



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 10

2nd Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, March 21, 1979 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon

Wednesday, March 21, 1979

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

We will proceed at this time with afternoon prayers.

(Prayers)

We will proceed at this time to the Order Paper.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

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

Tabling of Documents

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question of Mr. Byblow's, on March 8th, regarding a report prepared by the University of Alberta on continuing education.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question by Mr. Byblow, on March 12th, regarding this government's policy on travel arrangements.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to written question number four. I would also like to table the answer to oral questions asked by the Honourable Member from Campbell and the Honourable Member from Kluane concerning unpaid accounts by contractors in Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question from Mr. Penikett on White Pass and Yukon Route and CTC increase.

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

Are there any Reports of Standing or Special Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills?

Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

This then, brings us to the Question Period. Have you any questions?

Question Period

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was yesterday that the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West asked for an estimate for the year round maintenance of the Carcross-Skagway Road. The answer to this question is as follows: the lease summer maintenance cost is \$125,000; winter maintenance cost is estimated at approximately, \$175,000, for a total of \$300,000.

If summer maintenance is to include the application of calcium chloride and the periodic resurfacing of the road, summer maintenance would cost \$225,000. Winter maintenance costs at \$175,000, for a total of \$400,000.

At the same time I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it was yesterday when I referred to the cost of snow removal equipment and the cost is estimated at \$500,000 over and above that.

At the same time, it has to be recognized that to upgrade the highway to road traffic, I understand that there has been an estimate of \$16 million.

Further, while I am on the subject of roads, Mr. Speaker, I think I should clarify a response that I gave to the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, I believe, yesterday. He asked me if there had been a cost analysis study done of the Dempster Highway. I told him no, which is correct, but I should inform the House that there is a cost analysis study going on at the present time.

Question re: Director of Corrections' Resignation

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Government Leader with respect to the recent resignation of the Director of Corrections.

Will the Government Leader explain why, if the letter of reprimand and suspension has been removed from Mr. Mounsey's file as was indicated in the press release yesterday, why it was found necessary to issue it in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Justice to answer please.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, as indicated in our news release yesterday, Mr. Mounsey and the Government reached an understanding. One of the terms of this understanding was that neither of the parties would issue any further statement to anyone concerning this issue. I feel that I would be in violation of my word to Mr. Mounsey if I continued to make any statements concerning this issue.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I think a serious question arises on the authority of this House and on the Ministers who represent this

House with respect to their authority over their departments. In this question, there seems to be an obvious difference between the view expressed by the Minister in his press release, and that expressed by his deputy in previous undisclosed correspondence. In view of this contradiction, will the Minister undertake to make a full inquiry into this and report to the House?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared at this time to have a full inquiry, but as Minister of Justice, I have requested that the events leading up to, surrounding and immediately after the suspension of the Director of Corrections be prepared and given to me.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Will the Minister undertake to report to this House the findings of that investigation?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I believe I stated that this would be an investigation to me, and I do not believe that the internal workings of any department of the Government should be brought to the House.

Question re: White Pass

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government House Leader. This morning CBC Radio National News carried a story about a memorandum from White Pass to its employees which cited government intransigence as a possible cause of concern for the future employment of those people. Has the Government obtained a copy of this letter and, if not, will they attempt to do so?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, since this letter was apparently, designed to worry White Pass employees and create some apprehension in the community, will the government consider issuing a complete statement on the state of rail transportation in the Territory, given the facts of the situation as it understands them?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, this statement, I do not know what else can be said, has been said many times over. I said all that I think I am free to say in the House two days ago in respect to this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Final Supplementary.

Mr. Penikett: It appears the matter is not coming to any quick rest. Mr. Speaker, if the parent, Federal Industries, continues to dress his kid up in rags for a trip down to the welfare office, will the Minister consider inviting the company in question to appear before a committee of this House to examine the complete state of affairs as it regards our railroad?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, White Pass has got some legislative options open to them, some regulatory options open to them. I do not think that we dare interfere at this time with those options.

Question re: White Pass/Delivery of Ore to Tide Water

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to follow up on the previous speaker. The question is directed at the Government House Leader.

In a press release approximately, half an hour ago from the head office of Cyprus Anvil in Vancouver, assurances were given that neither White Pass nor Cyprus Anvil anticipated any interruption in the delivery of ore to tide water. It also indicated that no formal notice of shut-down has either been given or received.

Particularly, the press release states that the difficulties of the railroad have not yet been perceived by everyone in the Yukon and I am inquiring whether the Government Leader is aware of any pertinent information respecting the railroad's viability as a result of his recent talks that has not been disclosed in this House.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we, as a Government, are privy to confidential information that White Pass and Federal Industries made available in respect to their findings to the Federal Government Task Force.

That information was and is confidential and it was made available to the Task Force on that understanding, but, yes, we are privy to that information.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, since the Government is privy to this financial information and has, in fact, taken the stand that no financial assistance will be rendered, can the Government Leader confirm that he feels his perception of the White Pass situation is correct?

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

Question re: Justice Department/Employee Resignations

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice, and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, in the course of this question that the Minister of Justice has been in office all of three or four weeks and I realize that some of these questions are

not germane to this period in time.

However, I would ask him, in the course of his inquiry, which he has now stated he has undertaken to do, if he will look further than the resignation of the Director of Corrections and look into the other resignations which have occurred in this Department over the past three or four months?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Since these people have resigned, apparently voluntarily and with no muzzling agreement, will the Minister undertake to report any unusual circumstances which may surround these resignations?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, Mr. Speaker, again we get back to the same problem. These are, generally speaking, internal Department of Justice matters and, I believe, that they should stay that way.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: In the course of this investigation, will the Minister be looking into the alleged letter which he actually, has said existed, but which we have not seen, nor wish to see under a confidential basis, will he be looking into that matter and determining on whose authority it was issued?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I will, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Squatters

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. Could he briefly state what this government's policy is regarding squatters on lands around the Whitehorse area?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot be sure that Honourable Member's question is in order. However, I will permit the Minister to answer.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I must say that this is an area I really have not looked at at this time. At the same time, I think it is fair to say that from this side of the House and I am sure from the other side, we would like to think that land would be available for various lifestyles and; subsequently, that type of procedure does not have to occur.

I should further state, Mr. Speaker, that we are presently reviewing the Lands Ordinance, and that is an area of discussion that will be considered at that time.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to thank the Minister for his answer. I wonder if, when he reports to the House on this question, he will say if this Government will be making any distinction between long and short term squatters on Crown Lands.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that is another question that would have to be addressed.

Mr. Penikett: Finally, when the Minister reports back, could he also report on whether this Government has obtained a legal opinion as to whether squatting rights are enhanced by the continuous payment of property taxation, property taxes by such residents?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that is obviously, a legal question and one that I would have to address myself to.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, along the same vein as that, has this Government ever actually removed or sent letters for a squatter to move off of Federal lands?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I understand that has happened in the past.

Mr. Fleming: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if that has happened in the past, as the Minister thinks it has, could the Minister tell me where he would get the authority to move anybody off of Federal lands?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that it is Federal land and obviously, it is under the Federal Statute that now exists.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I might be able to clear it up a little bit.

The Government of the Yukon Territory has, in the past, acted as the agent of the Government of Canada in respect to the removal of squatters from Federal lands. The closest incident of it is just across the railroad tracks, what is now Rotary Park.

Question re: Whitehorse North Land Management Project

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

The day before yesterday, the Whitehorse North Land Management Project Report was made public and in a letter to the property owners in that area, the Director of Municipal Affairs said regulations to the effect that the area would be drafted and implemented after a public meeting on April 23. Can the Minister now say if residents will be asked for their comments on draft regulations for the area, at this April 23rd meeting?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that they will be addressing themselves to the final draft. You must understand that the procedure that has been undertaken, is that there has been three or four drafts and this is the final draft. This is the last kick at the cat, per se, for this particular area.

I am hopeful that people will address themselves to the final draft and when we see it in its final report stage, it will be submitted to the Executive Committee and a decision will be made and; subsequently, regulations drawn up.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the Minister describes these as the final draft, but I wonder, can he assure the House that he is not foreclosing on the possibility that some wise intervention at the meeting on April 23rd might not cause the Government to perhaps, do yet another draft if necessary?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member has not understood what I said. We are waiting for further public input into the report, for the final report. There could be changes to the draft that you had before you. When the final report is completed, it will be submitted to the Executive Committee, as I said earlier, and direction will be given to my Department in respect to drafting regulations.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I think I understood it. I am not sure I liked it.

One final supplementary, the Yukon Railway Task Force Report, we were not shown Chapter Six. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could supply me with a copy of page 11 of the Whitehorse North Land Management Planning Project, which was missing from my copy.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will see what I can do to accommodate the honourable gentleman.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think such questions would not properly be asked in the Question Period. I did wish, from the Chair, to suggest to all Members asking questions, that it is not competent for a member to ask a question of a Minister respecting policy. Perhaps, I have allowed questions that I ought not to have allowed, but I was going to raise that a couple of questions back in Question Period.

Are there any further questions?

Question re: Pioneer Utility Grant

Mrs. McGuire: I will direct this question to the Minister of Health and Human Resources.

In reference to some people who are over the age of 65, who have had their homes given to them or have had their rent paid for them, but who are still eligible and still liable for the cost of heating fuel, electricity and telephone, but do not qualify for the Pioneer Utility Grant, my question is, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister define what is the Pioneer Utility Grant and what does it pertain to? Does it subsidize rent, home ownership, or does it subsidize utilities that are necessary to maintain a home?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, the Pioneer Utility Grant Ordinance reflects upon individuals whose spouses have been deceased and the amount for application is \$300 a year and that is strictly for the utilities, lights in particular. There are applications available at Human Resources.

Mrs. McGuire: You still have not defined what it covers. What does it mean, utility grants? Does it cover fuel bills, electricity, is that what it is about?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, it covers utilities which is fuel, heat and light but we do not pay for the overall annual rate per individual. We pay only under the Ordinance, \$300 per grant.

Mr. Penikett: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could just ask for clarification of your earlier remark. This Member thought you said that questions that are asked about government policy are not in order. I have just consulted the Beauchesne reference to questions and I note that page 359, Clause 11 says that "a question which seeks an opinion about government policy is probably out of order in that it asks for an opinion and not information."

My understanding of that, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps, you would correct me, is that it is perfectly in order to ask questions about government policy, the fact of government policy, but that interpretation or an opinion of that policy may be out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion that I brought before the House, was with reference to an Annotation 359 (11). The question raised by the Honourable Member appeared to the Chair to have been phrased in such a way as the Minister was asked an opinion, and that was clearly out of order, and I mentioned at the time that it possibly was. I just wanted to bring that to the Member's attention at a later point.

Mr. Penikett: I apologize Mr. Speaker. I wonder, in the same Point of Order, if it would be possible at a later date for you to define your ruling because it was clearly my intention, of course, to ask what policy is, not an opinion about it.

Mr. Speaker: Well, perhaps, the matter can be resolved if the Members would be very careful in the phrasing of their questions, because it does raise difficulties with the Chair to uphold the rules of the House and certainly the maintenance of the whole Question Period.

Question re: YHCIP/Physiotherapy service

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Health. Some concern has been expressed regarding the provisions under the existing legislation of the Health Care Insurance Plan for the provision of physiotherapy service to outlying communities where qualified personnel are available. The problem is that these qualified personnel are not being allowed to practice, forcing needless referrals to Whitehorse for treatment. My question is whether the Minister is aware of this problem.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the problem. It exists in the Honourable Member's riding. The Health and Welfare, Canada and Yukon Territory are responsible for physiotherapists and it is under the hospital insurance, and if the Honourable Member is asking about the problems that exist in his riding, I am quite willing to look at the situation.

I cannot speak for the Government of Canada but I know that they are under restraint and it puts me in a position where there is no physiotherapists in these ridings. There is one person there, who is looking for a job but the Government of Canada does not have the man year to accommodate that person. However, my Department would try to accommodate for that in the future.

Question re: Pioneer Utility Grants (Continued)

Mrs. McGuire: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Department of Health of Human Resources, will the Minister consider tabling the Utilities Grant Ordinance for revision and amendments in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: For the Honourable Member's information, when we do look at ordinances as such, it goes through proper channels set out by the Government of the Yukon Territory. With respect to the Pioneer Utility Grant Ordinance, it has gone through proper channels, through the Justice Department, et cetera, and there is information to me that the Ordinance is in proper form and that the Department is going to follow that Ordinance. I see no reason to revise the Ordinance.

Question re: Canada West Foundation

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Government Leader.

A day or two before, in the debates on the Budget, we found that this Government is giving financial support to an organization called Canada West Foundation. Last night, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stan Roberts, a spokesman for that organization said, "He had a blueprint for a separate western Canadian country".

In view of this kind of statement, will the government undertake immediately, to withdraw that financial support?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, as was said in Committee, and I would hope that we do not get into the habit of bringing debates from Committee into the House, but as was said in Committee, we contribute a small amount to this organization each year.

The reports that we are in receipt of, although we may not agree with all of them, we feel some of them are beneficial to us and we do not particularly, I think, want to be the one area in western Canada that is left out of any considerations of this organization.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Do I take it then, that this Government supports a separate western Canada state or any such discussion of such a thing?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Souvenir Industry/Letter from Jim Robb

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have an easy question for the Government House Leader.

Can the Government Leader say if he has as yet had an opportunity to reply to the letter from Jim Robb, a citizen of Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Honourable Member is speaking of the letter which recently appeared in a local newspaper and it does concern my Department, since culture is a part of the recreation department. To date, I have not seen this letter that was supposed to have been sent to us, but I can assure the Honourable Member that strides are being taken to accommodate culture and cultural organizations within the Department of Recreation.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister finds the letter and replies to it, will he also take up the matter raised by Mr. Robb with his colleague, the Minister responsible for Economic Development, particularly, the proposal to develop a Yukon souvenir industry?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, anything that benefits the Yukon we, of course, are more than willing to discuss within this government, and I am sure that when these things are brought to my attention, formally, we will discuss them.

Question re: Land Claims Negotiations

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Government Leader. This is with respect to the land claims negotiations.

It has been noted that since the signing of an agreement between the Commissioner and the Minister of Indian Affairs that the land claims negotiations, which are a matter of great urgency to everybody in this Territory, that these land claims negotiations have been stalled. I would like a statement from the Government Leader as to what action his Government has taken since then to try and get the talks underway again.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Really none, Mr. Speaker, nor are we in any position to take any action. The land claims negotiations are primarily between the Government of Canada and the Council for Yukon Indians.

