



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 19

3rd Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, October 15, 1980 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Grafton Njootli, MLA, Old Crow

CABINET MINISTERS

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

Government Members

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalingua
Jack Hibberd	Whitehorse South Centre
Peter Hanson	Mayo
Grafton Njootli	Old Crow
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake
Howard Tracy	Tatchun

Opposition Members

(Liberal)

Iain MacKay	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

(New Democratic Party)

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

(Independent)

Maurice J. Byblow	Faro
Robert Fleming	Campbell

Clerk Of Assembly
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)
Sergeant-at-Arms
Editor of Hansard

Patrick L. Michael
Missy Parnell
Jane Steele
G.I. Cameron
Lois Cameron

ERRATUM

October 14, 1980 — Page 333, Right column:
The "File error in Paragraph 10 should read:

The Archive's public program has been unable to continue its Whitehorse lecture series but it has continued a very active public program outside of Whitehorse. Film showings have been held in several small communities and displays have been put in place in the Sternwheeler, Keno, the MacBride Museum and the Herschel Island display was sent to the Arctic Islands Symposium in Inuvik.

We have also successfully converted current health records to microfilm format and now we are in the middle of converting Workers' Compensation Board records. Completion date for the microfilming of half a million Workers' Compensation Board documents is mid-February. The next priority for microfilming will be

non-current records in the record centre to increase the efficiency of space usage and storage space in the area.

Mr. Speaker, that outlines, more or less, the things that have happened in some of the departments.

This summer, I had the pleasure of working with my new acquisition, the Workers' Compensation Board, when the Minister of Health and Human Resources was out of town attending a few conferences. One of the priority items in this area is to reduce the heavy premiums necessary to support the Workers' Compensation Board in the Territory. We are currently investigating several methods of reducing the premiums necessary. I will be happy to report to the House, the results of the investigations when they become available.

I think that basically covers all of my portfolio responsibilities, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Members opposite for their attentive interest in the speech. I look forward to answering more of your questions during further debate.

Whitehorse, Yukon

Wednesday, October 15, 1980 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper.

DAILY ROUTINE

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

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling the 1979-80 Annual Report for the Department of Justice.

Also, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 37(1) of the *Interpretation Ordinance*, I have for tabling a report on Regulations, dated September, 1980.

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

Petitions?

Reading or Receiving of 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. Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Constitutional Policy of Government

Mr. MacKay: My question is to the Government Leader with respect to government policy. Since the Government Leader has admitted that the secret paper on constitutional policy is now probably government policy, can he confirm today that the policy is that he wants movement on the constitutional process to begin now?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I should take umbrage or not with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's reference to these as secret papers. Mr. Speaker, they are not secret papers. We made those papers public for definite and absolute reasons. I was elected by the people of this Territory. I, and every Member on this side of the House, was elected by the people of this Territory to try and evolve responsible government and political evolution in this Territory at a rate that is meaningful to everyone in the Territory. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, I will continue working towards that.

Mr. MacKay: The Government Leader will no doubt be happy to admit that the other parties are also doing this. I would like to ask him, however, that if he can now say that the constitutional process — and I am talking about the development of responsible government to provincial status — should continue in spite of having negative effects upon current land claim negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Honourable Member is getting his information from. I am here to tell you that I am fairly close to land claims negotiations, and any suggestion by the Honourable Member that there is a negative effect upon them is utterly ludicrous. The only negative effect on land claims at this time seems to be in the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's mind. Everyone else in this Territory is viewing land claims on a very, very positive basis.

Applause

Mr. MacKay: That sounded like trained seals to me, Mr. Speaker.

Can he then state categorically, as he has stated in the past, that land claims, and the settlement thereof, is the number one priority with this government?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I stated it yesterday, I will state it today, and Mr. Speaker, I will state it everyday if the Honourable Member so wishes.

Question re: School Enrolment

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Education. In answer to a written question last fall, the Minister informed me that sixty school children in Whitehorse were attending schools other than the designated schools for those children. Since we are now in a school year, I wonder if the Minister could advise me if, to his knowledge, that number has increased or fallen since last year?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any idea at this time; however, I will endeavour to make sure the information is available.

Mr. Penikett: In answering the question last fall, the Minister was kind enough to point out that only a handful of these sixty children were allowed to ride the school buses to go to their non-designated school. I would like to ask the Minister, why is the Department of Education using the school buses to enforce the designated school rule, given that the effect of using the buses is to discriminate against parents who cannot provide alternate transportation for the students?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, we do not have any intention at all of using the busing system to force parents to conform to any one school system. However, we are also not in the habit of paying great additional busing costs to enable one child, or perhaps two children, to attend a school that he decides he would like to attend.

If the school bus service enables a child to attend a school other than a school that has been designated as his, then we allow him to ride the school bus. However, we are not going to re-route the school bus, in most cases at great additional cost to the Department of Education, and great inconvenience to the other sixty students who are usually riding that school bus. We are not willing to take that additional expense and inconvenience to those other sixty children to make sure that one or two children can attend a school other than their designated school.

Mr. Penikett: Given that the Department's employees, the principals, have been sufficiently flexible to allow some students to attend non-designated schools, does the Minister not recognize that a system that uses the buses to enforce the designated school rule, in effect, creates a double standard between those parents who can afford to provide alternate transportation to non-designated schools for their children and those parents who have no choice in transportation and must use the school bus system, and therefore are forced to go to schools that are strictly within the designated description?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I do not see any double standard at all. The standard is equal for every student in the Yukon Territory. If a student is attending the designated school and he is outside of the two-mile limit, we will provide a school bus to that student. However, if he is not attending a school that has been designated as his school then we will not provide school bus services to that school. He must provide his own transportation.

As we have said, we have made exceptions to this rule because it has not created any great difficulties for the Department or the other children riding those school buses. I do not consider that a double standard.

Question re: French Immersion

Mr. Byblow: Yesterday, the Minister of Education gave me lesson one on capital versus operation and maintenance budgeting; today I expect lesson two.

On the subject of French Immersion, could the Minister tell me what amount or amounts of money were applied for from the Secretary of State, or, even better, would I be able to procure a copy of the submission?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge we applied for roughly \$450,000 over a five year period. It would vary in amounts from year to year, but that seems to me to be about the approximate number.

Mr. Byblow: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that only the schools of Whitehorse will be affected if the funding comes forth. Why were any outlying schools not included?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, very simply, because none of the other communities had expressed an interest up to the time we had requested the financing from the Secretary of State.

The other reason is that we feel we need minimum enrolment

before we can offer French Immersion in any community. In our opinion, Whitehorse has the required minimum enrolment to enable us to offer a French Immersion program, should we get the funding from the federal government.

Mr. Byblow: I would then ask the Minister if he is familiar with, or at least aware of, the fact that Faro has a French Immersion program in place right now, being funded by the parents?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, I am.

Question re: Pipeline Corridor

Mr. Fleming: I have a question this afternoon for the Government Leader, concerning the freeze on the pipeline corridor, which was put into effect when Foothills were negotiating that contract with the Government. At that time it was understood that, after the centre line had been surveyed, there was a possibility that the moratorium on the five-mile limit might be taken off. Has the Government Leader had any communication with the Federal Government on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: First, I think the Honourable Member should understand that it is the Federal Government that has taken over that land, not Foothills. The corridor, at the existing width of five miles, will only be in place until the final centre line is identified. We have made representations to the Federal Government through the Northern Pipeline Agency to have that corridor reduced again at the earliest possible date, because it does have an adverse effect on some residents and businesses in the Territory who want to be able to get to that particular land.

Mr. Fleming: My supplementary is in the same vein, but it concerns whether or not Foothills themselves will be paying for the portion they actually agreed to.

Now that the centre line has been cut, in many cases, in many areas, I know in my own area it has been cut - and they have actually worked and are drilling on that ground in that area; does the Government Leader foresee any payments forthcoming now from Foothills that may be owing to this Government according to the agreement?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of negotiation with the company, because there is a major difference of opinion with respect to the interpretation of the agreement that exists between Canada and this Government regarding taxation.

Now, we must understand as well, Mr. Speaker, that the centre line has not yet been fixed. The work presently being done is to identify the centre line. The Northern Pipeline Agency will have to approve the final centre line and that has not yet been done. What is occurring now is their attempting to identify this centre line.

I am quite confident, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no lateral movement in the area referred to by the Honourable Member, but we are negotiating the taxation of the line.

Mr. Speaker, what has effectually happened is that the Government of Canada has expropriated that land and they have allowed the pipeline company to go on to it; however, we do not have any means of taxing. According to Foothills' interpretation, we will not have any means of taxing until there are improvements on the land. Clearing the right-of-way, as far as they are concerned, is not improvements.

Question re: Beaver Creek Customs Office

Mrs. McGuire: I have a question for the Government Leader. I am sure that you all know of the efforts put forth by the residents of Beaver Creek to have their Canadian customs office relocated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like a positive answer from the Leader as to what efforts have been made by the Minister and this Government in assisting the Beaver Creek citizens in their quest.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would be most happy to answer that question and I thank the Member for it. We had the absolute assurances of the Clark Government that the new customs station at Beaver Creek, the long sought-after customs station at Beaver Creek, would be constructed this summer.

Now as everyone is aware, Mr. Speaker, there was a new Government elected in Ottawa and they set new priorities. I regret to tell the House today that the customs station at Beaver Creek is once again lost in the shuffle, in respect to priorities. We have not been able to get any kind of a definite answer from anyone in Ottawa as to when they might even consider rebuilding that customs station.

Mr. Speaker, I explained this to the people in the community when we were there about a month ago.

Question re: Whitehorse Credit Union

Mr. MacKay: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the Minister update the House with a current estimate of the losses that have been incurred by this Government with respect to liquidation of the Whitehorse Credit Union?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I will take the question under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacKay: On the same topic but addressed to the Minister of Public Works: can the Minister of Public Works tell us if the Government has now completed the purchase of the Whitehorse Credit Union Building for some \$450,000?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I think I am the one the question should have been directed to. The Government has completed the purchase. Actually, it was not a purchase, it was a repossession of the building, due to the fact that we spent a great deal of money in liquidating the Credit Union. I am not sure of the exact purchase price but I will endeavour to make the information available.

Mr. MacKay: Perhaps when he is looking into these things, could the Minister also explain to the House why this building has been sitting empty for six months, while the YTG is renting space all over town, probably at a cost to the taxpayer of about \$7,000 a month.

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

Question re: Food Prices

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as well. On a day last June when the Alaska Highway was washed out, a constituent of mine was astonished to find that the price of milk had suddenly jumped up, in fact one particular brand of milk jumped from 93 cents to \$1.03 on the day that the road went out. Given that it was the same milk in the same store with the same expiry date, I would like to ask the Minister if this is the kind of complaint that he would expect to deal with in his investigation of prices that he announced yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea if the jump in the price of milk was related in any way to the fact that the Alaska Highway washed out. However, if the complaint were made to the Consumer Affairs Department, I am sure it would be followed up in our investigation.

Mr. Penikett: The Minister said yesterday an investigation and also a mini-enquiry was underway. I would like him to clarify whether these are two separate investigations; specifically, can he tell me now what is the mandate of the two investigations and to what extent they will be investigating specific food prices of the situation in general, or the spreads? Can he tell us exactly what the parameters of the enquiry are?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, it will be a single investigation looking at the whole problem. I see it at this time as a strictly voluntary thing on the part of suppliers, wholesalers, transport companies and everyone involved in the food industry in the Yukon. We are hoping they will cooperate on a voluntary basis in this investigation. If we run into some problems, of course, we are going to have to take a second look at the total issue. At this time we are trying to find out what the cause of the spread is; we will hope to indicate where the spread in food prices occurs and whether or not, in our opinion, that food price spread or increase is justified or not.

Mr. Penikett: Since the Minister has indicated that he expects voluntary compliance from the subjects of this study, I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether, at this point in time, he has received indications that all those involved will be cooperative?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to indicate at the present time.

Question re: Alcohol & Drug Abuse/Brass Report

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Human Resources. Yesterday in her delivery, the Minister made reference to the Brass Report, a study on alcohol and drug abuse territorially. Can the Minister say if her government's position on the Report is one of acceptance, specifically with respect to the recommendation supporting the establishment of a foundation?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, the Brass Report and other recommendations are being considered carefully and will be deliberated further by Cabinet.

Mr. Byblow: Can the Minister say if the Report is a public document, or will be tabled in the House, perhaps?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, the Brass Report is not my report; it is under the Liquor Commission, which is under another Minister, so I cannot say whether it will be tabled or not.

Mr. Byblow: As a supplementary to that then, I would ask the

Minister responsible, I would assume the Minister of Justice, whether he intends to table that Report.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, does not have the Yukon Liquor Corporation under his control.

I can see, Mr. Speaker, that I have to give the Member opposite a lesson not only in the difference between capital versus operation and maintenance, but also on who has what portfolios. I am afraid it is a task that I hesitate to undertake, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Psychiatric Care

Mr. Fleming: I have a question for the Minister of Health. In view of the fact there are no resident psychiatrists in Yukon at present, has the Minister considered expanding Yukon health coverage to pay for rural Yukoners to travel to Whitehorse to see a psychiatrist?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, there is not a resident psychiatrist as far as I know, but I understand that the Federal people have a psychiatrist who will come for ten days at a time, about four times a year.

Mr. Fleming: A supplementary: I presume that this means that there are some arrangements. My next question is: what arrangements are now being made for Yukoners who require mental health care?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Well, rural people will be able to take advantage of this service. It is just going into effect, as far as I know.

Mr. Fleming: Thank you.

Mr. MacKay: Supplementary to the previous question: does that mean that the Government had given up trying to hire a psychiatrist for the Yukon?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I presume the Honourable Member means this Government. This Government was never on a quest to hire a psychiatrist.

Question re: Game Management

Mr. Penikett: We seem to have been neglecting the Minister newly responsible for Renewable Resources, so I would like to ask him a question concerning some well publicized remarks by the former Director of the Government's Wildlife Branch, shortly prior to his departure last spring. I would like to ask the Minister, specifically, if the views expressed by Mr. Hartman prior to his departure in any way represented the Yukon Government's views concerning game management?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in the text of his speech, in some areas, yes; in other areas I have some questions as well. Mr. Hartman is no longer here, so the Member has put me in a very difficult position.

Mr. Penikett: That is wonderful, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister then if he might care, either in Question Period, or perhaps in a statement of policy, since he is a new Minister, to outline for the House the areas where he did agree with the former Wildlife Director. Even more important, I would ask if he has prepared a substantive response to any of the criticisms that were made by Mr. Hartman, and more particularly, if those criticisms were found substantive, from the Minister's point of view, what actions may have been taken to rectify the areas of neglect?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the Member is making the allegation that there are some areas of game management we have been neglecting. I cannot fully agree with that, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that over the past two years, and I am sure the Member can look at his budget and see how money is allocated, the area of wildlife management has been a priority, within the financial limitations of this Government.

If he looks on the capital side of this budget, he can see a great deal of money going towards capital works in the rural communities to try to get the necessary quarters for the conservation officers to work out of the smaller communities.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, in respect to policy and this type of thing, I will be more than happy to discuss it when I bring forward legislation, probably next spring.

Mr. Penikett: That may be an interesting indication of more amendments to the *Game Ordinance*.

I would like to ask the Minister specifically, since he is no longer responsible for the Dempster Highway but, instead, in some way responsible for the Porcupine Caribou Herd, if his new ministry has given him occasion to reconsider his opinions on that question?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that this would

be a discussion of the operation and maintenance budget to be presented in the spring. I would go further, Mr. Speaker, to say that we on this side of the House feel that we have a responsibility for wildlife as well as people. We also have the responsibility to ensure that there are jobs for the people of the Territory. We feel that a happy medium can be found with respect to the operation of the Dempster Highway, and that is why we have the Dempster management plan and the various regulations to go along with it in effect, so that we can protect the caribou and also take care of the living, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Alcohol & Drug Abuse/Brass Report (continued)

Mr. Byblow: Just moments ago I was treated to a typical example of buck-passing with respect to the Brass Report. I would now like to ask the Minister responsible for the Yukon Liquor Corporation, and I shall not name him in the event that he has changed overnight, will the Brass Report be tabled in the House?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, we are considering the Brass Report. We have not decided whether we will table it or not at this particular time.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary to the Minister of Human Resources, on a very specific aspect of alcohol and drug abuse. Does the Minister plan to fill a vacancy in my community, namely, the alcohol and drug worker?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we plan to fill all vacancies.

