



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 21

4th Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, November 25, 1981 — 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, Land Claims and Intergovernmental Relations.
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 Municipal and Community Affairs, Highways and Public Works, Yukon Housing Corporation and Yukon Liquor Corporation.
Hon. Meg McCall	Klondike	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Education and Information Services.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Justice, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Government Services and Workers' Compensation Board.

Government Members

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Robert Fleming	Campbell
Doug Graham	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Peter Hanson	Mayo
Grafton Njootli	Old Crow
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake

Opposition Members

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre

(Liberal)

Ron Veale	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

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

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

Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, November 25, 1981

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

Prayers

Point of Personal Privilege

Mr. Hanson: I rise on a point of personal privilege. It is a minor point, perhaps. As Minister of Renewable Resources in the latter half of 1979, and first half of 1980, I decided to say a few words in relation to the question of Goldrush River Tours Inc., raised yesterday, because this issue is very serious. Insinuations have been made in the press. There has been no evidence of impropriety.

The Member for Tatchun is the target of character assassination today. Any Member of the House could be the next target, if we allow these practices to go unchallenged. When I was Minister, I knew of nothing with respect to Goldrush River Tours that was not fully proper and open, as far as its relations with the Government were concerned.

I am glad to hear that Mr. Tracey has decided not to let the matter go unchallenged. It is a sad commentary on the level of public debate.

I would remind the House that the Government Leader obtained a legal opinion, and the then Leader of the Opposition indulged himself in this muck-raking in October. Of course his interest in Mr. Tracey's completely proper and open business background just happened to be aroused a few days before the Whitehorse South Center by-election. He was trying to damage the Government with insinuations then. The press is trying to do the same now.

Let me quote that legal opinion: "Reviewing the circumstances of this matter, and in reviewing the appropriate legislation and the Commissioner's Orders, it is our opinion that Mr. Tracey adhered to the rules governing the conduct of Members of the Executive Council." He did not violate or breach any of these rules in any manner.

We have already spent too much time responding to the non-issue. I urge the House to get on with the conduct of public business.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has heard many speakers on this particular point of privilege and is currently considering the matter; the remarks made by the Honourable Member will be taken into account.

We will now proceed to the Order Paper.

DAILY ROUTINE

Returns or Documents for Tabling?
 Reports of Standing or Special Committees?
 Petitions?
 Introduction of Bills?
 Notices of Motions For the Production of Papers?
 Notices of Motion?
 Statements By Ministers?

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: This brings us to the Question Period.

Question re: Wages and Workers' Compensation payments, relative to gold mining operations

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister responsible for Labour Standards.

A Mr. Gustaf Schmidt, of the Cogasa Mining Corporation, has, in a recent public letter, charged that some employers in the placer gold mining operation did not pay wages to their employees during the summer, and probably did not pay Workers' Compensation. Can the Minister confirm whether or not this is the case?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I cannot. If Mr. Schmidt wants to give us the names of the people who did not pay their employees,

then we will be quite willing to look at it. There are likely some organizations that went broke, and maybe the employers did not pay the employees, but I do not know who they are.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Schmidt also suggested that legislation should be introduced to make the Government responsible for settling unpaid wage claims. I would like to ask the Minister whether the Government is considering legislation in this area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Absolutely not.

Mr. Penikett: In the Minister's previous comments on the non-payment by employers of some of these contributions, the Minister said, "I feel very strongly that even if this is not illegal, this is certainly devious." Given the strength of the Minister's commitment, is it his intention to make some of the practices now under question, clearly illegal?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would like the Member opposite to tell me what practices he would like to make illegal, before I comment on it.

Response to Previous Question — Leases to Goldrush River Tours

Hon. Mr. Pearson: On previous days I have been asked a number of questions respecting federal land leases granted to Goldrush River Tours Incorporated, in 1979. I would like to take this opportunity to try to answer them all.

Earlier this week, based on a former Minister's spur of the moment recollection I advised the House that the Territorial representatives on the Federal Lands Advisory Committee abstained from voting on the consideration of lease applications in the name of Goldrush River Tours. In order not to mislead the House, I should clarify my previous remarks.

Firstly, the Federal Lands Advisory Committee is exactly that. It is a federal advisory committee to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, which considers applications for federal lands. In most cases, the federal lands which are subject to application are in areas where no land use planning or policy has been adopted.

The Committee, therefore, is technical in nature, and considers applications based on their merits. On no occasion has political direction been given to this Government's two Members on the six-member Committee. In addition, the Members had no knowledge at all that Mr. Tracey was associated with Goldrush River Tours, nor would it have been a factor.

In May 1979, the Committee considered applications from Goldrush River Tours. As part of the normal research, it was brought to the Committee's attention that most of the applications conflicted with areas of Indian interest. Based on this information, the Committee, generally, and the Yukon Territorial Government representatives, in particular, could not support the applications, and they were, therefore, rejected at that time.

Over the course of the summer of 1979, representatives of various Government agencies, including a representative from the Council of Yukon Indians, visited the sites which were under consideration, and mutually located other sites which were satisfactory to all parties. We are not certain as to whether or not Indian Affairs and the Council for Yukon Indians had consulted with the Carmacks Indian Band.

In August 1979, these newly located sites were unanimously approved. However, because of the fact that Yukon River planning was to commence, it was felt that the leases should be reasonably restrictive, and short-term in nature: no more than five years. At the same time, it was felt that since this river tours business had been operating for some time, and substantial investments were being made, that some form of short-term security would be in order. It is correct that a suggestion was made to the Federal Government, by a Yukon Government official, who was not a member of the Committee, that no further applications by new similar commercial proposals be entertained until the river management plans were completed. This was simply just that: a suggestion. But it did not become federal policy. In fact, since 1979, the federal govern-

ment has not refused to accept and consider land applications on the Yukon River.

In my opinion, this matter has been dealt with in a fair, open and equitable manner.

Question re: Government policy—commercial leases along Yukon River

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources, regarding the policy of the Yukon Government on the historical and recreational development of the Yukon River.

Does the letter, dated July 18, 1979, from the Director of Parks and Historic Resources Branch, which was referred to by the Government Leader, correctly set forth the policy of the Yukon Government regarding commercial leases along the River, at this time?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think there are a number of things that have to be clarified here. I would like to begin by referring to further muck-raking by the *Whitehorse Star*, with respect to last night's article, which had the caption, "Tracey Monopoly was Recommended."

It states very specifically in the article, and by innuendo, I think, gives the impression, that "A top official in the Renewable Resources Department recommended that a company owned by his former boss, Howard Tracey, be handed a monopoly on any commercial land leases granted along the Yukon River in 1979, the *Star* has learned."

The implication of that paragraph is that the Director of Parks for the Department of Renewable Resources did intentionally recommend the application of these leases.

I think it is imperative that this be clarified for the record. The public servant in question, first of all, had no knowledge of who the owners of Goldrush River Tours were; there was no question about it. So, therefore, what was written in the *Whitehorse Star* was inaccurate, because it implies that he did know.

Secondly, the Director involved recommended to, and agreed with, the Government of Canada that leases not be given out, initially, back in May of that year.

Further work was done, at the request of the Government of Canada, to look further into the allotting of various leases along that River.

If one looks at the letter that the Member is referring to, it states the matter very clearly, as indicated in the May 30 meeting. We were reluctant to recommend approval for any long term commercial land use along the River pending completion of the joint Yukon Territorial Government conceptual and management plans. At that point in time, 1979, and I stress this, it states that we would strongly recommend against any new similar commercial proposals.

I want to make it very clear, nothing has advanced any further with respect to the land use corridor along that river, partially on the request of the Liberal Party and the NDP — that nothing be done, really, of any significance until the land claims settlement is completed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I have permitted the Minister to make a fairly lengthy reply, because it was the feeling of the Chair that both sides of the House would be interested in such information. Indeed, it is somewhat of an abuse of the Question Period to go into these lengthy explanations that would almost allow one to think that a debate is taking place. Perhaps the Honourable Minister could briefly conclude his statements so we can continue with the Question Period.

Hon. Mr. Lang: With respect to the present policy as it exists today, from the Territorial Government's point of view — and you have to remember this is federal land and federal water — it is strictly first come, first served, so far as applications are concerned. It has to do with the Government of Canada's land policy, which is simply that. We have not authority; all we can do is advise, in regards to certain land applications coming forward. We have no intention of changing this at the present time, because we are confident that we can come to some amicable settlement over Indian land claims in the very near future.

Mr. Veale: The Minister is familiar with the concept plan, which is dated February 1980, which was prepared by his Government and the federal government. In that plan it states that, regarding policies on visitors' service, "commercial developments along the waterways should only occur according to an approved management strategy, with a view to the potential role of private enterprise in providing facilities and services for the river travellers." Is that now the policy that has been adopted between the two governments, or is that a policy which is still being negotiated?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No. I wish the Member opposite would read the full report. On Page 17 of the report that the Member refers to, and I refer to Visitor Services Policy, it states specifically the provision of commercial accommodation services by the private sector should be encouraged. And, on this side of the floor, we believe the private sector should have the right to invest, as opposed to enlarging the civil service and all the other costs that are incurred to the taxpayer.

So, as far as the policy of this side of the House is concerned, if the private sector is prepared to invest, we are prepared to support that type of investment, as long as it follows certain guidelines.

Mr. Veale: The point is that these commercial developments should be according to an approved management strategy, rather than on an *ad hoc* basis. When will the Minister be meeting with the representatives from the federal government to actually map out that strategy and make it public, so that the rules of the game are known to all Yukoners?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The Member opposite infers that the rules of the game are not known to the general public. The Government of Canada makes the rules. That is number one. And the rules are, with respect to federal land, "first come, first served", if they are prepared to release land. So that is number one. That policy is in place from the Liberal federal government. Now, concerning the allocation of land along that river, at the present time the policy is for people to come forward with applications, and if it fits in with what that waterway should be utilized for, for recreation purposes, it will be seriously considered. Unfortunately, perhaps, on an *ad hoc* basis, but that is the way it stands.

I am not prepared to commit myself to meet with the federal officials at the present time.

Question re: Qualifiers to Mobility Clause for Yukon

Mr. Byblow: I have a question I will direct to the Government Leader on a different subject. It relates to the Ministerial address he delivered yesterday in the House.

During the address he reaffirmed his Government's position of a commitment to the policy of local hire, and he stated, "We want Yukoners to be first choices." I can agree with that, and I would like to ask the Government Leader if this means that the Government has determined that the qualifiers to the Mobility Clause will apply in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, I am sorry to report that we have not been able to get that determination, definitively. I am happy to hear that the Honourable Member is supportive of our local hire policy. It is one that we are proud of. It is one area where we, as a Government, have really been able to have an impact, and we do appreciate the support that we get from across the floor on that.

Mr. Byblow: I appreciate the Government Leader's comments. I would like to ask the Government Leader if, since the signing of the Constitutional Accord, he has communicated Yukon's desire to implement the Yukon hire policy?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not sure that the Accord has been signed yet. The last I heard, it was still being debated. Mind you, I am out of touch with Ottawa, today in particular.

The federal government is very well aware of our concerns respecting the Mobility Clause. We are still in a negotiating stage with the Prime Minister's Office, with respect to that Mobility Clause, and exactly how it will apply to us. We just have not heard from them yet.

Mr. Byblow: I would like to advise the Government Leader that the Constitutional Accord is between the Prime Minister

and the Premiers, and that it has been signed.

On the subject of the Mobility Clause, Section 6 does refer to a qualification allowing regions with exceptionally high unemployment rates to institute local hire policies. How will the Government strengthen its organization to fulfill that commitment?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have to seek some kind of a special dispensation from the federal government, with respect to that particular clause. It is, as we feared, based on employment, rather than unemployment, statistics. If the factors used were in fact unemployment factors, then Yukon would be in a fairly enviable position insofar as that particular section is concerned.

Our first indication is that, with the section worded the way it is, based on employment figures, then we rank very high in Canada with respect to employment, as opposed to unemployment.

Question re: Government study on energy expenditures as a percentage of Gross Territorial Product

Mr. Penikett: While we are on the subject of the mysterious, I have a question for the Government Leader.

The Government Leader has told us that a Government-commissioned study determined that over the next ten years energy expenditures as a percentage of Gross Territorial Product would increase to fifty percent from seventeen percent, unless there are major, rapid changes in our energy situation. Is it the Government Leader's intention to table this report in the House?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not certain that I am free to do so. However, I am quite prepared to take it under advisement, and also to table as much of that kind of information as I possibly can to the House.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Government Leader for his commitment.

In this same statement, the Government Leader, having pointed out that changes are needed quickly, also said, "...Solutions to energy problems and large-scale economic development take time." Since there is an apparent contradiction between these two positions, could the Government Leader clarify his position as to the urgency of this matter?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes. We find it to be a very, very urgent matter, and we are actively engaged in looking at alternate sources of energy for the Territory. We are not satisfied that even hydro-electricity should be the end-all source of energy in Yukon. We feel that there are alternatives that should be looked at.

Just so that everyone is aware of it, Yukon is an exporter of natural gas. There is not very much natural gas burned in this Territory. There is also the strong possibility that we will be able to get natural gas, not from our own gas fields, but rather from the Alaska Gas Pipeline, when it is constructed. So, these alternatives are being looked at. Pan Ocean Exploration, in the past two years, has uncovered some one billion tons of coal in the Eagle Plains area, in the central Yukon Territory. We are looking at various methods of using that kind of energy source.

Mr. Penikett: During the Government Leader's recent visit to Ottawa, I understand that Mr. Munro told him that "...The elements of a radical energy package for the North are finally coming together."