We are simply a member of the government team and the decision as to when and where these meetings might be held, we do not have any input into whatever.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since the apparent difference, the reason for the stalling is a matter that directly concerns this Government, would the Government Leader undertake to contact the leaders of the CYI, who are not too far away from this place, to entertain discussions as to what can be done to resolve the differences?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, again I have to be very, very careful and we have indicated over and over and over again that we are most interested in these negotiations, we are most anxious to see them ongoing and concluded at the earliest possible time.

However, the suggestion that we may be the cause of the current delay may or may not be so. I would like to remind the Honourable Members in the House that the CYI, at the present time is, in fact, involved in a nation-wide advertising campaign, and I would like to suggest, may have some bearing as to when or where negotiations may start again.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I was not endeavoring to place any blame in any direction. I merely tried to suggest ways of going about it.

One final suggestion, Mr. Speaker, would he consider going as far as Camp David in this?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I will have to rule that question out of order.

Question re: RCMP Agreement

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

Can he say when the Territory will begin again, negotiating a new police agreement with the RCMP?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, the current Police Agreement is in, I believe, its third year of a five year agreement and when we get into the budget, I am sure we can discuss this matter further.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, on a non-budgetary aspect, I would like to ask the Minister in view of the increasing policing problems developing in the downtown core of the City of Whitehorse, will the Minister consider specifically seeking the inclusion of foot patrolmen in this city centre in the next agreement?

Hon. Mr. Graham: As I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member opposite realizes, we can request any number of police officers that we wish in Yukon, but; unfortunately, we are also in the position where we must pay some of the costs.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I understood the Minister's answer. Unfortunately, he did not answer my question. I wonder if he would be prepared to give an undertaking that he would seek this inclusion.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to discuss the matter with my Justice officials and, in fact, investigate the matter further.

Question re: Teacher Recruitment

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Education. It is my understanding that the Department of Education is about to actively engage in the yearly ritual of teacher recruitment for the

next academic year.

In light of the priority concerns expressed during recent debate regarding curriculum and programming, can the Minister reassure this House that he will relay this concern and accordingly, instruct his recruitment team in their efforts to locate top quality personnel?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, it is the Department of Education's priority concern to recruit top quality personnel in all of our recruitment campaigns.

Mr. Byblow: Could the Minister outline, very basically, the recruitment mechanics for teachers? Perhaps he could indicate the scope of advertising, the extent of interviewing, and perhaps, the pattern of applications respecting origin and qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member opposite is in a much better position to answer that question than I am. He has been through the system.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Small Business Loan Program

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, I have a further question for the Government Leader. At the present time, this Government has presented a policy thrust in the area of economic growth.

As one of the areas of economic growth, Mr. Speaker, that is of serious concern to a small businessman in the Territory, is that of capital and loan capital particularly, can the Government Leader tell me what steps are being taken now, to overhaul the Yukon Small Business Loan Program?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are reviewing the Small Business Loans Program with the intention of attempting, perhaps, to take it over from the Federal Government and remodel it and make it possible that we can finance small businesses on a more competitive and better basis. We are looking at that right now.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Will the Minister then undertake to recommend the inclusion of loans for working capital and inventory in any revised program?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, we certainly will be looking at it and that is one of the areas we will be looking at.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell me how many people are presently on that committee that reviews loans, how many there should be, and if there are any missing, when will they be replaced?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, at the present time I do not believe there even is a committee in effect. There has been virtually no activity under the Small Business Loans Program and this is the reason why we are looking at it.

Question re: Carcross-Skagway Road/Year Round Maintenance

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Has the Minister yet, had an opportunity to reply to the letter from the Mayor of Skagway requesting year round operation and maintenance of the Carcross and Skagway Road?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that I do not believe the letter is addressed to me, but I will have to review the matter and if the Honourable Member wants me to send a formal reply to the Mayor of Skagway on behalf of the City, yes, I will do so.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have a carbon copy of the letter sent to the Minister and I would be quite happy to provide him with it if he has lost his original.

I would like to know, at the time the Minister replies, the reasons he gives in his letter for the Government's decision on this question, and perhaps, he would consider tabling his reply.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will have no problem tabling a reply.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Senior Citizens' Services Coordinator

Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources. I have been informed that a term contract position involving the coordinator of senior citizens' services within the Department of Human Resources has been terminated. Will the Minister inform this House, is this contract non-renewable as part of the cost reduction move in the Department of Human Resources and, if this is so, could the Minister have found a position of lesser degree of importance to terminate?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Just recently, Mr. Speaker, I received word that the senior citizens in the Whitehorse area are in need of a person

who has background knowledge and a fairly good knowledge of health, with regards to senior citizens. Therefore, it was my intention to terminate a position replacing the position with the registered nurse to provide health service to the senior citizens.

Question re: Sterilization Surgery

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I have one brief question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources.

Can he advise the house if it is necessary for a women to obtain her husband's consent for sterilization or abortion surgery in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Honourable Member to be patient with me so that I can investigate that.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the Minister is investigating it, if he will also, seek to find out if a husband requires his wife's consent for sterilization surgery?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, the questions are getting to be very interesting here.

I will make an attempt to investigate that and I will bring the answer back.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify one thing. I think the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West has misled the house to a certain extent in respect to the questions that he asked about the letter from the Mayor of Skagway, on the maintenance of the highway. It should be pointed out that it was directed to the Speaker and Members, and the Speaker did reply on behalf of the House, but I will take the responsibility to give a more direct reply from the Government side.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, the Minister may also be interested in checking his files, because I think there was a request from the City of Skagway which was forwarded through the City of Whitehorse, to his department.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I think the Honourable Member is now making a statement.

Perhaps if there are no further questions, today, we will proceed to Orders of the Day under Motions Other Than Government Motions.

Mr. Clerk: Item number one, standing in the name of Mr. Falle.

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

Mr. Falle: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member for Klondike, that this Government review the Highway regulations concerning year around maintenance of recreational roads which are used by residents on a year around basis.

Mr. Falle: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I made this motion because I feel that there is a great need for a maintenance of year around roads, especially on recreational roads where there are plenty of people living on a year around basis. I should say, recreational roads, but they are living there on a year around basis. In my own area, Hootalinqua, I have Deep Creek which has about 18 people out there, Jackfish Bay about 5, and the Annie Lake Road, about 21, California Beach there is about 35. The main reasons I would like to see these roads plowed are: (1) access for school children, they do live there on a year around basis, they have children going to school; (2) I would like to see them plowed in case somebody gets hurt in there, for an emergency access.

I think just about every member here, has recreational roads. I have said my piece.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that directly affects one of the departments that I have under my responsibility, and it is an area of concern to me. As you know in the past, the previous administrations have maintained a very strong line in this respect to maintaining roads off the various highways other than for the fact that we are prepared to provide this service under the third party agreement which is reflected in the budget when we go through the Main Estimates.

From my vantage point, I can understand the concerns of the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua on behalf of his constituents. I would like to inform the House that I am prepared to review this particular area. I think that there are a couple of variables that are going to enter into any decision that is made, that will be finances. At the same time, I think there would have to be a formula if we can afford to do some of these roads, at the same time, it is going to have to reflect a formula so that we can say, for an example, in the busing policy, there are so many children that have to be living within a certain area, on that basis.

I can understand the problems that the Honourable Member has encountered in this area, but at the same time it is going to take some time and I hope all Members will bear with me.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion. I do not think it is a very strong motion. I think that in the past we have tried many times to upgrade a certain amount of the roads where there are people living. A good example would be the Annie Lake Road where the Canadian Government, in their wisdom, either leased, I do not think sold, but in some cases maybe, land which is off the main highway, and where, after people bought it, probably signed a lease saying that they will not ask for these roads. However, in their wisdom, they did place the people there and somewhere along the line the Territorial Government has to end up with that responsibility. It now turns out to be a recreation road which is not really a highway so they do not want to do anything to it, only in the summertime.

However, I think that we have to realize that these people are permanent residents in many cases and they are paying taxes, and they do have a certain amount of rights, as the Minister has said, and I applaud him on that, that he is going to try to review the situation and come up with something, I am sure he will. However, I will vote for the motion.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this motion, because I do believe a review of this policy is now appropriate. There is a trend in the Territory toward rural living. It is almost becoming a stampede, I think. Unless the Government sets some guidelines now, the people who live in or move to rural areas may rightfully, be able to call on the Government for any number of services which they presently do not provide.

There is no one in this House, I believe, who would try to deny the rights of Yukoners to choose their own lifestyle, provided that lifestyle does not adversely affect or inflict any penalty on people who choose a different lifestyle - it is a two-way street.

For example, just because I like to live close to downtown with all services supplied, I do not think that I should obstruct anybody who wishes to live in the country with little or no services. We have the freedom of that choice here, and it is one of the good parts of living in the Yukon.

The only possible objection by either urban dwellers or rural dwellers to each other is that one group would bear an uneven tax load vis a vis the other group. I think this is where the heart of this motion gets down to. The difficulty arises, as this motion indicates, that where there is a demand for services and this demand changes, usually when somebody buys a property, accessed by recreational road, he is aware that it is not serviced year round. No doubt, cases exist where people have bought land without thinking of this problem. One school of thought, which I think is the present Government's thinking, is that it is just too bad for these people.

However, I think that the times are changing and we have to move with the times. Today's situation is that there are many Yukoners living along roads on a year round basis that are maintained only part of the year. They cannot be ignored, nor yet, should they receive services which would be borne by other people who do not have the benefit of living out there. So the solution, theoretically, is quite simple, but very difficult to administer. Really, what it amounts to is that a calculation of the costs per mile to clear these roads, a polling of the residents along the roads as to whether or not they wish to have this service rendered, and then if the majority so wish it, some way of recovering the cost from these people. I think that kind of program to some extent, exists but I could add a couple of refinements to it.

I think that some may say that it is the right of each Yukoner to have his road maintained out of the general revenue; however, this right may not be economically feasible, Mr. Speaker.

I think, City residents pay dearly for their services, and I do not believe that they resent paying for these services, they recognize that you have to pay for what you get. At the same time, I think that people living in the City on acreages, just as an aside, pay a lot for little or no services, but that is another story.

I do believe that the rural dwellers outside of the City have no wish to burden any other group with their expenses, but there must be some equity in the taxation. I would suggest that one way of easing this would be to allow the cost of any such clearing of roads to be included in the property taxes, either strictly as a frontage tax, or some such way and that the Home Owners' Grant Ordinance be amended to allow for the frontage taxes to be part of the costs of the property taxes. This would enable some rural residents who do not pay much in the way of property taxes to recover some part of the additional cost of maintaining roads from the government, and thus, spread the burden more evenly around the Territory.

Perhaps, that is complicated concept, it perhaps, needs a little

more thought, but it is one way of trying to equalize the situation between the rural and city dwellers.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I think a review is needed; therefore, I support it, I think the service should be offered, I think that the cost of the service should be equitably distributed and I think that the Home Owner Grant could be used as one way of ensuring that these costs are equitably distributed.

I will support this motion.

Mr. Hanson: I think, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is taking a little on when he says the policy of this Government, he is not even sure.

There are quite a few of us here on the Government side of the House, that feel that this subject should be looked into. Unfortunately, on my road, we do not have too many people living on it, but the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua does have a problem. I think this side of the House, is fully in support of it, the motion that he came up with and that is about all I can say on that.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Mr. Falle: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition stated that the people of Hootalinqua are the outside and do not have to pay too many taxes. Well, we are heavily taxed, maybe not quite as bad as Whitehorse yet, that is one of the reasons that they are out there. They do not get anything for their service, other than paved roads, which I am talking of my area, we have. That road is not there because I am there, it is there because Anvil is there.

We did live along that road and we do pay our school taxes. As far as extra cost to the Government goes, I believe that the Government equipment is owned by the Territorial Government and we pay their wages. There are times that we have to hire extra equipment to do these roads. I do not think that the added cost to the Territorial Government is going to be that great. The only difference that I can possibly see in the difference of cost is the difference of idling time and the difference of running time. We do own the equipment, we do pay the manpower, we are not going to need, in my opinion, any extra equipment. Of course we will go into that later.

I am in support of it and I think this side of the House is.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member having spoken twice has now closed the debate.

(Motion agreed to)

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

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

Mr. Hanson: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Government investigate the possibility of establishing a Yukon Power Corporation, to be owned by the people of Yukon through the Yukon Territorial Government, and; further, that the Government of Canada be requested, through the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to cause to be transferred, debt free, to the said Yukon Power Corporation, all the assets of Northern Canada Power Commission, within the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, as you know, as a long time resident, for years and years we have talked about this possibility. So far it has just been talk, now we have a group in here that I think, are going to support this motion. I am pretty sure they are all going to support it as Yukoners, probably even the Leader of the Opposition, might even support it because they have been talking about creating work and bringing an industry into the Yukon. The industry is here now, but the money is flowing out. There are eighty people in NCPC office in Edmonton for administering the Northwest Territories and Yukon, and probably, a greatly reduced staff would come up here, but at least it would be here that they lived. The money that is taken from us would be spent here, so it will create jobs here, and a little more cash flow.

Another thing that was brought up today, I was told that it is just like buying a car from Ford Motors, we pay for it when we never own it. We have been doing that for a great many years.

I have been here thirty-three years and I think NCPC probably took over their first installation here in 1949, prior to that it was a different company.

I remember when I first came here, it was a diesel plant in Mayo, and the man that ran it last died last week here in Whitehorse and he used to get on his bicycle at midnight and go around and turn off the street lights, but he was paid to supply power to the town.

Things have improved quite a bit since then, but in Mayo, I think they have deteriorated, more because of a lack of maintenance. I think, the figures show that out of every dollar we pay NCPC that 77 cents go out for the retirement of loans that this giant corporation has and most of those loans, I think, are for the Northwest Territories installations.

We actually get 23 cents maintenance, and it showed in Mayo in the last month, that the 23 cents is not enough to maintain these operations. Last week, Elsa came pretty dangerously to shutting down and laying off a number of men because of the lack hydro.

I think, if we had our own corporation here, with a little more input from industry, we would probably be in a better situation.

I thank you.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, this is, as I am sure all Members are aware, is a subject very, very dear to my heart. It is something that I have been looking at for an awfully long time, trying to resolve the possibilities of it happening.

I am a firm believer, Mr. Speaker, in the fact, and I put it as fact, that the Northern Canada Power Commission is owned by the users, it is not owned by the Government of Canada. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because of the debt load that NCPC has.

The Government of Canada has not spent one penny of its money in the establishment or the maintenance or the upkeep of the Northern Canada Power Commission. Every penny of money that is spent by NCPC is borrowed, it is either earned from the users in the Territory or it is borrowed from Canada and we, today, are paying back those debts.