Question re: Social Assistance

Hon. Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Human Resources. I have a social assistance figure showing that over one million dollars was given out to 2,563 people in the Yukon during the period of one year. Does the Minister have a breakdown of the actual number of people who collected social assistance but who were not Yukon residents?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps that should have been a written question.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I do not have those figures at my finger tips but I can supply information further to the Honourable Member.

Question re: Foothills' Property Taxes

Mr. MacKay: I would urge the Minister of Human Resources to see to obtaining a psychiatrist, because I think we will all need one before this Session is over. My question is directed to the Government Leader, regarding the famous \$5 million Foothills tax payment. Can the Government Leader tell the House if this Government has backed off the position which it took in the spring that the money is due to Yukon in 1980?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, not at all. We feel very strongly that the agreement is specific, and that is exactly the point that our contention is based on. I think probably our position at law is not as firm as I first hoped we would be, but that has not deterred us in any way at all. We are actively negotiating with the company with respect to their payment of that \$5 million.

Mr. MacKay: In previous questions, the role of the Northern Pipeline Agency has always been somewhat murky. Can I ask the Government Leader if at any time he has appealed to the Northern Pipeline Agency for assistance in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we felt that this problem was one that we should be able to resolve directly between the company and this Government. After months of trying, it was our perception that that was not going to happen; we have now officially raised the problem with the Minister responsible, the Honourable Senator Olson, and with the Federal Administrator of the Northern Pipeline Agency, Mr. Sharp.

However, in fairness, Mr. Speaker, I must say that that was done very recently.

Mr. MacKay: I appreciate the Government Leader's occasional flashes of fairness, Mr. Speaker.

Can he tell us, in fairness, if he has received any initial response from the NPA as to whether they will support the Yukon Government in its contention?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received any official response from either the Minister or the NPA, other than a thank you note from the Minister for my having outlined to him what our problems were.

So, I anticipate that we will be hearing from NPA fairly quickly.

Question re: White Pass Freight Rates

Mr. Penikett: Perhaps the Government Leader could sell the note to White Pass.

On the subject of White Pass, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government Leader about the application by Cyprus Anvil seeking an order from the Canadian Transport Commission which would reduce the freight rates White Pass charges for hauling the concentrate on the railway? The application, I believe, was dated May of this year.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take that under advisement. I am not absolutely sure what the Member is referring to. As I said yesterday, there are negotiations going on on a daily basis.

One of the prime functions of these negotiations is to come up with a rate that Cyprus Anvil might pay for the delivery of their ore from Whitehorse to Skagway. The rate that is being suggested by the Canadian Transport Commission and by the Government of Canada is one in close proximity to what, in the Canadian Transport Commission Report, they were calling the compensatory rate.

Mr. Penikett: I am, of course, referring to the application on record before the Canadian Transport Commission and, of course, this Government's ability to intervene in such applications, notwithstanding other negotiations. I am particularly concerned as to whether the Government Leader has been apprised of the view on record, again, on behalf of the company involved, that the freight rates proposed would be detrimental to the development of mining in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the whole concept of compensatory rights, and how they might affect one specific company only, are at play in the negotiations that are going on now. One of the basic tenets of such a compensatory rate is that, should another major customer come on stream, that compensatory rate would immediately change. Maybe both of them would be paying, at that point in time, a "compensatory rate"; but it would not be the same as the one company. So as to what a fair and equitable freight rate is, that question is, I think, completely irrelevant at this point in time. The Cyprus Anvil Mining Company, along with the Government of Canada, along with the Government of Yukon, along with White Pass, have recognized the fact that the White Pass and Yukon Railway does have a problem. It is a unique situation and one of the ways of resolving this problem is to establish a different rate, a compensatory rate, not a fair rate or a reasonable rate, but a compensatory rate.

Mr. Penikett: I appreciate the Government Leader's reply and I accept his point. Given that there is now a demand, since the CTC report of some months ago, that there be a compensatory rate, which operates on the assumption that the previous rate was not compensatory, which may therefore, conceivably produce an unfair burden on the consumers in the Territory in terms of their having to carry the burden; I would ask if the Government Leader has had his officials examine that question with a view to intervening to the CTC on behalf of not only the consumers of the Territory who depend on White Pass, but also the people of the Territory who consume the products which must be brought in here at fairly expensive freight rates?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge this would fall under the purview of the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development. I am not absolutely certain that we have looked at that application with the view to intervening on behalf of the people of the Territory in respect to those rates other than the compensatory rates.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident the responsible Minister would be more than happy to respond to such a request from the Honourable Member.

Question re: Faro/Staff Housing

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I will direct to the Minister in charge of the Yukon Housing Corporation. It is of a local nature and it is the continuing saga, Mr. Speaker, in my community that goes on with respect to staff housing.

There has been an appeal from my community to have a permanent maintenance employee of the Government stationed in the town. Can the Minister say if he is aware of or has given approval for this to take place?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, no, I am not aware of it but I will certainly check into it for the Member.

Mr. Byblow: At this time, could the Minister indicate if he anticipates any staff building program in Faro over the next year or two?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot indicate at this

particular time whether there would be any staff building in Faro. Naturally, it is always under consideration, but at this time I cannot say yes or no.

Mr. Byblow: I would like to ask the Minister of Education where he plans to put his teachers, but I will not. I would rather, then, go back to the original Minister in charge of Yukon Housing and ask him if he can tell me in a nutshell and very specifically where the monies go that are recovered from the sale of Yukon Housing units to the public market?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure which particular aspect of Yukon Housing the Member is talking about; we have two or three plans. We sell a buy-back house, it goes into one fund; if it is something else it goes in another one. So, he will have to be more specific, please.

Question re: French Immersion (continued)

Mr. MacKay: I have a question for the Minister of Education with respect to the French Immersion program again. Can the Minister tell us how much of the \$450,000 over five years that he mentioned will pay for the whole program? In other words, what proportion is he requesting from the federal government for this program?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to say exactly what proportion we have asked for. We have asked for what we consider sufficient funds to get a good start on a program from kindergarten to grade four. We are willing to accept the responsibility for some of the grades once they have been established for a couple of years, but basically this money is to introduce the program into kindergarten, grades one, two, three and four over a five year period. It is also to provide the books, the teaching staff in the introductory year of each of those years. That is basically it.

Mr. MacKay: I think I understand the answer to be that 100 per cent of the funding is being requested. Perhaps the Minister, in his second reply, can clarify that, but my question is one of principle in that the responsibility for the education of our children is clearly within the ambit of the Yukon Territorial Government, I wonder why a program which the Minister himself desires to see, he feels it necessary to seek special funding for this when perhaps special funding could also be requested for other subjects.

Hon. Mr. Graham: It is very simple, Mr. Speaker. And it is not 100 per cent, it is only 100 per cent of the introductory year in each of those years. We do not feel, with the finite budget that the Department of Education presently has, that we should shift program priority in any of the areas that we presently administer with our operation and maintenance budgets. We feel that, due to the fact that Canada is the initiating agent of bilingualism in the country and since they also fund French programs in the Territory to some extent, we feel that they should also attempt to fund this one. They do in other provinces.

Mr. MacKay: Can the Minister of Education share with us what contingency plans he has in the event of the request being turned down? As I am sure we are all in favour of this program, what other steps does he foresee?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, several steps are possible. We could increase the school tax in the Territory to accommodate the \$500,000 expenditure. We can refuse to introduce the program at all in schools in the Territory or we can introduce it on a smaller basis, which would mean that students that started it in kindergarten and grade one probably would not be able to continue on in grades two, three, four and five. We have a number of options, all of which will be explored when the Government turns us down, if they do.

Mr. Speaker: Just to point out from the Chair I think the question borders on being quite hypothetical.

Question re: Occupational Health Safety

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we welcomed the announcement by the Minister of Education and Everything concerning the consolidation of the six pieces of legislation affecting occupational health and safety. I wonder if the Minister can, today, say whether workers or employers in the Territory will, in the future, be looking at one all-encompassing piece of legislation in this field? And if so, will that legislation be part of the revised *Labour Standards Ordinance*, which we have been waiting for, or will it be something else?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I think that, even with this consolidation, employers and employees in the Territory will be looking at two pieces of legislation for the total picture, as far as occupational health and safety in the Territory goes. One of the pieces of legislation is still within the Federal Government's con-

trol, and the other will, hopefully, be an all-encompassing piece of legislation which will include labour standards and all aspects of the labour standards occupational health and safety in the Territory. That is what I anticipate; however, I do not wish to promise anything to the Member opposite, because once we have done the proper research, as I am sure he expects us to do, we will then be in a position to inform him more accurately.

Mr. Penikett: The Minister can promise me anything. Given that working people are obviously the ones most seriously affected by accidents and deaths on the job, and the compensation due to them and their families in these tragedies is a matter of fundamental importance — has the Minister given any consideration to increasing the number of workers' representation on the Workers' Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not.

Mr. Speaker: The time allotted for Question Period has now elapsed. We will proceed on the Order Paper to Orders of the Day, first dealing with motions other than Government motions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 1, adjourned debate, the Honourable Mrs. McCall.

Motion Number 6

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to continue debate?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say that this motion is redundant. I am pleased to say that the reason is that a meet-the-standards grant has been given. I will explain briefly.

The total amount of the meet-the-standards grant is not to exceed \$5,000, therefore the five centres who are eligible to receive grant funds will each be getting a portion of the \$5,000, based on their identified needs. For example, they will not each be getting \$5,000.

The five centres eligible are the Jack Horner Day Care Centre, Happy Hours Play School, the Child Care Centre, and the Them Mah Day Care Centre in Whitehorse, and the Faro Day Care Centre in Faro.

The ordinance and regulations came into effect May 15th. The day care centres in existence at that time are eligible for a portion of that grant. No funds from the grant have yet been disbursed. Each of the eligible centres has submitted an itemized list of needs they have, to meet the specific regulations of the *Day Care Ordinance* and, following the completion of a review of all the five centres' licence applications, the Day Care Services Board will be reviewing these itemized lists and deciding on the portion of the grant that will go to each centre. This should occur by mid-November. The review of the itemized lists submitted by each of the five centres indicates the \$5,000 will be sufficient to meet their needs to meet the standards.

As indicated in the letter to the Honourable Member, this grant is not intended to meet capital costs. It will allow the centres to purchase equipment and supplies specifically required by the regulations.

I will be voting against this motion, Mr. Speaker, because it is now irrelevant.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I should caution the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West, in his speaking to the motion, he would close the debate.

Mr. Penikett: I think, Mr. Speaker, that may be the best thing for me to do, having heard what I just heard.

Mr. Speaker: I once studied logic and I had a hell of a time drawing from the Minister's response, which sounded reasonably positive, the kind of conclusions she would (unintelligible). I do not intend now to repeat all the arguments I have made on numerous occasions about the justice and economy of day care and the need for it in the Territory. You have all heard me a number of times on that point.

I compliment the Government party for what I think have been significant improvements in its policy in this regard at its convention this summer and the subsequent implementation of them. I would have thought, given those things, that the wording of the motion would have met with their approval. That does not really matter that much, I suppose; I do not really care whether they vote for my motion as long as day care gets the money.

I would state, however, that having made this one small step in the right direction, I hope the Government Leader and the other Members opposite will not be too outraged if I now proceed to try to make the next step recognized; that the level of funding for day care is not quite high enough and it could be better. I do not suppose anybody over there will be surprised if I start to make that argument and I do not plan to disappoint them.

Rather than prolong the debate, Mr. Speaker, as I think I have had four resolutions on this subject, we must have brought it to a vote four times. I, quite proudly, am going to vote "Yes" on the motion, Mr. Speaker as I intended to when I presented it.

Motion negatived

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item Number 1?

Mr. Penikett: Next sitting, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered. We will now proceed to Government Bills and Orders.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Mr. Clerk: Second Reading, Bill Number 38 standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Bill Number 38: Second Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 38 entitled *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1981-82* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 38 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this Government to use the vehicle of the capital budget to accomplish two important goals, the first of these being to improve the quality of life in all Yukon communities for all Yukoners, and the second to stimulate the economy of Yukon by injection of these capital funds.

In preparing our capital budget we have first tried to take into account the desires and needs of the people of Yukon and the communities in which they reside. We have then, Mr. Speaker, attempted to work these needs into the pot of capital funds available to us. I can tell you today, Mr. Speaker, that negotiating funding of any kind from the Government of Canada has been very difficult.

It is a clear and unequivocal fact, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government is seriously short of funds and they are cutting back wherever possible. In other words, the \$26 million capital budget now before you is the result of many hours of tough negotiating by this Government.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that for the second time we are able to present our capital budget to you at the fall sitting of the House. Our experience over the past year has shown us that we are better prepared to administer capital works and the contractors get the work done during the summer construction season rather than having to complete projects in the cold winter months, thus giving Yukoners better value for their dollar.

It is our intention, given the success of our change in this process, to continue to table the capital budgets at the fall Sessions.

The accent of this year's Capital budget is again to increase community services, to improve the quality of living to local residents and to cut down where possible the need for people to travel to Whitehorse to avail themselves of government services.

The budget, in addition to providing funds to start new projects, also contains provisions for monies which are necessary to complete projects presently underway. All the funds necessary to complete projects are not, in all cases, provided for in the 1981-82 capital budget, but rather are spread out over two or more years.

This process is beneficial to Yukon in many ways, but proves to be of the greatest advantage to local contractors who are able to bid competitively on these tenders and who are experiencing a large degree of success in terms of being awarded a capital works contract.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Yukon contractors have been successful in obtaining 55 per cent of all construction contracts let during the 1979-80 fiscal year. We expect this figure to improve this year.

All this means is that we are moving successfully towards our goal of stimulating Yukon's economy and you have my assurance, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue our efforts to ensure that Yukoners will receive the maximum benefits possible from all projects in which we are involved.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention now to highlight several of the items contained in the capital budget. Your Ministers will provide greater detail and will be available to provide answers to questions during discussion of this bill in Committee of the Whole.

The Department of Education has several capital projects planned for the coming year, all of which are designed to improve educational facilities for our students and increase educational opportunities for all residents. Some of these projects include design and engineering work toward the establishment of a Yukon College for post-secondary students, and the construction of new classroom facilities in Carmacks and Pelly Crossing. It is anticipated that passage of the capital budget will permit the calling of tenders for the proposed Porter Creek Junior Secondary School in January, 1981. This new facility will have eight classrooms, along with a double gymnasium, commerce, home economics, wood-working and metal workshops. We have set aside \$200,000 to conduct design and engineering work on a proposed Yukon College in Whitehorse as part of our commitment to improve post-secondary educational opportunities for all Yukoners.

Students in Old Crow will be able to watch the construction of their gymnasium starting this spring. This program is unique in that it will draw on local labour and local materials to effect its completion. The new structure will also have room for a woodwork area, home economics courses and, of course, the much awaited gymnasium. A total of one million dollars has been set aside to ensure completion of the Old Crow Gymnasium Project.

Work is also planned to begin this summer on the construction of a new school for students in Pelly Crossing. This plan has been amended to include the specific wishes of the Pelly Crossing Education Committee and Department personnel. Current plans call for four classrooms, a gymnasium, a community library, a home economics and commerce room, and a combined wood-working and metal-working shop. We have slated \$800,000 to be spent on that project in the next fiscal year, and a further \$1,000,000 to be used during the 1982 construction season.

We have also readied tender plans for an addition to the Carmacks School. This work will involve one new high school classroom, a new science room, a gymnasium and new vocational shops.

Work is also in progress to complete an addition to the Faro School early in 1981.

