader can correct me if I am wrong, but as I understand how this split of money will flow, it is that the apprenticeship money is in fact going to recall some additional people beyond the 210. Perhaps the government leader could confirm that, as I understand there will be probably 10 to 12 additional apprentices called back over and above the 200 specified, who are going to be paid out of this portion of the million dollars. The \$600,000 consists of \$60 per week per employee for 210 employees for 52 weeks. The \$300,000 is for apprenticeship money, and perhaps we could get that confirmed?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will answer these questions, since the Department of Education will be handling the program. What we

had in mind was: because there was only going to be some \$680,000 used under the section 38 for the 210 employees for the 52 weeks, the idea was presented about the apprenticeship program for approximately 20 to 22 apprentices. They could be part of the 210 employees who are going to be employed. We have had preliminary discussions with Cyprus Anvil, the Cyprus Anvil union and the management personnel in respect to the proposal, and we are awaiting word now. We have also been in contact with the CEIC because they would be responsible for contributing a certain amount of the funding as well, so we have to have approval of the program from them. We are waiting for them to determine which cost-shared program can be utilized and the number of apprentices who might benefit from the proposal.

Mr. Byblow: I guess the only confusion I had was if the additional apprentices would be over and above the 210 and that the magnitude was about a dozen, but the minister is saying that it will cover the cost of 20 or more and is included in the 210. I guess, because the whole delivery or the whole flow of money under the various programs is a fairly complicated thing, I will not pursue it much further, other than to say that, if the minister is correct, I am somewhat disappointed, because I was considering that there were some additional people above the 210 included in the program. Certainly, the \$312,000, divided by an average income of \$30,000 covers about a dozen people. Obviously, the minister is saying there is going to be some additional CEIC money and it is going to be included in the \$210,000. That is a complexity that I am sure many people at the moment are working out.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: That does not necessarily mean that all those apprentices are going to be included in the 210. We are anticipating some overlap; and the member obviously did not take into account the CEIC contribution. That would allow for more apprentices. Also, the cost-shared programs are in general industrial training and the critical trades skills training, so they have to be identified, too; we are not sure exactly which apprentices would be eligible and we are not sure as to whether the union is going to accept this proposal or not.

On Schedule A

Schedule A agreed to

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

On title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Mr. Chairman report Bill No. 12, *Third Appropriation Act, 1983-84*.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would move that Mr. Speaker 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. Philipson: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84*; Bill No. 9, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*, and directed me to report same with amendment. Further, it has considered Bill No. 6, *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*; Bill No. 7, *Financial Agreement Act, 1983*; Bill No. 10, *An Act to Amend the School Act*; Bill No. 11, *Employment Expansion and Development Act, 1983* and Bill No. 12, *Third Appropriation Act, 1983-84* and directed me to report the same without amendment.

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

Some Members: *Agreed*

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a point of order, I would like to inform the House of the way in which we would like to proceed. First, we

would call for third reading of those bills which are passed out of the Committee of the Whole without amendment. Second, I would request unanimous consent to call for third reading for those bills which were passed out of Committee of the Whole with amendment and to call Motion No. 18, which is on today's notice paper, and Motions No. 19 and 21, for which the hon. government leader has given notice this day. Following that, we would request royal assent to the bills which have passed this House.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. government house leader have unanimous consent as requested?

All Members: *Agreed*

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 5: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 5, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 5, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, be now read a third time

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 5 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 5 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 5 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 5 has passed this House.

Bill No. 6: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 6, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 6 entitled *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 6 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 6 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 6 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 6 has passed this House.

Bill No. 7: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 7, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 7 entitled *Financial Agreement Act, 1983* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 7 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 7 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 7 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 7 has passed this House.

Bill No. 9: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 9, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 9 entitled *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act* be now read for a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader

that Bill No. 9 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 9 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 9 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 9 has passed this House.

Bill No. 10: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 10, standing in the name of the hon. Mrs. Firth.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that Bill No. 10 *An Act to Amend the School Act* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that Bill No. 10 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that Bill No. 10 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that Bill No. 10 do now pass and the title be as on the order paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 10 has passed this House.

Bill No. 11: Third Reading.

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 11, standing in the name of the hon. Mrs. Firth.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that Bill No. 11, *Employment Expansion and Development Act, 1983*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that Bill No. 11 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that Bill No. 11 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that Bill No. 11 be now passed and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 11 has passed this House.

Bill No. 12: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 12, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 12, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 12 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, I move that Bill No. 12 be now passed and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 12 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 12 has passed this House.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 18

Mr. Clerk: Motion no. 18, standing in the name of Mr. Falle.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Motion No. 18?

