

some of these rather nasty issues. I would tell the hon. member for Yukon, and I am surprised he would not support me in this, that when I am faced with a choice of upholding the law passed by parliament or acceding to what may be a legitimate request which clearly is ultra vires, I have only one responsibility as a minister and as a member of this House and that is to uphold the law, but that has to be seen in the context of also being prepared to change the law.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, since this action taken by the minister is taken for the first time in the 70 year history of the Yukon house and is a precedent setting action, and since under section 20 of the Yukon Act passed by this House, clearly all bills that pass the three stages of reading in the Yukon house would be tabled here, and because this bill now will not see the light of day in this House, will the minister at least table the report of the standing committee on rules, elections and privileges of the Yukon house dealing with this matter so that all members will have full knowledge of the circumstances surrounding these events?

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to look at that suggestion and I will get back to the hon. member. I think it is important to recognize that on this side, and clearly on that side as well, there is a disposition to move toward natural constitutional development, although there may be some difference between this side and the Conservative party as to the pace and immediate goals. I understand the commitment of the Leader of the Opposition, but I made it quite clear to the people of the Yukon when I was up there, and to their elected representatives, that I was anxious to engage in a discussion now as to what are the next logical steps. I think it is unfortunate if these incidents of refusal of assent confuse, confound or compromise that process. My ultimate goal is to respond to their needs up there, and I am committed to doing that. I have to reiterate that there is a law which was passed by this parliament. That law may need updating, and I am not disputing that, but as long as it remains the law of this parliament it seems to me my fundamental obligation is to interpret it with the advice of the law officers of the Crown as best we can and to insist on it. I am surprised there is some dispute about that on the other side.

EXCEEDING OF DEPARTMENTAL APPROPRIATION—POSSIBILITY OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who has just enunciated his duty to uphold the law. I should like to ask what action he has taken when an appropriation for his department of \$1 million has been exceeded by \$400,000 on a deliberate basis? Has he taken any disciplinary action on that matter?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that we have taken disciplinary action. He was told that in the committee.

Oral Questions

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

DATE OF ACTION ON MOVING BRANCH TO CAPE BRETON

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Minister of Finance in his capacity as the minister in charge of the decentralization program. I presume he still has that job. Could he give us some idea when the 310 jobs that were announced for the industrial area of Cape Breton are actually going to be put in place there, because we are in a desperate situation, as he knows, from an unemployment point of view?

• (1142)

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add to the statements that were made at the time of the announcement in Cape Breton. If the hon. member is not aware of the precise date, I will forward the information to him. This announcement was made a few months ago and I do not have the precise date for Cape Breton. In any event, we are anxious to move as quickly as possible.

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, the date announced was 1981. Will the government try to push that up a little and add at least 300 jobs to this area of the Atlantic provinces as a recent economic study found that among women of workforce age, this area had the lowest labour force participation rate in all of Canada. Will he give us at least 600 jobs?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member clearly makes a representation rather than asking a question.

* * *

ENERGY

HOME INSULATION PROGRAM TO CONSERVE ENERGY—MINISTER'S POSITION ON CHANGES REQUESTED BY PROVINCES

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Yesterday the minister met with energy ministers across Canada. For the first time he actually drove them into a united front. I understand that eight provinces put forward suggestions for changes in the home insulation program. One suggestion which the minister accepted was to remove the precondition to all provinces joining. One submission made by the provinces is that the home insulation grant should be non-taxable in the other eight provinces of Canada as well as in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and that the program be decentralized. What is the minister's position on these requests from the eight provinces?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that yesterday the citizens of Alberta and Quebec became eligible for the national home insulation program. The reasons for the preconditions have now been removed. I am also pleased that the provincial ministers were able to put forward a number of constructive proposals for most of the national home insulation program.