We assume that the Government of Yukon was, in some part, party to that planning process. I wonder if the Government Leader is intending to advise this House, at some time, exactly what recommendations we have submitted?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am not aware of the comments made by the Minister, that they are finally coming together. I hope they are.

As I indicated a number of days ago, we have made recommendations concerning NCPC, and what we feel should be done. Further to that, it is my intention to go to Ottawa and have a meeting with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to see just what stage that energy policy is at.

Question re: Salaries and benefits of YTG representatives in Ottawa

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Government Leader relating to the salary and benefits of the Yukon Government representatives in Ottawa.

Does the Yukon representative in Ottawa receive any additional benefits not generally available to government employees?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I believe, in fact I am certain, that the only additional benefit that Mr. Murphy receives is in housing. The additional benefit, specifically, is that his home here in Whitehorse is rented out at the going rate here in Whitehorse. Mr. Murphy is renting a house of an equal kind in Ottawa and we have undertaken, as a Government, to pay the difference in rent between the two, if that difference does exist. At the present time, I believe that it is a \$35 a month difference.

Mr. Veale: Taking into consideration the fact that the cost of food alone in Ottawa is substantially cheaper than it is in Whitehorse, does the Government Leader not agree that any increased cost to the Ottawa representative would be off-set by cheaper consumer prices in that city?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We looked very, very carefully at this, and I am afraid that I am going to have to question the propriety of this kind of question in the House, because we are actually questioning salaries and benefits to a specific employee, quite easily identified. We looked at everything — not only the cost of food, but also I might say, we looked at the cost of income tax, and we determined that it was fair and equitable for us to ask Mr. Murphy to go to Ottawa under our pay plan, and remain under our pay plan, with this one additional benefit, only. And that is the only one that does exist.

Mr. Veale: Considering that this concept, of what might be called by some a southern benefit, may have a detrimental effect on this Territory's seeking northern benefits for its citizens up here, is there not some way that the Government Leader can revoke that, or is it a contractual matter that is fixed and set?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have no intention of revoking it, because it does not have any effect on anything, other than the welfare and the well-being of one of our employees.

Question re: Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon

Mrs. McGuire: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Municipal Affairs.

A contract for the clearing and grubbing of the Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon was awarded to a contractor in August of 1981. The contractor was then notified that the actual starting date was postponed until some time in the spring.

I ask the Minister why \$2,000,000 was approved and allotted in the 1980-81 Capital Budget. I also ask the Minister why this project has not commenced.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: We had a debate the other day on this particular subject. I explained the other day that we had problems. We still have problems. I understand the contractor was told we would probably be doing it in the spring and the contractor, from the latest information that I have, has agreed. I perceive that in the spring we will probably go ahead with this project.

Mrs. McGuire: A written reason given from this Government was that the project monies from the federal government had not been approved. This was the reason given to the contractor. I ask the Minister to verify that this Government has in its possession the \$2,000,000.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I will take that under advisement.

Question re: Single parent training

Mr. Byblow: I have a question that I will direct to the Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources.

I understand that the Minister's department is planning a pilot project for single parents and people on social assistance who are interested in training prior to employment. I would like to ask the Minister whether her department has implemented that project yet.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, it is still in the planning stage.

Mr. Byblow: Could the Minister then advise me what type

of training is being offered, and how many people will be able to take advantage of it?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, not at this time.?

Mr. Byblow: Recognizing that the pilot project is still in the planning stage, I would like to ask the Minister whether she would consider having the project offered in communities outside Whitehorse, or at least offering travel and accommodation assistance to those people.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: It is very possible that we will do that.

Response to Previous Question — Bus safety and seat belts

Hon. Mrs. McCall: While I am on my feet I have an answer to the alarmed questions on school bus safety and seat belts asked by the Opposition. I would like to answer as thoroughly as possible, so that Opposition Members will not be any further agitated.

The subject of seat belts being installed in school buses has been examined through consultation with federal and provincial jurisdictions, including CSA, over the past few years.

Provincial jurisdictions have placed their confidence in the federal expertise, which is charged with the responsibility of regulating the standards relating to the safety that is manufactured into school buses.

The safety of school bus passengers has been the subject of a great deal of research over the past several years, with arguments for and against seat belts in school buses.

There has been an improvement in exits and in the padding of seats. It has also been established that quick evacuation of passengers after collisions is much more important to passenger safety than the doubtful safety provided by the use and installation of seat belts.

The following is an excerpt from a letter from the Ontario Minister of Education to the Borough of York on this subject:

"Recent research has indicated that the use of seat belts for passenger seats in school buses may or may not provide a net safety advantage. Those studying the problem believe that misuse or improper wearing of seat belts by children on school buses could cause serious injuries. It would also be difficult for a driver of a school bus to supervise adequately the use of seat belts."

The Yukon School Service Supervisor further states, "Seat belts are not used or recommended for the following reasons:

"School buses are manufactured according to standards set down by the federal government. There are no recommendations or regulations issued to date for a school bus design that would require the buses to be manufactured, which would make seat belts adaptable.

"During the 1978 calendar there were in excess of 2,400 school buses ordered and manufactured in Canada, none of which required seat belts.

Present designs of school buses cannot be equipped with seat belts which would improve passenger safety.

"There is doubt of net safety in the use of seat belts in school buses.

The imposition of a seat belt requirement in Yukon school buses would require special design and order, which would result in a substantial increase in cost, without any evidence that would support the use of them being a safety factor."

"I am confident that this Department provides school buses that meet all requirements with regard to passenger safety. I am also confident that should research by experts in the area of school bus safety prove further requirements necessary, we will meet these requirements, in the interest of student safety."

I trust that answers some of the questions of the Opposition.

Mr. Veale: I am sorry that the Minister did not provide us with a written copy of that. Did I hear the Minister say correctly that there is no evidence that seat belts will lead to additional or increased school bus safety?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, indeed, it did say that. This is school bus safety we are talking about, not seat belts in general.

Mr. Veale: The Minister quoted a letter from someone in municipal politics — I believe, in Ontario. Now is that the

evidence upon which the Minister is basing the decision that seat belts are not an additional safety factor?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: With respect, the Member opposite must not have been listening. The subject of seat belts being installed in school buses has been examined through consultation with federal and provincial jurisdictions, thoroughly, over the past few years.

Question re: Fair Practices Ordinance

Mr. Kimmerly: A question to the Minister of Justice.

As the *Fair Practice Ordinance* now stands, individuals are protected against discrimination in acquiring an apartment, and the terms of occupancy of the apartment, only if the building consists of more than six self-contained units. Is the Minister willing to amend the clause and to remove any reference to the number of units?

As the Member across the floor knows, we are, at this time, working on new human rights legislation, and all of this will be taken into account in the new Human Rights legislation. To be more specific, no, I am not prepared to open up the Ordinance and take that section out of it right now. I do not think that it is doing any harm, and it can certainly wait until the Human Rights Ordinance comes forward.

Mr. Kimmerly: When the Minister is considering the green paper, will he consider widening the scope of this clause, so as to include suites and rooms and townhouses and individual houses?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I have said on many occasions, we are willing to consider anything. We will look at all the aspects of it. The Member across the floor will have all the opportunity he wants to put his position before the Standing Committee.

Written question to Minister of Health and Human Resources

Mrs. McGuire: I just want to present at this time a written question to the Minister of Health and Human Resources.

Question re: Woodcutting permits

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

The Minister recently announced an experimental program which allows Whitehorse residents to buy woodcutting permits, providing the firewood will be used for domestic purposes. You might say that is good news for Yukoners facing high heating bills. Could the Government tell us what conditions he will require before expanding this program, which he has described as experimental?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, we consider this particular project an experimental project. I am very happy to say that we have found, by the number of people applying for it, that it is a step in the right direction.

We have been doing quite a lot of consultation and research, and we will be continuing it wherever we can.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Minister for his answer, even though he did not quite answer my question. I agree that the experiment is commendable, and he has indicated that there was a lot of demand for it. In the light of that demand, I would like to ask the Minister if, since the number of permits issued was limited to ten, he could indicate why so few permits were made available in this experiment?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes. On this particular project that we were doing, we felt that since there was a small amount of wood, ten people would be a logical number of people to allow to do it. I perceive that on bigger projects we would give more permits, but it would be ill-advised for the Government to put too many people into a small area like that, and we felt that ten was a reasonable number.

Mr. Penikett: Those who are successful in obtaining permits must cut the wood between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., which are hours of work for most people. Could the Minister explain why this time limit was imposed, and whether he will consider, after he has expanded this program, the allowing of this kind of woodcutting during weekends?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: When we consider similar projects, we will certainly look at the hours. There was a construction project going on there, and it was felt that we should have a little

bit of supervision. On other projects where we will not run into this problem, we certainly will consider extending those times, considering especially the people who would like to do it on the weekends.

Question re: Rabbit Foot Canyon

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister of Highways. I am sure the Minister is aware of the section of the Alaska Highway, between Porter Creek and downtown Whitehorse, known as Rabbit Foot Canyon. There are many people who have expressed the belief to me that there are a great many more accidents on that section of the Highway than on other sections. Has the Minister's Department ever examined that section of the road, to determine if the statistics bear that out?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, we are looking at that part of the Highway. It is true that there are quite a number of accidents there, but, as I say, the Department is looking into it. We have addressed this problem over the years, as I am sure the Member is quite aware, and we have placed quite a few lights there, as one method to improve the condition of the road. In that area, we are boxed in, because it is a canyon and we therefore cannot relocate the road.

I might also say, and I am sure the Member will agree with me, that this problem will be alleviated to a great extent by the foresight of this Government in providing the Porter Creek Access; when that road is opened, it will take a lot of the traffic off the Highway.

Question re: Lighting from Rabbit Foot Canyon to Kopper King

Mr. Veale: I recommend that anybody going to Porter Creek use the Porter Creek Alternate Access now.

I have a question for the Minister. He mentioned the lighting issue, and I have a great number of complaints from people about the fact that there is no lighting from the end of the canyon to the Kopper King. Will the Government be completing the lighting on that section of the road?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I am very glad to address the Member on that aspect. We have looked into that, but, while checking into the matter with the supplier of electricity, we found that the only poles available at this time are wooden poles; it has been proven, from a safety standpoint, that wooden poles are not a good type of pole there. We understand that other light standards will be available in the spring and, at that time, I am sure that we will act on it further.

Mr. Veale: I am sure that people will be pleased to know that lighting will be coming in the spring. There is also, at the present time, a very large bump or frost heave on that section of the road that is perilous, whether you are driving at a safe speed or not. It is a very perilous section. Will the Minister be repairing that section, or can it even be repaired before the winter really sets in?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: All I can say now is that I will have my Department look at it. I have not experienced any particularly outstanding bump, and I come in on that road every day, and I have done for the last twenty years. I go home the same way too, sometimes twice a day, but I will definitely have my Department look into it.

Question re: Addictions counsellor for Whitehorse Correctional Centre

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

I will preface the question with the observation that it is a known fact that a high percentage of prisoners at the Whitehorse Correctional Centre are convicted alcohol and drug offenders. I would like to ask the Minister if there are any plans for an addictions counsellor to work full-time at the Centre?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I cannot give you a definitive answer on that. That would be required through the Department of Health and Human Resources, and I cannot give you a definitive answer. Perhaps the Minister of Health and Human Resources could give it to you. If she cannot, I will bring the answer back to you.

Question re: Proclaiming present legislation on mandatory license suspension for convicted impaired drivers

Mr. Byblow: I take it that the question is being taken under advisement. My information indicates that the incidence of impaired driving in Yukon is three times the national average. Can the Minister indicate, at this time, whether his Government is considering proclaiming legislation, passed by a previous Legislature, which would require mandatory license suspension for convicted impaired drivers?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I can only reiterate that we are prepared to look at anything and, yes, we would be prepared to look at it. Whether we would bring it in is a different matter. We have grave doubts about that. There are very many dangers in bringing something like that in. We could even go further, I suppose, and do the same as they do in the Scandinavian countries where they give them an automatic two years in jail. Maybe that would help out.

Mr. Byblow: I would note to the Minister that the legislation is in effect; it is a matter, simply, of proclaiming it. However, as a small step to the solution for impaired drivers, would the Minister consider legislation towards mandatory alcohol treatment for impaired driving offenders who are put in jail?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think I will have to rule that question out of order. As I have stated before, questions seeking the opinion of Government are clearly out of order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker: At this point, we have now reached the end of the Question Period, and we will proceed to Orders of the Day.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion Number 18

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

Mr. Falle: Next sitting day.

Motion Number 23

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

Mr. Graham: I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, THAT this House deplores the principles contained in the gun control legislation proposed by the Honourable Warren Allmand in Bill 0451, which is before the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Graham: This motion may be somewhat premature, in that I understand Mr. Allmand has seen fit to change some sections in his Bill. However, I believe that the Bill, even in any amended form, should not even be brought before Parliament in Ottawa, let alone even be considered by that House.

A number of provisions contained in that new gun control Bill, known as 0451, are as follows: all retail sales of firearms to be handled through a new government agency only; compulsory registration of all firearms by serial number; possession of any firearm by police permit only; permit holders must file annual reports as to the use and condition of all firearms in their possession and, if the owner does not use any firearm or has not lawful need of it, the firearm becomes subject to confiscation; no firearm may be disposed of by sale, barter, gift or bequest; at the decease of the owner, all firearms in his possession must be turned in for immediate disposal and destruction by the police; rifles and shotguns will be classified as restricted weapons; permits will specify time, place and conditions of use.

Provisions such as that, contained in any bill, before any legislature in this country, as far as I am concerned, are very, very out of place. I urge all Members in this Legislature to support this Motion: to deplore the principles contained in this proposed Bill. I would further request that you send a message to Mr. Allmand in Ottawa, informing him of the decision of this Legislature.