The official opening of the addition to the Haines Junction School is set for this week and renovations are continuing at Christ The King Elementary School.

We have set aside \$100,000 under the Department of Health and Human Resources in anticipation of assisting the Yukon Rehabilitation Centre Society. It is our intention to make these funds available so that the Centre can proceed with its plans to obtain suitable premises for their operation here in Whitehorse.

A new sewage lagoon for Haines Junction, a new Yukon Government Administration building for Mayo, and continued funding of the Capital Assistance Program to Yukon communities are part of the major capital programs planned for the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs.

The Haines Junction sewage lagoon has been ordered by the Yukon Territorial Water Board to replace the existing lagoon in that community. This proposed project has been on the books for about the past three years and it is now hoped that construction will commence next spring.

Planning and preparation has involved the study of a number of sites, numerous meetings with the Water Board and a technical sub-committee of the board, discussions with Parks Canada and the Local Improvement District Board. A public meeting is slated for tonight to discuss the latest proposal with residents in that community. We have allocated one million dollars in anticipation that the proposal will meet the approval of all concerned and that we can begin construction next spring.

Citizens of Mayo can expect to see the start of construction of a new Government Administration Building, which we hope will be

completed by 1982. This new facility will house offices for our Wildlife Branch, Human Resources personnel, new library facilities, a new liquor store and offices for the Yukon Housing Corporation. It will consolidate government offices now located in several parts of Mayo and improve the public's access to government services.

A total of one million dollars has been set aside to ensure that work on the Mayo Administration Building can begin during the next fiscal year. Use of the Capital Assistance Program depends on the applications made by Yukon communities for these funds. We have set aside \$4.25 million to improve their standards of service and facilities for their residents. We anticipate that some of these funds will go towards the upgrading of the sewage treatment facility in Watson Lake and to help complete the expansion of sewer and water services in Faro.

Also identified in this capital budget is \$350,000 which will be used as this Government's contribution in the coming year towards constructing a proposed new swimming pool for Whitehorse. We have also proposed a further one million dollars be allocated in the 1982-83 fiscal year to bring this proposed recreation project to completion. These funds are over and above additional funds which will be extended to the City of Whitehorse under the Capital Assistance Program.

A combination of totally funded and cost-shared programs will cause the Department of Tourism and Economic Development to spend some \$745,000 on capital programs for the coming capital budget year. The largest single Territorial contribution to cost-shared programs is the \$374,000 being set aside to continue the tourism sub-agreement. This program has so far been successful in providing for cross-country ski facilities, Yukon River attractions, the Carnegie Library restoration in Dawson and the creation of our Tourism Accommodation Assistance Program to encourage the creation of new hotel rooms in Yukon.

We will be contributing \$100,000 towards the continuation of the Special ARDA Program in the Yukon, while the Federal Government will contribute an addition \$100,000 towards that same program. Money from this fund has been used in a variety of ways. Work is now in progress to implement energy conservation programs in the Territory, and our \$125,000 contribution to a joint program with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is expected to go far in reducing Yukon dependence on imported sources of energy. Our renewable energy program is designed to develop and identify sources of geo-thermal energy and energy efficient homes for Yukon conditions.

The Energy Conservation Incentive Agreement will provide sound technical advice and financial assistance to commercial, industrial and institutional establishments to improve their energy use efficiency.

We propose to spend \$30,000 during the next fiscal year in the form of grants to non-profit organizations, for the construction of new tourist attractions or extensions or renovations to existing attractions, including museums. These grants are provided on the recommendation of the Tourism Advisory Board and have been used in the past to the benefit of the Dawson Museum and Historical Society and the Keno Hill Mining Museum, to name two.

We have set aside \$100,000 for a downtown Whitehorse beautification program. The funds are earmarked as our contribution to a program which will have to be worked out between the City and the downtown businesses. We are showing our good faith by allocating the money, and if the other two parties can come up with a package which meets our criteria, we will be ready to put in our share.

The continued re-construction and paving of the Klondike Highway is once again a major program of the Department of Highways and Public Works. This Capital Budget provides for three million dollars to be spent during fiscal year 1981-82. Work will be done on both the Carcross to Whitehorse section of the road and the Whitehorse-Dawson section. A quarter of a million dollars has been allocated for the upgrading of the Mount Freegold road west of Carmacks. Mr. Speaker, over the summer we had numerous representations made to us that the Mount Freegold road badly needed major repairs and our own assessment of the high level of activity in the area led us to putting this item in the budget. We feel strongly that, as I said earlier, we do listen to the people of Yukon and this is a clear example. Work will continue on the South Canol Road and this is the last year of a two year \$1½ million project to install culverts and replace wooden bridges which have become hazardous to the public.

The 1981-82 budget provides for \$800,000, while \$700,000 was spent in the current year.

Another on-going project involves this Government's commitment to energy conservation and our desire to improve workers' health safety and working conditions in our grader stations and maintenance garages. The \$400,000 identified for the coming year will be used towards improving the heating systems within our work camps, and installing the exhaust systems for the safety of our employees.

The \$214,000 being allocated to the Information Resources Department is designed to bring our library services into the computer age. This capital expenditure is designed to purchase a turnkey mini-computer base library system to support a single data file of all the books and other material in the library's collection, and automate a variety of library functions. At present, Mr. Speaker, 58 per cent of the Library Services Branch budget goes into salaries and this ratio is rising. Two-thirds of this payroll budget pays for performing repetitive mechanical tasks. Without automation, we face continued demands for clerical staff, poor public access to our library resources, especially outside Whitehorse, and a growing gap in our ability to tap outside services as they change.

This proposed expenditure will assist in the production of a catalogue which will allow everyone in Yukon access to the total resources of our libraries. It will improve the circulation of our library material and permit us to tap into library computers in North America for further cataloguing of available books. The proposed computer system will improve the volume of materials distributed throughout our school system, improve our circulation control, and improve circulation and cataloguing in special libraries.

We anticipate a dramatic increase in the use of our library resources, once the computer system is in place.

Proposals will be called for the delivery of a computer system designed for Yukon needs, and we anticipate the system being in place by the late fall of 1981.

The Department of Renewable Resources has budgetted \$117,000 for the coming fiscal year to improve campground facilities on the Haines Road, expand facilities on the Dempster Highway, improve the campgrounds in Watson Lake and establish a new campground for Carcross. These new expenditures will mean that the Parks Branch will have spent over \$2 million during the last three years through the cost-shared sub-agreement on renewable resources with the federal government.

An initial start will be made at Watson Lake next summer with the construction of an access road and park roads for a new park campground, which will include camp sites, boat launch, vehicle parking, privies, tables and stoves. On the Haines Road, a new campground new use area consisting of 28 camp sites, as well as 10 tent sites with adjacent parking, will be developed next to Million Dollar Falls.

The Wildlife Branch commenced a program of building storage warehouses and workshop facilities at Watson Lake, Ross River, and Haines Junction during the 1980 summer, and this Budget calls for similar capital spending in Mayo and Dawson City next summer. Further improvements, including the construction of security fencing, will be completed this coming year for the outside storage of park and campground equipment. The Department will spend about a hundred thousand dollars in the next fiscal year, to construct a residence and office facilities for the establishment of a permanent conservation officer in Old Crow.

The various cost-shared programs of the Yukon Housing Corporation mean that \$320,000 allocated for 1981-82 expenditures will actually amount to about \$630,000 worth of projects. The largest single expenditure totally funded by the Housing Corporation will be the \$200,000 earmarked for two staff housing units in Haines Junction and one staff unit in Elsa. The Rural and Remote Housing Program, carried out in conjunction with the Council for Yukon Indians, will see the construction of about five to seven housing units in communities outside Whitehorse. We are contributing \$75,000 to next year's program, while Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation will be putting up \$225,000, for a total funding of \$300,000 worth of new housing. Basically, this program is aimed at assisting individuals unable to obtain home ownership on their own.

The Corporation's insulation program will involve \$40,000 being spent to improve energy conservation in Government-owned housing units in Dawson City, Teslin and Ross River. Our contribution represents 50 per cent of the total cost of the program during 1981-82.

The increased demands on our liquor store in Faro, and the fact that the present lease at the shopping mall expires next year, has prompted us to allocate over \$200,000 towards construction of a new liquor store in that community. Volume sales have increased by 45 per cent in the past year and caused overcrowding of our present facility. At the same time, we desire to separate the operations of our territorial agent from the liquor store activities. We will construct a separate office within the new liquor store to improve and increase the public's access to the services of the agent. The proposed 4,000 square foot building will be a self-contained unit separate from the existing shopping mall. This move is also intended to enhance the development of the Town Centre of Faro. The project adds impetus to a growing business core, and we hope the private sector will follow Government's lead and make investment in Faro that is necessary to accommodate the needs of the community.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel I have clearly outlined that our capital budget is one which moves towards meeting the needs of Yukoners in general and will definitely improve the quality of life in Yukon as a whole. We have taken some major steps in this budget to meet the needs expressed to us by people of Yukon and towards fulfilling our mandate as given to us by the electorate. It is evident that such people-related services as education, libraries, territorial agents, road up-grading, housing, recreational facilities, campgrounds and energy conservation are high on our list of priorities. As long as we get the message from the residents of this Territory, they will continue to be at the top of our list.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other discussion?

Mr. MacKay: There certainly is, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Government Leader for his explanation of how they are doling out the goodies this year. I would say that it is very easy to say that they are trying to meet the aspirations or the needs of the Yukon people. I think if you spend \$25 million, hopefully you are meeting some of the needs, so I am not going to criticize that aspect of the Government Leader's speech.

I suppose the area the Opposition should look carefully at, is what are the identified priorities in this capital budget, what is the Government trying to do with this capital budget, and what is the game plan for Yukon in this capital budget. I must say when I look at it, I really do not detect any large plan. I think I see a lot of basic needs being attended to and looked after. I think that they tend to have selective hearing, they tend to hear pleas from constituencies which have elected the right kind of member, — P.C. — they hear these more clearly than they hear other ridings. That is an unfortunate reality of party politics, I suppose, and the Member for Campbell will no doubt elaborate on that at some point. I just pass that on at this point, saying that it is too bad. As we go on today, we will hear from other Members, the things they would have looked for in this budget.

In a general way, I think that, and it cannot be said too often, the quality of life of people living in rural Yukon has to be a major concern of this Government. The specific things we take for granted living in Whitehorse, such as paved roads, such are often not the God-given right of rural communities. I think that I would have liked to see more of a thrust in this budget of funding of paving within communities. It is a difficult thing to see from this budget exactly how much paving is going to be done in the communities, so I may stand to be corrected later on when you get into the details of the Community Assistance Programs.

I hope I will find, when I get in there, that there is some money for paving in towns such as Watson Lake, which have a growing and good suburban population who are presently putting up with one single strip of pavement down the middle of town. I would hope that that is going to change soon.

On the school program, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, perhaps, to the Minister of Education, that in a recent survey that I made in my riding, from which I received some 100 replies, that one of the questions I asked was whether or not they were satisfied with the physical facilities within which the children were being educated. There was an unequivocal "yes". So, I feel that my riding is well served, and the pressure that there was for an addition to the Selkirk Elementary School has passed; I think that the Minister of Education handled that difficult potato two years ago with some adroitness.

I would point out though that, just in general talking with parents in my riding, there is a general concern about the junior secondary school. And while this is not perhaps related to capital expendi-

tures in my riding, it is in Porter Creek. I would suggest that while I am always welcoming new facilities, that the whole concept of a junior secondary school should be looked at carefully with respect to the purpose for which that school is there. It appears that many parents feel their children are rather standing still; they are in between primary and Grades 10, 11 and 12, this twilight period. Often they do not seem to progress very far. It is a very difficult age for children, and perhaps the experience in other areas of segregating that difficult group of teenagers when they are at that puberty stage and very difficult to handle is not the best thing for them because it separates them. It puts them in their own world and they do not seem to have any leadership from the grade 12's available, nor do they have to set an example to the younger kids. I think you should take a look at that specific problem and perhaps the answer is having two secondary schools, from grade seven to grade twelve, one in Porter Creek and one downtown.

The swimming pool in downtown Whitehorse, I would like to see some funds coming through for that. I presume that that is going to be in conjunction with the further funding from the Federal Government. Hopefully that million dollars that the Mayor has been discussing for the past year is still on the table. The feds have handed us some \$25 million here so I do not think we should be too nasty to the hand that feeds us.

Looking at Faro, I do not want to say very much other than that it is singularly ironic to me that of all the needs that Faro has, the Government should choose to meet the need of a new liquor store. Faro already has the highest per capita alcohol consumption of any town in the Yukon and all I can see is the Government making more profit and selling more booze. It is merely a revenue-raising device rather than looking at what that community needs. I leave the more detailed discussion to my colleague from Faro.

The other thing, looking at the overall game plan; where are the future mining developments likely to happen, Mr. Speaker? What is this Government doing, in a tangible way, other than saying we welcome it, what is it doing to try and facilitate that? I said last year, and I see again that some considerable sums of money are being spent in the South Canol and virtually nothing seems to be allocated to the North Canol. If one looks at the relative importance of these two areas to future development, one clearly has to agree that the North Canol is where the action is going to be. It is the most likely area to see new developments and I hope that in the event that this Government has an opportunity to review its priorities, the North Canol will be given more attention than the South.

I would like to talk a bit about the Tourism development program that the Government has embarked upon. I think in principle that additional spending of money, with the very generous help of the Federal Government, for which we are always grateful, should result in a boost to the tourism economy. I would question the judgment of the free enterprise Minister, — the man who is always saying, "Let the money fluctuate in the pockets of the people and everybody will prosper" — in the open-handed offer of a handout, which is the only I can describe it, of \$300,000 to any particular free-enterpriser, free-booter, I might add, who would build some rooms in Dawson City.

Now, the extensible reason, Mr. Speaker, for this hand-out was that the Downtown Hotel burned down and that we had to replace that number of rooms.

Well, that was the initial excuse for this. The Minister must surely have been aware that these rooms were indeed replaced by private enterprise this spring and that there was no need for us to go out and spend any money. The further rationale is, "Well, the tourism industry really needs more rooms up there so the Government has to step in and encourage private enterprise."

I find it very difficult to accept this kind of Government interference in the normal process of business, because what is this actual situation in Dawson, Mr. Speaker? The actual situation is that the largest single hotel in Dawson is presently in receivership because it is unable to make enough money to pay its bills — this is public knowledge. Here we have the Government coming along and are going to subsidize somebody else, Mr. Speaker, to build some rooms in competition with the guy who is already having great trouble making it.

I know as well as many of the people on the other side that this is just regarded as a straight hand-out by all the businessmen in Dawson, and they are quite irate in many cases at this type of interference with the normal process of commerce. I think that the Government, should review this policy before it is too late; this misconceived, ill-begotten policy of putting money into private hoteliers' hands.

I think that, if they were going to initiate such a program, first of all they should not single out Dawson. There are many other communities that need hotel rooms, Faro, for example. It is not available to people other than those living or planning to build in Dawson City. They are obviously, I think, reacting in panic to a situation which really no longer exists.

If there was a market for hotel rooms, somebody would go in and build them and somebody probably will, Mr. Speaker. The truth of the matter is they do not need us to spend \$300,000 of the taxpayers' money to see that happen.

The other point that I notice, and it is the same kind of thing, is this \$100,000 for downtown beautification. Nobody in their right mind is against the beautification of downtown, but what we are questioning is whose responsibility that is. I have some difficulty understanding that, because of zoning decisions on the part of City Council some years ago of allowing the establishment of a shopping centre, which has caused the decline of downtown, now we have to spend more money to upgrade downtown. That is a situation, Mr. Speaker, that is mirrored in many small communities across Canada, where the death of downtown is occurring because of zoning decisions, and now the taxpayers are having to subsidize the downtown area. This is all that is; it is a \$100,000 subsidy to the downtown merchants because of poor planning on the part of the City Council. I do not think that that is an area that is necessarily beneficial for this Government to be subsidizing.