As a consequence, any assets, I submit, that NCPC owns are, in fact, the property of the users of NCPC, being people north of the 60th parallel in Canada.

Now, it is going to be a very, very complicated affair because it is going to have to be split. The Northwest Territories is going to have to get their share and we are going to have to get our share, but I think, the key to the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, will be negotiating some kind of a deal with Canada, whereby when this does happen, and I am confident it will, we are not going to be required or saddled with the debt load that NCPC now has. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is unbearable.

I think that the motion is a good one. I think that the key element is there. We must ensure that the debt load is done away with first, prior to us taking on a Yukon Power Corporation.

I would urge every member to support the motion.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Well, I am happy to tell the Government Leader and the mover of this motion that I will be supporting this motion, too.

It is all sweetness and light here, today. I cannot understand why we cannot disagree.

It so happens that this particular motion follows right in line with a policy goal of the Yukon Liberal Party, of many years standing. The search for power has always been one our Party has had difficulty in succeeding in. However, together we might be able to win this one.

In the course of the investigation, the Government should, I think, consider certain points though. I do not mean to be negative towards it, but I think that prudent planning would suggest that we look carefully at it and there are a few basic ones.

The question has to be answered as to whether the development of Yukon will be assisted or retarded by this move. We cannot automatically answer yes, because there are many consideration.

The other question will be, will higher power bills to Yukoners result from this move? Really, these are questions very much in line with the whole argument for or against provincial status. It is a sort of miniature of that and it is a good exercise to look at it in that way.

Nobody is against the principle, I think, of acquiring the Yukon Power Corporation. We have to find a way of doing it.

I am wondering, too, if the Government will be looking into what financial resources it would have to throw behind the Yukon Power Corporation, in the event of such a thing being realized. You know, I can throw out an example of in the event of a major power project being built, and most of these projects should be built in excess of the short-term capacity requirements, to plan ahead, that is prudent, will the extra cost of that excess power be bearable by the small number of rate-paying consumers in this Territory? How long could we carry an excess capacity before it would become a very, very heavy load on all consumers?

The question that also, should be looked at as to whether this will be any different than it is today, because I believe such a major

power project, under NCPC's existing rules, the excess will still all have to be charged back to Yukoners. No solution has been found to that problem by NCPC either.

The other one is that, should any of the profit in distribution of Yukon Power Corporation be left in the hands of regulated private enterprise? By that I mean, is, the question will arise whether the whole distribution of power in Yukon should be carried out by this Yukon Power Corporation and; thereby, extinguishing Yukon Electric as a supplier. That question has to be looked at very carefully.

I can tell the Members opposite now, that I do not think you will get Yukon Electric debt free, if they were to buy it. I think the last number mentioned was around \$10 million.

The other point is that whether the Government of Canada can, in fact, efficiently deliver retail services as sufficiently as a private enterprise. Yukon Electric's quality of service has been pretty good, I think, on the whole. It should be looked at as one which we may not want to lose.

There is one final point I would ask the Government to look at in the course of their investigations. That is that provincial governments often receive large sums of money from Ottawa in the form of their pro rata share of Canada Pension Plan excess funds. I do not believe that such funds have ever been made available to the Yukon Government, yet these very same funds are used by British Columbia and other such places to invest in their own hydro projects. There may well be a large source of funds there, if we can get the same treatment as a provincial government, funds which would give us the financial support to be able to undertake such an acquisition.

So, in summary, I think we should get underway in the investigation. I think it is going to be very interesting and it is a step, if not a leap, towards more responsible government and the old saying, let's look before we leap.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view there is only one thing essentially wrong with this motion and that is it is attacking only half the problem.

It would make no sense for the Yukon Government to take over the assets of the Northern Canada Power Commission in Yukon, unless it also took over the operations of Yukon Electrical Company and Yukon Hydro.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Campbell, that Motion Number 14 be amended by adding the words "and all the assets of the Yukon Electrical Company and the Yukon Hydro Company within the Yukon Territory".

Mr. Speaker, the mainstay of democracy is the concept of equal rights. This concept has been reflected in the policies of various Liberal and Conservative and New Democratic governments across Canada by their provision, or their attempt to provide, equal access to service.

For example, I give you on a federal scale, the Canadian Broadcasting--

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the procedure in the House was that if an amendment to a resolution was coming forward that it would be distributed, read from the Chair and; subsequently, spoken to and; therefore, all Members have the chance to peruse the amendment while the Member is speaking, and it gives the opportunity for other Members to collect their thoughts and speak to the subject that the Honourable Member is also addressing.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the Honourable Minister, there is no rule that proximates the remarks that he has made in raising his point of order, other than it is usually a courtesy of a Member to do this, but there are no rules insisting on this.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, with the assistance of some Page, I am prepared to try and get copies of this amendment to Members of the House as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the concept of making equal access to such services is one, fundamental of democracy and it is why, I think, you saw some years ago in this country, CBC set up by a Conservative government, you saw the creation of things like Air Canada and CNR. When we look at most provincial governments, we see that most electricity or hydro corporations are provincially owned. I think it is worth noting that they were not what some people would call socialistic governments that took over these private hydro corporations. It was usually the so-called free-enterprise governments such as W.A.C. Bennett's in British Columbia, or the Conservative Government of Ontario.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that public ownership of public utilities or such corporations is not necessarily socialistic at all. It is quite the opposite in many cases. I cite the case of Air Canada, CNT or, contrary to the Government Leader's assertion, even NCPCL. Recently, for example, the Federal Government changed Air Canada's priority from service to the public to serving the dollar. The Liberal Government had a law passed which said that Air Canada must be operated on the basis of making a profit, as its top priority rather than service to people. And that, I submit Mr. Speaker, is not public ownership, that is quite simply, state capitalism.

The principle underlying social ownership is that all citizens of a country, a province, a territory or a municipality, should all have equal access to certain kinds of service — Because as they are citizens, they are entitled to equal rights, to fairness in some essentials. In some areas of eastern Canada, the Maritimes, where dollars became more important than services to people, one has seen historically, in this country, the growth of community owned businesses, cooperatively owned enterprises and consumer cooperatives and credit unions and, in other parts of the country, the increasing use of public utilities to provide essential services. This has happened because powerful monopolies and cartels, were not, at the time, meeting the social needs of the people in the community.

Mr. Speaker, for this Government to simply take over the operation of N.C.P.C. without the rest of the electrical system in the Yukon, is nonsense. There are obvious problems of economies of scale. In fact, to do what is proposed would be like telling the people of Whitehorse that there should be, for example, competing sewer and water systems. One would be privately owned and along side of it, we would have another publicly owned one which would be owned and operated by some local business. That I think, would be in a word, wasteful. It would be inefficient. It would be, frankly, quite stupid. It would not work.

There are more important reasons, I think, for getting control of an operation like Yukon Electrical, for practical reasons of having one agency do the job, instead of two doing one job. This probably, makes the most sense to most people in the Territory. But there is another reason and I think, it is the situation of another leaky tap in the Territory. The problem with Yukon Electrical, Mr. Speaker, is that it is American owned. The impression that most people in the Yukon have is that it is owned by friendly, old, Alberta Power Corporation of Calgary. And that is true. But like the old song, certain connections link it to some nice gentlemen in Philadelphia. You will recall the old song about the toe bone being connected to the foot bone being connected to the leg bone, the leg bone being connected to the knee bone, well, we have a somewhat similar situation here, Mr. Speaker.

Alberta Power, it turns out, is owned 100 per cent by Canadian Utilities of Calgary. Alberta Power was formed in 1971, specifically to take over the outstanding debt obligations of Canadian Utilities and it appears simply, to be a convenient corporate form for Canadian Utilities to run its power operations.

Canadian Utilities is 86.7 per cent owned by the American International Utilities Corporation of Philadelphia.

These corporations all have a classically big business way of operating. For instance, Canadian Utilities in 1973, had a net profit of \$17 million, which it paid to its parent company in the States. But, I note also that its net income that year was only \$14.4 million. The reason for this is that part of International Utilities revenues from Canadian Utilities is being taken in the form of interest payments on debentures, part in other types of debt and part in the form of operating payments that show up in the Canadian Utilities' books as operating expenses. Then, of course, there are the dividends.

When the relationship between Alberta Power and Canadian Utilities is examined, I am sure we can see the same thing happening, money being funnelled to the parent company in various indirect ways. So what of Yukon Electric and Yukon Hydro and the parent, Alberta Hydro? Probably another leaking tap. Another unnecessary drain of dollars to the south. I would say to all honourable members and with respect to the Honourable Member from Mayo, that it is our money that we are talking about here, it is our power. It is our rivers, our resources and we should, I believe, control them for our benefit, not for the benefit of some wealthy gentleman in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, certain that all Members of this House will be enthusiastic about this amendment and, on the grounds of common sense, electrical service for the people of the Territory, public utilities, I believe, should be publicly owned. That is, I admit, Mr. Speaker, an article of faith with me.

But more importantly, I believe they should be owned by the public they serve and I say, with respect to the Government Leader, that I do not believe that is the case with NCPCL.

I appeal to the House, let us not support half measures, let us do the serious, sensible thing. Let us put the power, all the power, in the hands of the people of Yukon.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, seconded by the Member from Campbell, that Motion Number 14 be amended by adding the words "and all the assets of the Yukon Electric Company and the Yukon Hydro Company within the Yukon Territory".

Any further debate on the amendment?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As you know, I seconded it and I will be supporting the amendment and also, congratulate the Member from Mayo for this motion in the first place, to make the amendment possible, because I will be supporting that, too, if we can get some support for this amendment.

I see no sense in going halfway, as the Member in front of me has said, as the mover of this amendment has said. To take over just NCPCL, we will be exactly in the same boat as we are now, except that we will own something, but we have still two power corporations in the Yukon Territory which we do not need.

The people of this Territory have the right to one corporation and pay to one corporation and they have a right to own that corporation, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little worried about the first motion, just taking over the assets of NCPCL. I am a little worried that when we take over those assets, we take over something that is actually, maybe, going to harm us more than do us any good. It is like giving a shotgun to somebody and one shell and have him shoot himself with it.

I do not think that probably, the studies or the intelligence or something that has gone into the building of the Aishihik Dam in the first place; therefore, we are buying a pig in a poke. We need power all over the Yukon, we need a grid system, we need something that is established and large enough to handle this country for the next few years.

As I say, if we take and just go along with the motion as it is and not the amendment, we are not really doing ourselves any good. If we are going to run the power in this country, let us own it all, not part of it. Let us not have two companies to pay for or let us not have one of our own and pay somebody else.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Division.

Mr. Speaker: I will call division on this matter because the Chair cannot determine from the calls of the House as to your disposition in respect to the motion.

Mr. Clerk, will you kindly poll the House at this time?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Disagree.

Mrs. McCall: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree.

Mr. Hanson: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Disagree.

Mrs. McGuire: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Disagree.

Mr. Penikett: Agree.

Mr. Lattin: Disagree.

Mr. Byblow: Agree.

Mr. Falle: Disagree.

Mr. Fleming: Agree.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are three yea, eleven nay.

Mr. Speaker: It would appear as the nays have it. (Amendment defeated)

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the motion?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I had every intention of supporting this motion, but after what I have seen in this House today, I do not think I will support this motion.

As I said before, I am not prepared to go halfway with things like this. I have not got any love for any power company or anybody else. I am interested in the people of the Yukon Territory.

I know, and these Members well know, what it costs in the outlying districts for power in this country and I think, any member should be willing to go all the way in anything that would help this country.

After what I have seen here today, no, I will not be supporting this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the motion?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Power Corporation, NCPCL, would be a major economic development tool. We are sup-

portive, our party is supportive of the Yukon Power Corporation and at present, we are investigating taking over the NCPC corporation. I have been in contact with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on it and it is an ongoing process. Hopefully, within the next 2 or 3 years we will have more concrete things we can put to the House.

We will not likely get a debt-free corporation, especially if we are looking at a major hydro development. I would doubt if the Federal Government would spend up to \$5 or \$6 million and then hand it over to us.

If we did take over the NCPC corporation, I think we would have to look at a self-financing corporation, we would not want to have a corporation that was a millstone around our necks. So I appreciate the Honourable Members' comments from across the floor on different methods of financing it and we will be looking into it.

Mr. Byblow: I will be supporting the main motion, Mr. Speaker, because I think we have to begin somewhere, and as the Honourable Minister has pointed out, it paves the way to the avenue in industry for development.

I think we are all quite aware of the key to development, that being energy. We know that currently, energy is not available in the Territory for any accelerated development.

This move, I believe, would pave the way, would be the beginning, for the ability or capability of the Territory to provide more of its own energy.

An optimistic estimate in the mining industry is that between 1980 and 1990, five, and possibly six, new mines could be put on stream. To put those mines into operation, to concentrate the minerals that we have got, the lead, zinc, the copper, the tungsten, would require anywhere from fifty to one hundred megawatts of power, somebody has to take the initiative to establish this. If we are looking at a smelter, as we have debated over the last couple of weeks, we are going to need in the area of 250 to 300 megawatts. At the moment we are stalemated as to any progressive action in this area.

Certainly, the escalation of costs of power supplied in the Territories is part of the prohibiting factor. As a form of a public utility, I think, we can begin somewhere.

Another very serious concern is that, at the moment, there is no policy to developing energy. Perhaps, this will be the framework and the mechanics to set this policy. For various reasons, NCPC says there are no funds available for any site studies, for any investigations for new sites for the power for new mines.

Various studies have been done by private firms. In fact, my understanding is at least nine sites have been investigated in an overview sense. Energy people who study these reports say that there is not enough data there, not enough money was provided. Certainly, if we have a framework in the Territory, we are going to have decision making closer to home. People who can pressure action in terms of what the Territorial needs are, feasibility studies, reports are necessary.

We are told that it takes up to eight years to conduct the required studies to put a new dam into production. At the moment, we have not got any mechanics in place to start this. Essentially, for the economic development potential I will be supporting this motion, I think, it is a beginning and I think, this is where we can start.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak on this resolution, but in view of the comments of some of the previous speakers, I think that there has to be put to rest the allegations that have been made that since a private corporation is in charge of distributing power in the Yukon, that is the reason for our high rates. I think this is definitely, a misconception that should not be propagated any further than what it has been.

You have, under present legislation, a Yukon Electrical Public Utilities Board, which is vested with certain authority, that does a comprehensive job of going through the books and any increases that are intended by the company and; therefore, there is a very thorough procedure gone through in order to ensure that the company is running to top efficiency.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody should delude themselves that because we are passing a resolution in this House, all of a sudden, tomorrow we are going to have a Yukon Power Commission.