Mr. Penikett: First of all, I want to say something about the principle of the Bill, and then I want to say something about the principle of the Motion.

I think that, coming from such a well-known and prominent Member of the Liberal Party, the former Minister of Northern Affairs, it is a great pity that so little affection and regard should be shown for our culture. I know that the Minister has, on a number of occasions, expressed his heartfelt concern for our futures, and our welfare, up in this part of the world. I know that he has, on a number of occasions, even parted company with his own Party with respect to the fate, and the status, and the situation of the most significant minority in Yukon, and, on many other occasions, he has expressed deep anxiety about the future of the majority of the people in the Northwest Territories.

I therefore find it strange that that Member of Parliament should, having expressed his concern and his love and his affection and his high regard for the people here, introduce in Parliament a Bill that does not recognize a certain fundamental cultural reality about this region, which is that in cultures that operate here, that survive here — and there is not one, there are several — guns are an important tool of these cultures. A little bit of anthropological realism being introduced into the Member of Parliament's education would have led him, it seems to me, to that conclusion.

There are a number of people who, from time to time, would suggest that great harm has been done to the North by people in Ottawa running around in their ivory towers, in their suits, with their briefcases, in and out of offices, in and out of taxi cabs, and back and forth between meetings, making plans for us. Consider if the world had been inverted, and all of a sudden, the capital of the universe was Whitehorse, and we had the power to legislate in such cultural matters. Say, we decided, as a matter of vital public interest, from our learned cultural experience, that people with briefcases were dangerous to our health, threatened our survival, that people with briefcases could do irreparable harm to our culture and our fragile civilization, such as in this case; that people with briefcases containing strange and powerful weapons — black marks on white pieces of paper, that have mysterious power over our lives, that can change our social arrangements, our economy and wreck havoc in this community — if we had the power, and then we were so insensitive, so disrespectful, so unkind, as to introduce into the world law-abiding briefcases, because they were dangerous to the health and safety of this community. I am sure that there are a few people down there, in the mysterious east, who would take deep exception to that principle.

Now, having made that light-hearted remark, I do not want to suggest that gun control is an entirely frivolous matter. But we have debated it before, and it is that previous debate that I want to refer to for a moment. This House, on another occasion, did have an opportunity to express itself on the principle of gun control. And it was an important principle to many people in this community, whose recreation and in some cases, whose livelihood, depends on the use of this tool.

And on that occasion when the House had an opportunity to express itself on the principle of gun control, namely when we debated the *Firearms Administration Ordinance*, we were told that we had to vote for it because it was worth \$50,000 for the Territory. That works out to about \$2 a head. Not, I would suggest, a very valuable principle. Most of my principles, I would suspect, and I have principles I have not even used yet, would go for a much, much higher price than that, I assure you. I want to say that, at the time we had previous opportunity to vote on that principle; my friend, my colleague, the Member for Faro, and I, and one other Honourable Member from a rural constituency — the Member for Campbell — were proud to stand and oppose the introduction of gun control in this Territory, and to oppose the assistance of this Government, this Government majority, in introducing it, imposing it, and administering it in the Territory. We voted against the principle at that time, and I want to tell you, now that the Government Members opposite have seen the light, and have once

again taken two positions on every issue, and after telling it both ways, that we are pleased to say that they are right the second time, and we will support this resolution.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think my own personal feelings, with respect to gun control, are very well known, however I cannot help but rise and respond a little bit to the Leader of the Opposition.

We were right the first time, too, because I am confident that everyone will recall that we had been told, in no uncertain terms, that if we did not administer this little piece of federal legislation, the "feds" were going to, and that they were prepared to have us — the Territorial Government — administer the legislation, and that they were prepared to pay us to do so. It was nothing but good sense, and reasonable sense, to do that at that time.

This is something entirely different, and I am quite disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition would take the opportunity to try to link the two, because this is something completely unreasonable. It is out of proportion to anything that is real in this country, and we should not even consider this kind of restrictive legislation at any time.

Mr. Njootli: I just want to put on record, too, that I would like to support the Motion. I am happy to hear that the Leader of the Opposition is going to support the Motion, also. I am not too familiar with the Bill that Mr. Allmand introduced. I am concerned with the details put forth by the Honourable Mr. Graham: that the possession of firearms would be only by police permit, and retail sales only by the Government. I am concerned because a lot of my constituents use firearms to a large extent. So, I would like to put on record that I will support this Motion.

Mr. Veale: While there are some issues that I would support Mr. Allmand on, such as aboriginal rights, I certainly would not support him on the principles as elicited by the Member for Porter Creek West. The gun control legislation, in the belief of the Yukon Liberal Party, should not proceed any further than it is right now, and we will support this Motion.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is with a great deal of pleasure that I stand up and speak about Yukon's old friend, Mr. Warren Allmand. Unlike the Member across the way, there are very few things that he and I agree on, if any, at any given time. I am one of the few Members in this House who speaks from experience, because I recall when he was the Minister of Indian Affairs, and when he came to address this House. In fact, it was in these Chambers.

I have never seen such a spectacle in my life, and such a terribly thought-out speech being put forward by a Minister of the Crown to the people of the Yukon Territory. It was totally derogatory, and it had no substance, other than the fact that no people in the Yukon should live here unless they could trace their ancestry back to the year 1700.

I have to rise, with respect to the comments that were made by the Leader of the Official Opposition. I should point out that, in his capacity as the president of the National Democratic Party — and I am going on memory — I believe that particular national Party did support some aspects of the gun control legislation being introduced into the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Penikett: We do not mind if the Member gets his facts wrong; we expect that to happen. I would, with respect, say that he ought to know by now that the name of the political party of which I am a member, and of which I am proud, at present, to be president, is the New Democratic Party, not the National Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I would ask for the cooperation of all Members. As they know, in this case there is absolutely no question of privilege, and it is an abuse of the Rules of the House to rise on questions of privilege, which should only be raised under the most urgent and pressing necessities. If Members would kindly refrain from doing this, I am sure that in debate they might have an opportunity to get their points across in other ways and manners, within the Rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I does not really matter to me what it is called. I have heard some people refer to it as the Non-Descript Party, but for what that is worth, one has to take it for what it is being said for. I just wanted to point out that he, as the president of the national party that he is so proud to represent, and the New Democratic Party did support, in large measure, the gun control legislation put forward. I should state further, that the situation of introduction was by the Government of Canada, and it was put forward to this Government, and was delayed for approximately one year prior to introduction into the House because we did not want to introduce it into the Yukon. As it turned out, we had no choice. As the Government Leader indicated, it made common sense that the Government of the Yukon Territory at least administer it, and attempt to administer fairly, rather than have the Government of Canada do it.

So, I would like to go on record, with respect to the Motion before me, that I do deplore the principles put forward by the previous Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Honourable Warren Allmand. Further to that, if people like this continue to get elected to office, and they are in the majority, it is the tip of the iceberg, and I would say Canada is in big trouble.

Mr. Falle: I seconded the Bill, so I am definitely going to support this Motion against the Bill.

About two and a half years ago, I stood in the House in a debate and was questioning the RCMP Budget. Maybe not knowing the ropes then, I suggested that we were in a police state. I now question where the mentality is in any politician who wants to disarm the people of a country. This Bill is clearly and plainly to disarm us. It is to take away the guns from responsible people.

I have always had guns; I have been trained with guns and they are a tool. A gun is definitely a tool. It is like a mechanic's tool, a welding wrench, or anything else. It is a tool that can do harm. A hammer can kill a person. A knife can stab a person. It is not the tool you try to control; it is the people. This clearly calls that gun a dangerous weapon. A knife is a dangerous weapon; a hammer is a dangerous weapon. Anything that you can hurt anybody else with is a dangerous weapon. I do believe that people who use guns should know a little about them — at least, which end the bullet comes out of.

I dislike the idea of any government's trying to take away weapons from people — we use them for protection; we use them for survival. I have heard people talk about not needing a gun: you use a camera, you do not shoot the animals. I know of some areas in the Yukon where I would like to set them down with a helicopter and a 35 millimeter camera, and come back in a week for them. The camera might be there, but they might have wished they had a gun.

It is a tool for protection. It is used for everything from hunting rabbits to prospecting, and I believe that the people in the Yukon really dread the idea of the principle behind this Bill.

Mr. Fleming: I rise to support the Bill with a few words, and maybe a few words of caution.

I think we in the Yukon Territory, and of course in the other Territories are unique. The fact is that we are so few, on millions of acres of land, and the fact is that we in many cases make part of our living with what is called, "this dangerous weapon." Of course, to me the weapon is not the dangerous thing; it is the people who handle it.

I think that we must remember, too, that in some big cities — the United States, especially — one single weapon can cause a lot of problems, and this is something that we should all remember. We are unique. We are not in those big cities. I think that they look at a gun in an entirely different way. In fact, thousands and thousands of them have never had a gun. They do not understand that the gun is not doing the damage that they read about in the paper every day, or see on television every day, so they have a little different outlook on the situation.

What we want to remember is that we can carry on. We are unique now. We can carry on that way. I think education in our schools is the start of taking care of gun control, rather than

taking guns away from everyone.

The one section that I really just cannot swallow at all is, "permit holders must file annual reports of the use and condition of firearms in their possession." For a person who does not use a firearm or has no lawful need of it, the firearm becomes subject to the government's just taking it away, without compensation.

At death, they plan to take everything: it could even possibly be a collection worth thousands and thousands of dollars. Many people have a collection that is worth thousands of dollars. There must be a better answer than that one, somewhere.

I just do not support the Motion in any way, shape, or form.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I rise in support of the Motion. I liked the Opposition Leader's referral to our being the centre of the universe, and outlawing the briefcase. I think all the Members of this House should also consider that there is probably more damage done to people, and more people harmed in this world every day, by the pen. Maybe we should outlaw the pen as well.

There was an article brought out by the National Firearms Association, just a few days ago, in regards to Ireland and Switzerland. Ireland has the most strict gun control laws in the world, and kids all over Ireland are running around with sub-machine guns, whereas Switzerland has the fewest controls on guns, and very little need of them. I think everybody in Canada today, and in North America, should take that into consideration. You do not stop the use of guns by outlawing the guns. You have to educate the people not to use them improperly.

I think that a bumper sticker that used to be put on the back of cars in the United States, when they were talking about gun control, says everything: "Outlaw guns and only outlaws will have guns," and that is exactly what would happen in Canada.

Motion agreed to

Motion Number 26

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

Mr. Graham: Yes, I am.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, THAT the Membership, as established by Motion 33 of the Second Session of the 24th Legislature, of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments be revised:

(1) by rescinding the appointment of the Honourable Mr. Tracey and by appointing Mr. Hanson to the said Committee, and

(2) by rescinding the appointment of Mr. Falle, and by appointment Mr. Kimmerly to the said Committee.

Mr. Graham: This Motion is quite simple. Mr. Tracey has, since his appointment to the Committee on Statutory Instruments, received the portfolio of Justice, which has the responsibility, in many cases, for writing the regulations to be sent to this Committee; and whereas we all have a great deal of trust in Mr. Tracey's fair-mindedness and abilities, we felt that it would be better if some independent person, such as Mr. Hanson, be made Chairman of the Committee.

Also, since Mr. Fleming has seen the light and agreed to join this side of the House, we felt that it would be better if we had one Opposition Member on the Committee. Consequently, we would like to see Mr. Kimmerly appointed to this Committee in place of Mr. Falle.

Motion agreed to

Motion Number 27

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

Mr. Graham: I am.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalingua, THAT the Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly be amended by:

(1) striking out the expression "Standing and Special" wherever it occurs in Standing Order 11;

(2) adding the following new Standing Order:

"12(3) A motion for concurrence in the report of a committee

standing on the Order Paper in the name of a private member may be called as government business if the Government Leader or his designate gives the House at least twenty-four hours' oral notice.";

(3) adding the expression "Unless otherwise provided for in these Standing Orders," at the beginning of Standing Order 22;

(4) striking out the expression "or a Special or Standing Committee" in Standing Order 23(1)(g);

(5) striking out the expression "Standing or Special" in Standing Order 30(1)(b);

(6) renumbering Standing Order 30(1)(g) as Standing Order 30(1)(h) and adding the following new paragraph:

"30(1)(g) for referring a bill to a Select Committee after First Reading;"

(7) adding the following new Standing Order:

"30(1.1) Two clear days' notice shall be given of a motion for concurrence in the report of any Select Committee.";

(8) adding the expression "excepting proposed amendments to a bill at the Select Committee report stage" at the end of Standing Order 30(2)(b);

(9) striking out the expression "Standing or Special" and the word "Standing" wherever they occur in Standing Order 46;

(10) adding the following new Standing Order:

"57(1.1) Notwithstanding Standing Order 57(1) a bill may be committed to a Select Committee after First Reading.";

(11) striking out Standing Order 58 and substituting for it the following new Standing Orders:

"58.(1) During formal proceedings in any committee of the House upon bills, the preamble and title are first postponed, and if the first clause contains only a short title, it is also postponed; then every other clause is considered by the committee in its proper order, the first clause (if it contains only the short title), the preamble and the title to be last considered.

(2) All amendments made in any committee shall be reported by the Chairman to the Assembly.

58.1(1) The consideration of the report stage of a bill from the Committee of the Whole shall be received and forthwith disposed of, without amendment or debate.

(2) A bill reported without amendment by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the Assembly.

(3) A bill reported with amendment by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole shall not be read a third time until the following sitting day or such other time after the following sitting day as may be appointed by the Assembly.

58.2(1) When the order for Third Reading of a bill is read a motion may be made to discharge the order and recommit the bill.