My friend to the left here is, no doubt, going to give us a lot of socialist drivel, and I am sure I should get my licks in first, because he is going to follow me up and tell me what terrible things Liberals do.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that it only gives comfort to our enemies on the other side of the floor when the Opposition picks at each other. However, not being the first one to start it, I would like to be the one to finish it.

Mr. Speaker, I have not really made up my mind what to do about this budget; whether I approve or disapprove. I always approve of certain parts of it, and I have criticisms of others. So I will probably listen to other speakers before I make up my mind whether this is worthy of a "yes" or a "no" vote.

Mr. Penikett: An accountant recently told me that accountants are a dull lot, but I think I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that they are much more amusing than the speeches I heard yesterday. In fact, when I was an alderman, one of the slowest parts of the regular meetings of City Council was what we called the City Manager's Report. Pretty dry stuff: how many fires, how many buildings were put up, how many buildings burned down, how many people they hired, how many people they fired. I had a deep sense of *deja vu* yesterday, listening to the very informative, but, with no disrespect let me say, not terribly exciting, statements yesterday. They make good reading, actually. They made better reading, I should say, than they did hearing. But we may have an opportunity, I understand, to talk about that later, so I will stick to the bill before us.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, never in my wildest moments did I expect to be standing here in a parliamentary body listening to a colleague lecture Members opposite on the trials of puberty. I recognize that they are an eminently youthful lot opposite us, but the problems they are experiencing I would have thought were of decidedly different kinds than we normally associate with young manhood or young womanhood. I will let you, Mr. Speaker, speculate on the kind of possibilities that that question raises. I do not, of course, wish to waste the time of the House in going into it.

I was, of course, also fascinated by my friend-to-my-right's criticism of the expenditure in Faro. It occurred to me that only a Scot would have wanted to insist that people drink more booze, but do it in misery. Or, perhaps I should say, more fairly, it is a Presbyterian point of view. It seems to me, though, that the people in Faro ought to be allowed to drink in as much comfort as the people in Whitehorse, and I do not think they should be begrudged that at all. In fact if there is one item in the budget that I would be prepared to approve, it is that.

There were allusions made to the North Canol Road, by my friend to the right, too; and I am sure when the Cabinet tour goes into the North Canol Road, or when they discover that part of the Territory, you may see a rash of expenditures up there too; even though there is nobody living there, there may be a lot of money spent there.

The Member for Riverdale South did make one point which I think is a very important one. I was surprised, given some of the outrages emanating from Ottawa in recent years, that he chose to chastize the new Minister of Tourism for his expenditures on hotels in Dawson. I was fascinated by that Minister's associating himself to this expenditure, given his oft-stated opposition to public housing. I was surprised that he would be prepared to support it for tourists, but not for residents in the Territory.

I know that he also has some Scottish antecedents, and I am sure some of the folk wisdom that would have been imparted to him on that subject would have taught him that charity begins at home, but perhaps that is one of the many ways in which he has become confused since entering government service.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that we could do as we did last year, analyze this capital budget from the angle of which ridings were receiving the government bounty, or which Ministers were in ascendancy based on the expenditures in their departments.

I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I did not think this was an appropriate line of inquiry, and I would like to tell you that I thought that this was an improper line of approach, that it was not an elevating kind of debate. But I have to be honest, Mr. Speaker, and tell you I really did not have enough time to do this kind of analysis, otherwise I might have done so.

So I would, in fact, restrict my remarks on this expenditure, I think, to more than just the politics of the thing, but to the economics of the thing. If I may, I would like to talk briefly and entirely seriously about these capital expenditures in a general way, because we are going to be talking about each one of them in particular.

It seems to me that we have, right now, in our economy in the Territory, some very serious structural problems. Now, I do not for a second want to suggest to you that I know what the instant answers are. I think part of the answer is, as the Opposition Leader has suggested, the need for some kind of coherent economic plan, some kind of sector-by-sector analysis, some kind of establishment of specific targets and objects for growth, growth measured by employment and investment and other indicators, and then some kind of specific game plan to do that.

Of course, Liberals are never afraid of contradicting themselves, so the Opposition Leader would fail to point out that to have such a plan and to implement such a plan would require him to do exactly what he did not like government doing in the case of hotels in Dawson, which is, interfering in the economy. That is the kind of contradiction, though, I do not want to waste time in the House following up today, because I am sure it is obvious to all Members here.

What I do want to talk about, though, is some kind of tests which I would now like to put to each one of these individual expenditures when we go through it in Committee.

This deals with the principle of this bill, the capital expenditures and why we are making them. Given the economic problems we have got and the fact that we have a situation in the Territory which I think you could accurately describe as recessionary right now, it seems to me all Government expenditures should be analyzed, not just from the point of view of their obvious value or economy in terms of a particular demand or a particular need of some sector of the community; nor simply is it enough to do what some Government budgets have done, use a zero base principle and start with nothing and really try and make a case for every single expenditure, really challenge it.

It seems to me that the expenditures we have to look at now, particularly these capital ones, is how do they stack up as long-term investments. I think there are very few expenditures that we can make now which produce immediate economic benefits. Very few of them produce long-term jobs right away. There are very few capital expenditures which, once the initial construction period is over, turn out instantly into more permanent jobs in a healthier community.

It seems to me that one of the things that we ought to be doing, one of the basic tests that we ought to put to every single expenditure, is, how does it stack up as an investment. If you were going to put your own money into this thing, how does it stack up in terms of the jobs that it is going to produce down the road? More importantly — because you have to get a recovery from this — the kind of tax revenues it will produce for the Government down the road in order to finance other expansion of services.

It seems there is another fundamental structural problem here, a problem I talked about before, in terms of our planning. If you are going to deal with economic planning and economic development in the Territory, you have got to have some tools, some instruments, to control some aspects of the economy that you would have some influence on, other than just Government spending and level of public sector employment.

One of the things that makes that very difficult here is that there are some sectors of our economy that are not controlled here in the Territory at all, in fact, all the major ones. The Minister of Tourism and Economic Development is quite right. You are talking of resources. You are even talking about the biggest spender, the Federal Government here, probably not the Territorial in one way or another. You have service sectors, much of it probably locally controlled, and that is all well and good, but the service sector is so dependent on the others. Transportation is not controlled in the Territory. Resources are not controlled in the Territory. Timber is measurably good. Most of the mineral resource development is not controlled at all in the Territory.

You go through it, sector by sector, and you really realize that, in terms of the Government directing or legislating, even with the best will in the world, the power and the control of these operations is largely outside of our boundaries. Now, that is not to say that you write off any potential planning, but it makes it that much more difficult. So, it seems to me that one of the economic development goals I would like to see is some increasing way in which this Territory can gain more control over its own economy. I mean, we might argue about whether it is public or private control, but let us not deal with that right now. Let us ultimately say that everybody will agree that it is in our interest to have more control over our economy here.

Most of us will agree that we all want to have that kind of increasing control over our own economy. We want control of the economy resting in the community. That is only democratic. We want control of the society here and we want control of the economy.

The more of that the better, and that means that one of the things that we should be looking for in economic development is, how do the policies of this government advance the end of capital formation here, whether it is public capital or cooperative capital or private capital. That is another test, it seems to me, that we should be putting our expenditures to. Do they advance these goals?

The other obvious thing we should consider, is to look at it as an investment: is it going to produce short-term benefits or long-term benefits? What are our real needs there? Do we need some short-term stimulus or do we need something that is not going to pay off for quite a few years? I think an example of that is educational expenditures. With educational expenditures, it seems to me that you do not see the benefits very quickly. Perhaps you see them quicker when you are making vocational training expenditures than you do in those involving junior high school, but we may decide in terms of the long-term health of the Territory that we really have to do that.

We also have to look at what the cost is of not making the decision now. We all know that things get more expensive in time; materials may not be available, a certain kind of skill may not be available. So, we have to make the decision from that point of view. That is another test of our spending decisions that we have to make.

What I am arguing for is, I very much want us to look at each one of these things as we go through. How do they stack up as an investment? How do they stack up as something that will produce jobs for people in this community? How do they stack up in advancing the desirable goal of this community controlling its own economic future?

I would suspect, and I just pick one out of the air, that maybe there are some expenditures in here which do not stack up very well from that point of view. The Government Leader has talked about some very desirable things in terms of library services and the problem of having to have a lot of clerks do a great many complicated and repetitive procedures which could be done more simply and readily by some machine.

At a simple stand of efficiency that argument may stack up very well, but in a time of high unemployment, I would suggest it is possible — and I only make this argument tentatively — it is possible that it is wise to defer that investment, because we do not want to do anything in the short-term which may increase unemployment.

The Government Leader is making gestures to indicate that he

may have heard a similar argument from inside his Cabinet ranks. If he has, I apologize. There are fingers of accusation pointing in every direction, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just draw your attention to another problem, which is not an easy problem and I do not have any instant answers, but it is the kind of thing we should be thinking about very hard when we are talking about spending this amount of money. That is the real fundamental, economic contradiction we have between high unemployment and certain critical shortages of certain skills.

We have, in fact, had a high unemployment in Canada for quite a long time now. In fact, in spite of the statistics made recently that it has dropped a bit, it has gone up. It has been higher than most of the other countries in the western world, and Yukon, let us be honest, if you include many of the pockets of chronic unemployment in this Territory, has had a much more serious situation in the country as a whole for a longer period of time.

We have, combined with that, many employers, who, and I think government is experiencing the same thing, have a great deal of difficulty finding certain people with certain skills.

I think I heard the Minister of Economic Development say they could not find any engineers recently. We have also had some experience finding accountants. Apparently they are all moving to Vancouver.

There are other skills which are in short supply here. It seems to me that one of the things that the Minister of Education has started to address, but will have to increasingly address, is that problem of resolving the contradiction between high unemployment and a shortage of skills. You can only do it, it seems to me, by the most sensitive and skillful planning. I do not know if we have the human resources inside our government to be able to do that now, and I am not sure that even with the best guesses in the world and the most skilled people in the world you can always come up with the right answers. I mean, one new mine or one mine less makes a big difference in the whole picture and all your plans and predictions may prove very wrong. We probably cannot anticipate certain technological changes and new skills and new jobs that may be required ten years from now, but we should do as well as we can on that. We should do it because the price of not doing that is to spend enormous amounts of money, a huge investment in educating the children of the Territory for export. Because if they get skills that they cannot use here, they are going to go somewhere else where they can use them.

Some Member: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Penikett: Very poor example, may I say, Mr. Speaker, but the other price is that you continue to, until very recently, and I suspect still going on, have to import from outside at great expense, people to do the jobs that need doing here. In such a small community, that kind of wasteful expenditure is something that cannot go on.

I am going to - and I am sure everybody will be grateful - conclude my remarks right now. I just want to say that, as we go into the Committee stage on this, item by item, the kind of test that I suggest is the test that I want to put each expenditure to - and I would hope that Ministers, in addressing their needs and expenditures, and justifying them, will talk about the kind of employment benefits, and the kind of economic benefits they expect to see out of each of the investments.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, you have been very patient.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, we've all been very patient.

I think I will be rising in support of the resolution in front of us. I do not see too many problems, other than in some of the areas that my colleagues in front of me have spoken on already, because they do not miss very much. I think that they may have been right in some of their estimations that maybe the money is going here or there in areas where there is more Government participation. However, that is a normal thing in politics, as they say. Until we get into the budget itself, I will be questioning some items there and possibly that might not be so. I was interested when the Government Leader spoke on the rural and remote housing in conjunction with Indian Affairs; I was very interested to know whether there was anything that might be slated for Liard in the horrifying situation that exists down there. Now, as I say, maybe in the budget somewhere, there will be mention, or maybe the Government will be looking into that situation. I will be very interested in that area; hopefully there will be something.

As for the Honourable Member in front of me on the right and his concern over the South Canol, I cannot quite agree with him; I did not last time, either. I think the South Canol is as good a place to

spend our money as anywhere else in the Territory. It is a road between our two main highways, and is used extensively. There may be more mining north of Ross River than south, I think there will be, but there are also some pretty good areas in there that have been proving out lately. As I said, I think the road will definitely be used if it is upgraded.

I am very concerned over \$300,000 going to Dawson City. I do not realize just how and why that money went to private enterprise, or is going to private enterprise in that area. I think whenever a government spends or gives away monies, in an incentive program of some type, whether it be for tourism, whether it be for business of any kind, that the total population of the country should be included - the total of the country. No one area or town should be given things like this and it does not seem as if that is quite the case in this area.

The \$100,000 that he spoke of for beautification of Whitehorse, I would absolutely vote "No" on, because Whitehorse is not the only place in the Yukon Territory. As a municipality, it can probably support itself just as well as all of us. I have heard you many times, saying that we are supporting you all the time, well maybe it might be the other way around, we are supporting some people too. I do not agree to that entirely.

I would liked to hear somewhere in the budget a little more about adult and special education in Yukon. Hopefully it is in there and we will come to it. In that case, I will be very happy. I say, I will be voting for the resolution. I see no real problem. Mr. Speaker, and with that comment, that is all I have to say. I go along with it.

Mr. Byblow: It is with some regret, Mr. Speaker, that I was not able to prepare forty minutes of rebuttal on this very disproportionately apportioned capital budget. I think that I can certainly share with the Government their position that their objective is to improve the quality of life in all the Yukon communities. I can share with the Government their position that they have had a difficult time negotiating for these funds with the federal government. I can share with the Government their concern that they had to disburse the money in some equitable fashion across the Territory to the various communities.

I do not believe that they have done a good job of that. I think, as we get into the specifics, we must have some reasoning behind why certain facilities are constructed in certain communities, why certain projects are going into others, and just basically the entire rationale behind the specific appropriation.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I feel aggrieved. I feel aggrieved on behalf of my constituents. I feel that the attention of this Government has not been directed to addressing the concerns of the riding that I represent. Mr. Speaker, for the ease of Government, so that I would not have to stand up here and spend forty minutes deliberating the arguments, I submitted a brief to this Government, as I have discussed with this Government over the past couple of years about the various needs that are required in Faro. I see very little evidence of this in this budget.

I have not had time to analyze it or scrutinize it closely. I just received it yesterday. I look at it and I see some obscure back road in Carmacks getting a quarter million facelift and I have got a six mile access road where people are being injured, where trucks are being ditched, where it is virtually a public risk to get on that road. Mr. Speaker, it is not a statistic that I am proud of, but we have had a fatality on that road. Now where is the sense of commitment for the Yukon as a whole?

You know, I look at the budget and I see a Territorial administration building being constructed in the booming metropolis of Mayo. And what does Faro get? A liquor store, yes, a liquor store. Mr. Speaker, this is insult to injury. I submit that Faro needs another liquor store like it needs a hole in the head. That would look just fine at the entrance to town, where you have just come off a road giving you the most harrowing experience in your life on wheels. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with the priorities.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I am not opposed to the construction of a liquor store, but we have one, and we need other things more, is what I am telling you. We have one in which the needs of Faro are being met. Why are you building another one?

We need an elementary school. We are going to be teaching our students out on the pavement or the gravel playground next year if we do not get into some of these other priorities. That is my concern.

I agree with the previous speakers that no doubt there is a tremendous amount of thought and planning that went into this budget. I am not sure I completely understand the reasoning be-

hind the allocations. I am simply telling this Government that I have submitted a ten-point, eight-page brief that represents the position of my constituents. I simply request that perhaps you pay attention to it. Nobody asked for a liquor store, nobody really wants one. I will go back to my riding and I will solicit unanimous support on that position.

With respect to previous speakers, I think we have an obligation to scrutinize this capital budget closely. We have to think of it in the long-term, and I think when you are looking at not just my riding but the entire resource corridor that my riding is part of, you have to think in the long-term. We have some dispute over where these priorities should be put with respect to the long-term.

I say that that is a very important consideration and I would respectfully submit that the area of the Pelly, Ross River and MacMillan should be attended in the long-term with capital preparation.