First of all, NCPC has to be split into two areas, the Federal level, and then the subsequent step is to take over that responsibility with the Government of the Yukon Territory, which I am sure is the ultimate aim of the present Chairman, whom, I think, we all respect in the person of Mr. James Smith.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should not rule out

the concept of a private company actually distributing the power with the controlling factor of the Power Commission lying with the Government of the Yukon Territory. That is an option that should be looked at at that time, then decisions could be made.

I think at the present time, in respect to the distribution of the electricity by the Yukon Electrical Company, I think, overall they do a pretty fair job on behalf of the people that they are serving.

I, once again, want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the high rates of power can be fully put on the shoulder of the Yukon Electrical Company. I believe that there are a lot of other variables involved, not just the fact that it is a private company opposed to a government corporation.

Mr. Hanson: Well, I will just close it off very briefly. The Honourable Member of the Opposition was wondering where we were going to get the money from to build the dam as it comes up. Now the Mayo dam, I think the Honourable Leader of the Government will remember this, he is not that young, the Mayo Dam was only built because of United Keno Hill being in operation. They signed a contract with the NCPC to build the dam. They also did that with the Federal Government, that is why we have the road to Mayo today, because it was built on their agreements, long term agreements with United Keno Hill.

So, if we are going to build a dam, we are going to build it for several companies, they will have to sign contracts that they are going to take X amount of power for a period of time, to pay for the original cost of the dam, which should not raise the price of electricity.

Of course, the way things are going in prices around the world today, it could change the prices very easily and raise the prices.

One thing about it, when we talk about building a dam here, it is not somebody in Ottawa that decides where it is being built. I mean, how many people, actually in Ottawa, that will decide where a dam will be built in the Yukon, knows that there is a place called Five Finger Rapids, or some of these other spots in the Yukon that are very dear to us, who have been on the rivers. Therefore, we would have the control of actual sites, where they are going to be built and it will be local people working on them, which I have heard from the Opposition of how much they want that and how much we are in favour of it, too.

I would want this Bill not to be just another Bill from this House that is going to die and be covered in dust and be forgotten. I would wish then, that I had never brought it up. I think we can do something with it and if we have the full support of this House, I think Ottawa would realize that we are unanimous in it and we want it, the people of the Yukon want it, because we are elected by the people of the Yukon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member, having twice spoken has now closed the debate.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 3, standing in the name of Mrs. McCall.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 3?

Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Klondike, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse North Centre that it is the opinion of this House that the Government should review the services provided for the care of the elderly in Yukon.

Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the situation that affects Dawson City in particular, and certainly, very possibly, other Members of this House may have a similar problem.

There is a saying that society is judged by the way they treat their elderly. The proportion in Dawson City is larger per capita than any other place in the Yukon. One hundred and eleven people was the figure given in a study, I believe, done in 1977 called "Aging in the Yukon".

Presently, MacDonald Lodge in Dawson is staffed as a residence only, not as a nursing home under the Territorial Government. The small hospital in Dawson is Federal. We have four nurses, one of whom does public health, daytime home visiting, schools, and so on.

Our charge nurse is called away very often to nursing conferences and, though they do a splendid job, two days is the limit patients may be treated in the small hospitals. After that, it is required that they be sent to Whitehorse or elsewhere.

However, terminally ill or patients unwell by reason of old age or patients for whom no actual treatment is indicated but who, nevertheless, require some help just to keep them comfortable and

to look after their well-being, help them bathe, change their linen and so on, are not provided for at this time and find themselves in a very unhappy situation.

When MacDonald Lodge was changed from a nursing facility to a residence, it was not unreasonable because there was a large staff with comparatively few patients and it was a very costly proposition. The major disadvantage to this was that elderly residents who usually, only for a short time, may need a registered nurse, a practical nurse or merely an attendant, depending on the necessity, must now be sent to Whitehorse, away from their family and friends.

To send these people to Whitehorse hospital as upon chronically ill patient, considering the transfer by air, by stretcher with an attendant, with a fee per diem in the hospital of approximately \$100, it seems not unreasonable that help could be provided in their own environment. These older people violently object to being sent away.

It might be considered at this time, with reference to Mr. Falle's motion, that the supplying of recreational roads ties in with the pros and cons of elderly people staying in their own cabins, compared with the cost of staying in a residence or hospital.

In small communities, without an over abundance of facilities, it is patiently counter-productive to have rigid rules and the bureaucracy or administration must become more enlightened on this very real and pressing problem in the rural communities. "Adaptable" is the key word.

I feel this whole situation should be reviewed and moneys voted for an undoubtedly sensible and desirable purpose. This attitude is concurrent with advanced medical/social thinking, that whenever possible, people ought to be kept in their home environment.

As a Legislature, this would indeed seem to be something with which few would find fault, that our elderly and infirm may stay where their family and friends can be with them. Surely, it must be the very last right we have on this earth, to die amongst those we love.

The system must adapt to the people, rather than forcing the people to adapt to the system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. McGuire: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the motion put forth by the Honourable Member from Klondike and also, Mr. Speaker, to point out to this Government that one of your top priorities should be the well-being of our senior citizens, who, in the early days, were the very backbone of this country.

Yesterday, the Minister of Health and Human Resources implied that a great thrust will be made to alleviate the hardships of our senior citizens. I am now appealing to this Government that time is essential, perhaps not to us, but to them.

Therefore, every effort should be made to implement, immediately, any plans or recommendations of improvement that this Government may have, or that have been or will be, presented to you.

It has been quite obvious from past history that many important concerns of the senior citizens were swept under the carpet, most probably with the assumption of out of sight, soon forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add further that, being a firm believer of equal rights and unity of human beings, I cannot accept the fact that this Government does not feel obligated or accept any responsibility for elders who are status Indians.

The status elders come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. We all know this, but why does this Government not take some positive steps to overcome the situation by formulating cost-sharing agreements with the Federal Government. I will assure this House that there will be no protest from the elders to this arrangement.

It grieves me deeply that some of these people are suffering needlessly while this Government is sitting idly by, watching this happen.

I will close with a thought which I will throw out to you. If not for the elders, you would not be sitting here.

Hon. Mr. Nijotli: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to reiterate to this House that I am looking into the situation and will continue to investigate the situation in Yukon with regards to the elderly.

Up to now, my Department has been concerned with the elderly with regards to counselling services. If they have management problems or financial, hygiene, then my Department is prepared to look at these people, but they, too, have to cooperate with the department.

Also, if their income is insufficient then we are quite happy to

assist them under the Social Assistance Program. This House is well aware that there are two lodges in the Territory. Right now, in Haines Junction, they do not have anything, they do not offer any specific services to senior citizens, with the exception to what I have just mentioned earlier in my speech now.

So, with those specific details that I just mentioned, I, too, would like to see more detail and more senior citizens' protection in the Yukon Territory, but I would like to mention, too, at this time, that I have just entered the Government, with some interruption from the beginning, and I should not be expected to come up with a full range of programs. It will take time to investigate into these. It will take money and everybody knows that the Government is in a time of restraint.

Based on those facts, despite those facts, I, too, would like to support the motion.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I am sympathetic with the aims of this motion. Indeed, I find that my thoughts have been very parallel to the first speaker here.

I believe that this motion will raise the level of awareness of the Members of this House to the plight of some of our senior citizens. Though statistically, they are few in number, they are, in fact, our living heritage.

I think probably at this time, as many of our long-time residents live downtown, it might be appropriate for me to make some apology to them, Mr. Speaker, with respect to referring to downtown as the poor end of town. Not only was that incorrect, it was dumb. I hope the Member from North Centre will appreciate that. My apologies.

I am very concerned with the number of people in the Territory who are subsisting at very low income levels. Many of these people are among our elderly population, Mr. Speaker, who have been caught by inflation and by the rocketing cost of living. It is to those people we should address ourselves.

The Department of Human Resources, as has just been mentioned, does include various services such as counselling, residential services, social assistance, home help meals, Pioneer Utility Grant, low-cost housing even. In addition, many local business, I should mention, offer discounts or free services to the elderly and that should definitely be applauded and continued, encouraged.

I also, understand that the Yukon Housing Corporation is presently planning a senior citizens project in Whitehorse. These are all very well intentioned efforts, Mr. Speaker.

However, I would like to suggest that the Department of Human Resources take a close look at the experiences elsewhere, in other jurisdictions, to avoid repeating mistakes.

One such mistake, Mr. Speaker, is to isolate our senior citizens from the rest of the community. Many elderly people can look after themselves with a little help and are now living in their own homes. Every effort should be made, I say, to help them stay there, in their own homes, where family can visit, where neighbours can come around and call and where, really, their home is.

The Pioneer Utility Grant, the home help and the meals are excellent tools in this regard and should be continued.

Let us not forget that if we isolate our senior citizens, we are not only doing a disservice to them, but we are robbing their children, many of whom do not have grandparents close by. We are robbing our children of knowing older people, hearing of their ways and of the past. At the same time, older people do seem to have a very special affinity towards young children.

I would urge the Department; therefore, to find more ways of helping our elderly live in their own homes as long as possible. If it is necessary to move them though, it should be to a location in a mixed development with other families, with easy access to shopping and other facilities. This is a method that has worked well in other areas and should be looked at very closely. I do not think building a lodge in an isolated area or just not downtown or close to shopping is a very good idea.

My speech, Mr. Speaker, is really only concentrated on this one area because I feel strongly about it. I am learning from the other members of their concerns.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I also speak in support of the motion by my colleague here, and I would like to answer the Member from Kluane. I have an Indian band in my area and they, too, have the same feelings as you do. In fact, I think they are now going to a program of the Federal Government where they would like to eventually have the Federal Government and the Territorial Government, both get together with them and build a home in Mayo for the elderly native people to be looked after by the native people

themselves.

I think that is the way we have to go, is to have the native people participate in it very actively themselves. I am definitely in favour of that.

Thank you.

Mrs. McCall: I thank the Members for their support. I want to make it clear that MacDonal Lodge is a residence, like a boarding house, in other words. There is no medical attention at all and this is where the lack is, particularly.

I am sure that the Minister for Human Resources will do his best ameliorate the situation.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The Member having twice spoken has closed debate.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 4, standing in the name of Mr. Byblow.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 4?

Mr. Byblow: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Faro, seconded by the Honourable Member from Campbell, that this Government take steps to assume the responsibility for the disposition of all Yukon land under a comprehensive land policy that accommodates the residential, industrial and commercial needs of Yukon communities and individuals with special consideration for varying degrees of development dependent on land use and with prime consideration for land leasing and purchasing schemes, and in all land disposition that government cost be directly reflected in land sales pricing.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, the topic of land has probably been debated at more length in this House than any other topic and, no doubt today, we will add to some of that length.

It is also, probably, one of the most sensitive and emotional topics around. It is also, one of the most important. Its high-profile importance to Yukon is derived from the abysmal record of land non-availability to Yukoners.

Presently, under Territorial control is some 361.6 square miles of Yukon's 207,000 square miles of land. Within those 361.6 square miles, the past Territorial administrations have attempted to set up land development schemes that release available land into the hands of the people and the interests of those who want it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not so much the intent of the motion at hand to take the Government to task for their present land disposition policies and practices, though we well recognize the dire need for greater guidance, but rather to address the colonial mentality that prevails over the disposition of the 206,000 remaining square miles.

Mr. Speaker, to belong, one must own. That is an adage that has been applied through the generations in this quest for private land ownership.

The strength of that adage does not mean that people all want to own 75 foot by 100 foot fully serviced, pavement-fronted, pillbox lots. In that respect it does become very important then how well Yukon is capable of administering the 360-odd miles that it has presently under its control.

But, Mr. Speaker, the 360 square miles of Territorially administered land is inadequate to serve the needs of the 23,000 people that we have.

At the same time; however, the degree of administrative competence and the degree of ability to cater adequately to Yukon needs in the communities, within the parameters of those 360 square miles, will determine whether or not this Government, in fact, should assume the responsibility for controlling the rest of the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we witnessed the budgetary estimates for land disposition. To a large degree, on this will hang the future of our capability to negotiate for and take over Territorial disposition of land.

If the Minister's Department can keep up, and improve upon the momentum of land disposition that has taken place in the last four years, our credibility to assume the control of the rest of the Territory will be enhanced, but, that credibility has already been shaken by the Government's position in Land Claims.

I find it hypocritical that the Territorial Government would assume a stance, seemingly synonymous with the Federal position against the Native position, rather than assuming a stance that would eliminate division and confrontation in its own backyard.

Mr. Speaker, Territorial land disposition is predicated on Land

Claims but this has been highly overrated and abused. Under the pretext that nothing can be done until Land Claims are settled, we have deliberately held off any progressive development ideas about the rest of the Territorial land. That can not go on, certainly under the present positions and mechanics.

Mr. Speaker, a land use plan for the Territory, with full consultation and representation by Native organizations, by corporate concerns, by private interest, by people at large, must be put into place. This will not only provide that credibility factor that is necessary for the Feds to be less reluctant to give its last colonial vestige greater responsibility, but it will also provide a unified land dispersement position necessary for the Land Claims settlement.

I also note, Mr. Speaker, that there are no land transactions and the Government's position being worked into the Pipeline Agreement. Mr. Speaker, you cannot ask for any responsibility without demonstrating the capability to handle that responsibility. Show that you have a plan, show that you have addressed the people that you represent their needs, and show that you have the administrative framework to effectively manage your added responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, this now relates to some of my earlier remarks respecting the capability of the present administration to handle the existing demands within that 361 square miles.

Mr. Speaker, this country was settled and built by people who came from around the world by the attraction of land ownership. Perhaps, the days of the 360 acre entitlement simply for the price of settlement are over naturally, but the disparity between that original Canadian offer and today's costs have to be attended. The policies of present administration not only inhibit and retard accelerated growth and development, but they make land ownership, to a large degree, prohibitive.

The fundamental reason, Mr. Speaker, is that policy has not been made with adequate people consultation. Let me elaborate with this on a specific example. We were having some difficulty getting some commercial lots on the market in Faro back in the early 1970s. The lots were zoned, they were surveyed and they were sold. Mr. Speaker, it took 6 years to get the lots on the market, why? Well, some bureaucrats decided one lot needed more access right-of-way, another lot had a boundary dispute, and then of course, to top it off, the whole process was shelved as somebody decided that a community development plan was needed for the town.