(2) When a bill has been read the third time and passed a motion may be made to rescind the Third Reading and passing and recommit the bill.";

(12) adding the new heading "Reports of Select Committees" and the following new Standing Orders:

"60.1(1) The report of a Select Committee on a bill which has received First Reading only shall be accepted by the Assembly, but may not be further proceeded with until such time as the bill has received Second Reading.

(2) Following the Second Reading of a bill previously reported from a Select Committee, notice of a motion for concurrence in the report of the Select Committee will be accepted.

(3) In cases under Standing Order 60.1(2) the Select Committee proceedings shall be deemed to have occurred after Second Reading.

60.2(1) A motion for concurrence in the report of a Select Committee must receive at least two clear days' notice.

(2) A motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill will be allowed during debate on a concurrence motion if written notice of such motion has been given to the Clerk prior to 5:00 p.m. on the sitting day before the concurrence motion is called.

(3) The Clerk will deliver a copy of the notices of motions received under Standing Order 60.2(2) to all members.

60.3(1) When the concurrence motion is called the Speaker shall first allow a general debate following the normal rules of the Assembly. If notice of amendments to the bill has been given, however, he shall postpone putting the main question until such amendments have been disposed of.

(2) Following the general debate on the concurrence motion any amendment to the bill of which notice has been given shall be open to debate and amendment.

(3) When debate is permitted, no member shall speak more than once or longer than twenty minutes during proceedings on any amendment.

(4) The Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments to be proposed.

(5) When a recorded division has been demanded on any amendment proposed, the Speaker may defer the calling in of the members for the purpose of recording the "yeas" and "nays" until any or all subsequent amendments proposed to the bill have been considered. A recorded division or divisions may be so deferred from sitting to sitting.

(6) An amendment, in relation to form only in a Government Bill, may be proposed by a Minister without notice, but debate thereon may not be extended to the provisions of the clause or clauses to be amended.

(7) When all proceedings on amendments have been completed the Speaker shall put the question on the concurrence motion forthwith.

(8) Where necessary, the Speaker is empowered to add the phrase "as amended" to the concurrence motion.

(9) When a bill has been amended during the proceedings of a Select Committee it shall not receive Third Reading on the same sitting day as the concurrence motion is dealt with by the House."

Mr. Graham: I do not believe that this Motion will warrant a great deal of debate, in the main, because the Members opposite and I have done a certain amount of negotiation, to come up with Standing Orders which would be acceptable to all Members of this Legislature.

The reason behind this change in the Standing Orders is, as everybody, I am sure, is aware, so that the Government may send bills, policy papers, green papers, and other legislation to Special Committees of the Legislature established for the sole purpose of considering that legislation, that green paper, or whatever else happens to be recommended to the Committee.

The Committee, in that sense, would then be able to get public input, if such input was required, and would also be able to meet in Committee at times when the House would not be in a position to meet.

In all areas of these Standing Orders, we are attempting to be flexible in order to facilitate the smooth movement of the legislation, or of the green papers, through the Committee system. None of the Standing Orders are cast in stone, and from time to time, if we find there are changes necessary, we will be only too happy to make them, if it would facilitate a smoother movement of legislation.

Mr. Fleming: On the Motion itself, you will notice that under 60.3(4) it says "The Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments to be proposed," and I would move at this time, by myself, and seconded by the Member for Whitehorse South Centre, that Motion 27 be amended by striking out the full Standing Order 60.3(4) and substituting for it the following:

"The order in which amendments are to be selected may be determined by the House Leaders. In the absence of direction from the House Leaders, the Speaker shall have the power to select the amendments to be proposed."

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Campbell, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, THAT Motion 27 be amended by striking out the proposed Standing Order 60.3(4) and substituting for it the following:

"The order in which amendments are to be selected may be determined by the House Leaders, but in the absence of direction from the House Leaders, the Speaker shall have the power

to select the amendments to be proposed."

Mr. Fleming: I think the amendment speaks for itself. Before, it was merely the Speaker, and now they can get together, and everyone has a little say.

Mr. Penikett: I think it is worth pointing out, for the record, that the concern on the amendment was simply that, in other legislatures, there is what you call "the stacking of votes", and from time to time, the stacking of votes could have the effect of forcing Members to vote for two amendments, one of which they support and the other one which they do not. That could be a problem. In fact, the most famous case that I recall in the House of Commons was the case of the gun control bill. Some Members wanted to vote against wire-tapping and for gun control, or vice versa, and they could not, because the two were voted together.

It seems to me that, in a Legislature of this size, without the kind of pressing demand of business that they may have elsewhere, this is the most sensible arrangement, as proposed in the amendment, and we support it entirely.

Amendment to Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared for the question on the Motion as amended?

Motion agreed to

Motion Number 28

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

Mr. Graham: I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, THAT a Select Committee of the Legislature be established;

THAT the Honourable Member Mr. Hanson be Chairman of the Committee;

THAT the remaining four members of the Committee be set by separate motion of this House on each occasion that a matter is referred to the Committee;

THAT the powers of the Committee be specified on each occasion that a motion is referred to the Committee; and

THAT the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly be responsible for providing the necessary support services to the Committee.

Mr. Graham: This Motion simply follows in line with the previous Motion: that of the change in the Standing Orders, giving the capability to establish the Select Committee.

What we would like to see is a permanent chairman appointed: Mr. Hanson; and that the remaining four members of the committee be totally flexible, in that the Government would appoint two members, the NDP would appoint one, and the Liberals would appoint one, to each committee, as bills are referred to the Select Committee for their perusal.

We also see each bill, or each piece of legislation, being submitted to the Committee as a separate item, and therefore requiring separate specific instructions for the Committee to follow, during their perusal of that bill. We can see that time limits may have to be set, from time to time, and also that the Committee may also have to do some travel in the Territory to gain the public input that we wish to see on these bills.

Mr. Penikett: I rise in support of the Motion.

I just want to briefly say that, as all Members will know, it arises out of the Report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges that we debated in the last sitting. Some of us had hoped that there might be two Select Committees, which could sit simultaneously and divide the work, but the obvious has been pointed out to me — that there is a finite number of members in the House and that we are probably reaching the practical limit for the work. Maybe, one day we could have two Committees sitting side by side.

I want to congratulate the Member for Mayo on his nomination, and I wish him well in the chair. I am sure the Member for Porter Creek West will be glad that he has not got the job, because he was dangerously close to creating the widespread public impression that he was chairman of everything around here. He will be glad to be an active participant, rather than just a judicial figure.

The Select Committee proposal, as I had something to do with its germination, will, I think, be an important new experience for this House. I think it has a number of very interesting possibilities. I do not doubt there will be some difficulties in working out its procedures and its practices, but I am sure, with the wise counsel and assistance of the Table and the other officers of this House, it will get by.

Mr. Njoodi: I would like to say that in establishing a Select Committee for the first time in the history of the Yukon Legislature, we followed the recommendations put forward. I think that the Select Committees will be working well for all Yukoners.

I have often wondered about some legislation, where it affects, in particular, my constituents, and wished that they were able to participate in its development. I think this Select Committee will give that opportunity to those people to appear, and to get first-hand information in regards to some legislation.

I am really happy that the Government has come forward with this particular Motion. I will be voting for it.

Mr. Veale: We certainly support the concept of the Select Committee which is now being introduced. I believe that it will provide two things. Specifically, it will allow individual Members to develop expertise in certain areas where they might not be able to develop under the Committee of the Whole system. Secondly, I think it will have the additional benefit of allowing public attention to be focused on specific pieces of legislation in their entirety, in a way that will be of additional benefit, I believe.

It occurs to me so often that we sit in the Committee of the Whole and debate legislation, and ask questions and so on, and the public sometimes is not really aware of what is transpiring. I believe that the Select Committee system may, in fact, improve public awareness, and also public involvement in the legislative process, through the witness system. I look forward to it.

Mr. Falle: I would like to support this Motion. This Government, in one more step, is proving itself to be an open government. It is looking for public participation and I see no better way to get it.

Motion agreed to

Motion Number 29

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

Mr. Graham: I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, THAT the Government of Yukon investigate the possibility of transferring to the municipalities in the Territory the responsibility for developing residential and commercial properties within municipal boundaries and that, in doing this investigation, the Government give consideration to supplying funds to the municipalities for this land development at a negotiated interest rate.

Mr. Graham: I suppose this will be more of a philosophical debate than anything, because a number of times during the life of legislation we have heard that governments should be closer to the people, decisions should be made by the political people closest to the electorate, and various other things such as this. This Motion came about simply as a result of a discussion with a couple of municipal politicians. I should also point out that it in no way represents Government policy, at least Government policy to date, that I know of. Motion Number 29 came about simply as a result of asking another Member of the backbench to go with me, so we could have a discussion, and perhaps at some time we can convince the Government that it is a good idea. I believe that, in the cases of municipalities, municipal politicians and administrations should, in theory at least, know the needs and the requirements of their municipalities better than any Territorial Government official or politician ever could. Even with unlimited interaction between the Territorial politician and the city Administration and politicians, I still believe you are missing that important element of the city politicians being able to decide, on their own, what they

require in the area of land development for their community.

I realize, and the second part of my Motion takes this into consideration, that municipalities do not have the tremendous number of dollars that are required, in most instances, to develop land. Consequently, what I would like to see this Government do is provide funding, at a reasonable interest rate. I realize that the Territorial Government cannot provide money interest free, or at an interest rate much below that that they already borrow at, but at a reasonable interest rate. I would like to see the Territorial Government lend money to the municipalities, to develop the land that they require.

In this matter, the municipalities could make the decision as to whether or not they want a huge land bank, a huge number of developed lots available for citizens in their area, or whether they wish to allow private enterprise, instead of the city or Territorial Government, to actually develop the land. It is a possibility that has never before been available to municipalities in the Territory.

All in all, from the point of planning, from the points of knowing what the citizens should want, and just generally, of transferring the responsibility for decision-making closer to the people that decision making affects, I think that the Motion is a good one. I am not asking the Government to do anything except investigate the possibility. Perhaps we can depend on the Minister of Municipal Affairs to, at some time, give a statement to this Legislature, as a result of the investigation he is doing. Perhaps he has done an investigation, in the two days that this Motion has been on the Order Paper. I guess we will see that when he gets up to give us his comments.

Mr. Penikett: As I was listening to the Member opposite, the words of the old hymn, "Nearer My God to Thee," were drifting through my brain. I had heard rumors that the Member for Porter Creek West was seriously considering running for Mayor in this fall's municipal election, but until now, I had not expected him to be making a statement of his intentions. The rumour, in case he is interested, has declared that he and Mr. Willis, president of the Conservative Party, are running on the platform together. I will say that, now that the truth is out about his municipal ambitions, I may make him eat a few words he said with respect to my situation three or four years ago, but we will deal with that later.

I will say that this is a fascinating Motion. I do not know what municipal politician he was talking to, but I am sure AYC will be very interested, probably taking notes. It is interesting, for other reasons: two matters of high principle — land and money. Right now, the land that is being suggested might be adopted by the municipalities is presumably that land within the municipalities and owned by the Territory. In fact, the 361 square miles that the Territory has is all in municipalities.

If the Member is seriously contemplating turning over this land to the municipalities and L.I.D.s, I assume that they might welcome this gift. I seem to recall something about beware of Grahams bearing gifts.

I wonder why is he being so nice to us.

Now on the other matter of the high principle of money, if we are going to give the land, and money, it is a very interesting proposition. Even then, though, with respect, there might be a serious problem. I think that there are not very many municipalities, if we were perfectly frank, that would have the capability to develop land the way the Yukon Territorial Government has. In fact someone in municipal government recently said to me that he doubted that the Yukon Territorial Government, at the time of developing the Hillcrest subdivision, was really in a position, in terms of staffing and experience, to be able to do the job.

I think that there is a certain kind of expertise and staff and ability and human resources and money needed. The difficulties are that making market assessments, and so forth, in land development, is not easy.

The Member is quite right. The municipalities are closer to the people. I think that they should probably have a lot more to say about what land developments go ahead, and I think that

experienced municipal politicians would have a much better idea of what land they could put on the market, what land they could afford to service, and the kind of services they want to provide, and the way in which they want their communities to develop. That is one of the more commendable trends in the municipal legislation that is appearing in the Government.

However, the Motion does suggest that the Yukon Government investigate this possibility. I guess that we are in favour of the Government's investigating this possibility. I cannot be opposed to that.

I want to say that we look forward with eager anticipation to the results of the investigation, because — if what the Member of Whitehorse Porter Creek is proposing is something known among poker players as the quick shuffle, namely, that the land development is not going to go to the municipalities, but it is going to go to speculators, private developers.

If that is the implied intent, then I feel that we might have a reason to have a fairly long discussion about that proposal. As the motion says, we really cannot do that until we see the results of the investigation.

I look forward to seeing the results of the investigation, perhaps sometime in 1982, or 1983, or 1984. Then, we shall have a very fine debate, I am sure, on this important subject.

Mr. Veale: I think I can categorically state that one of the finest things done by both this Government and the one that preceded it, has been making available to Yukoners residential and commercial land at a very reasonable price. I think that is a very tremendous thing, especially if one compares the price of a piece of residential land anywhere else in this country. To actually go out and buy a piece of serviced land, we are probably getting a substantial benefit over many other areas of this country, and that is certainly something that we do not want to, in any way, sacrifice or lose.

I could not disagree with a motion asking for an investigation into a possibility, but it is very important that we consider why we have some of the cheapest residential and commercial land in Canada at the present time. Some of the arguments are that the Government now has that expertise and ability to develop the land, and that what may be required is greater consultation with municipalities, which may be the result of the investigation that, no doubt, the Minister will make, to ensure that land actually stays at the same good price that it is, and also that the principle of local control is given full recognition.