Mr. Speaker, I have said all I really wanted to without any preparation. When we enter into debate, and I hope we do not get into Committee on it until tomorrow so I have more time to peruse it, we will get into specifics. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker I am going to refer to the Member for Faro in a few minutes, but I just want to make a couple of comments generally in respect to the budget that has been put forward. I think it is a very fair budget and one that has tried to meet the concerns of the various communities throughout the Territory. I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition, who seems to have difficulty in trying to resolve his philosophy, that on the one hand he says that we should be not involved in the resources and on the other hand he says we should develop them. I hope he and the new party leader get the exact road that they are going on cleared up.

I should point out in respect to the South Canol versus the North Canol, I was on the North Canol, Mr. Speaker, and I did happen to have the pleasure of looking at a number of bridges that had been built with my assistance a number of years ago, and I am pleased to say that a lot of them are in very good shape and they do not require major culvert work at this time.

In respect to the Tourism Subsidiary Agreement, there are two points that have to be remembered.

The Tourism Subsidiary Agreement is primarily to promote tourism throughout the Territory. Basically we are attempting to put this one time capital fund into areas that will increase the number of tourists and also provide facilities that can be used locally. So in other words, like the Carnegie Library, it is an historical site, but at the same time, we will put in the monies in such a manner that it can be utilized by the people locally on a twelve month basis. In respect to the finances being made available, on proposals put forward by the Government, for assistance in the area of hotel space in the Dawson City area, there is a demand for more hotel space, not just the hotel space that is presently there, but more. At the same time, I think if the Member, being an accountant, was to analyse the situation in Dawson City, he would probably invest the money in Vancouver, where you have a twelve month period in which you can recover your investment, as opposed to Dawson City where you have a four month period. Basically, we are trying to give incentives for people to put capital investment in that community so that we can increase the area's tourism. It seems ridiculous to me, Mr. Speaker, to be putting more money into tourism marketing, to encourage more people to come to the heart of the Klondike, when at the same time, we could conceivably - and we have had in the past year or so - have some people sleeping in buses on the streets of Dawson City.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out in respect to the budget that is before you that I agree with the Member of the NDP, and it does not happen that often, incidentally, that the allegations being made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Faro are totally inappropriate and improper, that monies are being spent only in ridings that happen to have Conservative Members.

I think if one looks though this budget, we are trying to meet the various needs of the community.

I will now focus my attention on the Member for Faro and his fair community. The statements that have been made, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have been propaganda at its worst, in writings in the *Raven*, where he indicates that there has been no money spent in the Faro region.

I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last year we have been informed about the longevity of that community, the major capitalization, the major capital infrastructure

that the mining company of Cyprus Anvil is putting in there, and we have attempted to meet the demands of that particular community, in fact delaying projects in other communities, in recognizing the importance of that community to the Territory.

I have some statistics here, and I hope the Member writes them down so that he can formally apologize to me either by letter or in public statement. The school addition in 1979-80 cost this government roughly \$600,000. In 1980-81, it is \$1.9 million in that particular community, which is needed, but the Government of Yukon made the decision that the money was going to be spent in that direction.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, there was \$10,000 for ground improvements that was put into that community. If the Member begrudges that or if he really wants to go along with the philosophy that money should not be spent in his riding because he does not happen to be on the right side of the floor, then perhaps he could make a resolution to that effect and we will put the money elsewhere, in Hillcrest.

I think it is time that the Member started recognizing and telling the people in Faro that the Government that he happens to be a part of in this Legislature is spending money, instead of giving them the erroneous statement that there is no money being spent in the Faro area.

He says that the Government of Yukon collected \$5 million in royalties. Number one, the Government of Yukon Territory does not levy royalties. In his brief that he tables in this House he says, no, it is \$5 million in corporation taxes. This government, over the past year, has not collected any money in corporation taxes. So it all goes to the Government of Canada. He had better get a few things straight. I would have thought that over the last two years he would have learned something about how the financial framework of this Government worked.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that in the Information Centre \$2,200 was spent in the 1979-80 year. You go down the list: the Department of Health, the expenditure for the expansion was \$100,000 in 1979-80. Land development, now there we are getting to the crunch of the problem, Mr. Speaker. In 1979-80 \$220,000 was spent on his request to develop country residential lots. How many people have bought them? He gave us the advice, the money was put in and if we do not recover the money all the people in the Territory are going to have to pay for it. How many have we sold? On his request, his advice, in fact they call it Mr. Byblow's Heights.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of money spent through the Community Assistance Program on lagoons, on the cemetery, utility expansion, a million dollars this year, and \$1.2 or 1.4 million this coming year. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are putting a fair amount of money into the Faro region.

He tries to propagate to the people of the Territory, whether they live in Porter Creek, whether they live in Haines Junction or anywhere else, that Faro is being ignored. This is a total and absolutely inaccurate statement. I think he has a responsibility, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Byblow: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order, please.

Mr. Byblow: Before he proceeds, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Member is misleading the House. I did not say that no money has gone into Faro. I said that the Government was not meeting the basic requirements of essential services in Faro.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member has no question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, further to this I will read from his article. He states: "Faro needs immediate planning, and corresponding dollars in a number of areas. An elementary school must be constructed."

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, he knows and he has been involved in discussions with the Minister of Education and with the people within the Department that planning is being done, in cooperation with the town and Cyprus Anvil. When the projected numbers meet that need there will be a facility built, providing monies are available.

In the airport up-grading, Mr. Speaker, he does not mention in this House that this side of the House met with the Municipal Council, made an arrangement to do a study of the airport, which we felt was necessary, but which the Government of Canada would not participate in. We did that of our own volition, but at the same time he will go back to his Riding and say "Huh, I'm trying, I'm trying, I'm not succeeding." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the

Member has a responsibility to tell the people in his constituency that there are obligations being met by all Members in this House, because we represent the Territory and we cannot forget that. We do not represent just one area. This is not a municipal council. This is the Territory we are talking about.

Over the past two years there has been roughly \$6,000,000 spent in that area. There appears to be approximately one-and-a-half, perhaps more, being spent next year and over the course of the next year. Incidentally, in respect to the liquor store, the Member was not in Faro when we went to the community of Faro and had a public meeting and that particular question was raised. We need a liquor store in the community of Faro, our lease is running out, it is too small, et cetera, et cetera. Mr. Speaker, the Member should be in his constituency when we are there. When people are asking for and requesting various things, we attempt to meet the needs of that particular community.

So I would say, in respect to the Members opposite, that we have brought down a fair budget. In respect to the Faro area we have brought down a very fair budget, one proportionately to one side of the economic scale when you balance it to other communities; one that we recognize we have a responsibility to; we will try to meet those obligations within the financial limitations in which we find ourselves. He also has to recognize that when he is in this House, Mr. Speaker, he has two responsibilities, one to report the true facts to his constituency, second to represent the whole Territory. We all have a responsibility.

Mr. Byblow: I would like a clarification of the Minister's statements; if he in fact is saying I lied to my constituents —

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will give you an idea of what I have said here —

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Economic Development. Please wait to be recognized by the Chair. Proceed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will point in here - where is it? - "Territorial Budgets seem to get appropriated into Conservative-elected Ridings", and I am just pointing out to him - well, maybe he is a Conservative, I do not know and I do not think anybody knows - but, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that we are appropriating money where there is a need within the Territory. These types of things that are written in black and white by a Member of this Legislature, I think, are totally and absolutely irresponsible and I feel he has a responsibility to report back to his constituency that the Government of the Yukon Territory, the Legislature of this Territory, is appropriating a great deal of money towards the updating of that particular community to meet the future needs and expansion of that area.

Some Members: Hear, Hear.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Bill Number 40, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Graham.

Second Reading: Bill Number 40

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Tatchun, that Bill Number 40, *An Ordinance to Amend the Compensation for Victims of Crime Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, that Bill Number 40 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Ordinance is to obtain approval to amend the *Compensation for Victims of Crime Ordinance*. It is a transfer of the jurisdiction for deciding who should be compensated and how much they should get from the Supreme Court of Yukon to the Workers' Compensation Board, and to make certain administrative changes in the payment and collection procedures.

A number of years ago, Canada and the provinces agreed to a cost-shared scheme under which individuals who were injured by a criminal were compensated. The Territorial split for this compensation is twenty-five per cent. Seventy-five per cent of the cost is picked up by the federal government. The maximum payable under the current Ordinance is \$15,000 for total incapacity.

An alteration order can award a series of monthly payments which must not go beyond a \$25,000 maximum.

In our annual appropriation, the Department of Justice carries a one dollar figure, but over the last three years the claims has been as follows: 1976-77, (inaudible); 1977-78, \$1,184; 1978-79, \$17,479.

In 1975, when we put through the appropriate legislation, we had

no Workers' Compensation Board. The Alberta Board handled the matters of this Territory. The Canadian jurisdictions had, at that time, either administrative crime compensation boards or they were administered through the Workers' Compensation Board.

The Government, at this time, feels that with the recent changes to the structure of the Workers' Compensation Board, our change should be more in line with the practice in the provinces. We are also suggesting three administrative problems that should be resolved with the passage of this legislation. The total monetary awards should be cleared up and clarified. The procedures for collection of compensation from the criminal should be clarified as well. Usually, in most cases, the person who commits these crimes for which compensation is paid is penniless and we have a great deal of trouble collecting any money from them.

Nevertheless, the effort is made as much as possible, but the sections concerning this item should be strengthened.

Also, the role of the public administrator in representing minors during the compensation for crime should be cleared up and it will be with this Ordinance.

One of the prime reasons that the Workers' Compensation Board has been requested to assume the additional responsibilities at this time is due to the fact that the compensation board has a staff and procedures geared to measuring injuries and then fixing a level of compensation. The Workers' Compensation Board, after hearing discussions with the Justice Department and polling its members, is satisfied that it can handle the whole administration of the Ordinance without a requirement for extra funds or staff and without the delays which have marked the administration of this Ordinance in the courts.

These are the reasons we are seeking the changes outlined in this Ordinance and I think it is a very good change and appropriate at this time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacKay: I did have the opportunity to do a little preparation on this particular Bill. I have no major concerns with it; I think that it is a streamlining of the process, a logical move. There seems to be one or two areas in which this bill could be looked at again. I would mention that apparently there is no way that a victim of an auto accident, which has resulted from a criminal act on the part of the driver, perhaps under the influence of alcoholic beverages, but having no insurance, there is no way a victim of that kind of crime can come under this Ordinance. While I appreciate that the law requires that you carry insurance, there remains the fact that someone who is a criminal by way of drinking in excess and killing someone or maiming them, is quite likely the same kind of person who would break the law and not carry insurance. In that instance it appears that we have a victim of a crime that is not allowed for in this. I appreciate the recent example of that where there was some insurance and that claim should have perhaps been made at that time, but I think that some consideration should be given for allowing for the victims of the kind of crime where there is no insurance to claim on.

The rate of compensation which is fixed in the bill is the same as it was when it was first initiated two or three years ago. It seems to me that that is not a reasonable approach to take in the light of inflation. What was a large sum of money almost ten years ago is only worth one-half of what it is now. This legislation will rapidly become outdated with respect to the kind of compensation available to the victims that the legislators who originally passed this bill had intended. The ratio of \$75,000 to how many years income somebody might have earned is actually much less than when this Bill was originally passed.

I would ask the Minister if perhaps he would consider, and I appreciate that there is the subject of the federal government matching funds involved in this and he may be tied to this formula, but some consideration should be given to some indexing provision for this kind of compensation.

A small point which should probably come up in the clause by clause debate, but the provisions for appeal seems to have been left the way they were, is that the Court of Appeal can hear appeals from the Board, and I wonder if perhaps if it might have been more expeditious to have the appeal go to the Supreme Court rather than to wait for the Appeal Court to come around. That is all I have to say on that Bill. I will be supporting it in principle.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 44, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Lattin.

Second Reading: Bill Number 44

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon-

ourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 44, *An Ordinance to Amend the Community Assistance Ordinance* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 44 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I just want to say a few brief words on this *Community Assistance Ordinance*. This has to do with TV charges. At the inception of the program to promote television service to remote communities, a charge of \$1,000 per year was assessed. During the spring Session, a unanimous motion of the House approved the elimination of the annual charge for television services.

The amendment now before you would eliminate these annual charges. I am sure that the out-of-town Members will be pleased to support this ordinance, especially those who represent the communities of Teslin, Carmacks, Carcross, Stewart Crossing, Beaver Creek, Haines Junction, Old Crow, Destruction Bay, Burwash Landing, and Pelly Crossing.

I do not think there is very much more I can say at this time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. MacKay: I would not want the opportunity to go by without congratulating the Minister on the supremely competent way in which he has handled his first bill. I hope that it all goes this well for the *Municipalities Ordinance* and I will look forward to hearing him further on that. Needless to say, he will not meet any opposition on this Bill from this side of the House, as I understand my colleagues to be thinking.

Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Minister for bringing this bill in. I have been one who has been fighting against this \$1,000 injustice to the outside areas for quite a few years. I am very happy to see this day come in the Legislature today. Thank you.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 47, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Graham.

Second Reading: Bill Number 47

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 47, *An Ordinance to Amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 47 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Although our *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Ordinance* is based on a Uniform Act, we have not adopted the amendments made to the Uniform Act in 1962 and 1967. The effect of the amendments is to rectify some deficiencies in the special procedure established by the Ordinance for the expeditious establishment of extra-territorial judgments in this Territory, and to answer some of the questions which have arisen under the old Act.

The Ordinance allows judgments of reciprocating jurisdictions to be registered in our Supreme Court and enforced accordingly. The alternative is to commence an action in our court to prove the judgment. This is rarely necessary but always extremely costly.

Mr. Speaker, the bulk of this Ordinance is simply procedural and the single policy point is to enforce the reciprocal enforcement of judgments made in other provinces in the country. Thank you.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 50, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Second Reading: Bill Number 50

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Justice, that Bill Number 50, *An Ordinance to Amend the Insurance Premium Tax Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice, that Bill Number 50 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to this bill are quite short and it is strictly an administrative thing that is trying to be accomplished here. We find that we collect insurance premium tax from two sources, one being insurance companies

selling general insurance in the Territory, the other being insurance companies selling fire insurance in the Territory. We collect these taxes under two different Ordinances and, because of that, in our administrative make-up, the collection is done then by two different departments of the Government of the Yukon Territory. Yet we find that these taxes are being paid, in both instances, by the same companies. In other words, the same companies pay both the fire insurance premium tax and the general insurance premium tax. After some consultation with them, we are proposing here that the requirement to pay the fire premium tax, which is now in the *Fire Prevention Ordinance*, be repealed from that ordinance and in fact be put into the *Insurance Premium Tax Ordinance*.

The other conflict that we had going, Mr. Speaker, was that one of the taxes was due on the 15th of the month and the other due at the end of the month. So there were a number of inequities that we felt should be cleaned up. The purpose of the bill, and the principle behind the bill, is simply to clean up these inequities and make it easier both from the standpoint of the people having to pay the taxes as well as those that have to collect them.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Second Reading, Bill Number 51, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Second Reading: Bill Number 51

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Old Crow, that Bill Number 51, *An Ordinance to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Member for Old Crow, that Bill Number 51 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the principle behind the amendments to this bill is to make the Home Owners' Grant more available to people in this Territory. The original legislation was quite restrictive in some instances. We have put together what we think are suitable amendments to allow the ordinance to be taken advantage of by more people in the Territory.

The basic philosophy behind our amendments, Mr. Speaker, is that every home in the Territory is eligible for one home owners' grant per year. We did have instances, because of the number of days that you had to live in the house, where, if you moved on the wrong day or if it was leap year, you were not eligible for a home owners' grant that particular year. We hope that we have cleaned that up. We are also recognizing common-law relationships as being a fact of life in this Territory and one that should not penalize a person from a home owners' grant. So the basic principle and philosophy is that every home in the Territory should be eligible for a home owners' grant.

Mr. Fleming: I certainly will rise in support of the principle of this bill and the bill itself. It has been one of the items very dear to my heart for about the last four or five years due to the facts that the very problems the Government Leader has spoken about have happened in Yukon, and the principle of this bill clears up those areas where people have small businesses and they have their home in the back. It puts the Government in a position where I think they will now see on their assessments that those homes are taxed properly and they will be able to do that.