The real irony of it all, is that the community development plan, done by an assumed reputable consultants at a \$24,000 cost, was a joke. Development since the plan was adopted has hardly conformed to the plan noticeably, because its orderliness was not in the best community interests.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, that the plan I refer to made no reference to small acreage lots in the vicinity of the town. Yet, within a year the townspeople convinced YTG to develop a sub-division, an example of grass roots opinion, over riding a sophisticated and invalid government oriented, government directed development plan.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that present land dispersement policies are not in total harmony with the people who want the land, and whether you accept it or not, Yukon land must be for Yukoners. They do not all want space age services in tidy little packages. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but praise for the 2,000 lots of all descriptions that the government has developed of the past 4 years, and in particular, the former local government is to be commended for their efficiency and cooperation in bringing our Faro subdivision on stream. Is that is all we are assuming people want, lots, at a questionable price range because of the requirements to have this land serviced and developed? There are people who do not want the basic services. They do not want to live in the tiny package deal in neat rows adjacent to a community core that you are offering.

It appears that the method and credibility in land dealings is being promoted, at least in part, by idealistic bureaucratic decisions in a vacuum of public consultation.

I am sick to death of the phrase that land is free in the Yukon save for the price of development. It is that free land that needs to be released. We have 361 square miles at our disposal and we are developing in a restrictive and stifling manner. I am not sure, I was so hung up on telling people the kind of land they must have and the kind of services they must take with it. If this theory were in place, Mr. Speaker, in 1867, we would either be in total wilderness or another country.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government is to take steps to assume the responsibility for the disposition of all Yukon land, it will have to show a more receptive methodology in the disposition of land presently under its control.

When people have to hide behind the provisions such as the Yukon

Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act to get some land that is not hung over with bureaucracy, then someone has to redefine their priorities. When a subsistence agricultural industry has been a proven viable resource, some planning has to be done immediately, to encourage it to those who want it.

When the only development strategy of a government hinges on subdivisions that are costly and do not meet the demand, some alternatives have to be explored.

We need dry lot development, we need agricultural land, we need known serviced remote land released. We need more variety in the residential, in the commercial and in the industrial land use.

If the government is bent upon orderly development around communities, I agree with it. It must make that costly development more accessible to those who would make valuable use of it. To this end, the government must reinstate greater lease and lease-to-purchase arrangements. What use is developed land that does not have someone on it contributing to the Territory? Whether industrial or commercial, the enterprise is often a marginal one, beneficial to the services of the Territory, but requiring the incentive of lease arrangements to establish and survive.

Mr. Speaker, we have, therefore, an obvious need to visibly address the total needs of the people to whom we can give the land that we have got.

I am most impressed with the recently prepared preliminary report of the Whitehorse North Management Project. Many of the points stated are echoed in that report. The ideas established there must be expanded to encompass the entire 361 acres you have got and then to the Territory as a whole. Demonstrate that you can do this. The rest will follow.

The steps that the Government must take will have to be with greater consultation, consultation between the three levels of government involved and between the people who make up the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest is made up more and more of people who passionately demand land ownership, who want privacy, who prefer life away from the city, who want a better family life, a closer proximity with nature, freedom to raise animals and grow things. We have the availability of the land to support these interests and I challenge the government's activity towards response in these concerns. And as of now, there is contradictory policy in dispersement of that land.

Again, it is imperative that development policies are established by Yukoners, and your first step is to re-define priorities; firstly, with respect to Native Land Claims, and automatically with the people who want the land and who will give the Territory something in return.

I might note in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I expect unanimous consent on this motion because of the seriousness of government to live up to its election promises. The motion before you is entirely extrapolated from the Conservative Party resolution on land development. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I have an amendment to the resolution by the Honourable Member, and I would like to send copies around to all Members to peruse while I am speaking to the resolution in hand here.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, prior to getting into debate on the subject that I am the Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs and I am not the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, so number one, my responsibility lies in approximately 362 square miles of land. The remainder of the responsibility lies with the Government of Canada.

I was impressed with the Honourable Member's speech and I almost got the impression he was running for Member of Parliament. Maybe I can start a rumour and get everybody talking about other names that are running for that particular position.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member has contradicted himself in many areas. I think, first of all in respect to what has transpired in the last four or five years, that the Territorial Government has done their best to try and keep up with the supply and demand for land, where they are capable of doing it. As you all realize, we have impediments put in the way of the Territorial Government, and I think that we are all aware of the situation as the development in Haines Junction finally resolved itself after, I believe, six years.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that all Members realize that we are doing our best, from this side of the floor, to going through a planning process for various areas and utilization of land. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that my people do everything they can in consultation with the municipality, which the Honourable Member alluded to in his presentation,

in particular in Faro, but it also happens in all communities, because as the Honourable Member well knows, these municipalities and local improvement districts do have a certain authority invested with them. I am sure that the Honourable Member would not want this Government to dictatorially to go in and say you are going to have a certain type of subdivision whether you like it or not. That is not the approach this government takes, it tries to work with the elected Members. We feel they are elected to make decisions and they should subsequently, be prepared to make those decisions when various options are presented to them.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a couple of things in the resolution that are lacking, and that is in the first part of the amendment that I am presenting which states, "Yukon Lands be developed by the Government or the Government, in conjunction with private enterprise". It is a very important principle Mr. Speaker. I think that in order to dispose land, first of all, you have to develop it and I think that the Legislature should show, one way or the other, if they are prepared to accept those two basic principles. From this side of the floor, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is fair to say that we believe very strongly that government in conjunction with private enterprise should develop the land on behalf of the people of Yukon Territory, and I would be interested to see what other Members have to say in respect to that particular item.

As I have stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, we do have a planning process going on; for example, the northern part of Whitehorse just outside the boundaries, and we also have one in the southern extremity of the boundaries of the Whitehorse area. We are trying to develop land for different uses.

Now this, once again, depends once again, on the consultation with the Federal Government. As you well know, the planning mechanism is set up as Federal-Territorial and City participation if they wish, to review those particular areas of the land usage. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, one of the most important principles on behalf of land management is that it should be under one administration. Quite obviously, if the Member from Faro is confused in respect to just what exactly the land situation is, you can imagine what it does to the individual on the street. This is one of the reasons that I maintain that we must have all the land in the Yukon Territory administratively transferred to the Government of the Yukon Territory, and at the same time the policies must be coming from the elected people in the Yukon Territory.

That means, in the final analysis, the buck stops in this Legislature. I think all Members would agree with that, I have heard them all speaking on the campaign trail.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that the development costs of land be recovered in the sales of land. I think, this is evidenced in respect of land sales that have gone on in the past and I should like to see it continue. At the same time, I think that there is a difference between the residential areas that are put into a mixed development.

I do not think that the Honourable Member from Faro would want this side of the floor of the House to say if they had land that had developed five or six years ago in a particular area, say, for example, in the downtown core in Whitehorse, and turn around and sell it to some friend for \$2. I think it has got to go on the open market and people have to be prepared to pay for it, depending how the zoning and, as the Honourable Member well knows, the zoning has a lot to do in respect of the sale price of any piece of property.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is also some other important aspects on the land situation. This Government is actively, since it took office, discussing the situation with the Government of Canada. We are attempting to get land transfers in the areas of campgrounds. We are initiating discussions for the land transfer once we have completed the review of the land just outside the outskirts of Whitehorse, so that it can come under the administration of the Yukon Government.

I fail to agree with the Honourable Member from Faro, saying this Government has to prove itself in respect to land management. What he is saying is that the Government of Canada can stand back and do nothing with the land, land they have and we have to go out and turn around and do all these great and wonderful things that he alluded to in his speech. I should point out to him that the problem that we are having with the Honourable Member from Campbell, if he is listening, the Honourable Member from Campbell has in respect to Downey Lake. You cannot get land.

When we provide land to the public of the Yukon Territory, Mr. Speaker, it is for everybody, for all Yukoners.

Mr. Speaker, in the resolution, the Honourable Member has stated the leasing and purchasing schemes. Mr. Speaker, this Government is not a lending institution. We are not the Bank of Montreal, we are not the Bank of Commerce. It is the Government of the Yukon Territory. If you want to borrow money you should go

to a bank.

What the Honourable Member is indicating is that we should be setting up various programs within the Government to offset the costs of land over a long period of time. I do not believe we should, Mr. Speaker. I think we have a responsibility to develop land, to provide that land, but at the same time the individual has a responsibility.

I think that too often we say that government can do this and government can do that. The state not only has a responsibility, the individual has, and I, personally, believe that they have to be prepared to come and put their money up for a piece of property so that they can procure the title to that property.

I, personally, do not believe in the concept of lease. I think that there are various types of titles that can be devised in the Lands Ordinance, whether it be agriculture or whatever, but I would sooner go to the concept of title than lease. I think that not only for a psychological point of view but from the government's point of view, once the buyer has purchased the land, gone through and met the requirements that have to be done to that land, I think that he or she should have the right to have a title to that property. Then the government does not have to go in and inspect and do all the other administrative problems that you get into when you get into a leasing agreement. And the costs are incurred by all the taxpayers in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I think it is fair to say in respect to the disposition of land for title, it is that much easier for an individual to procure money from a lending institution so that they can purchase that land, and they can put their improvements on it. As you well know, the title is a very valued document in respect to trying to procure money for improvements to a piece of property, and that is one of the reasons, for the individuals sake, that I think we should be doing the utmost we can to get that title to that individual and as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I believe it was the intention of the Honourable Minister to table an amendment. Is that still the intention of the Honourable Minister.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua that the following resolution be amended.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua that Motion 11 be amended by deleting all words after the words, "Yukon land" and substituting, therefore, the following: "by developing a comprehensive land policy which will include provisions that: 1). Yukon lands be developed by the government, or the Government in conjunction with private enterprise; 2). the degree of development vary with the different uses of land; 3). the development costs of land be recovered in the sale of land; 4). land be made available to accommodate the needs of Yukon communities; and 5). lands be developed to meet the specific commercial, industrial, and housing needs.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I start, I should explain I am feeling a little ill, and if I pass out in the middle of the speech I do not want Members opposite to think that it is because I have been floored by their arguments.

A number of years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Quaker Oats Company had a gimmick in which they gave away square inches of the Yukon land. At that time I remember hearing the story about the rural Yukon family who, literally, ate themselves sick trying to get enough square inches on which to build a house. I was reminded of that story today, when we began the debate on this Motion.

I want to say at the outset that I see nothing fundamental with the original motion with which to disagree. The only problem I have with it is some questions about people who will carry it out if it is accepted.

The first words, Mr. Speaker, of the motion that remain even the amendment proposed are, "should take steps". I guess the problem is how this government takes those steps, because I suspect here, that those moves could either make or break the all-important Land Claims Negotiations. I think that talks may not go too well unless this Government opens, and keeps open, its hearts and minds to the Indian community on the question of land.

I was very glad the other day to hear the Honourable Member from Kluane say that this government had a wrong approach to the question of land, and she suggested, I do not think too lightheartedly, that the government should involve itself on the Indian side of the Land Claims negotiations, so that we would have the CYI and YTG ganging up on the Federal government, instead of the YTG and the Feds ganging up on CYI. That may seem like a fantasy to

some people, but it seems to be in some ways, a delightful proposition. I think that from my point of view, the only way that we are going to build a true community in this Territory is when we achieve that kind of respectful dialogue between the Indian and non-Indian community.

Mr. Speaker, it may come as no surprise to Members of this house, but I am particularly fond of the policy of the Yukon New-Democratic Party on the question of land. I think it has the best policy on this question. I really quite like the policy. I think that if there were, in all seriousness, a majority of NDP members opposite that we would be seeing our way towards some healthy progress towards a Land Claims settlement, and I think that we would see adopted the kind of posture suggested by the Member from Kluane, and the Leader of her party. I think, if those attitudes were more wide-spread, I think, we would see some real development towards resolving the kind of conflicts which this motion addresses.

Some of the candidates in my party in the election, I should make clear, were actually counting on a quick solution to the land problem, even before the Land Claims talks resumed. One of them actually wanted our party policy put into action the day after this legislature took office. So long as, of course, the Indian organizations could be persuaded to agree with it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, with the present government people in charge, that we are probably in for a long wait before we can really come to finally, making some sense of the crazy state of Yukon land.

My party has proposed a Yukon Lands Commission, with representation from all walks of Yukon life. These people would be in charge of all Yukon land. Through this commission, with the proper use of land-use planning, as is being done in the areas north and west of Whitehorse, and the areas south and east, all the needs, commercial, residential, agricultural and industrial, can be met. I would see such a commission carrying out inventories, assessing needs, and finally, zoning and disposing of the land according to its various uses.

I believe that such a commission, could be very effective, and cause little or no increase in bureaucracy. It could, in fact, be a focal point of policy planning for the Territorial, Federal and Indian land departments.

Of course, in the time following the Land Claims Settlement, and following the transfer of most of the land to the Yukon Territory, I think, it would be the ideal agency to supervise the disposition of land and, in fact, mediating the kind of inevitable conflicts that we are going to have about different land uses, in different areas. I do not think that this body is ideal for resolving those conflicts, and I think, they will be ongoing and continuous, as they should be, in a healthy democratic community.

My view is that such a commission could be established now, through amendments to the Area Development Ordinance, which already give the YTG power of zoning and land use anywhere in the Territory, irrespective of who owns that land. Under that, land can be zoned and allocated, for agricultural, residential, business, industrial, education, public, and other purposes, and there is currently a Zoning Appeals Board, which hears objections to decisions made under this ordinance. Actually, I think the government could probably establish such a commission without even amending the ordinance. The powers of regulation are quite broad, as the ordinance is less than two full pages long. The commission could probably, legally be established by regulation if this government could see the wisdom of such a move.

I think it could be done, I think the law is there, and I think the government has the power to take some effective short-term steps to deal with the land problem. I think that so long as there is fair representation on such a commission for the Indian population of the Territory, many of their concerns could be taken into consideration. The Indians could have lands set aside for their use in places they want, and non-Indians could have theirs. There could be occasions when Indian groups lease lots from the Federal Government or Territorial Government, as they currently do for the recreational properties. The one thing needed to settle the land problem, it seems to me, in the Territory, is trust.

Mr. Speaker, this trust between Indians and non-Indians in the Territory is the most essential thing and until we evolve it into a firm and healthy situation, we are not going to be able to deal with the land problems, we are not going to be able to deal with them if some of the traditional attitudes persist.

We all know there is lots of land in the Territory, but what is missing is a comprehensive policy. Given good will and trust, this policy will emerge, and I believe that ultimately, all interested can be accommodated. Those of industry, those of the commercial

sector, those of conservationists, those of the hunters, the concerns of everybody can be met. A comprehensive land use policy for the entire Territory is a long way off, Mr. Speaker, even given a maximum of trust and sincerity of all concerned. If the trust was present right now, at least some of the immediate concerns could be taken care of. Yukon Government has 360 square miles, approximately, of land under its control, and usually in places where people live, like Whitehorse, but there are demands for policy on Federal lands, and until Land Claims are settled, there will be no quick resolution of the land problem on Federal lands.