The best part of the Motion is the principle of local control. I do not think anyone would speak against that principle. It is extremely important that each community have a very large say in when, where, and how commercial and residential lots are developed, within the municipal boundaries.

The other aspect about local control is that there is no question that the development of residential and commercial land has also been a sort of political hot potato. No doubt the Government feels that sometimes they are unjustly criticized for the method of distribution, or that there are too many lots, or whatever.

It is attractive to think of each municipality's actually setting the parameters of its own land distribution, because that takes the heat off the Government; there is no question about that. It also provides the citizen in that community with a more direct access to the officials who have made the decision. To that extent, if they have elections every two years, instead of every four years, they may feel that they have more accountability than they have when this Government makes the same decision in that community.

It is hard to criticize a principle of that nature; however, there are very, very serious problems in terms of the overall Yukon, and Canada-wide economic trends. Those development trends are not necessarily subjects that are widely known in each municipality. What I am essentially saying is that, if we take the pipeline as an example, a small community might, in anticipation of a pipeline, bring a tremendous number of lots on-stream, far more than the municipality has the ability to carry if those lots do not sell and the pipeline simply does not come.

That is another indication of the advantage that the Government of Yukon has, that a municipality does not. We have the ERPU unit, which is always checking on information and employment trends and development trends, and that information, of course, could certainly be made available to communities. Nevertheless, the Government of Yukon is in the best position to determine when decisions should be made to bring large numbers of residential and commercial lots onto the market.

I would hope that, in his deliberation on this, the Minister involved will do a great deal of consultation to ensure that municipalities across Yukon, and the Association of Yukon Communities, have a great deal of input to it. I do not feel it would be something that the Government would like to rush into very quickly, and, perhaps, it is something that should be negotiated very carefully. It does not resolve all the problems. If a community decides it wants to make land available, and if the Government says there is no money available to do that, because we gave it all to another community, the same political problems, and the same political heat on the Government, will still arise. So, it is not the be-all and the end-all to the difficulties that we so often encounter in land distribution in Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I felt that since we were discussing what I consider to be a very important Motion, that probably I should give you a few outlines of what we have done, and what we feel about it.

It is the Government's view, and I think it is shared by most local officials, that land development programs must attempt to provide a variety of lots, to meet the diversified needs of all Yukoners.

This Government has been involved in the development of serviced residential, country residential, serviced industrial, and dry industrial and commercial lots in many communities. We are now extending our efforts, in order to meet perceived needs for rural residential, recreational, and agricultural lands. In addition, where particular land is required, we have co-operated, and will continue to co-operate, with local governments in calling for and evaluating proposals for development of a specific nature.

I feel that is a very worthwhile process. I think it shows that we believe that the people in the local jurisdictions should have a great input in how they want land developed in their areas.

The land development program is a large program, requiring the co-ordination of legal surveys, planning, engineering, contracts, and construction. It requires, in many cases, the co-operation of the Federal Government in providing for land development. It also requires careful financial control and accounting, and fair distribution of developing costs among lots, and, finally, a fair and equitable sale procedure.

Land development is a complex task and I am pleased to say that this Government has done a very creditable job to date.

I would like to focus, for a moment, on one of the key elements of the land development process, and that is the role of local government, and the co-operation we have enjoyed with local governments over the last several years.

The very important role that local governments play is in determining how and where their communities should develop. Through the community planning process, local governments decide where residential or industrial subdivisions should be. It is only after the land is identified for development, and where demand warrants it, that we get involved in the development process.

Once the process begins, I want to assure you that the community is consulted; their advice and views are sought every step of the way, including the general timing of the sale. This Government does believe, however, that, where possible, local governments should be more involved. They should assume the lead role and responsibility for the planning, management, and development of community lands.

I believe it is possible now, under existing legislation. It is abundantly clear, however, under the new *Municipal Ordinance*, now scheduled for implementation next year, that local

governments can assume this major responsibility, and I have no doubt that the complex task will be carried out with a high degree of professionalism by the local governments, which we are interested in seeing assuming their responsibilities.

I would like to indicate that we are moving in that direction now. In Faro, for example, the town has assumed the lead role in the planning and engineering of a new serviced commercial, medium density residential and mobile home area. We are presently discussing with local officials the management of a construction program with funds provided by the Yukon Government.

Similarly, as early as 1976, we have suggested the take-over of this responsibility by the City of Whitehorse. In recent weeks, we have suggested the City assume the lead role in the development of new country residential subdivisions. We think that would be an appropriate development to start with. It is, after all, the City which must identify the land to be developed as, under the present arrangement, it is this Government which experiences the pressure for the development of land in this class of property. I think the land development process would be more responsive to local demands if it was to be allowed at the local level.

We have offered, and would be amenable to, the turning over of the task of selling our inventory of lots to the City. This would eliminate the problem currently experienced with our overlapping jurisdictional responsibility. I should point out that not all communities have expertise, or interest, in assuming this responsibility, but where this exists, we will continue our efforts to ensure this is a local responsibility.

On the question of financial arrangements, I wish to remind the House that the land development program operates on a cost-recovery basis, and fortunately we enjoy a preferred interest rate from the Federal Government. This program should continue to operate on this basis, regardless of who operates it.

One of the ways in which we could play an important role in assisting the local governments is by extending our present loan funding arrangement with the Federal Treasury Board, to include funding for local land and development projects. I believe this is a logical route to follow, and we will be exploring it, as communities assume this important responsibility.

Finally, I would like to indicate that this Government believes that the responsibility for management of community lands should be primarily a local responsibility. I have already indicated that the local government clearly has the responsibility for planning and zoning. The logical extension of this would be the actual land management function.

In conclusion, I think that planning, management, and development should be locally controlled wherever possible. To date, it has been a co-operative effort between this Government and the various local governments, as we are amenable to, and very interested in discussing, the negotiating of the transfer of even more responsibilities to the local level. This is consistent with the philosophy of this Government and with our efforts to encourage and foster local decision-making.

In conclusion, I have to support the Motion.

Motion agreed to

Motion Number 30

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item 7?

Mr. Falle: I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, THAT the Government of Yukon consider utilizing the publication "Yukon Info" to advertise, on a monthly basis, all current Government of Yukon job opportunities as well as upcoming Invitations to Tender for Government of Yukon Public Works projects.

Mr. Falle: I believe that the motion pretty well speaks for itself. We have a good information sheet, which a lot of people in Yukon are reading. I think it is only good business practice on behalf of this Government, and a good service to the community and to the people that it serves, to give them the in-

formation that I believe is very interesting to them. When it comes to jobs and contracts, anybody that is reading what the Government is doing would like to know what we have available.

I would like to see just another insert into this *Info*, with the Government contracts, the upcoming tenders, and the availability of any jobs. I cannot say too much more about it; that is my position on it.

Mr. Penikett: I have been dying to talk about this.

I have been kind of wondering what the Government has been doing, in terms of its media strategy. We have heard stories about public speaking courses, and so forth, though there has been no evidence of them taking place yet, at least not in this House. However, we heard that there were some, and everything was going to be new and hunky-dory, and that there would be a new era in media and community relations.

I do not know, but it seems to me that this Government is just trying to get the media mad at it. I mean, what have they done recently? They have started Yukon Information. Even if it were effective, it is a gratuitous insult to the media because it suggests that somehow the one newspaper that is already printing all the press releases is not printing all the press releases, or is somehow suggesting to that newspaper, a fine, old upstanding Yukon small business, that nobody is reading it.

Some Member: inaudible

Mr. Penikett: No, the Government Leader is not reading the *Whitehorse Star*, I am talking about the *Yukon News*. Maybe he is not reading either newspaper; in which case, he is going to be suffering sadly for lack of information, because he ain't going to get it by reading "Yukon Information".

That will be too little, too late, in terms of running the Government.

What is next in the things they have done? They have also started the *Yukon Gazette*, another publication, and now a Government Member is proposing to take the advertising revenue. Now that is a cruel blow.

How are these good Yukon small businesses, the *Yukon News*, the *Whitehorse Star*, the *Faro Raven*, and C.K.R.W. to survive, if they are going to be denied or are going to have to share in the split: the tiny trickle of advertising dollars that flows from the advertisement of the many, many, many jobs available in Yukon Government — not that there are so many jobs, but the turnover is still so high that there are a lot of ads, as well as the Invitations for Tender, and there will be a lot more of those as a result of the new Budget.

As I understand it, small businesses have a tough time now, what with interest rates and everything else. They need every advertising dollar they can get. If the Government of Yukon is going to take this money away from these small businesses, why, that is just awful.

It seems to me that the Government of Yukon is being mean to the media in the Territory. Now, they cannot be mean to C.B.C. because they do not have any advertising; at least, what advertising they have is free.

Mr. Graham: inaudible

The Member for Porter Creek West is complaining about the money he pays for his C.B.C. every month. I believe, if he were capable of doing the calculations, he would find that the number of cents the C.B.C. costs him every year is much less than the cost of the pirate radio station, which he pays for by the added-on cost of the cost of advertising of this station, which is added on to the price of products.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Nothing is free.

Mr. Penikett: The Member for Porter Creek East has added the profundity that "nothing is free". Believe me, the best things in life are free. Love, charity, respect for one's friends, his reputation, the society in which one lives, the history of the community, are all free. There are many, many good things in life that are free, and the best things in life are free. I just have the earnest hope that one day the Member for Porter Creek East may discover some of these wonderful and free things.

The proposal before us is one that really surprises me, com-

ing from the Member for Hootalinqua, because it really does sound a bit pink to me, suspiciously pink. Now, perhaps according to the new law of conversions, the Conservative Party is trying to move more to the centre.

I suspect that is not the case. It is clearly not the trend among the Conservative Parties today. We have heard the offerings from the Member for Porter Creek East, recently, and there is clearly no indication of any progressive thought there whatsoever.

What we have, it seems to me, is, purely and simple, a gratuitous attack upon the media of this town: small businesses, operated by Yukoners who are working hard to serve their community; struggling away to provide a service to the community and meet a payroll and earn enough money to pay their income taxes and their taxes to this government.

It seems to me that we are wasting a lot of money on this *Yukon Info*. It is, I think, a totally unnecessary and rather wasteful expenditure in the first place. What we are doing if we adopt this Motion is adding insult to injury, because what is being proposed is that, in addition to the waste, we are now proposing to dilute the advertising revenues available to the small businesses in this community, by giving them to a Government publication, and thereby reducing the amount of revenue that should properly be received by the small business community in this town.

Mr. Veale: On the face of it, the Motion appears to have some good points about it, except that one would have to assume that the present advertising of jobs and the present advertising of tenders was somehow ineffective.

One would also assume that the Motion would not really arise unless the Member had had some representation that there has been a problem in that regard. I did not hear that, but maybe we will when he speaks to the Motion at the end.

I have not heard, in this community, any complaints, except the complaint that sometimes the Government has not actually advertised for its jobs in the local newspaper and has simply done it Outside. Although I do not believe that occurs very often, it has occurred, and people have complained about that, and rightfully so.

There is no question that there is a bit of a war now between one newspaper, which I note does not actually carry *Yukon Info* inside the paper as the other local newspaper does — but there is a bit of war on about whether the media is being fair and so on, and that may be. There is always that kind of discussion in a small community, about whether a medium is being fair, or whether a particular medium is doing the job adequately, or whether it is being non-partisan.

A few years ago, it was exactly the opposite. I expect that Members on this side were complaining about the *Whitehorse Star*, for one reason or another, and Members on the other side were quite happy with it.

It is only in the last few years that that change has actually taken place.

However, what we are seeing in this motion is the foot in the door. The foot in the door is going to be, ultimately, the Government newspaper, and not only will the Government newspaper be able to compete with the local newspapers, but, eventually, the local newspapers may have a great deal of difficulty in surviving.

One of the most severe problems that the local media has now, is in actually hiring people and having enough staff to do the media coverage that is so required in this Territory. For example, there is a long stretch of period of some seven months between Sessions of this Assembly, and between Sessions of this Assembly, it is only the media that are actually providing that watchdog assessment. There is no other forum except the media, to have that assessment of this Government.

I think that it would be very unfortunate to reduce in any way the ability of the local media to actually perform that job. I think that it is very important — in fact, the Government should really be considering methods of strengthening the local media in some ways.

All we are seeing lately are attempts to suggest that the

media are not doing things right, and that Government knows best and Government can do it best.

I would think that the Members opposite, particularly on the upper level, would have some difficulty in supporting this Motion, because the Motion really means more government. We do not like what someone is doing in the private sector, well, let us have more government.

It is a difficult philosophical leap for Members to make. I am sure that most of them will overcome their difficulties. It is a very strong issue.

I would like to have the Government tell us how much money is injected into the private sector through these advertisements. How much money is injected into the private sector? What does it mean when that money is taken out of the private sector?

Mr. Graham: Cut it off at the neck.

Mr. Veale: That is right. That is exactly what it means. The signal from the Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West was, cut off at the neck. I think that is precisely what is going to happen.

Mr. Veale: No, it is a dangerous trend for the Government to proceed with *Yukon Info*, in any event. The next step will be a motion saying perhaps Government Ministers could have their photographs there, because they are not well known enough; if they had their photographs in there, people would get to know them and recognize them on the street, be able to avoid them on the street, perhaps.

It is all going to build up, and eventually we are going to have this clever little newspaper that comes out once a month, and it is all we really need. God help us if it becomes a daily.

Nevertheless, we will be opposing this Motion because it is an expansion of *Yukon Info*, which basically has some very serious flaws that are probably going to rise their heads every month if that publication comes out.