Mr. MacKay: I do not have many problems with the technical amendments that are presented here. An unfairness that did exist, particularly that I have run across many times, was those people who had to operate a business out of the same premises in which they lived. It is a good amendment and much needed.

I was not quite aware of the problem of leap years. I now understand the reason for going to 184 days in a year instead of 183 so that is no doubt an improvement and the recognition of common-law relationships is only a reality that must be recommended.

The principle of a home owners' grant, however, should be reviewed occasionally, I think, with respect to what it is doing and what they are trying to achieve. I recall very well the original debate in the predecessor House with respect to the home owners' grant. I think I appeared as a witness on behalf of one organization in support of that grant.

My riding probably benefits the most from this, because it does favour the house which has the highest property tax, up to a certain limit. So I do think then that it is worth examining the principle of the thing again. As I recall, it was brought in in a way to redistribute some of the higher taxes which were being generated by leaving assessments on industrial type of properties, i.e. mines,

who were being subjected to higher taxes. In the process certain other home owners were subjected to higher taxes as well. This is one way of alleviating it and I supported it from that point of view. But I wonder if it is the most efficient way of the Government's collecting taxes and redistributing money. If the property taxes that were paid in the first place were just merely \$200 or \$300 lower, it would be a far more efficient way of leaving the money in the people's pockets. I wonder if the Government ever looked at that at the cost of all its paper work, whether it could not be done in a grant back to the municipalities. Presumably after this Session, we may indeed have more entities which we could identify as municipalities. Possibly that kind of money could go back as a way of getting some financial muscle to the local community.

The leaders that we elect draw upon this terrific scramble every year right after June 30, for everyone to file his home owner's grant form. It is a thought I will leave with you, and perhaps we might return to that when we get into the municipal ordinance.

Mr. Penikett: It pleases me to point out that I think the Leader of the Opposition has a good idea. I think the principle of this thing is something that ought to be reviewed once in a while. I share that view. I am afraid that it comes as somewhat of a surprise to me to realize that the Leader of the Opposition has yet to understand something very fundamental about politics, and that is the political benefits of giving away money. The problem is that even with the best motive in the world, even if the money were turned over to the municipalities to grant back, as he calls it, I think it would take a genius to create a situation where the people of the Territory in their wisdom would elect municipal Liberal administrations any more than they would Territorial Liberal administrations.

This raises the conflicting values which always affect legislatures, the value of efficiency as opposed to the value of what is politic. It is, I guess, deemed to be politic to take this money from the people and then give it back to them, even if the forms are late, and it takes a little longer to get it back to them than expected.

I do, though, want to deal in a serious way with a question by the Leader of the Opposition, because it is something I think that, without diminishing the political benefits to the Government Party in any way, could improve the efficiency of the system. Perhaps I could raise this as a question of principle by asking a specific question in a way that will signal, or flag the subject, which we can get into when we get to this in Committee.

I would be interested, if some Member of the Cabinet or some official would be prepared to look it up, to see how the dollar amounts in a city like Whitehorse or any other municipality, compare in the following respects: what kind of money was collected from school taxes and what kind of money was paid out in home owner grants? I would be interested in seeing how those figures compare, because I suggest there may be a solution in that.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I think when we are debating this ordinance in principle, what people really mean when they say that, they are usually talking about money. That is what this bill is about: who collects the money and who hands it out?

As befits an accountant, the Opposition Leader has raised the question of efficiency, and that is something we should be thinking about. But, there are other values. Is it the most effective way of redistributing this income, or relieving the burden on the home owner of property taxation. We did, as everybody will recall, a major revision of the *Property Tax Ordinance* last year. I think we will soon have had enough time to see, the way it has worked out in terms of the new assessment formulas, if the impact on people is more fair than the previous system.

With that assessment in hand, it probably would be an opportune moment to take a look at this creature, which was, in some sense, developed as a remedy to the previous inequity in the former property tax system, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to

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

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 1, adjourned debate, Mr. MacKay.

Motion Number 13

Mr. MacKay: I appreciate it has been a long afternoon and I hope that everybody can hold up for a little longer. In the event that the Government Members wish to leave and listen to it elsewhere, of course I can also move closure to question, so I hope you will stay and listen to it all and enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that the people get the government they deserve. I hope, for Yukon's sake, that this is not true because I do not think that we have done anything quite so bad as to deserve this Government.

Yukoners cannot be content with the Government's record, as we have heard of it. It certainly was an incomplete exposure of it yesterday because the record is also one of indecision, petty politics, obsessive secrecy, and of incompetence. Naturally I will have cases to prove this before you and I ask you just to please hold your applause until I reach the proper point.

Let us talk about indecision. It is stunning, Mr. Speaker, stunning. The prime example that I would like to quote on that is the Kluane Game Sanctuary negotiations and the mess that was created by this Government.

The Minister of the Government with, I firmly believe, the concurrence of other Ministers, decided to permit the people of the Kluane Tribal Brotherhood to trap in the sanctuary. The Government allowed this decision. It then changed its mind when it was found out publicly and, in the process, they sacrificed one of their more progressive ministers.

I find this kind—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order.

Mr. Hanson: I hardly think it fair that the Leader of the Opposition, at this time, be running off at the mouth on the subject that is still in the hands of the court. I realize it is his handpicked successor who was handling the case for the Tribal Brotherhood. I think at this time it is improper for the matter to be discussed in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further discussion on this question of privilege?

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, the facts of what I have been talking about are in respect to government decision-making. They are not in any way touching upon the matter before the courts. We are talking about how this Government makes its decisions or fails to make its decisions. I do not think that the Member has a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: In respect of the Member's question of privilege, in discussing this subject, as the House has been informed that the matter is before the courts, Members, I think, ought to be very careful to ensure that they do not breach the *ultra vires* provisions of the House.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition will continue.

Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The next thing that I could talk about with respect to indecision did not wind up in court, as far as I know. That is the unalterable decision that was announced by the Government that they were going to close down the Destruction Bay Maintenance Camp, knowing full well that it spelled the end of that town.

It was inevitable that a change of mind followed this very quickly as soon as any pressure came to force. It became a rubber government of indecision.

The petty politics that we have seen, Mr. Speaker—I was shocked to hear the Members opposite voting against the motion to fund day care centres today. They had done precisely that kind of action that was requested by that motion, but they are so petty that they cannot recognize that that suggestion has been put forward from this side of the House by the Member for Whitehorse West, time and time again. They had to vote down his motion for simple petty politics. That is typical of the attitude that they have.

That is a small matter, Mr. Speaker, but in other things they have been even more petty. What other rationale can there be for the Government Leader to refuse to represent Yukon at the historic First Ministers Conference in Ottawa? Yesterday, the Government Leader made a partisan attack upon the federal government to hide his embarrassment in failing to represent Yukon.

Let us get the record straight once and for all, Mr. Speaker. The Government Leader refused to accept an invitation of the Prime Minister to the Conference, an invitation which was, incidentally, accepted by his NWT counterpart, and I believe he did turn that down for partisan reasons, and partisan reasons only. What a terrible motive, because the only people who were hurt in that were not the Liberals, it was every Yukoner who was embarrassed by the failure of their Government Leader to attend that historic conference.

I also want to set the record straight about the kind of invitation and the participation that Yukon requested. It was not only turned down by the Prime Minister, it was also refused by some of the Premiers. That seems to have conveniently escaped the Govern-

ment Leader's mind. If he has some dispute about that, perhaps when he is on his feet he could explain why, if he is so much a peer of these premiers, he was not invited to their conference this weekend to discuss the reaction of the provincial type people to the very worthy constitutional propositions put forward by the federal government.

The excessive secrecy of this Government, Mr. Speaker, was never better demonstrated by the way this Government's position on constitutional development was made public. It came out by accident because a federal politician did not understand that such matters are deadly secret in Yukon. You cannot talk to Yukoners about their political future because they will not understand it, or some might even object to some of the ideas.

It is a sad commentary on this Government that all the constitutional developments seem to be done in secret.

It really makes the whole process seem underhanded.

If they were straightforward, they may well find there was support in principle for many of the ideas that they express in these secret drafts.

However, until the Government adopts an open style of government, I will always be suspicious of their secrecy because it may be due to some awful things that have not yet come to light.

The incompetence that affects this Government can be demonstrated by their lack of ability to find an answer to the problem of higher taxes being paid by business as a result of the Yukon *Income Tax Ordinance*. This higher tax is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

For one, the Government Leader is on record that no higher taxes will be paid in 1980. Now, he does not seem to think that that statement weighs very heavily on him. I do believe that he has an obligation to find any possible way to reduce that income tax burden on these people who were unfairly affected. Yukon businesses need help, not higher taxes, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope that the answer is available in the form of an amendment and, unfortunately, I have not seen it yet but I hope that we still have time to do that.

It is ironic that in the first place the Government Leader even had the nerve to blame this Honourable Member for not picking up the error in the first place, as if I am responsible for writing his legislation. Now, having had it pointed out to him four or five months ago, there still has been nothing done yet. I think that proves that even had I picked it out at that point it still would have been put through the way it was.

The question arose yesterday, Mr. Speaker, about the terms of the *Constitutional Act* that has been proposed with respect to mobility of labour and what that section does to the present preferential treatment that is hoped for by Yukon workers.

I think the point has to be made here that we are talking about two or three different concepts. The first concept that you can get confused about is the Newfoundland concept that seems to say that they can prohibit other workers from coming in there and working in certain areas. Now that is one form that obviously should not be permitted to happen in this country.

The second form is where you seem to be able to get preference if you live in a certain area. My researchers indicate that the Government Leader is correct in his assessment of that, that that section would make it very difficult for a preference to be offered to any Yukoner on the pipeline. We can say, "Oh, terrible, terrible." How bad is that, really? Is it a bad thing that an unemployed person in New Brunswick can come across Canada looking for work and can wind up in Yukon and he can find a job. I mean, is that bad?

The point about the Yukon is that we have unemployment right now, but they are not unemployed skilled people and that is what the pipeline is going to hire; they are going to hire skilled people. They are going to hire the skilled people and every employer in this Territory will then have to go out and bring in their replacements. That is all that is going to happen in the preferential hiring and it is probably a damaging thing in the first place.

So, I do not think that that should necessarily be a large concern. I think that one thing that should be said, though, is that nothing in the constitutional amendment is going to stop the affirmative action programs that are presently in place for disadvantaged people. That will still continue, there is no problem in that area.

So, I think these three points should be made. The Government Leader is quite right, though, that preferential hiring may well go by the board for the Alaska Highway Pipeline.

There are some other points that other Ministers made that I

would like to rebut, or comment, upon. I think the Minister of Highways and Public Works should probably send another letter to the banks asking them for their explanations as to why they will not give mortgages. Perhaps he could put in writing a cast-iron commitment that the Government will not make any more unalterable decisions to close down a town, because that is why they are having trouble. You cannot take back something that you have said from a guy who is about to lend a thirty or forty thousand dollar mortgage. He is not going to lend money if he thinks there is not going to be a town there in a couple of years.

Now, the Minister of Education, I would like to say something in general about his Department, and I say it at this point in the hope that he is listening in a constructive way, because I mean this to be a constructive comment. I think that the administration of that department is going well, and that he has everything rolling in a positive way, but I think the underlying problem of the education system, and it is not only Yukon, it is shared across the country, is that we really are not producing a very high quality of product. I do not put that problem entirely on the shoulders of the Yukon's Minister of Education, but I do say that somewhere, as politicians and the people who are directing the education system, we have to look at the way we are doing things as compared with the way they are doing it in other countries, particularly in Europe, and perhaps even in the Soviet Union. Why do our grade 12 graduates not stack up to these others? What are we doing differently? Are our kids not working hard enough; are our teachers not working hard enough? Is it a basic problem in our education system? And it seems that we have a pretty inefficient system, as a whole, and I use this opportunity just to say that, without pointing a finger at any particular Yukon Department of Education.

Well, my friends across the way may think that I am being uncomplimentary, and rather dreary, and perhaps even petty in my politics, in that I have been doing nothing but point out problems. I would like to point out a few areas where they have said right things or have done the right things. I think the Government Leader was quite valid in one of his attacks, perhaps the only one he was valid in, on the Federal Government, and that is with respect to the handling of the Tahltan Land Claim situation. I think that the federal government has learned nothing from the mistakes they made in the COPE Agreement, and that mistake is primarily one of a lack of consultation, a lack of putting people in the picture as to what is going on. I think they have committed exactly the same error in respect to the Tahltan. I think that is unfortunate because what it does is obscure the basic issue of whether or not we should have a comprehensive land claim settlement in the Yukon. It seems to me that the principle has been obscured by the way it has been handled. The principle really is that if there is going to be a Yukon land claim settlement, let us settle them all. Let us get them all out of the way. Let us find out who has got a claim and who has not got a claim. I think that the Minister, having given money to the Tahltans, will enable them to make some research to be able to present a claim. Whether it is accepted or not is a matter of negotiation. Whether anything will come out of it for them is a matter of negotiation.

In any event, it is very important that when we settle the land claims of the Yukon that we settle all the land claims in Yukon and there be no others. I have said in the past and I will say again, aboriginal rights trespass over borders that we have since drawn. Aboriginal rights are a concept, if you accept that the law goes back to the native people as they lived here hundreds and thousands of years ago. If we accept that principle, and I believe every party does, then we have to accept the problem of negotiating with peoples whose claims cross present day borders.

Let us get on with it. I hope that the way the initiation of these claims are started will not prejudice the way in which they are negotiated from here on.

The Minister for Tourism and Economic Development showed some good judgment in his willingness to react objectively to the Public Accounts Committee Report and I am glad to hear that some of the recommendations are being implemented.

The Minister of Health and Human Resources has closed down Wolf Creek and I think that is a long sought after goal on this side of the House and, I believe, on the other side of the House. It certainly has been a big step towards efficiency in that department. I think, more importantly, the fact that this major step has been taken, it will deal far more effectively with the problem with Wolf Creek was supposed to be dealing with.

It may well be the dawn of a new day for this department, who knows?

The Minister of Highways and Public Works showed flexibility in his handling of problems arising from the employee housing buy-back plan and I think that he should be congratulated for moving so promptly to correct it.

The Minister of Education, Justice and everything else is tackling the high cost of food, the high cost of Workers' Compensation and the high cost of prisons. I wish him luck on all three counts.

Mr. Speaker, it is all not gloom about this Government, but I think the major problem this Government has had is its intransigent attitude towards Canada's constitutional problems. I think it is an attitude unfortunately shared by many provincial governments in that they failed to have caught up with the mood of the people. They are Canadians and they want to see this thing resolved; they want to see everybody working towards it in good will, with an attitude of conciliation. I do not think this Government has shown that attitude yet. It is my firm hope that they will and that if they do not, Yukon would get, someday, the government that it deserves—naturally, a Liberal one.

Mr. Penikett: Yesterday we heard, and some of us read, the progress reports from the front bench opposite on the activities of the Government over the summer. I think, as the Minister of Economic Development indicated, that is a useful exercise in that the day to day activities, perhaps the less press-worthy activities, of the Government should be recorded early in the new Session as a kind of report to the House and that the House, appropriately then, should exercise its judgment on the performance of the government.

I want to say, however, that I clearly have been affected by the attitude from some of the people in the media which was that the reports we heard yesterday were about as exciting as the reports I give to the annual conventions to my party every year—not terribly exciting stuff, pretty informative, pretty solid, but not very inspiring.

Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I want to tell you that listening to our friendly Government Leader yesterday I was inspired neither to glee nor to rage. He did not make me happy, he did not make me sad. I was not mad, I was not even turned on a little bit. Perhaps that is not so bad. The Chinese have that old expression about "May you not live in interesting times". Well I happen to think we live in very interesting times, but if you wanted to convey a contrary impression, as somebody suggested yesterday, as the Government Leader gave a state of the union address, he certainly conveyed this as a much more business-like, down-to-earth, ordinary and uneventful place than it really is.

I think yesterday the Government Leader really did reveal some of his better qualities and some of his strengths as a public servant, because he gave the kind of report that I think perhaps the chief executive officer of a corporation might have given to the shareholders' annual meeting right after lunch, and been received the same way. I think the applause was just something they started today, was it not?