So I will restrict the rest of my comments to lands under the control of YTG.

There is currently a big demand for land around Whitehorse and the government has accordingly come up with a big budget to cope with that demand. However, it may be doomed to at least partial failure because not all the desires of the government are going to be met.

There are lots, standard, suburban, residential lots being made available, but I think there probably has been too little variety, few lots that give people much freedom and, of course, absolutely no land is being made available for strictly agricultural purposes. The closest we have got to agricultural land development is a few tenuous grazing leases.

Lots of between two and five acres sound nice until you see the price tag. We note that there are many 20 acre titled lots on the market now, but they have not been sold because few want to pay that kind of price.

I think there are a number of people who want to be able to homestead, but they are being that right now by not only the Federal government, but the Territorial Government as well. I think that everybody knows that homesteading in Alaska is allowed, subject to local regulations. The same thing could happen here, if we had some imagination.

The YTG could make the land available to people, in accordance with proper land use planning and regulations and at a price that they could afford, if the government was determined enough to let everyone get a piece of land.

The only reason country residential property is so expensive is that they are provided with underground electricity and telephone cables. And, if you were to knock the price of those, the land would probably sell for a few hundred dollars an acre.

People want land to live on, Mr. Speaker and the people who need land most cannot afford what the YTG is offering, nor at the current rates of taxation. The Territorial Government could, if it really wanted to, open up 200 lots of between five and fifteen acres next summer near Whitehorse, at a cost of perhaps no more than \$500 an acre. It is possible, of course, that that might go a long way to solving the squatter problem that we now have.

There are a large number of Yukoners who want land and land that is not in dense subdivisions, land that will give them more than token privacy at Wolfe Creek and MacPherson-type subdivisions, land that will come only with a few hydro poles and a passable road. There are people who are saying to the government, let the rest to them. If they want telephone service they can have it at a price they want. If they want lines put underground, they will pay for it. They also want to see, in some cases, the lowest bidder have a chance to do the work.

I think it is appropriate that the government should continue to make more country residential lots available because there is a demand for them. Of course, I think the Minister is aware and I too am aware that there are considerable planning problems involved in continuing forever the supply of country residential lots. I do not think that we have yet come to grips with those planning situations that would emerge if we had to start considering a generation now the servicing of a city full of country residential lots.

I suspect the next generation of homeowners that move on to some of those lots will be demanding municipal services that the present owners have agreed not to request and, when that time comes, we should be having some, I think, fairly acrimonious debates about the payment for those services.

But, I think, too, there is also a large demand for the standard subdivision lots. I think that the government is, quite rightly, doing its bit towards meeting that demand, and I hope that we can count on the Minister's assurances that very soon the supply will overtake the demand.

I think, the important point, Mr. Speaker, is that people have to be given a choice. I think, people come to Yukon looking for various lifestyle opportunities. They do not want to be stuck, I do not think, as the Member for Faro said, in some rigid pattern that evolved in southern Canada. I think, many people bought lots at Wolfe Creek

because that was the only thing in town, and I think, this government party ran in the last election on the basis that it would provide land of the kind people want, to all Yukoners.

I think, it is significant that the resolution from the Member for Faro was stolen almost word for word from the Conservative Party Convention Manual. For that reason alone, I am sure that the original motion will eventually receive the support of the House.

I think, we must give not only a variety in the choice of land, but it must be available at prices people can afford. I am sure that as we increase the supply, some economies of scale will come into effect and, in fact, we may even be able to, somewhere along the line, lower a little bit the price per lot as they are now coming on the market.

Mr. Speaker, land as it has been said, is the single most precious and finite of all Yukon natural resources. Everybody wants it. Pipeliners want it, miners want, conservationists want to protect it, animals need it for their habitat, people want it to enjoy and live on and with. By setting up a Yukon Lands Commission, staffed and operated by a representative group of Yukoners, the Yukon Government could see all these needs met, based on what people want, based on what uses are best for the different areas in the Territory.

All interests could be accommodated if the willingness and the sincerity of the government is there, and if there is a trust between those who own the land and those who want to use it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, in reply to some of the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, saying that the Yukon Government is now waging war against the Indian people, I do not think that is the case.

Mr. Penikett: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I did not say what the Member just said I said.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Well, maybe I could then apologise to the Member, but he knows very well what I am talking about. Maybe it is time now, to put forward to this House that I am elected by the people of Old Crow, and appointed by the Government of the Yukon Territory, and; therefore, have dual roles within the government structure here in Yukon.

With regards to the former motion, without the amendment, put out by the Honourable Member from Faro, it seems to me that no consideration was given with regards to the people of Old Crow.

Despite of the fact that the press people are present, with regards to the amendment of that motion number one, that Yukon lands be developed by government in conjunction with private enterprise, I would like to see the specifications of those lands described before I support such a motion, whether it is the original or the amended motion.

I admit my feelings are strong, are based on the fact that I was born on a land base that is not imaginative but, in all reality, using the land and what is on it. Now that I am sitting within the government, I would like to make my feelings known, not only in the confines of the four walls of the Executive Committee, but make it known to the people in Yukon that I do now, take the Indian people in consideration with regards to land disposition in the whole Territory.

I feel that I have an obligation to all of the Indian people, mainly because I have worked with them before, and I feel that if this government is going to come to an expeditious land claims solution, I think that we should have some sort of compact with the other third of the population, mainly because they use the land more than we who are sitting either on the opposite or on the government side of the House, or in the gallery, or anywhere in the City of Whitehorse.

I think that the people who actually are in need of the land are both Indian and white. So, I see no reason to neglect contact with the other group of people who live in the Yukon Territory.

Now, I see in the amended motion that my honourable colleague says that the land should be developed by the government and private enterprise. I feel that, despite the fact that he is on the same side as I, and we are in government, I feel that the Honourable Member should have consulted with me before the motion was amended, either outside or inside the House. I see no reason why I should support the motion in its former form, or in its amended form.

Again, I would like to express my view that if all Yukon land is in the hands of any government, federal or Yukon Territorial Government, I think Indian people should have input into the disposition of those lands.

For instance, if I was in Old Crow Flats minding my own busi-

ness, I would not like to see Gulf Oil of Canada come in and say, look, we have a piece of paper here giving us permission to destroy some of this area for the benefit of the people of Canada.

I see in the future, Mr. Speaker, that, with regards to provincehood, and the relationship that we are going to have with the Indian people, that it is too soon, I think, for this government to acquire all the lands.

I think that we are in force. We can ask for some of the land, but not all of the land, as the Honourable Member from Faro and Porter Creek East has suggested in these particular motions that I am speaking on now. I feel that, not just because I came from Old Crow, there are a lot of native people using the land with regard to hunting and other purpose, with regards to subsistence in other parts of the Yukon, meaning Klukshu area and Liard area down in Watson Lake. The statistics with regard to my Human Resources Department and Social Assistance, does not provide me with any facts that no Indian people are using the land, so with that I would like to close with saying that I will not support any of the motions, regarding to the taking over of lands, but if the motions states that we will take over some of the land, or try to take over some of the land, then I will be in full support of it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, granted, I am following the last speaker, because I was having some of the difficulties he was having, too, in supporting this motion. However, before we get into that particular area of it, I would like to say that I truly appreciated the thrust that was being put forth from the Member from Faro with respect to the need for a flexible policy on the part of the government to proceed to develop the land that they have, in such a manner that they satisfy the needs of the people who want it.

It is very good, the government should be aware of the needs and we do have to plan these things carefully. However, there is a real problem in this motion, because it just says that the government take steps to assume responsibility of the disposition of all Yukon land, and I have a problem with that. The problem is that this government has recently, by agreement with the Federal Government, become one of the parties to a negotiation that involves the disposition of Yukon lands to another party, who is nowhere mentioned in this motion. I think that it would be irresponsible of this assembly, because we are not just a debating society, Mr. Speaker, we are an assembly of power to enact laws whose opinion should be respected and listened to throughout the country, to pass this motion in its present form without some reference to that all-embracing, all-encompassing, pervading issue, that of the Land Claims.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to redirect this debate away from what is essentially, a debate of how to use the land if and when we ever get it. That is what the debate is about, I do not want to do that, but I do not want it misinterpreted either, and I do not want it to become an inflammatory kind of resolution that other people outside this assembly could say, "Look there, that Territorial Government is at it again, they have no consideration at all for Land Claims." I think that we have to acknowledge, as I think everybody has acknowledged in this house, at one time or another in their careers, that such a thing as aboriginal rights exists with our native people. The aboriginal rights relate directly to land and its use, and that these aboriginal rights are in the process of being negotiated, or settlements are being negotiated in Ottawa.

So I am going to move an amendment to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. Moved by myself, seconded by the Member from Kluane, that motion number 11 be amended by inserting after the words, "takes steps," the following words, "subject to a prior settlement of Indian Land Claims". I apologise to the Member Opposite to not having had this prepared in triplicate ahead of time. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I can give it to one of the Pages, I will read it again, that motion number 11 be amended by inserting after the words, "takes steps," the words as follows, "subject to prior settlement of Indian Land Claims".

I will give that to the Page now. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if you pursue it, you could authorize copies.

Mr. Speaker: I am wondering if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, could assist the Chair, if we could just take a 20 minute recess at this time.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would be most grateful for that Mr. Speaker.
(Recess)

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair for allowing that brief recess.

Mr. Speaker: Is the copy of your proposed amendment now available?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, it is in the final stages of being

copied. If I can talk for a few minutes more, and I am sure, by the time I am finished it will be here and available.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would, as I was saying before we recessed, not want to draw away from any intention of this motion, which is to try and give some guidance to the government with respect to the kind of development policy we would like to see, in fact, I have no problem accepting the amendment of the Minister that he has put forward, with respect to the particular way of going about the development. I have heard speeches from all sides, now, in the detail of that kind of development, and I support them in the main, because we do have to prepare for the day when land will be available for disposition by this government to the people of the Yukon. So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that I do not want to see development stifled. I do not want to see blame being placed, or that it someone's fault because we can not do this or that. That is not the kind of acrimonious situation that we want to get into, we just have to make a plain recognition of fact. There is a negotiation going on right now, there are aboriginal rights, and that all this amendment would do, Mr. Speaker, is just make recognition of that, so that when this is taken from this house, the people of all walks of life in the Yukon will see that we have considered all the people of the Yukon in drafting this resolution.

So, I submit this amendment, in the hope that all members will see it to approve it.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, in relation to the amendment submitted by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, it is not possible for the Chair to accept the amendment at this time, in that it relates to amending, not the amendment before the house, at this time, but the main motion, and perhaps, the Honourable Member would want to deal with the proposed amendment he has made once the amendment under consideration of the house has been considered.

Any further debate?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not too clear on just exactly what your instructions were to the House. Are you saying that we must vote on the resolution that I have put forward, and then the one by the Leader of the Opposition, or is it the other way around?

Mr. Speaker: The House has received an amendment from the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs amending Motion Number 11. That is the amendment that is now before the House. There is no subamendment.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in respect to the resolution put forward. I am sure, from this side of the House, that we have no problems accepting the subamendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member has also spoken in this debate, and cannot speak twice.

I am sorry, I am in error, because the Honourable Member has moved the amendment. If the Honourable Member is speaking to the amendment, then he may proceed.

Again I have been in error. The Honourable Member does not get to close debate on an amendment, so the Honourable Member can speak no longer on this subject.

Some Members: Question.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the main motion?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would, at this time, like to propose an amendment to the main motion, which is moved by myself and seconded by the Member from Kluane, and that is that Motion Number 11 be amended by inserting after the words, "take steps", the words, "subject to prior settlement of Indian land claims".

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at some length on the subject, so I will not belabour it.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Motion Number 11 be amended by inserting after the words, "take steps", the words, "subject to prior settlement of Indian land claims".

Is there any further debate?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that, from this side, we would be most happy to accept and support this amendment. Any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian land claims are not of number one prime importance to this government are false suggestions.

I am sure that anyone who wishes to pursue the Throne Speech,

the many statements that have been made in this House in respect to land claims, must realize that this is our number one priority item.

We are most concerned that land claims not only be dealt with, but they be dealt with fairly and equitably for all of the people in the Territory.

So, we certainly, from this side, Mr. Speaker, have absolutely no problem with this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will make it very brief. I must apologise to the Member from Old Crow, when seconding this motion, for not noticing that it was for the disposition of all Yukon lands, and I am very sorry it happened, and I am willing, very willing, to support the amendment.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the main motion?

Mr. Byblow: I would like to briefly, make note that the original intent of the original motion was, in fact, to take into consideration the concerns that have been expressed. I have no difficulty with any of the amendments, and certainly, will endorse the full support of the changes.

Mr. Speaker: The Member having twice spoken has closed the debate at this time.

(Motion agreed to)

(Item Number 5)

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 5, standing in the name of Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 5?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Campbell, seconded by the Honourable Member from Faro, that Standing Order 11.8 be amended by deleting the words, "a spokesman for each of the parties in opposition to the government," and substituting; therefore, the following words, "any member".

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this motion is very small here, but in the overall picture, it is a very important motion to all peoples in the Yukon Territory and all of the members of this House.

I think that in this motion we are asking merely for a right for all people and all members. I, in no way, want anybody on the Committee responsible for this, to feel that I am opposed to what they have done, because that is not the case. I will try to explain that it was just something that was overlooked; and therefore, maybe it could be corrected here, today.

In explaining, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to go back a little for the rights of all of us in this House. Maybe, the federal government has taken some of those rights away, and we do not want that to happen.

In 1970, Jean Chretien, who was Minister of DIAND, made what you could call a deal, you could call it some arrangement, with Ottawa, to provide for two elected members on the Executive Committee for the first time in the history of Yukon. That change, Mr. Speaker, was made by Ministerial Order.

This meant that the Minister provided a constitutional change for Yukon without going to Parliament for any authority, and no change in the Yukon Act.

Mr. Speaker, this kept the change and status of the Executive Committee entirely within the boundaries of his own office, and it also meant that he could withdraw that privilege at any time, without, of course, consulting Parliament.

It was therefore, an experiment, I feel, and it is still an experiment. It also, means that the Executive Committee is not, in that sense, the government, but a majority opinion of the people in Yukon.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker. In this case, there are no Ministers of any government, in this sense. The present executive are not really and truly government, because the federal government has not really allowed this to go forth.