I would hope that the Government would very seriously consider whether it would have any interest whatsoever in following through with this Motion from the Member for Hootalinqua. There is an election coming and we would not want citizens to think that this Government was somehow preparing the way for its re-election. We would like to think that everybody is going to have an equal opportunity, and we are all going to be out there hustling and that there will not be any advantages to the Government's side, on Yukon taxpayers' money, to get re-elected. I wonder if that is what is really happening.

Some Member: inaudible

Mr. Veale: Well, I hope that we do not see his name in that publication.

Mr. Fleming: I am going to rise in support of the Motion.

I am appalled at the Honourable Members opposite. I know some of them are sort of new in the House, but, in the seven years that I have been here, and I have been on that side of the House a good length of that time, we have, myself and the Members opposite that were with me, always been saying that the Government does not inform the people of what is going on in this Territory. They do not inform them of this, they do not inform them of that. My goodness!

As far as the Honourable Member worrying about the Party and the election, I would just remind the Honourable Member right now that I think he has lost a lot of votes in my Territory, I am sure, from the little speech this morning.

The newspaper is something that we all appreciate, and I think that maybe there is not quite enough information put in there. But, all the Government work that is supposedly put in a newspaper and is demanded by law to be put in there for contracts, it will still be there. I cannot see this Motion changing that; it may just add a bit of information, more or less.

I myself, from out in the country where we do not get a lot of information, and a lot of my constituents, we are going to be very happy that we do find out a few things. This might not be exactly the answer to everything we want but I say this, that it is a start: to try to do something that the people have asked for for many years in this Territory.

The Honourable Member probably does not know when we get the paper, probably does not even know if we really do get the paper — although I think he is wise to the fact that we do get the one paper once in a while — that we are not all watching TV or radio or whatever, from wherever all these things may come.

I do not think there is too much wrong with the Motion, and I like to believe in the fact that something should be tried to inform the people a little more. Let us make one try; it might not work in the long run, but if you do not try it, you will never know.

Mr. Graham: I cannot believe some of the comments I have heard come from the opposition, about how we are going to kill the businesses, the poor little newspapers; how we are going to do them irreparable harm; how we are going to take all these advertising dollars away.

If you read the Motion, it says "THAT the Government of Yukon consider utilizing the publication to advertise, on a monthly basis, all current Government of Yukon job opportunities, as well as Invitations to Tender for Government Public Works projects." Nowhere in that Motion did it say, "Take all the advertising away from the newspapers or the radio station." Nowhere in that Motion does it say "Let's go out and get the *Whitehorse Star*." It is all a figment of some fertile imaginations in the Opposition. Of course, they are known for that — all dreamers and no body of action over there, but we have come to expect that.

When Mr. Falle explained to me what he would like to move in this Motion, I seconded his Motion. I thought that it was a very reasonable thing that he was asking. He was saying that there are a lot of people who live outside of the City of Whitehorse that do not get the information which would be contained in this separate sheet we are proposing to go along with the *Yukon Info* pamphlet. They do not get information, and this is one method of getting that information to those people. I saw no harm in it; of course, I do not see boogie men behind every bush, as some of the opposition Members obviously do.

I did not have a great deal of problem with the Government Cabinet's taking a look at the possibility and seeing whether it is cost-effective. Maybe they do not want to do it, for some reason that they will probably explain to us later, but I think that we should at least give them the ability to take a look and see if there are some good points to the Motion made by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua. I think that he had, at heart, some very good intentions. I think that for that, if for no other reason, I support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Seeing that I am the Minister who has to investigate it, I do not have any problem investigating it at all. It might be a good idea.

I am sure that the scare tactics used by the Members across the floor are going to be well recognized by the public in the Territory, anyway. They are constantly haranguing about local hire, and local contractors, and then, when a Member from this side puts an idea on the floor that perhaps we should get the information out to these local people so that they do know what is going on, the Members say that the Government is using it for propaganda and that we are going to put the opposition newspapers out of business.

As the Member here just stated, I do not see anywhere in this Motion where it says that we are going to put advertising in either one of the papers, or on television, or anywhere else. All it says is that, as well as doing that, we will, perhaps, insert the information in the *Yukon Info*, so that people who do not happen to read the newspaper, or who missed the edition, or the daily that it is in, will have it at least once a month. They will have a record of the jobs and contracts that were available.

Personally, I do not see anything wrong with the idea. It might be costly; that is the only thing that I would look at, really: whether it is too expensive for us to proceed with.

Mr. Njootti: I would like to support the Motion, on the basis that the Government is always close to the people. Jobs could

be made available to people in Haines Junction, for instance, or in Faro; people might be interested in Government jobs. I have a copy of it here. There is lots of good information in it which the Old Crow people do not know about. It says \$18,600 goes for a Women's Transition Home; how many people in Old Crow know that?

I think that because the Government's policy is to be as close to Yukoners as possible; I think we should put an extra page in there. I would suppose that it would cost about the same amount of money as to prepare one of our order papers here every day. I do not think the cost factor should be considered.

I strongly support the Motion.

Mr. Kimmerly: I wish to speak, albeit briefly, on this particular Motion. It is a fascinating Motion, in that it is my belief that, if there were to be a Government publication, these are precisely the things that ought to go in it: job opportunities and public works tenders.

It is fascinating that a Government publication exists and that these things are not in it, and it is incumbent on a Government back-bencher to bring a Motion such as this. It exposes *Yukon Info* for exactly what it is: a political advertising.

Because of the principle of the Government publication, which Members opposite have criticized federal Liberals for, and on which the Federal Member of Parliament for Yukon has spoken extremely forcefully — this principle of government entering the advertising field — it is because of that principle, and only because of that, that I am going to oppose this Motion.

Mr. Falle: I would like to emphasize that I would like to see a sheet in this paper, strictly just an additional sheet, not part of the *Yukon Info*.

We have been criticized, as a Government, that we are not getting the information out, that we are not telling the people what we are doing. The other day I heard in the House a beautiful speech from Mrs. McCall, the Minister of Human Resources, on what we are doing. I do not think that there is any Member on the other side of the House who realized what we are doing. They heard in her speech what they are doing.

I know the people on the street do not know what we are doing, and it is not because we are not trying; it is not because we are not socially conscious; and it is definitely not because we are "pinko", I can assure you of that.

By no means am I suggesting in my Motion here that we are going to take any advertising away from the paper; no way. This is definitely a duplication. I am not saying it is nothing, but it is to get the people to be able to see the jobs that are available. I have had many constituents tell me we are not advertising the jobs: where are the jobs? This is a means whereby the Government has a listing of the jobs that are available. Anybody who is interested in working for the Government, or looking for a contract, here is a concentrated little sheet with everything in it.

Now, in the paper, they are scattered from one end of it to the other, most of the time. They are sometimes in a block, or a little here and a little there. You have to concentrate on reading that paper, and you do miss jobs, you do miss contracts. Well, hopefully, this is going to be just an addendum, and a help to the public. That is all I intended it to be and I definitely did not intend, at any time, to take any advertising from the papers. I could see this would be an economical way for the Government to put their point across, and to be able to give the public more information on things that they are very interested in.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called. Mr. Clerk, as it appears that all Members are here in the House, would you kindly poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yea.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yea.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yea.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yea.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yea.

Mr. Njootli: Yea.

Mr. Falle: Yea.

Mr. Hanson: Yea.

Mr. Graham: Yea.

Mr. Fleming: Yea.

Mr. Penikett: Nay.

Mr. Byblow: Nay.

Mr. Kimmerly: Nay.

Mr. Veale: Nay.

Mrs. McGuire: Nay.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are ten "yea", five "nay."

Motion agreed to

Motion Number 25

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to proceed with Item 8?

Mr. Penikett: With the consent of my seconder, I would request unanimous consent to withdraw the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have unanimous consent to withdraw Item 8?

Agreed

Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders.

On Bill 101

Mr. Penikett: Next sitting day.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Bill Number 103

Mr. Speaker: Second reading, Bill Number 103, *Court Order Interest Ordinance*. Adjourned debate.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is the intention of this Government to introduce uniform legislation next spring to deal with court order interest.

This side of the House will not be supporting this Bill, only for that reason. We are in agreement with the concept of obtaining interest on money that is being held, or money that has been ordered to be paid by the court, however, this year there was uniform law being looked at by the Uniform Law Council. So next spring we are going to introduce uniform law and, if in the future there is any change to that uniform law, we will make it at that time.

Mr. Speaker: I must now caution the Honourable Member that if he now speaks he will close debate on this matter.

Mr. Veale: I think it indeed unfortunate that the citizens of the Yukon are going to have to wait another four months to have this legislation. The suggestion that it cannot be passed, as uniform legislation will be brought in, I submit is really fallacious, because this legislation is so important to individual citizens who are now negotiating damage settlements with insurance companies as a result of motor vehicle accidents, or whatever, and are once again going to lose interest on that money. This piece of legislation could very easily have been passed, and put on the books in the interim, and do no ill, but do a great deal of good, and result in people being able to obtain the benefits of interest on those judgements. I think it indeed unfortunate that the Government feels that it has to wait until it is ready for its complete uniform Ordinance, and not allow this to go through. We must remember that this was brought forward last spring, and it was adjourned over until this Session so that the Government could take a look at it. It was indeed unfortunate that if they were going to go for uniform legislation that they would not have brought it forward in this Session. A whole year has gone by. Let us take an example of what that year's delay means to a citizen who has settled, for example, for \$10,000, because of an injury received. He has settled with the insurance company, and it took a two year time period to do that.

At interest rates of 20 percent, he is losing a substantial amount of money and it is a loss to the citizen of Yukon. I simply do not understand why this legislation cannot be passed. I would hope perhaps that the matter would be reconsi-

dered and that Members would say, "What are we losing to pass the legislation now and amend it in the spring?"

Any interest is better than no interest. I think it is very important that, perhaps, each Member reconsider that and support this piece of legislation.

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

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Mr. Veale: Division

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called. Mr. Clerk, as all Members appear to be in the House, would you kindly poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree.

Mr. Njootli: Disagree.

Mr. Falle: Disagree.

Mr. Hanson: Disagree.

Mr. Graham: Disagree.

Mr. Fleming: Disagree.

Mr. Penikett: Agree.

Mr. Byblow: Agree.

Mr. Kimmerly: Agree.

Mr. Veale: Agree.

Mrs. McGuire: Agree.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are five yeas and ten nays.

Motion defeated

Bill Number 106: Second Reading

Mr. Speaker: Is it the intention of the Honourable Member to proceed with Bill Number 106?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Faro, that Item Number 3 under Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders, which is Bill Number 106, *An Ordinance to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance*, be discharged and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that Item Number 3 under Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders, which is Bill Number 106, *An Ordinance to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance*, be discharged and the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to briefly put on record the reasons for the Motion. There was a discussion this morning between myself and the Minister of Justice, and he gave a commitment that an amendment to the *Landlord and Tenant Ordinance* of this nature, along with some other amendments, is going to be introduced in this Session. It is because of that commitment, and only because of that, that I wish to withdraw the Private Member's Bill.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Bill Number 106 withdrawn

Bill Number 107: Second Reading

Mr. Byblow: I too, at this time would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, that Order Number 4 under Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders, identified as Bill Number 107, *An Ordinance to Amend the Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance*, be discharged and the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Faro, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, that Order Number 4 under Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders, which is Bill Number 107, *An Ordinance to Amend the Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance*, be discharged and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Byblow: Just briefly speaking, I, too, would like to note

for the record that I have withdrawn the Bill because of an assurance I received from the Minister of Justice this morning.

It is my understanding that the Government intends to introduce several other amendments to the *Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance*, and I would like to compliment the Minister of Justice for his intention to do so.

One of those amendments, I understand, will be the amendment contained in the Bill that I have withdrawn, so I simply take that as a commitment of honour, and leave the matter to the tabling of the Government's bill later on in the Session.

Motion agreed to

Bill 107 withdrawn

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Bill Number 67: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill Number 67 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill Number 67 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt a title for the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill Number 67 do now pass and the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill Number 67 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill Number 67 has passed this House.

Bill Number 69: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill 69 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill 69 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill 69 be now passed and that the title be as the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill 69 be now passed and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I declare that Bill 69, *Warehouse Receipts Ordinance* has passed this House.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure.

Mr. Graham: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

At this time I will call a short break.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call the Committee of the Whole to Order. *On Department of Renewable Resources*

Mr. Chairman: I would like to refer Committee to Page 49 of the Capital Estimates, the Renewable Resources Department. General discussion.

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is a continuation of the cost-shared agreement we have under the General Development Agreement, which is 40 percent territorially financed and 60 percent federally financed.

I should point out that the Campground and Parks Development is going to be continuing. We intend to rehabilitate, as well as continue with, the one major territorial park, which is the campground in the Watson Lake area.

Further to that, we have been consistent from last year in putting more monies forward to get a good inventory of capital assets respecting the Department, mainly in the Wildlife Branch of our Department, but as well, in the overall Department as a whole.

You will realize that there has been a number of changes and realignment of responsibilities that have taken place over the last couple of months and it appears to be working fairly well.

There have been some criticisms, and constructive ones, I might add, by the Public Accounts Committee, concerning Renewable Resources, and we are centralizing our financial responsibilities within the Department to ensure that there is no duplication, at the same time that all financial procedures are followed.

Along with that, we are also, as I indicated some time ago, combining our various expertise into branches within the Department and, at the same time, our enforcement responsibilities are going into one branch of the Department, as well.

With that, I will leave it open for questions and then we can go through the individual points.

Mr. Kimmery: With respect to the Capital Estimates, generally, I notice that the departmental objective this year is changed over the departmental objective of last year. I would ask the Minister for an explanation of that change in the departmental objective, and would ask if that means that funds, especially capital funds, are going to be directed in different directions from the past?