The report was thorough, it was complete, but it was not exciting. It did not indicate a powerful, compelling vision of the Territory. It did not convey a deep, profoundly held, emotionally committed philosophy on the part of the Government Leader. That is, he did not give a report to us yesterday, I think, as a partisan party leader. He gave a report which was basically a progress report to the shareholders' representatives, if you like, on the activities over the summer months. And because he gave that kind of report and partly because of the content of his report, I want to reply in kind.

Now the Opposition Leader has just mentioned to me that he thought it was a partisan kind of report. But I want to challenge that assertion. It seems to me that the Government Leader had written into his speech a couple of fairly chippy, rhetorically tough statements about the Liberal Party. But the delivery of them, it seemed to me, was done without passion, without any fury, without any rage. It was done because, I think, so much of this exchange that we hear—let us be honest—is a ritual dance. You know, we have heard it all before and it is only rarely that we are privileged to hear the kind of outrageous performance that we heard from the Minister of Economic Development this afternoon.

The Government Leader talked about the major philosophical issues, I think, that concern this Government. They were the Constitution and Land Claims, I believe he identified. I think they are tough, philosophical issues for all of us. Unfortunately, in this House, I think we have neglected our responsibilities to the public of Yukon, particularly our responsibility to advise and educate them, because that is a responsibility of leadership too—in connec-

tion with Land Claims, because for whatever reason there seems to have been what I consider an ill-considered embargo on the discussion of the fundamental philosophical concepts about them except as they arise in documents on the Constitution. I think there is some confusion of purpose and some uncertainty in official circles about that separation which causes us all problems.

Now as everybody knows, I have, as all Members have, a great interest in both subjects. We have not been able to debate, I think, in any very rational way—let us be fair—the question of Land Claims, in this House. We have had a lot of discussion about them, but I think even my friend to my right would agree that a lot of times there has been more heat than light.

I want to say a little bit more about that later.

I want to say that I took the trouble after the announcement, I think it was on October 2nd, that there was going to be unilateral action from the leader of the majority party in Ottawa to obtain the statements of all the party leaders and, without regard to my own deeply held partisan views, I want to say that the view that most immediately struck a chord in me was that expressed by the leader of the federal Progressive Conservative Party.

I want to read for you, just briefly, something of what he said. "The Constitution is no ordinary law. It is the fundamental document of our nationhood. It must serve not only our needs today but it must endure to serve our children tomorrow. Because a constitution is so basic to a country, it must be a product of the broadest possible consensus. It cannot be arbitrarily imposed on this nation by any one individual or government nor can it be achieved through threat, ultimatum or artificial deadline. That kind of constitution-making does not serve Canada."

In this, I share the views of the Leader of the federal Conservative Party so much that I would be prepared to make a similar if not identical argument in the case of Yukon and Yukon's constitution.

I, quite obviously, restrained my normally combative tendencies in the flurry of a few weeks ago surrounding the discussion of the leaked, so-called "secret" paper. I must say I contained my nervousness and my anxiety at having widely proliferated and broadcast over the national media a document apparently in some way representing government policy, to which neither I, nor a committee of which I am a member, had had access.

I restrained my immediate inclination to express my concerns in the kind of language which I have been known to use on the media because I agreed so much with Mr. Clark. I started off, in speaking to the motion to establish our constitutional committee some months ago, arguing that the intensely kind of partisan debate that we have had both nationally and locally on the constitution may win any one of our parties points on a day to day basis. It does not, in the long run, advance the cause of building either a constitution for Yukon or a constitution for Canada.

I therefore find myself in the situation of being grievously troubled by Mr. Trudeau's initiatives and profoundly nervous about some of the views being circulated by my government, to which I must say frankly I do not subscribe nor do I think do all of the people in the Territory.

Now, I do not want to contribute in any way to any further partisan division and fragmentation of this community on this issue. I want to explain to you briefly why.

It seems to me that one of the things that did not get much press coverage this summer was an exchange lasting a few days between the Constitution Development Committee of this House and the members of the Ontario Legislature's Constitution Reform Committee.

We prepared for this meeting, I think, without being fully aware of the status, the reputation and authority, in Canadian terms, of the Parliament of Ontario, every member of which, it should be remembered, has a constituency many times the size of the whole of the Territory, the legislature, which, notwithstanding the view of its Premier, has seen, and participated in, most of the intensely felt constitutional debates in the history of the country. I want to say that our Committee, a committee which includes representatives from all three parties, quite depressed me. This may come as a surprise to everybody, but I really learned something from that experience of the five of us trying to articulate to five elected people from outside of the Territory, something of our concerns. It really was an education for me. I want to say that the Member for Kluane and the Member for Tatchun, and the Minister of Justice and the Member for Hootalinqua, my colleagues in that Committee, all acquitted themselves on behalf of the Yukon extraordinarily.

ly well. I do not want to suggest that we were as lucid, or as articulate or as intellectual, or as polished as the politicians with whom we met from Ontario, but I think the sincerity, the commitment, and most profoundly, the unity of our vision, was quite astounding to me.

We sit in our Committees and in our House on a day to day basis, and we have been intensely preoccupied with, and very aware of, the differences between us. We have become far too concerned with disputes about small matters, but what I think I learned and understood, for the first time, in those two days of meetings with our colleagues from Ontario, was how much the five of us in that Committee had in common on the Constitution. And what that led me to speculate about was the prospect of five people who I think did not start off with much community of interest or unanimity of view on the constitution, over a period of time, working together on a question, coming closer to an understanding of each other, and each other's points of view, and ultimately drawing closer together, in terms of each one's view, of the Territory, of where to go, and how we can design a Constitution which does justice to the significant minority in this community, and provides a vehicle for achieving our highest aspirations.

More than that, that emerging consensus among five citizens of this Territory, who have different partisan colour, and come from different backgrounds, and have different attitudes and educations, struck me as an indicator of the possibility of sixteen members coming to a consensus, not tomorrow or next week, but sometime, on a Constitution.

And inasmuch as the sixteen members of this Legislature represent the twenty-some thousand people of this territory, the possibility exists for, as much as humanly possible under any circumstances, a broad agreement on the major elements of the Constitution, to come and be arrived at in this community. It seemed to me that that is the objective on this issue to which we should all be working.

I want to make an observation as a partisan politician, someone who has been involved in this game unsuccessfully and successfully for some time. It seems to me that it does not matter what the political strength of the Government in Ottawa, it does not matter what kind of intellectual rigidity there may be in Ottawa, in terms of our aspirations; from the very moment this community achieves a consensus on our own future, on our own Constitution, it is only a matter of time, not money or population or anything else, only a matter of time before the Federal authorities must accede to a demand that is based on the broadest possible consensus.

It seems to me that in the present Government Leader, we have, on the basis of his personality and his experience, a man who is eminently qualified to play a conciliatory role in this process, a man, in my judgment, whose personality ably equips him to play the conciliator kind of leadership role that is needed in this kind of process. I do not think, and I say this as a heartfelt remark, the Government Leader, even the leader of a political party, is very credible or convincing on a partisan hobby-horse on this issue. I did not feel the weight or the force or the blood-boiling kind of commitment from the Government Leader yesterday when he was attacking our Liberal friends in Ottawa or here, the same kind of passion that the Member for Porter Creek East is able to summon every time we suggest that we may be able to achieve more economic equality in this community or some other subject which he opposes. I withdraw that temporarily.

Let me do this without being too partisan about it, the manner in which this discussion paper or position paper, or whatever it is of the Government, was conveyed this summer, was, to say the least, most unfortunate. The fact that we as Members of this Legislature have to hear about it on the radio is unfortunate. The fact that in attempting to define the Government's position in the Committee in which we were working this summer was trying to do, that was unfortunate.

I say this with all sincerity because I think this issue is of fundamental importance to us. I do not think it gets us anywhere splitting partisan hairs on it. My perception of the Government Leader is, and I say this as a personal thing, that his strengths are not as a confrontation leader. I do not think he does it nearly as well as other people in this House. I think that his talent and his training and his ability could be much better directed on this issue. I think because of his background he is well equipped to deal with this issue, the issue of bringing together the parts of the community and the parts of this community include people who vote NDP and people who vote Liberal and people who may not agree with the Conservative Party on very much. But this is not a question on

which the Conservative Party's future is at stake or the Liberal Party's or the NDP's. We are talking about the future of our community and we are talking about something so basic that we should not ignore the possibility of us coming together in an agreement. It can only do that if you are talking to everybody, if you are open to everybody, if you are listening to everybody and if you are doing in the most even-handed, fair-minded, open-minded, open-handed way.

I think that the manner in which those of us who were trying to see what options were available to us this summer, including the Government Party's option, and the manner in which we had to be apprised of the Government's position, was most unfortunate. I want to say that, at the very least, having heard the Government Leader a number of times anticipate the possibility of a Land Claims settlement before provincial status, and that is the sequence he anticipates, that the suggestion, no matter how well-founded it may be in terms of the technical science of the art, that provincial status can precede land claims, was a provocative statement, a politically provocative statement, and a divisive one. I happen to disagree with it. I think we would be absolute fools to get into the situation that B.C. or Quebec would be, but that is another question. Enough said about that.

I want to deal with this question of local hire, because it seems to me it is a constitutional issue. It is a question that the Government Leader has addressed, and the Leader of the Opposition. It, too, is a potentially divisive one, and I am going to repeat myself on this, but it is one that we have to be careful about. The issue here is not so much that our local hire policies seek to give unusual preferences to people in the Territory. I might think they should, but I don't know whether there is a consensus on that. What we have in this Territory, right now, is a situation where people in the Territory cannot get an even break on some jobs in the Territory. We have a situation where we need affirmative action programs, politically tied to local-hire policies, because I think that is one of the best ways to sell them. We need affirmative action programs and tough local-hire policies, just to give our citizens an even break. It is ludicrous to suggest that people from New Brunswick, or anywhere else, should have the kind of access to jobs in this community that people in this community do not have. Let me deal with the structural problem. It's not because I tend to have some sympathy for the union movement that they are blameless in this regard, or the private sector, or the Government, or anybody. Let's deal with the structural problem that we have. I was trying to deal with some cases this summer, one of which concerned a person who was a graduate of Yukon training institutions, with a qualified trade, who wanted to go to work to a job in Yukon, a construction job, and was eminently well qualified for the position, but could not go there because the company that was doing the job was based in Vancouver, and the Union that represented the employees of that company was based in Vancouver. The person from Yukon could not get into that Union unless they already had a job, and they couldn't get a job unless they were in the union, and they couldn't get into it either unless they lived in Vancouver.

That kind of outrageous situation is exactly the kind of situation that tough-minded, fair, just local hire policies need to address. I think every fair-minded person in the Territory, whatever their political stripe, would support the Government Leader in his assertions in that regard. Not only that, but there is need to get together to argue the case with the outside. I want to tell you that in this particular case I was so angry I wrote to everyone under the sun. A list of c.c.'s on my original letter takes a couple of pages. I also wrote to the Human Rights Commission, Mr. Gordon Fairweather, a nice, bright man, but it seems there are a lot of misunderstandings on this subject. He had apparently given a speech where he was attacking what he thought was going on in Faro, and he is also a man who supports affirmative action programs for native people. I wrote him a long letter asking him to explain the contradiction, because he wasn't going to have one without the other in a place like this. There are all sorts of reasons. We talked about the scales problem earlier today. There are a lot of people in this Territory wondering why the largest corporation in the Territory needs to go to Cape Breton, when there are communities in this Territory with statistically practically the whole of the adult population who have been unemployed for most of their adult lives.

Surely that is the kind of thing where the government and business has to be getting together to make sure that we train local people, even if it requires a massive investment in training. Surely we have a natural right, especially in resource industry jobs, given the Canadian tradition of resources, for people here to work in those resource industries first. Not because they are better Cana-

dians than anybody else, or that we should ignore the unemployment problem everywhere else, but our responsibility as a Government of Yukon is to look after the people of Yukon first. That includes unemployed Yukoners and people who may lack the kind of training and skill to get into the job market.

This is a particular case, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to talk about at length on some other occasion, it seems to me, in some budget, because there are a lot of aspects to it which bother me.

Let me just say a word about C.O.P.E. It seems to me that this is one of those issues that 20 years ago in the Territory a hotline radio show host could have had people marching in the streets about. I do not know whether this community has become more tired, or more jaded, or more sophisticated, or whatever it is, but I find that people are not so easy to arouse to passion. Some people are, but not everybody. In some ways one of the gratifying things I think that I have seen in my life in political activity in the Territory is how much more mature this community's responses are to some kinds of questions.

I want to tell you that one of the things that I did when I received the glossy literature on the C.O.P.E. claim from the government, being of a skeptical nature, I wrote to anybody who I thought might have some facts on the subject to tell me what they thought of this material. Some people in Ottawa shed some light on the subject, not much. I received a fairly passionate, but not terribly substantive, communication from an MLA in the Northwest Territories on the subject concerned.

I would serve notice on the Government Leader now that I am going to ask the government its intention some time as to whether we are going to accept her offer to have C.O.P.E. people come down here and, at some point, address this Legislature on their concerns, because I think that may be a good way of hearing from them first hand.

One of the things I heard after having written that letter, from other people in C.O.P.E., was to discover that they had some grievances against this Government of Yukon, which I had never heard of, specifically concerning the *Game Ordinance* and some rights and things that they were concerned about. Their complaint against this Government of Yukon was that it failed to consult them. I thought that sounded very strange.

Not to go into this in any great detail, it seems to me, and not having all the facts available, as they are available to several members opposite, consultation is a two-way street. If we want to amicably resolve this kind of problem, which is one with a constitutional dimension, too, as we all know, we have to be talking and we have to be listening. We have to do both.

On an entirely serious note, I do hope at some time, because I was quite impressed with some of the critique of the *Game Ordinance* and, in fact, it is probably much better than mine, that was made by some people in C.O.P.E.

I do not want to drone on forever, because I see some members' opposite eyes drooping. It often happens when I speak, Mr. Speaker, but I did not want to do a rhetorical dance today. I did not want to generate any synthetic anger. I want to talk quietly. I want to try and talk reasonably, and I want to talk about something, again, which the Government Leader said was a deep philosophical concern to him, and that was the constitutional question.

I have not gone into any kind of detail. It seems to me that is the kind of discussion we should hold until we deal with the work of the Committee.

It does seem to me though, and I would urge this on the Government Leader in a non-partisan way, that I do not know who is advising him on this question, but I think the people who have been advising him have made a faulty assessment of his own talents and his own abilities, and that his strength as a human being and a political leader would be much better directed toward trying to achieve consensus, community of interest, a *rapprochement*, in this community, than carrying on with this quite enjoyable, but ultimately not very edifying, spat with Ottawa. It seems to me that there are many things in terms of our disagreements, our relationships with Ottawa with which Yukoners are going to agree, but if they were reduced, and I am as much to blame for this as anybody, to a Conservative-Liberal gamesmanship, or NDP-Liberal gamesmanship, it does not really advance the cause of writing a profound and lasting and enduring Yukon Constitution.

The other point I have urged the Government to consider again, if it is possible, is its repeated refusal to debate philosophical principles behind the kind of acceptable kind of land claims settlement he would see in this House. There has been some debate

outside this House. It seems to me that, for the sake of educating Yukon population, of preparing the Yukon population for a land claim settlement, which is part of our responsibility, we have to talk frankly about whether we are in favour of enshrining aboriginal rights in a new Constitution, whether it is the position of the Government that they should be extinguished, or enshrined. What are the kind of possibilities in terms of satisfying the Indian demands for Indian Government? I think that if we ignore them, we ignore them at our peril, because one morning we will wake up and there may be a settlement, and all of a sudden we will have a reaction to the settlement, and that may exhaust any political energies that are left of the people who are involved in achieving that settlement.

I think a lot of their time, energy, patience and goodwill will have been exhausted to no good end.

There are people in this community who are beginning to believe that some of the actors in the land claims negotiations seem to have more of an interest in perpetuating the negotiations than they do in reaching a settlement. I feel bound to report that there have been people in the community who believe that even the federal government may find it cheaper to negotiate than to settle.