As I have said before, I do not believe in a Speech from the Throne. The Throne is in the Senate in Ottawa, and not in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Speaker, we are speaking of the rights of every member in this House, but we are speaking mainly, and moreso, of the rights of every constituent in the Yukon Territory, when we wish to change Standing Order 11.8.

To clarify that, Mr. Speaker, I would direct you to page 9 of

Beauchesne 7, and here, I feel, this is a right that has been given to all of us, and we must appreciate this right. I quote, 7.1, page 9, "Another collective right of the House is to settle its own procedure." This is such an obvious right. It has never been directly disputed, that is unnecessary to enlarge upon it except to say that the House is not responsible to any external authority for following the rules laid down for itself, but may depart from them at its own discretion. This is equally the case, whether the House is dealing with a matter which is finally decided by its sole authority, such an order or a resolution, or whether a bill is the joint concern of both Houses. This holds good where the procedure of a House, or the right of its members to take part in its proceedings, is dependent on statute.

For such purposes, the House can practically change or practically supercede the law."

Mr. Speaker, that is why I say, the Committee has made some decisions, right decisions, I think, except for something that was just overlooked. I am very happy that we are able to make our own rules and regulations in this House.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on page 78, paragraph 83, it finishes with, "Mr. Ramsey MacDonald, Prime Minister, who was a witness before a select committee on procedure in the British House of Commons said, on the 16th of February, 1931, 'The House of Commons consists not only of a government but of an opposition, and they both have functional rights.'"

Mr. Speaker, that means to me, that we have, both sides, functional rights and possibly, the same rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the main one in Beauchesne, which is on page 110, 119.2, at the bottom of the paragraph, "In parliament, every corner of the country is represented, and no rule should silence elected representatives when they think they have a message to deliver. Freedom of speech is a sacred principle, and if there is a place where it should be fully represented, that place is in the parliament of the nation and it is the Speaker's responsibility to see that this principle is not infringed upon."

Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking of Mr. Speaker infringing upon anything. I merely finished the sentence, that is all. I am merely stating that I think, the rights that our constituents and of every person who stands in this House should always be our first thought.

I say that an Assembly elected by the people should give every constitutional right to the people who elected that member, for him to say his piece for them in this House.

I think we should remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are not here to consider only our feelings. We are here to consider the feelings of the people who elected us.

Any encroachment on their rights, through rules or otherwise is absolutely unforgiveable. We must be sure, Mr. Speaker, that we as an Assembly make every effort to uphold this obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I would direct you to a quote, actually, from the Minister of Indian Affairs to the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, when he gave her the terms of reference for her office.

On page 5, it says, "Yukon Indians must be adequately represented and effectively involved in government at both territorial and community levels. They must be assured of appointments and effective participation in subsidiary bodies of government, advisory council, management boards, commissions, committees, and public service of the Yukon, especially in the areas of government responsibility that bear directly on their well-being."

Mr. Speaker, in my language that means that they should be given also a right to be able to have their representatives speak in this House on matters concerning their areas or themselves.

I do not bring the Indian people into the argument for the sake of political involvement or a political football, but I might remind the Members of this House that my constituency was created and is 75 per cent native people and we do have the problem of them not knowing sometimes, just what the political situation is. In fact, in the last election, there were many that did not know that they could vote for an independent in this House.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they do need representation in here. They elected me to be here. The Honourable Member, who is Independent, next to me, Mr. Speaker, I think that we just fundamentally wish and should give that right to be able to speak to every Member of this House.

I see no problem that the Opposition could have with this motion, actually. If they are going to make a statement, I am sure that statement should be pretty well settled by everybody in the House. If some member in that group, because they are a political group, Conservatives, Liberals, NDP, whatever, really do not appreciate that statement, or really feels that it is going to hurt his con-

stituents and if the Honourable Leader cannot talk him out of saying something against or for, then I think he should have that right to speak.

So, I see no problem, and I would hope that I have unanimous support for this because, as I say, I do not wish to do something to our Committee that would hurt that committee. I am merely trying to make sure that we have all our fundamental rights given to us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. Hibberd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Honourable Members concerns that he might be facing some sort of muzzling process, but I think that is indeed, stretching the rules considerably, to say that that is actually happening in this instance. Now the quotes that he has used, I think, tend to confuse the issue, if anything. He is using a letter of reference with regard to the government formation, the Executive Committee, and trying to apply that to the Legislative end of the proceedings, which is where we are. He is quite right to say that we indeed do function under the rules which we laid down for ourselves, and we are responsible for formulating those rules, and for that purpose we formed a Committee of Rules, Privileges, and Elections, to deal with those issues. Indeed, that committee has the responsibility to deal with such things as this, and to report back to the House.

The Member has every opportunity to appear before that committee, make his views known, and again, when the report is tabled in this house, he has the opportunity again, to make his representations known. I would suggest Mr. Speaker, because we do have this mechanism available, we should use it in this instance, and permit that committee to review this possibility that has been presented to us and report back to this house.

I would, therefore, recommend an amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that motion number 12 be amended by deleting all the words following, "that," and by substituting therefore the following words, "the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges consider the the amendment of Standing Order 11(8)."

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member of Education, that motion 12 be amended by deleting all the words following the word, "that," and by substituting therefore the following words, "the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges consider the amendment of Standing Order 11(8)."

Is there any further debate?

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that debate is on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is on the amendment.

Mr. Byblow: I do not believe that I have any difficulty with supporting either the original motion or the amendment, because in fact, we will initiate the mechanism to bring about a change, and perhaps, in bringing about that change, I could offer some observations to the house respecting the proposed amendment, whether it goes to the Standing Committee or whether it is amended here today, in the House. As I recollect, it was about two weeks ago that the possibility that Opposition Members' curtailment of privileges was brought to the floor. At that time, some rather valiant and eloquent efforts were made to prevent the very situation that arose last week respecting the parliamentary rights of Members to reply to the Ministers' statements.

The Honourable Member who just spoke, referred to this as the forum where this debate could take place. I note that there was debate on this, yet the House saw fit to pass that report without amendment when that point was actually raised.

Mr. Speaker, in my attendance of the Committee meetings, from which arose the wording of Section 11.8, I received a clear understanding that no member would be disallowed response to Ministerial Statements. Not only does the section or the report fail to contain a definition section, but the word "parties" is not even capitalized, nor does it specify political parties.

I might further note that the only official recognition of political parties in the Territory is under the Societies Ordinance.

I am a person and, therefore, a party to these proceedings, Mr. Speaker. I am my own spokesman and represent my riding. The underlying intent, as I understood it to be established in the Committee, was not to censor members but to protect their basic human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I too will quote, but from Section 9 of the Yukon Act, that spells out the responsibility of elected members to represent such electoral districts in the Territory as named.

I submit that the full import of this Act is not being observed, that it is being denied. Some members are not being allowed their full electoral representation.

Mr. Speaker, I further submit, and as the Honourable Member has quoted from Beauchesne, I, too, refer to it because there is one case in point that is spelled out in the text. In outlining the principle underlying parliamentary law, it says that one of those principles of parliamentary law is "to protect the minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority".

Mr. Speaker, I do not submit that we have the makings of a tyranny but we do have a case of an abused minority.

Beauchesne makes one further point, that a traditional feature of parliamentary law "respects the rights of the minority which precludes a government from using to excess the extensive powers that it has, to limit debate or proceed in what the public and the opposition might interpret as unorthodox ways".

Mr. Speaker, I submit that in light of the precedents set in this House for replies to some statements from Ministers over the years, it is certainly unorthodox for this Government to use its extensive majority powers to stifle the rights of some of its elected members to speak.

Mr. Speaker, it simply boils down to a democratic principle. I may never want to reply to a Minister's statement, but I resent being told that I have to or that I cannot.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I must caution the Honourable Member if he speaks again--

Mr. Fleming: The amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, the amendment, I am sorry. Proceed.

Mr. Fleming: I think we are all getting tired, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I believe we are.

Mr. Fleming: I will not belabour the subject. I have no real problem with the amendment, because I think that we have given you our case this afternoon and I feel that this Committee must be able to understand our feelings and wish for the rights of our constituents, as I have said before, to have a spokesman here.

It is not for myself, whether I speak to any statement or anything. It is for the people who put us here, which is some majority in the Yukon in some ways for all of us, including the backbenchers of what we call government or whatever.

I would have no problem with the amendment, Mr. Speaker. As I say, I am easy. I like to see people get along. I like to see things happen and I sincerely hope that they do. If they do not, I suppose there are other ways, because people usually do end up having their rights, one way or the other.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I will, I support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up a lot of time of the House on this. I think the Members opposite are having difficulty casting themselves in the role of ogres.

Yet, I do have sympathy for this motion, though, and I think I should explain to the House why, because I am the leader of a Party and I, perhaps, would have been expected to oppose this, on the basis that we should be dealing exclusively on Party lines.

The fact is that we are not dealing exclusively on Party lines, Mr. Speaker. We had hoped that this might happen; however, the voters of the Yukon have decided otherwise. They have elected two independent Members and, I think, that the rules of the Standing Committee should take into account that factor. These are two Members who wish to speak as independents. They have been elected by their people as such.

Indeed, it may be recalled that one Member, the Member from Faro, was elected without any opposition from two other parties in this room. So, it may well be that we have permitted the election of an independent and now we are trying to turn around and restrict some of their rights.

One final point, I would make is that the debate, the time that this debate has taken, both in the original report and now, today, I am sure exceeds many times over the few minutes that it would have taken for them, the two independent members to have made whatever replies they may have wished to, to the several Ministerial Statements.

I do not propose to take any more time of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

(Amendment agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the motion as amended?

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 6, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to proceed with Item Number 6?

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that it is the opinion of this House that the Yukon Territorial Government should make available to child care facilities in Yukon, direct funding of a level at least sufficient to cover the costs of implementing YTG regulations or standards for such facilities.

Mr. Penikett: Tuesday, March 8th of this year, the House unanimously endorsed the objectives of International Women's Day. One of these objectives, I should tell the House, is financial support of day care.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the Yukon and the rest of the world is celebrating the International Year of the Child. Accordingly, the Government promised to bring in legislation this year, to establish badly needed and long overdue day care standards.

What this government has failed to commit itself to doing is to provide funding to the centres for the benefit of the children now using them and, of course, for the benefit for their fathers and mothers as well.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some people in this Territory and maybe even some in this House, who still think of women merely as mothers and sisters and daughters. Such views, Mr. Speaker, inhibit the progress towards true equality of the sexes. This view ignores all but the few roles in which women have usually been allowed to find their fulfillment in society. Such a view does less than nothing to bring us a true state of justice and equality to society as a whole.

In many cases, women in the home are isolated from each other and from society at large. Their loneliness often leads them to live precariously, to experience life through the achievements of husbands and children, rather than through full participation themselves.

The social responsibilities they bear are heavy. They provide cooking, cleaning, laundrying services for each household. They act as emotional service stations for other members of their families. They carry the responsibility for the endless care of children and for what kind of adults these children become.

Any attempts women make to expand their activities into outside employment or further education are frustrated by the lack of child care facilities, by the criticism heaped on the neglectful mother and by the fact that it costs money to work in order to make money.

Because a woman's social function has, in the past, been defined only as that of wife and mother, they are considered peripheral to the real work force. When they do get work, it is at a rate of pay much less than a man. Traditionally, society regards women as a reserve pool of cheap labour to be dropped in and kicked out of the labour market as the twists and turns of the present economy require.

What is worse is that sometimes cheap and available female labour is used by employers to blackmail male employees into accepting poorer wages and to nourish hostility between men and women on the job market.

Mr. Speaker, to reach true equality, this image of women must be shattered. I believe it is a government endorsement of the objective on March 8th that makes it their duty to do all that they can to help expand the role of women in our society. It is their responsibility to enable women to participate equally in our work force and in our society at large.

Mr. Speaker, for women to be able to participate equally in the Yukon work force, there must be a marked improvement in the day care situation. Day care is now denied to many mothers and fathers simply because they cannot afford it. Considering our high cost of living, if a family where both parents worked to pay off a mortgage and generally try and make ends meet, they barely have enough money left over at the end of the month for \$150 or \$160 per child day care bill.

If they have more than two children, preschool children, the cost is unbearable. Most families find they cannot afford these prices. To their credit, most day care centres in Whitehorse prefer to operate in debt rather than increase their fees to parents because they know what will happen. The day care centre would die due to lack of business. It fold because it would then be uneconomical for the parents.

The result is that many families in Yukon decide that only one parent can work and the other should stay home and care for the children. The parent that stays home is usually the mother, the

woman, forced by economics to stay "barefoot and pregnant", as the old saying goes.

I ask the House to imagine how beneficial and how productive to society it would be if that woman could, in good conscience, in the knowledge that her young were well cared for, enter the workforce, be productive and pay taxes.

What of the single parent, widows, widowers, parents divorced, parents who have been abandoned by the child's father or mother, what of their plight? If they are working, trying to meet a mortgage or rent payment, then the high cost of living is even more difficult. It is practically impossible for these people to manage the essentials, let alone what is obviously a luxury to some people, the cost of day care.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, such people need it. They are, or can be, productive members of our society, our economy. Yet now, they are being denied that opportunity because of government policy, which is not to fund day care.

These people also deserve justice. They deserve it just as much as people who are members of happy and stable marriages.

In the old days, and to some extent this applies to Yukon, tradition would have the grandparents or aunts or uncles take care of children while parents worked. This does not happen much anymore, especially in Yukon, because of our transient and young population.

What is the current day care situation in Whitehorse? There are six centres caring for about 150 children. Only two of the centres are what one could call financially solvent. One is privately owned and finds that it has enough money to buy cots and toys and other equipment when it needs to, as well as enough money to pay for all of its regular operating costs. Parents are charged \$160 a month for full time care of their child, which includes snacks and juices. Parents, in this case, make their kids' lunches.

The other minor success story is a centre which is not in debt, but which plans to use its bank account this summer to build a new playground for children. It charges \$140 a month or \$9 per day. Although it is not in debt, it openly admits the wages to its child care workers are simply not enough.

The third child care centre's books balance, but in reality a debt owed to it is not expected to be paid off. So it looks as if the real situation is that the centre is about \$1,000 in debt, it barely meets its operating costs after charging \$150 a month for full time child care, and could not afford a \$25 smoke detector if it was required to do so right now.

It too, wants to pay its workers the salaries they are worth. Wages they can live on but cannot. They are currently paid about \$4 an hour, \$4 an hour for the protection of human resource, our children. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that even MLA's earn more than that.

The fourth centre reports that it is \$1300 in debt for last year, and it is trying to pay that all off, by having fund raising activities. Its rates are \$155 a month and has no money for new toys for the children.

The parents in this House, of course, know how quickly kids go through toys.