Specifically, the departmental objective in the current document and Bill 70 refers to the wise use and management of the Yukon renewable resource, implying a continual yield and conservation principles. I would ask the Minister to reaffirm if that is indeed the case, and if it is a change in the philosophy or the objective of the Department from last year?

With reference to that general question, I note in last year's Capital Estimates that there was a figure for wildlife workshops. We have no figure for wildlife workshops in this Budget. Also, the Minister has made a public statement about auxiliary conservation officers and the training that they are going to receive, and I am specifically interested in that training as it affects capital expenditure. Of course, I might expect that the O and M Budget is possibly more relevant, but the Capital Budget might also be relevant.

With regard to the development of campgrounds and parks, of course, it is an important consideration to consider the movement of species of wildlife, and the various populations in the various parts of the country. I am interested in any planning which is done concerning the location of parks and campgrounds, in relation to the location of game.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not think that it is fair to say that the philosophy has changed any from last year. I think that, with the various realignments of responsibilities in the Department, we are going to be able to strengthen our capability to sufficiently enforce the laws that are passed by this House.

I think the Member knows full well that there is a Bill on the Order Paper for consideration of this House which definitely outlines the importance that we on this side of the House place, with respect to our wildlife and the responsibility that people have towards preserving the wildlife under the various stipulations that allow the harvest to take place.

I should point out that there has been a shift in priority regarding to the game inventories, which was largely prompted here last spring, but we are putting major emphasis on game inventories, which is also on the Operation and Maintenance side of the Budget.

I should, perhaps, go further into that. We are putting priority on inventories in those areas that have resident and non-resident hunting pressure — in fact, in effect, close to where the major population of the Territory is. So we are in the process of doing that; that inventory is in the process of being compiled, and will be analyzed and brought forward here, probably in late December or January.

With respect to the Wildlife Workshops, we have completed them. There is no point in building them if we have got a need for them. They are in most of the communities throughout the Territory.

As far as our auxiliary conservation officer program and the training that is required, we are just getting the program into effect. I needed Cabinet approval to go ahead with the program, which I obtained. We are in the process of beginning an advertising campaign for people to apply, and the Department will be putting forward a training program for those people who are interested.

I understand that there have been some remarks made that it is not going to work, but I understand that there has been a number of interested people already calling. If that is any indication, I trust that it is going to be successful. It is going to serve a number of purposes. Number one, it will not require us to go out and hire more people. It will cut costs as far as the Department is concerned, but, just as importantly, if not more importantly, it will allow the public to become involved as assistants to the conservation officers; have them become involved and allow them to see what the day-to-day problems that the Game Branch does have. It will also impress upon the public the importance of our wildlife.

Further to that, as far as the development of our campgrounds are concerned, most of our campgrounds are located relatively close to a community, except in those areas where there is a large distance between communities and it is deemed that we should have a campground there for the travelling public. It takes a relatively small area and they are very close to the highway. In fact they are right off the side of the Highway, except for the Kusawa campground, which we hope some day will become a Territorial Park. The long range plan for that area is that it will be a multi-purpose park, under the territorial conditions approved by this House about a year-and-a-half to two years ago.

*Department of Renewable Resources Agreed to
On Campground and Parks Development*

Mr. Chairman: Shall we consider the line items starting with Campground and Parks Development, \$422,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: To give an idea of the breakdown. As Phase One, \$285,000 is projected to be spent for the Watson Lake Territorial Campground. It will be completed in 1982-83. Basically, it will allow for a 30-site campground and related facilities, parking lots, et cetera.

The hardest part about that campground is that it is relatively close to the community of Watson Lake, but it will allow the people within the community, as well as tourists, to benefit from the recreation that Watson Lake can offer to the community. I think it is going to be a very good amenity for the community, as well as for the tourists. Hopefully, it will encourage people to spend an extra day in the Watson Lake area, as opposed to what has been going on in the past.

We estimated about \$75,000 for rehabilitation. There are a number of campgrounds slated for rehabilitation. They are the Dezedeash Lake, Pine Creek, Mendenhall, Dragon Lake, Frenchman Lake, Drury Creek, Squanga Lake, and Tagish Lake campgrounds, where work will be done.

We also estimate that approximately \$45,000 in 1982-83 year is going towards campground shelters, which will continue the program we started a number of years ago. Any of you who have used the campground facilities will see that, in most of them, we have log kitchen shelters.

This will allow us to construct at least one kitchen shelter in each of the major campgrounds.

There are going to be some campground signs required, somewhere around \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Also, we are going to be putting someone inside to see how we are going to be able to put in some type of safety measures and signs at the Million Dollar Falls — a very beautiful campground that we are developing, but we are going to have to look at the safety side of it. There are various legal arguments about whether we are potentially legally liable, if we put up signs or not. That is the situation that we are in. We are watching that very closely to see which way we can go in that respect.

That is largely the breakdown of Campgrounds and Parks Developments.

Mr. Byblow: How many campgrounds does the Yukon Territorial Government now maintain?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is not often that I am stuck for an answer, but I will have to bring that information in. It is quite a few.

Mr. Byblow: I take it that only one campground is identified for new construction in this budget for this coming fiscal year, and that is the Watson Lake one.

Is there any other source of funding to increase the numbers of campgrounds in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not at the present time. As I indicated, we are working on the General Development Agreement. I am satisfied with the campground system that we have in place. I do not think that there are too many areas now where we require a major campground.

One area we will probably have to look at in the 1983-84 year will be up in the Campbell Highway-MacMillan Pass area on the North Canal, in view of the increased traffic. That is a year or so down the road.

With respect to this Budget, as far as the major highways go, and the utilization of the campgrounds are concerned, with the Watson Lake campground, I think it will pretty well meet our requirements, except possibly for the Selwyn Basin area, which we should possibly look at.

Mr. Byblow: In light of the \$75,000 allocated for rehabilitation of existing campgrounds, and the \$45,000 for shelters, is any of that identified specifically for the Campbell Highway corridor?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, except for Frenchman Lake. Campground and Parks Development agreed to
On Resource Planning and Wildlife Equipment

Mr. Chairman: Resource Planning and Wildlife Equipment, \$90,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not have a distinct breakdown in respect to how these finances will be expended on specific items. It is to upgrade our capital assets within the Department. Last year we voted a substantial sum. I do not perceive major capital items, year after year. Once we get our inventory and our resources together: our boats and snowmobiles, and the list goes on, all in place, and with the controls and the procedures that we are putting into place, I think we can rest assured that the Department will make the best utilization of the equipment that we have. If the Leader of the Official Opposition is going to equate it to the VHF system, it will not be the same. I think it is a question of getting some capital assets in place, as far as an inventory is concerned, and proper procedures in place, then we can control it accordingly.

Mr. Kimmerly: I wonder if the Minister could give us a rough idea, not a specific one, as to the kinds of capital assets these are? Are they calculators, computers, what?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Just as I outlined, we have wildlife workshops in the various communities now, so we are going to be required to supply chainsaws, canoes, motors, snowmobiles, items of this kind. So I think it is very well spread around.

Mr. Byblow: I have a recollection of fairly extensive discussions last year about a problem with this department in monitoring wildlife populations. It was dealt with at length, both in the Public Accounts Committee, and in debate last spring, in the O and M section of the budget. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not any of these capital monies are identified for assistance in that specific area?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If a biologist needs a canoe, I guess it would be identified as such for the purpose of him or her doing his or her work. As I pointed out earlier, we picked our priorities in respect to getting our inventory up, and we expect that data to be compiled very thoroughly.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am specifically interested in the resource planning aspect of this expenditure as opposed to the Wildlife Branch, or the local offices. Is the Minister satisfied that the expenditure to be voted covers all of the necessary equipment for all of the data collection necessary for resource planning?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Let us face it, there is never enough money. But I am satisfied that we will have enough to be able to do an adequate job over the course of this year. There is no question in my mind that it would be nice to have some of our present equipment upgraded, but the point is that we only have a certain amount of money, and you can see we are asking for a fairly sizable increase, as opposed to what was asked for last year. Prior to that, there was very little money made available. As far as the inventory is concerned, most of that is used out in the field. Most of it is done through rental of helicopters, et cetera, as far as the field work is concerned. I think that we have enough money to carry out our responsibilities.

Mr. Byblow: I was planning to ask the Minister if he knew how many moose there were in the Territory, but I shall not. There was some discussion, approximately a year ago, or perhaps as recently as this spring, respecting the use of aircraft. Is there any intention to purchase any aircraft for monitoring wildlife?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, one area that we were investigating, and as far as I know it has not gone any farther, was the possibility of contracting an airplane on an annual basis. The various types of inventory that are required require different types of airplanes. That is the situation that we find ourselves in, so I think we will be proceeding as we have in the past. If anything of this nature were to come up, I would be the first one to notify the Member opposite during the spring budget.

*Resource Planning and Wildlife Equipment agreed to
Renewable Resources agreed to
On Government Services*

Hon. Mr. Tracey: All I can say is that this is the best run department in the Government. Let us just pass it and get it over with.

Mr. Penikett: I understand it does have an excellent Deputy Minister. I might ask him if he feels that way about some of the Ministers who have departed this place?

Once again, we seem to be spending a lot of money on furniture. He might provide us with some information about where that is going.

Perhaps the most significant expenditure is the Word Processing and Printing Equipment. We have heard reference to this under other items. I gather there are terminals turning up here and there, which we are going to be accommodated. I want to know how far along we are on that program. We had a small item last year. I understand that there is a fairly significant training problem with this equipment. I would like to know about the training, the staffing, the readiness of the Government to receive the equipment, and how long it is going to be before the system is on line and functioning.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As far as the furniture is concerned, it is ongoing replacement. I think the Member opposite must realize that with 1400 to 1500 employees, there is going to be a significant amount of furniture that is worn out and replaced every year. Actually, last year there was a decrease in the amount of furniture that was purchased. The average from 1970 to 1975 was 14 percent, and this year we are only looking at an 11 percent increase.

Last year, there was a decrease of \$7,000, so it is not an extravagant increase. It does not even take into account inflation, actually.

As for the computer equipment, this is one of the major areas that we have in this Department. All departments are trying to computerize because of the speed that they can handle in-

formation, so they want word processors and terminals to hook up with the computer, and we are attempting to do that. We do have some manpower problems, as has been pointed out during this Session. We have problems getting enough manpower to do the work. I can assure the Members opposite that when terminals go in, the people are trained. We have some excellent people in our Department who train the terminal operators as the terminals are put in.

Mr. Penikett: Briefly, along with the general debate, I wonder if the Minister could just elaborate a little bit on the nature of the manpower problem. Do we have people here in the Territory who want the positions, or have an adequate educational level to be able to move into the positions, or is it a problem of not having the people to train, or exactly what is it? Perhaps he could just define it a little bit? And, while we are on the subject of general debate, could he also briefly tell me if the new transportation pool, which is being operated by this Department, is proving to be cost-efficient?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In regards to the manpower, there are two problems. One of them is expertise. When you are dealing with computers, you need expertise that we do not have in this territory, and we are not getting them as fast as we need them. We are training people. For example, in Justice right now, we are training a person from our Department to handle the computer terminal that will be over there to keep track of all our records. We do try to train local people, but we do not have enough expertise in our Department. We are short-staffed in the computer end of the Department.

Mr. Veale: Can the Minister advise what happens to the furniture that is actually being replaced? I notice that there is no entry for capital recoveries, and I presume that might not qualify as a capital recovery, but, what in fact, is happening to the furniture that is being replaced, and what, for example, would happen to any of the word processing and computer equipment which might be replaced, as well?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It would be treated the same as all other equipment in this Government. It would go to the Board of Survey and it will be sold.

Mr. Penikett: I asked a question about the cost-efficiency of the transportation pool. It is a new system. It was, I gather, controversial in a couple of sections of the public service. The Minister has now had time to evaluate that program, and since he is committing a fairly significant amount of money to it, I wonder if he is prepared to report to the House on that evaluation?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: To the best of my knowledge, and I am positive, we are saving a significant amount of money by having it pooled in one department, and by having all the cars put in the pool, and only other cars in departments where they are necessary. We are monitoring that steadily. If the department does not utilize a car often enough, we take that car away, and put it back in the pool so that we can utilize it. This has been very cost-effective. This coming year we will also be taking over the vehicles in the Renewable Resources Department. The reason why you see such an increase there is because we have to replace some of those vehicles. For example, we have to replace approximately 12 vehicles, and when we get to this part of the Budget, I will give you a little more detail on it.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps the Minister could explain whether any of the capital expenditures under Computer Equipment and Word Processing are related to the implementation of the *Personal Property Security Ordinance*, the *Bulk Sales Ordinance* or the *Warehouse Receipts Ordinance*; all of which are going to, presumably, come on line in that computer system? Is the *Personal Properties Securities Ordinance* system dependent on this Capital Budget?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, that is true.

Mr. Veale: In terms of priorities and when things will come on line, I understand the *Personal Properties Securities Ordinance* was supposed to come on line in April, 1982. Will that occur if the budgetary item does not actually get spent until the 1982-83 fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I said the other day in Question Period, we do have a manpower problem, and one of those problems was training enough people and getting enough expertise here. We are hopeful that we will have the *Personal Properties Securities Ordinance* and this computer installed, for operation on June 1, 1982.

On Furniture and Office Equipment

Mr. Chairman: We will begin with Furniture and Office Equipment, \$160,000.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I have already detailed, the average increase since 1970 to 1975 was 14 percent. Last year, there was actually a decrease. This year, we have increased by 11 percent, which does not keep up with inflation, so we are actually having a decrease this year in Furniture and Office Equipment.