Mr. Falle: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Hootalinqua that the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and

Privileges consider and make recommendations at the 1983 fall sitting on a pension plan and a severance allowance plan for members of the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Falle: I made this motion in consideration just lately that the federal government has taken away all members' benefit to unemployment insurance and I do think it is high time that this government, along with other governments in Canada, look at a pension plan. I think we are about the only one that does not have one right now, and I think it is really proper that we do look at it.

Motion agreed to

Motion No. 19

Mr. Clerk: Motion No. 19, standing in the name of the hon. government leader.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. government leader prepared to deal with Motion No. 19?

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that the membership, as established by Motion No. 6 of the first session of the 25th Legislature, of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges be revised: one, by rescinding the appointment of the hon. Mr. Lang and by appointing the hon. Mr. Tracey to the said committee, and; two, by rescinding the appointment of Mrs. Joe and by appointing Mr. McDonald to the said committee.

Motion agreed to

Motion No. 21

Mr. Clerk: Motion No. 21, standing in the name of the hon. government leader.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. government leader prepared to deal with Motion No. 21?

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that this House recommends to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development the appointment of Ronald Fred Holway to the Yukon Territorial Water Board for a three-year term.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think it is public knowledge that Mr. Neil Olsen, who has been a member of the water board for three years and who was an appointment of this Legislature, has resigned and it is now necessary that we make another recommendation to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development pursuant to *The Northern Inland Waters Act*.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: It would appear at this time that the House is now prepared to receive Mr. Commissioner in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor to give assent to certain bills which have passed this House.

Mr. Commissioner enters the Chambers

Mr. Speaker: May it please your Honour, the Assembly has, at its present session, passed a number of bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the Assembly, I respectfully request your assent.

Mr. Clerk: *An Act to Amend the Territorial Court Act, Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84, An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act, Financial Agreement Act, 1983, An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act, An Act to Amend the School Act, Employment Expansion and Development Act, 1983, Third Appropriation Act, 1983-84.*

Mr. Commissioner: I hereby assent to the bills as enumerated by the Clerk, and I wish each and every one of you a very good summer.

Mr. Commissioner exits the Chambers

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until it appears to the satisfaction of the Speaker, after consultation with the government leader, that the public interest

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the government house leader that the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until it appears to the satisfaction of the Speaker, after consultation with the government leader, that the public interest requires that the House shall meet; that the Speaker give notice that he is so satisfied and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and that, if the Speaker is unable to act owing to illness or other causes, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for the purpose of this order.

Mr. Penikett: Just a brief discussion of this motion: I wonder if the government house leader or the government leader might give us some indications of House business in the next few months. We have had a number of references to a fall session, of course, but on a couple of other occasions the government leader has hinted that there might be need for the House to sit for some other purpose, either with respect to the general development agreement or, I have in mind, the problems of *The Children's Act*. If we are still bound to the proclamation date of October 1 with respect to the federal *Young Offenders Act* what implications does that have for House business? Does that mean we would need to come back into session in August or perhaps early September? I wonder if the government leader, before we vote on this question, could give us some indication in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would anticipate that we can, in fact, get by until our normal fall sitting with respect to the development agreement. I do not think that not being in session would preclude us beginning work on the general development agreement. In respect to the *Young Offenders Act*, there may well be a requirement that, in fact, we call the Legislature back into session prior to October 1 to enact legislation to ensure that we do have the proper authorities in place to cover ourselves in respect to that federal legislation.

As has been indicated by the Minister of Justice on a number of occasions, there is a strong indication from the Government of Canada that October 1 is their target date for proclaiming the *Young Offenders Act* in effect in Canada. However, we are aware that virtually every province in Canada is lobbying the Government of Canada and is opposed to October 1 being that date. It is my hope that the will of a majority of the provinces will prevail and that that date will be postponed. I would anticipate, if that happens, that possibly we should be looking at about mid-October as a reasonable time to start our fall session, and I would think that it would be a fairly heavy legislative session; particularly given the fact that we will have *The Children's Act* as one of the pieces of legislation that we will have to deal with at that session.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government house leader that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned.

The House adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

The following Legislative Returns were tabled May 3, 1983:

83-3-26

Occupational Health Surveys (Ashley); W.Q. No. 8, 2nd Session; W.Q. No. 4, 3rd Session

83-3-27

Labour Standards exclusion for Columbia Gas Development of Canada Ltd. (Ashley); W.Q. No. 20, 2nd Session

83-3-28

Companies registered in Yukon (Ashley); W.Q. No. 4, 2nd Session