The fifth centre charges \$160 and is in debt well over \$1000. It is 3 or 4 months behind in its rent payments and has lots of outstanding bills to pay.

Obviously, from a financial point of view, this centre should close, but it will not, because it is concerned with the children and the needs of the children's parents.

The sixth centre is just "barely making it" and that is with cheap rent. It finds itself going into the red every summer, when there are fewer and fewer children to care for. There is also a possibility the building they are in could change ownership. A rent increase would probably follow and they might have to close down or move and there clearly are not many good locations for day care centres in Whitehorse.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is clearly tenuous at best, for most of the day care centres in Whitehorse. I suspect the same holds true for centres and nurseries in the outlying communities. If it was not for the dedication of the parents and staff for the children, day care simply would not exist in Yukon.

Fortunately, the people of Yukon are good-hearted and make personal sacrifices so that the next generation will have the best possible start in life.

Whether this situation can continue is another question. Whether the day care facilities in Yukon will be ready for the pipeline era is an even bigger question. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that our day care centres are in trouble and need help, the parents need help,

the children need help, but so far, this Government has shown no indication of wanting to help. It is not only neglecting an important section of the population of Yukon, it is, and would, amount to reneging on its acceptance of International Women's Day and of the International Year of the Child.

In my view, what the Government should be doing is making payments to the centres so at the very least they can pay their staff a decent wage and let the centres have enough money to buy a few toys now and again. Regular grants to cover operating costs really are required, and they are required now.

In theory, Mr. Speaker, full public funding of day care centres is economically perfectly defensible, because of the enormous benefits to society the child care centres bring by way of increased family productivity and tax generation, as well, and this is significant, as a reduced demand for Social Services.

From the information I have gathered, it looks like some financially marginal centres will have difficulty in meeting costs that will be brought in with the government's standards for child care facilities. Others will not.

Now all the centres agree, standards are needed. The Government agrees with that, so does the Opposition and so does the public. It too, wants standards set.

To make sure that no day care centre will shut down because of the standards, I feel, I am sure all the Members of the Government Party would agree, that the least the government can do for the sake of Yukon children, for the sake of our future, is that money be made available to these centres if it is needed to meet the forthcoming standards.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with a summary of the Child Care Facility Standards proposed by the Child Care Association, which were revised in May, 1977. They define a day care facility as a place for children under 16 years of age, staying overnight and day care for 5 or more children under the age of 7 years of age, but this does not include homes of relatives or YTG Group Homes and the like.

Obviously, there is a board needed to administer such standards, and the Yukon Child Care Facility Certification Board has been named and 5 people on the board would certify these facilities. They propose that the Director of Child Welfare be chairman, Chief Medical Officer of Health be a member and 2 members from the Child Welfare Association, all serving on 2 year terms, staggered for continuity.

The centres should be certified by the board, there should be a 30 day grace period for facilities in operation to meet the standards once they come into effect. They have suggested a \$25 fine or closure of a facility as penalty and a \$250 fine or 2 months in jail for not closing if ordered to do so by a Judge.

They have suggested annual inspections, with a copy of the report going to the Board and copies to the facility and operation. They suggest that the facility must be approved by health, fire, building and electrical inspectors. They must be dry, well ventilated, well lighted and in other respects, suitable for the care of children. No sleeping facilities can be located more than 2 stories above the ground, unless specifically approved for that purpose. No eating facility would be in the same room unless specifically approved by the health officer. Meals served shall be ensured by the operator to be of adequate quality, quantity and well balanced and sufficiently varied according to Canada's Food Rules and shall be appropriately served with consideration given to the individual requirements.

A copy of the daily menu, it is suggested, must be posted in a conspicuous place. All kitchen facilities must be kept clean and sanitary and acceptable to the health inspector. Any structural changes to the facilities must be approved by the building inspector and others necessary. Children cannot be cared for in a facility without the written permission of the parent or guardian or person in whose charge he is, it is also suggested.

Children, it is suggested, cannot be supervised by anyone younger than eighteen. Facility operators may report to the Director of Child Welfare "any information regarding the abandonment, desertion, physical ill-treatment or need for protection of any child attending the facility".

It is also suggested that every facility has to have at least fifty square feet of indoor space and seventy-five outdoor space per child. At least one primary staff person for every four infants under 18 months of age, one staff for every five toddlers, one staff for every seven kids three to four years of age, one staff person for every ten kids five years or older, and no more than two infants per operator at any time.

It is also proposed that there be individual sleeping space for all children.

Now, these regulations that have been suggested are not onerous and not crippling. They are necessary for the proper care of children. But they may, and this is important, involve some significant expenditures for the day care centres which are providing a much needed social service now. These expenditures may be beyond the means of some of the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I quite frankly would not want to be responsible for participating in a decision which might amount to causing the closure of some day care centres at exactly the point in time when we need more, not less, of such facilities.

The regulations that are proposed are not elaborate, Mr. Speaker. Every indication is that they will not cost a great deal of money, so the government should not have a great financial problem with this.

But I want to make sure that the day care centres will not be crippled by the regulations they were designed to protect. I urge the House and I urge the Minister of Health and Human Resources to listen to the children, to hear their parents well and to reconsider his previously stated opposition to this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the Honourable Member's speech on child facilities. As I read it in the motion, he is referring to child care facilities. Nowhere in the motion do I see day care, so based on the motion, I would like to submit to the House here, Mr. Speaker, that, based on the 1979-80 Main Estimates, yesterday, the Honourable Member had agreed that there would be \$1,363,000 put aside in my Department for the administration, field services and social services. Those are to provide the administration of programs for public welfare services and geriatric child care facilities in the Yukon Territory, under Statutory Regulations.

Again, on the following page, I see that \$45,000 short of a million, a total of \$955,300 set aside for child welfare services. The reason why I am bringing these figures out, Mr. Speaker, is because the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West had suggested that this is the International Year of the Child and that he is inferring that this coincides with the International Women's Day.

So, based on those facts, these \$955,000 are to provide funds for the care and maintenance of children in care of the Director of Child Welfare, in accordance with the Statutory provisions of the Child Welfare Ordinance.

There are provisions also, under the Social Assistance, on the following page, there is another \$1 million, if you add \$7,600, I would be correct in saying \$1,007,600 set aside for social assistance and that is to provide financial assistance to individuals and families on the basis of need in accordance with statutory provisions of the Social Assistance Ordinance.

There again we make provisions under the Human Resources Department to make sure that the child in the community is better taken care of.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, on the following page, I see again, another \$20,000 that is set aside by this Government and agreed upon by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that \$20,000 would be provided for the day care centres to subsidize families in need.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that, the Honourable Member has suggested that we should recognize women and the child in the community, everybody in the Yukon Territory. I do not believe that the Honourable Member knows that the woman is biologically adapted to have child birth and that does not mean to say the Government is going to take care of all children that are born in the Yukon Territory, or in fact, if I was Madam Begin, I would speak on a national level.

I will keep my former position on the subject of day care, if that is what the Honourable Member is talking about. In my mind the motion is not directed at day care centres, Mr. Speaker. The motion reads that the Yukon Territorial Government should make available to child care facilities, so based on my assumptions and facts that I am bringing out with regards to the Main Estimates for the year, and I am sure that this Government is going to reflect on the fact the Women's Association here in the Yukon are pressing for an ordinance.

Recently the Yukon Women's Association approached me in the office, saying that they will accept an ordinance for the safety of the child. There is no use bringing in an ordinance after a child is burned or after the child has been harmed in some way because of poor regulations in the day care centre. I also stated, Mr. Speaker, that they will agree with me that they are not pressing for financing of day care centres, but only the ordinance.

I would like that point clear to the Members Opposite that the

message that I got from the Yukon Women's Association was the push for regulations on day care standards. I would like to reiterate that before the election of this Progressive Conservative Government, we had a policy convention which we, as a Party, did not support in any way infer that we will even come to a point where we will bring in a day care ordinance.

Despite the fact that, against my Party's policy, I will make an assurance that there will be regulations up to a certain standard, just for the safety of children. Again, I would like to infer that there are a lot of children in need. I, for one, was a child at one point in time inside the Arctic Circle, on March 10th, I was born inside a tent, there was no doctor. Yet, I am standing here speaking on behalf of 21,000 people.

At the age of five, I had never heard of day care, and again on ten years later at the age of fifteen, I never had heard a word about day care centres. Fifteen years, later, I still did not hear anything about day care. This seems to me that this is a new thing that is coming into the Yukon from the Outside, based on new people coming in with new ideas.

I would like to see the population of the Yukon Indian people and the overall population of the Yukon Territory to be as independent as possible and not to be dependent on the government so much as we have provided in the Main Estimate, taking into consideration the national restraint, the cut-backs, whatever the people on the street might call it.

I know there is poor consultation between the private sector, the people on the street and the government, but through the veins of the Yukon Women's Association, I have made an attempt to try to go along with the association that they represent.

I realize that there are some day care centres that are operating under a severe conditions and they are interested in regulations so that these regulations could bring them back to my department asking me to meet the day care standards, which I have established or imposed on them. I would like to make it known to the public that was not the case when I made that decision that a Day care Ordinance would fall into place during the fiscal year.

I will not support the motion but I will, in fact, consider the intent of the motion in the future. But I do not feel that at this time, if the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West is indicating that this motion on day care facilities, then I feel that I am under the obligation of my Party policy that I will not go further than the Main Estimates where there is over \$2,000,000 set aside for the welfare of the women and the children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief remarks. I think that we have, today, a fairly classic confrontation between the powers of conservatism and the powers of enlightenment and the Member speaking before me has indicated that this day care thing must be a real new idea that has just come in and I do not know where he has been but it has been around for quite a long time, Mr. Speaker. It is a product of our society which requires the working participation of many, many more adults than perhaps it did at the time since most of us were youngsters. And even some of us who are in the older ranks will probably be able to go even further back than I can.

However, we have a situation where there is a real need, day care is a necessity for many parents, particularly the single parent who have children and who must work to keep them. They are not faced with any choice in this matter it is a question of need. They have a program available to them if they want to go to the Department of Human Resources to obtain funding to assist them. I should say my Party, during the election, did not support across-the-board-subsidy of day care. This rejection was based on the belief that the parents were primarily responsible for the care of their children prior to school age when the funds were available for those in real need from the Department of Human Resources, and thirdly, that working parents, by paying to day care, were in fact able to then deduct these payments from their income tax returns and in that way obtain an indirect subsidy from the government to assist them in payment of these things.

However, what has transpired now, is that we have a situation where the government, or indeed, this side of the House, have committed themselves to bring forward regulations, to introduce standards of day care, and I am very much afraid that unless we look beyond the introduction of these things, that we will be in fact window dressing. We will not be addressing the true problem, and that is the provision of proper care facilities.

I hope the Government will not see the requirement of funding as an excuse for not introducing regulations. I think that we are the only jurisdiction left in the country now, Mr. Speaker, who does not have regulations of day care facilities. We may feel that the gov-

ernment should not intrude in these things, but the plain fact of the matter is the government has to because, without some regulations, some tragedy will occur and nobody here in this House wishes to be responsible for that, so we are faced with regulations, we are faced with standards.

I hope that in the course of preparation of legislation, these standards will be fair and reasonable, they will not intrude too deeply into the private home and into the neighbourly and motherly care services that are given in the towns around the Yukon, that we are addressing ourselves more to commercial operations where larger number of children are present and that may include the private homes. There are some horror stories about fifteen children locked in the basement room, that is the kind of thing we certainly want to regulate and ensure it does not occur.

I will support the motion, however, to this extent, that if the regulation does require the expenditure of capital funds, by these day care centres that are existing to bring themselves up to the physical standards required by regulations, I think the government should make some provision, Mr. Speaker, to assist them to do this.

I still do not feel that a day to day subsidy is proper. I do not think that across the board, because most parents can and do want to look after their own responsibilities. The provision of child care assistance to people who cannot look after their responsibilities because of financial circumstances or other circumstances should continue, should be enhanced. I hope that the questions we have been directing with respect to the way you obtain these funds are getting through; that perhaps there is a need here not being met simply through ignorance and not knowing that this is available. I hope that is getting through.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we would support this resolution simply because there is incumbent upon the government if they do make it very difficult for child care centres to continue, through their own regulation, they should be taking some responsibility to assist them to meet these standards.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, the major points in the reasoning for the support of this motion have been very well articulated by the previous speakers. I would perhaps note in passing that I know of at least one day care facility in an outlying area that survives on the strength of its highly underpaid and largely volunteer staff and organizers.

There is no doubt that attention must be focused or addressed to this concern of our society. The attention assured by the Minister of Health and Human Resources reassures me that we can expect some rather complementary assistance to child care facilities. I will support this motion since it will show perceptive consideration at the same time when facilities standards are being upgraded. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to oppose this Motion, primarily because we have not got any money to do this. We do not wish to raise anyone's expectation. We have had consultation with the day care centres involved or with representation from those day care centres. We have been assured that what they want immediately are the regulations, that funding will not be a requirement of those regulations at this time and we have agreed, Mr. Speaker, with them to go ahead and get these regulations into place at the earliest possible date, knowing full well that we do not have funding, there is not money provided in the budget for it.

As a consequence, at this time so we do not raise anyone's expectations we are going to have to oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair cannot ascertain from the votes, and division not having been indicated. The Chair will call a division.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Hon. Mr. Pearson: Disagree. | Mrs. McCall: Disagree. |
| Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree. | Mr. Hanson: Disagree. |
| Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree. | Hon. Mr. MacKay: Agree. |
| Hon. Mr. Graham: Disagree. | Mrs. McGuire: Agree. |
| Hon. Mr. Njootli: Disagree. | Mr. Penikett: Agree. |
| Mr. Lattin: Disagree. | Mr. Byblow: Agree. |
| Dr. Hibberd: Disagree. | Mr. Fleming: Agree. |
| Mr. Falle: Disagree. | |

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are five yea, ten nay.
(Motion defeated)

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

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, that Mr. Speaker do now

leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

(Motion agreed to)

(Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I shall call Committee of the Whole to order.

At this time, we will recess until 7:30 this evening

(Adjourned)

The following Legislative Returns were tabled on March 21, 1979:

79-2-2

Continuing Education Report by University of Alberta

(Oral Question, March 8, 1979, Page 28)

79-2-3

Y.T.G. Travel Arrangements

(Oral Question, March 12, 1979, Page 43)

79-2-4

Water and Sewer Contracts

(Written Question Number 4)

79-2-5

Contractors re: Unpaid Accounts

(Written Question Number 2)

79-2-6

White Pass Freight Rates

(Oral Question, March 12, 1979, Page 43)