I think none of us should contribute to any kind of tendencies in that direction in any quarter. For the sake of everybody, we must conclude a land claims settlement and we must get on with the work of building a Yukon constitution, but I urge everybody, whatever our difference on other issues, to always be aware of what we have in common in this question, and to work on that foundation rather than to be continuing to tear down or destroy what primitive foundations are already in place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fleming: Before I start, I will say that I am supporting this resolution before us. I want that said because I am going to say some things to the Members opposite that they probably will not appreciate, even though I am supporting the fact that they have done their best to run the government, to the best of their ability, and not too bad a job at that.

I would like to lay the blame right where it belongs, and I think I might say right now where some of the blame lies; maybe there are things that they have not done the way that the people wish them to be done, or the way I wish them to be done, but this may be due not to the people in the government but in the fact that it is not the people in the government, but the fact that we turned political a couple of years ago.

To turn political with only 16 members, and with only so many across the floor; I cannot believe that those eleven members would not be as good as eleven members from over here, or anywhere else. However, it is a fact that you might not be able to get the exact calibre of people you wish for every job out of those few members. That is where I lay the blame for some of the problems we have today. I think that time and numbers will repair some of that.

There has been a lot said about the right of the Government Leader to speak at the provincial conferences. I can remember back a few years when we stood up in this House and howled to high heaven because we did not have the right to speak at almost anything and, in fact, we did not have the right to speak at anything. We howled everytime there was something that somebody could go to and could not speak.

I think maybe at that time we had a right to do that, and we were probably right in doing so. However, I am not so sure that maybe there should not have been more thought put into it by the Government Leader this time, and in fact, perhaps he should have gone to that conference, even to be there as an observer.

Now, I am not saying that he should back down from federal governments, but the part of politics I hate, and I see it in this arena, many times, over and over, is that there still is a federal government, and they still are the boss, and they run this country. It is different from a few years ago. We have to remember that there is a land claims settlement, that there is a group of native peoples of about one-third of the people in this Territory and, in some cases, they might say that they had a right, too, to have a representative at that provincial conference, and possibly rightly so, because part of those claims are before the courts, and there is no real settlement yet.

I say that, until such time as we have, more or less, two groups of people in this Territory, I am not so sure that our Government Leader should not be there as a provincial representative, when we are not a province yet. I think maybe he erred in not taking the opportunity there. I wonder if the Government, in their support of

the Native Land Claims are aware that one of the things they are always saying is that they wish to see one government. Now, I might, myself, say the same thing. But we have to go a little bit farther than that, I think. If I were a government, I think I would go to the extent of saying that no matter what that government is, we are under one law, where everybody is treated equally. That is our problem today. We have two laws. This is the area, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to speak on a little, and will probably chastise the Government in some ways for not really seeing what is going on in the small towns in the Territory. Where they have tried in some ways, and are trying now with the new *Local Improvement Ordinance*, for instance, which I think is a wonderful thing, is something that is possibly needed here, but it is just another piece of paper that is not going to be worth ten cents until the Native Land Claims are settled. I do not mean to say that we have to stop everything, but I can see in the future that this thing is not going work until such times as Land Claim settlements are finished, and everybody is either under one law and one government, or two governments but one law. I do not know whether the Government really realizes how people there are in a small town, and I will give as an example Teslin, maybe Carmacks, or Carcross, small towns, that all the paperwork is done with the thought that there are probably 200 people, that there are 300, that there are 150. But if you come right down to the basic fact, in some of those small towns, there are not 75 people to whom the paperwork would amount to anything, because the other people are not under those laws. I am not saying anything contrary, with all respect, Mr. Speaker, to both the Native peoples and the Party, but it is a fact of life and that is the way it is. You make laws, and then you have a problem. I would suggest to the Government that they do try to come up, some day, with policies in their Constitutional development ideas, that there is one law in this Territory. As I say, I would not care how many governments, but that there is one law for all of us people.

Now, the Government Leader made some remark yesterday about the Tahltan claim to a part of the southern Yukon. Which part, we do not know. I do not know, and I do not think anybody else knows all about it yet. I felt it was a political thing, because they are the Conservative Party, to say that the Liberals had given them authority to go and see if they could get some of our land or something. It is not necessarily so. I would ask a question, maybe. If lawfully - I do not want anybody to take our land or anything - but if lawfully they had a right, would it not be better to see that right in court today and have it over with and find out if there was a right, rather than to have it ten years from now after everything else is supposed to be settled?

So I do not blame the Liberal government in this way for doing something to find out whether they do or not. You and I, and everyone else in the Yukon Territory, have a right to know whether he is right or wrong in his claim for things. I am not saying that we should give away land. I am not saying we should not try to see that we do not get taken, but I am saying that everybody has that right. I am saying, "Do it now, not ten years from now." I do not blame the Liberal government for some things they do.

You must look at the facts of life as to why they may be doing it. If this could go to the courts and be settled, then it would be settled. Possibly it is too bad land claims were not in there long ago and settled.

The Minister of Public Works has mentioned the things they have done this summer and this fall and that they are going to do in the Territory. The good things, of course, naturally I have not got too much time to say too much about, but there are many, I agree. They have done a good job.

There are a few things that I am not so sure are really that good. I am wondering about the three-year water project which was supposedly good. I doubted it when it went in and I am still doubting it a little bit. The very fact that now we have contracts that are three years old, that that portion of the highway may be mud and muck for the next few years - and I drive them a lot and I know - when really the rest of the highway in the British Columbia area and through there has been chipped and tarred this summer and it is wonderful. I think it would be much better, probably, than to stay with our water business for three more years.

However, the contracts are out and maybe that might cause us to have that mud for three more years.

The fact is I feel the same as some of the other Members on this side about the Destruction Bay situation. I will make the comparison of Destruction Bay and the Teslin school and the bus that was taken away from there in the same text because it is the same. I think that you, as a government, did not make those people aware

of something that was coming and possibly a little awareness might have changed the whole picture.

For instance, I was a little concerned when the Teslin bus was taken off its run, but nobody seemed to know about it until it was too late. They were going to get grade 11 if they gave this; you give this you take that. There is not too much awareness of just exactly what you are going to do. There was awareness of the grade 11 school and we are all thankful. These are merely things that I think you should try to remember.

The fact that you are not really acquainted with many of the areas that have problems in the area of people moving onto the native reserves and things like this is something that you, as a government, cannot really do very much about. I realize that because I read the *Indian Act*. I just finished it at noon and there is a section in there that says as plain as the nose on your face that the Minister of Indian Affairs, through the consensus of the band, can allow any individual to live on the reserve for a period of one year or more. That is how simple it is.

However, I think that there should be some negotiation with the native peoples in this area and that we, or the Minister, should find some way to alleviate that situation and see that white people just do not all go over there and we will not have any taxes for ourselves in the future.

I am not going to go on because as I said I am going to support your resolution; I am going to support the Government. I think you are doing as good a job as you can with what you have got. With all due respect to all of you, I think that is just exactly the way it is, and that is because of the political situation that you have got yourself into.

I would like to congratulate the Government on their citizens' housing in Mayo and in Watson Lake. I would like to also congratulate them on the fact that there is an ambulance in Ross River. I may have a question or two in that area, but I would like to congratulate them especially for that. As I say, all the other aspects of their speeches were very good.

I was trying to find something to congratulate the Minister of Renewable Resources on but I just have not found it yet, except that he spoke for a long time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have called the question?

The Honourable Member really should have been on his feet, but I know that the House would wish to debate this further, so I call upon the Honourable Member for Faro.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your latitude and I apologize for not being on my feet sooner.

I believe we have a motion here that, in essence, is a request for an endorsement of the activities of the Government since Session adjourned in April. Yesterday we heard the defence; today we seem to be hearing some form of prosecution. We had the detailed accounts of the operations of each of the departments yesterday and we heard the reasoning behind the posturing and the accomplishments of the Government and fundamentally I am not going to take issue. The departments are reasonably well-run. I have had excellent dealings with officials of departments in dealing with constituency problems.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but observe that in all of these proceedings, it is so sad, in a way, that we went into party politics so soon in Yukon in one respect. When you are in my position on the outside looking in, or in a position of independence, you can afford to make observations about the system. I was deeply moved by both the previous speaker and in particular, the speaker for Whitehorse West, because I think he talked about the transcendence of petty partisan politics. He made reference to the fact that we are going through ritual and rhetoric and it should not be considered too much. I say that it is heavily considered in what we are doing.

By our approach of being so badly partisan, we are making it difficult to listen to how those bad guys in Ottawa hamstring our constitutional efforts, our evolution, how they are breaking agreements, and how the federal Liberals are giving away Yukon. Then I listen to how the visionary ideals of some people get published around the country before Yukoners see them, and how ghosts of Yukoners get welcomed to important meetings, and how wonderful it is to practise being a minister, and they are Yukon Conservatives.

It seems that the party label identities are the excuse for the reason for whatever it is, be it good fortune or bad. The irony, perhaps the reality, really, is that these party labels identify the power, not the ideology, as the fundamental thrust should be.

I believe that, had the Prime Minister been Mr. Clark who called the constitutional talks in Ottawa, our Government Leader would have been there personally monitoring things. I believe that if it were not a Conservative government across the floor, it would be a Mr. Lalonde, a Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources, rather than the Minister of State, who would be coming, and probably would be here now, and not maybe in December.

It is unfortunate that our territorial-federal relations are strained by the partisanship of things. It is unfortunate that this partisanship precipitates these charges of secrecy in legislation, the uncertain policy posturing that is so difficult to modify, or retract, or whatever. It is unfortunate that the posturing in this House has to be so political, so partisan.

This afternoon is a prime example, and the same Minister yesterday afternoon, in giving a reasonable answer to a reasonable question, to me, could not help but take a closing shot my Liberal colleague over here, and that was while he was talking to me. I suppose that is the political system we are in, and that is what we chose as our method of representation.

I was really impressed, and I must emphasize it, that perhaps we must make more of an effort to get out of the wheelbarrows of partisanship and jump into the trough of unanimity. This is something that has to be done more often.

I guess I am a little disappointed in that aspect of what is happening. I am not going to stand here and criticize the department performance that we had so wonderfully articulated for us yesterday. I feel that there is very little there to criticize. They are doing a good job. I get good results. I am pleased with the programs. I think there are some good things happening, but, you know, it is the style of the politics, as the Honourable Member for Teslin gave in a dissertation a moment ago.

I think that politicians, probably more than any other occupation or profession, or whatever, have to be big people. I do not mean that in the physical sense, at all.

Far be it from me to criticize the front bench. I think politicians have to be big enough to address the total concerns of the total area of jurisdiction. I guess that is where I have some problems identifying with the goals of the Government. On the one hand, we have the claim of self determination, the practice of that philosophy is under question, witness Destruction Bay. We say we want into Confederation then we do not go when invited. I know, the Government Leader made his position clear, he thinks he was right in not going and I suppose, because the capital budget does not have in it what I think it should have, I should resign and go home too. I have some difficulty.

Speaking of capital budget, it introduces the concern that I began to articulate this afternoon and I am certainly not going to repeat them. I think in the rebuttal that I received from the Minister, he did challenge me to respond in some respect to several points that I noted. One, he makes charges with respect to the land situation in Faro that I was responsible for having put in place a quarter of a million dollars worth of land development. And I say, "Yes, I was," and I tell the Minister that that is the only land now available because of the foresight of some people.

The Minister charged that X number of dollars was put in place in Faro and quite legitimately so.

He makes specific reference to a three-year capital funding of a school. There, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Honourable Member, and the House, that it was a deliberate campaign to Ottawa by the community that assisted in the acquisition of that money. When this House first sat, that was the priority concern and it was 26th in priority at the time and it had to be a new effort of acquiring the funding.

On a couple of occasions there has been reference made to the capital assistance. I think it has not been emphasized enough that a year ago we all knew of the planned development going on. Now why was there not adequate funds put in the last budget? Why does it have to be under the pretext of taking it away from the communities; why does it have to be under the pretext of having been taken away when it should have been put there in the first place? That is the point I want to make.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member also made a number of charges with respect to statements allegedly in the local newspaper, the Raven. I am not even going to respond to them. There is no error of fact in them. The only error I may concede, and perhaps it is just a matter of wording, and that is with reference to the \$5 million I believe the word is accruing. Certainly if the income tax bill goes into effect that is the ten per cent of the corporate tax

share that would have accrued were that in place. So, perhaps I stand to refine the reference in that.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I guess I strayed somewhat from a general discussion of the motion at hand, but I feel that it was important for these notations that I have made to be corrected.

I carry on, Mr. Speaker. It has been since 1978 that I have been pleading with this government to address what is happening in Faro. I was pleading. I still am. I tell them that no longer is Faro a fly-by-night community. I tell them that we are entering a period of rapid expansion. I tell them that 150 new homes that are going into place are going to be filled with people, not concentrate. I tell them that Faro is a municipality, and Cyprus Anvil is not going to provide the services normally expected of government.

I tell them to get started on another school, put some bucks into the utilities expansion. Granted, this is beginning to happen. I say rebuild our access road, fix up government housing, and the list goes on.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this government could appreciate the demands that are placed on me, as a representative of my riding, to come up with the demands that are expected from this government.

Mr. Speaker, what I have done, in the sincerity of it all, so that this government could really take full charge of the responsibility that has been placed on me, and I have passed it on to them, I have articulated a summary of those concerns. Yesterday, I tabled them, and I do not propose to go into detail on that brief. I trust the government will read it. I trust they will respect the effort that I made in compiling it, and the work that I have done to assist their departments in the planning necessary for that specific area.

I simply must emphasize that there is a tremendous responsibility, Mr. Speaker, on this government, to adequately address the entire Yukon. I am part of that. I know we differ as to how much responsibility the government feels it has already given. I say it is not enough. I say it is a case of need. I say it is also justified by the arguments presented.

I have said this before in the House, Mr. Speaker, as Faro goes so goes Yukon. We do not have the economic base to get away with ignoring a community on whose strength rests the fiscal wellbeing of the Territory.

Sure, quite obviously, we should not be in that kind of a fragile position, where one major mine commands that much effect on the Yukon economy. For that reason, I am encouraged by what I hear from the Minister with respect to development, and it is good.

For that reason, I take little issue with this Government's handling of their departments. I again emphasize that there are some good programs being delivered, some excellent management, and there has been some of the necessary changes taking place that we have been talking about. Certainly, as Members before me have also stated, I have some questions. As the Session advances, and as I cannot reach satisfaction in personal dealings, I will have to raise them. I have raised some points. I have questions with respect to the Tourism funding. I have questions with respect to the capital granting of funds. I have enquiries with respect to business development and the ordinance we passed this spring. But, those things are part of the process.

Principally, Mr. Speaker, my immediate concern and responsibility is to appeal to this Government for due consideration to be given to the reasoned statement, tabled in the House yesterday on behalf of my constituents. That is my answer. And please, Mr. Speaker, I would request of the Government that they understand that that brief articulates a pretty reasonable argument, a pretty reasonable approach to the rapid growth situation in my community. Collectively, the Government is responsible, municipal to federal, to have a responsibility to address those needs. We are dealing with a couple of thousand people, and probably another thousand within a couple of years. I do not have to repeat the effect, or impact, or worth to the Territorial economy.

As the brief states, we are facing some very critical situations coming up. Faro is home to a lot of people. I do not expect immediate funding tomorrow, or construction to begin in each one of the ten areas. That would be unreasonable. But, I do expect some of the priority issues to be attended to and certainly I will be waiting for a general response in due time on that particular brief. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn debate to the day following.

Mr. MacKay: I will second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker: Is it then the intention of the House to sit at 7:30?

Hon. Mr. Graham: It is, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: The House stands in recess until 7:30 p.m.
Recess

The following Sessional Papers were tabled Wednesday, October 15, 1980:

80-3-20

Annual Report for the Department of Justice, 1979 - 1980

80-3-21

Report on Regulations, September, 1980

EDIT 60