*Furniture and Office Equipment agreed to
On Pooled Road Equipment*

Mr. Chairman: Pooled Road Equipment, \$180,000.

Mr. Penikett: My first question to the Minister concerns the vehicles they are buying to replace those in the fleet now. Energy conservation is a new priority in this Government, and I wonder if the Minister can say if he is fulfilling a previous commitment to purchase energy efficient vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think most vehicles that are produced in North America today are energy efficient vehicles. When we buy new vehicles, they will be energy efficient.

If the Member is talking about the size of the vehicles, we previously have tried smaller vehicles in this Government. They are not comfortable. A lot of people have to use them for long distances. It has been proven that it is not cost-efficient and it does not work well. So, as far as buying small vehicles, I cannot state whether the Department will be buying any small vehicles or not, but I would doubt it.

Mr. Penikett: Can the Minister say yet if he knows what kind vehicles they will be buying, what size? Will they be six's, eight's, four cylinder? He has committed himself to the North American vehicles. I understand there are some other cars available on the market.

Perhaps the Minister could say if there is going to be some kind of long-standing agreement with one dealership for one kind of car to make the components of the fleet compatible, or is this just going to go to tender as soon as we have approved it?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is to be treated the same as it has in the past: it will go to tender. We do not do all the maintenance on our own vehicles. We put much of it out to private enterprise to try and get a little money out in the communities, like the Member was talking about an hour or so ago. We support small business, but we do not have any intention of purchasing one line of vehicle so we can have all the parts in our own garage to maintain them.

I think that we do have some small vehicles. I do not know if we are purchasing new ones this year, but we could be. They will be North American vehicles, certainly. They are not going to be foreign. They are not going to be Proches or Jaguars, or anything like that.

Mr. Veale: I understand the Minister's position about large cars and the safety features and comforts for long distances and large numbers of people. However, there is a great deal of traffic that the Government would have within Whitehorse.

Do you want me to repeat it. The Minister was reading some newspapers. The question I have, though —

Hon. Mr. Pearson: On a Point of Order. I have accused the Member opposite of giving false impressions in this House before, and that was a perfect example of it. The Honourable Member was not reading a newspaper.

Mr. Veale: I do not really care what he was reading, I will repeat my question for him.

I agree that there are large vehicles required for long distances in Yukon, for comfort and safety and so on. However, within the City of Whitehorse, I expect a lot of Government usage of vehicles takes place and that, it would seem to me, it would be an appropriate place to have small cars, if they are

just going short distances and not carrying a lot of people. Is there any possibility of the Minister considering having some portion of the fleet in smaller, more energy-efficient cars?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I stated earlier, I think this Department is run very efficiently, and I am sure that the Deputy Minister of this Department and the people who are purchasing these vehicles, will purchase energy efficient vehicles. If they feel that small vehicles are the best for the purpose, those are the ones that they will purchase.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to ask about the policy, when adding cars to the Government car pool, of painting them black and orange. For some parts of the Government service, specifically social workers who are going to cases, the black and orange has proved to be an impediment to social workers actually doing their duties, in that when the black and orange pulls up in front of a house, everyone leaves through the back door. I wonder if the Minister would consider, for some parts of the Government service, not insisting on the black and orange colors?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is not a policy of this Government to have unmarked cars for social workers.

The Member across the floor might say that because the social worker is driving a black and orange car it is going to affect the people. Well, I say, I do not believe that it affects the people. I do not believe for one second that it is degrading to those people to have a black and orange car drive up to their door, or that they have to go to the Government Building to get welfare or anything else. Social workers are members of this Government, they are employees of the this Government, and if they are going to use a Government car it will be a marked car.

Mr. Veale: The Minister indicated that Pooled Road Equipment was taking over the Renewable Resources vehicles. Are there other departments that remain outside the car pool at this time, or is everything, now, within the pool?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I believe that Renewable Resources is the last department where we do not have control of the vehicles. There are some departments, naturally, like Highways and Public Works, that have numerous vehicles all over the Territory that we do not control, because they use them on a steady basis. As far as the local cars, Government Services will, at this time, control all the vehicles.

Pooled Road Equipment agreed to

On Computer Equipment

Mr. Chairman: Computer Equipment, \$228,000.

Mr. Penikett: Just for the record, I wonder if the Minister could say what kind of equipment this is. I do not mean in technical terms. What is the brand, or who is the manufacturer of this equipment? Are we all going to be dealing with one manufacturer throughout the system? Could he tell us something about it?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is equipment from different companies, such as Xerox and AES. As long as the equipment is compatible, will work with the rest of the equipment in the system, then it is purchased on the most cost efficient basis. Whatever does the best job for the best money is what we purchase.

Mr. Penikett: These different systems are compatible now, are they?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. In many instances they are compatible.

Mr. Veale: Will the computer equipment be primarily used in the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department, or are there other areas of government that it is going to go to?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is various equipment for all areas of government. It includes tape storage racks and document storage racks, and an uninterruptable power supply. One of the problems with the computer right now is that we have fluctuations in the power, through the Yukon Electric grid here, and if the power happens to fluctuate at the right time, it shuts the computer down, and it loses everything, and it has to be reprogrammed again. That is one of the major costs. That alone costs \$21,000. There is a controller to handle remote terminals. Be-

cause the computer has not the capacity right now to handle very many remote terminals, there is another remote terminal controller that will be attached to the computer so that we can put more terminals on it. There are remote, smart terminals that have an added memory in the terminal itself, which will be located in remote areas in the Territory, plus printers and local terminals in the building.

Mr. Veale: One of the areas of concern about computers is who has access to the knowledge and information contained in the computer. What is the government policy in terms of exchange information with other governments or government departments? Is there a specific policy on how computer information is going to be handled?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, there is a policy. I cannot tell it to you right off the top of my head. I can certainly tell you that there are security systems to stop any classified information, or anything, getting out. That will be maintained. Except for access by local people to their local terminals, they do not have the ability to access the classified information, in a lot of cases.

Mr. Penikett: I have a general question about computer equipment, and it also would apply to the next item. Computers and word processing systems are often advertised as labour-saving devices. I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea of the impact on employment in his Department, and in the public service, of the installation of these systems? I am not talking about total numbers, but I wonder if he could tell us if it will have the impact of cutting down the number of jobs that are now in place, or will it be otherwise?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think that all of the Members here realize that there is more and more and more information acquired all the time. I would not be in a position to say that any one of these terminals is going to put somebody out of a job. What it will likely do is mean that we will not have to hire somebody else in the not-to-distant future. It is hopeful that, through the use of these computer terminals, we will be restricting the size of the public service.

Mr. Veale: Following up on the subject of access to computer information, would the Minister be prepared to produce that policy in the House, so that we will have an opportunity to examine it? It is a very important issue because sometimes some of these computer records will contain very personal information. Perhaps it will be on health services, or something of that nature, just so that the general public can be assured that that information is not something that will be exchanged with other governments, or in any way allow access to some other person to information relating to a private citizen.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am no expert on computers, and I am sure the Member across the Floor is no expert on computers.

Yes, I would be prepared to table in this Legislature the policy that deals with security of information. I do not have any problem.

Mr. Veale: Just one more question relating to that.

Is the computer system a self-enclosed system within the Government, or are there inputs from other areas outside Government, or are there any printouts in other areas outside Government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is self-contained. There is access to other computers such as the one in ERPU. In certain circumstances, you can acquire access to other computers, to gather information.

When we put the computer in at ERPU, about three years ago, we had a direct line to Saskatchewan. We could access their large computer to get information that we needed to do our computer printouts.

Mr. Veale: Is there any other government that has access to us in the same way that this Government has access to Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, they could not have access without us allowing them to.

Computer Equipment agreed to

On Word Processing and Printing Equipment

Mr. Chairman: Word Processing and Printing Equipment,

\$290,000.

Mr. Veale: One of the greatest problems, I suppose, in the word processing area today, is that it is a fast growing and expanding technology. What is best today may not be the best tomorrow. What is the nature of the contracts that the Government is entering into with the word processing companies? Is it going to be the type of contract where you can move into new systems, and that sort of thing, or is it a capital purchase, outright, which then depreciates, and has to be replaced at a future date?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That is the question that I cannot give you a definitive answer on. Some of the word processors we are purchasing outright. I do believe that there are some of them that we can upgrade. I may be wrong on this. I cannot give you a definitive answer, but I believe that we are purchasing most of them outright. This word processing equipment is for 17 of these word processors. They will go in various departments of the Government, such as Health and Worker's Compensation Board, Finance and Municipal and Community Affairs, and all over the Government. Again, to keep us from having to increase the size of our clerical staff. But I believe that the majority of these are outright purchases.

Mr. Veale: Just to follow that up. Is the Government dealing with one particular firm in word processing? There is AES, Xerox, and I am sure a number of others. Is the Government, basically, going to be having all the word processing units the same, so that staff can go back and forth from department to department, if necessary, or is it going to be split up between manufacturers?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In this case it is going to be the word processor that is most capable of doing the job. Some will be able to hook up to the computer, some are freestanding, so it could be different ones.

Mr. Veale: One of the most difficult areas the Minister has already mentioned is the difficulty of finding people who are capable of operating this type of machinery, and who will stay on that job. It ends up being more of a machine job and less dealing with the public, and sometimes there is a lot of dissatisfaction. I am wondering if the Minister is going to be setting up an in-Government training centre to train people, if manpower is going to be a problem, because it is a serious problem to keep manpower on these machines. Will the Government be getting into it to that extent, or is it going to be left up to the supplier to do the training? It is also an expensive proposition. Some companies have people flown to Vancouver for training, and they offer it once, or they offer it maybe two times a year. Is the Government going to enter into those kind of contracts, or will the Government actually take over the training process itself?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In most instances, in fact in almost all instances, we will train them here to do the job. We are trying to keep local people on the jobs.

*Word Processing and Printing Equipment agreed to
On Public Affairs Equipment*

Mr. Chairman: We shall now discuss the Public Affairs Equipment, \$6,000.

Mr. Penikett: We enjoyed the Minister's remarks earlier today when he was proposing the abolition of the pen.

In Public Affairs equipment, I assume that is mostly pencils and paper for putting out press releases. The Minister might briefly tell us what it is about.

If any of it is new expenditures, in connection with the Government's new newspaper, Yukon Info, perhaps he might indicate if that is the case, too.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, this is for replacement of photographic equipment and cameras. There has not been a new piece of photographic equipment bought in the Department for three years. The equipment is getting very old and outdated. That is one of the items. In fact, there are quite a few photographic items: camera bodies, motor drives and lenses.

The other is for the replacement of the folding machine. The folding machine folds up all the information papers that are produced by the Public Affairs Department. It is over ten years old. It is constantly breaking down and you have to fold

by hand. It is very inefficient to maintain the old folding machine. So, part of the money is to purchase a new folding machine.

Mr. Penikett: We will support this purchase, but I must say in passing that sometimes I think that Wayne Towriss has the best job in this Government.

Public Affairs Equipment agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Total Authority, \$864,000?

Total Authority agreed to

On Yukon Housing Corporation

Mr. Chairman: Yukon Housing Corporation, \$1,572,000.

Mr. Penikett: I move that we recess until 7:30 p.m.?

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We shall reconvene at 7:30 this evening.

Recess

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

Mr. Kimmerly: I should say to the Minister that I may just as well be first, because with this particular amount of money there is nothing he can say that will stop me from saying what I want to say.

I am very interested in the Departmental objective in this Capital Budget estimate. I would say that the objective stated in last year's Capital Budget was more closely the truth than is the objective in this year's Capital Budget, if we are to look at the actual figures in the Budget.

Last year the objective was this: "the Corporation is established and is responsible for the provision, development, maintenance, and management of various housing programs throughout the Yukon." That is certainly a true statement. The Corporation certainly does do that.

This year the objective is this: "to create, coordinate, and give direction to housing programs, to ensure that all residents of Yukon have the opportunity to have access to an adequate standard of housing, whether this be done through home ownership or subsidized rental, and to improve the quality of services and amenities relating to housing in Yukon."

We, in this Party, agree wholeheartedly with the departmental objective. It is unfortunate that the amount of money to be voted, and the programs contained in the Capital Budget, come nowhere near fulfilling that objective, even in one single year.

I would make reference also to the Government's publication, the Annual Report, 1980-81, where the responsibilities of the Corporation are listed as these: "The Corporation is the Yukon Government's housing agency whose prime responsibility is to provide access to housing for persons and families unable to obtain adequate housing in the marketplace." The Capital Budget in this area does not do that.

I would also refer to the Government Leader's statements on the 27th of March, 1979, in this House. He said this about the Yukon Housing Corporation: "Basically, the objective of this Government in the area of housing is to ensure that all Yukoners have the opportunity to have access to good, adequate housing. Naturally, it is this Government's feeling that, where possible, private enterprise should fill much of this role. However, the Government does have a responsibility to provide housing for those needs that cannot be met privately, and I am sure all governments in years to come will have that responsibility."

We agree with that statement. The Government Leader goes on, and he says, on the 27th of March, 1979: "Work has been underway for some time now exploring alternatives to assist families to enter the arena of home ownership. I am hopeful that we can bring forward a program which will help alleviate the hardships which are encountered when one purchases a private home." That was the 27th of March, 1979, and I ask all Members to look at the current situation; I am going to be making extensive reference to that. I would also make reference to the CMHC programs, which are obviously very relevant. Projects of this Corporation in the past were undertaken with the co-operation of the CMHC, or as joint-ventures,

I will read now from a letter to Mr. Byblow from the Yukon Branch Manager of CMHC, dated October 28, 1981.

It says this: "Experience in the Yukon has shown Territorial assistance to be necessary in almost all non-profit projects. Therefore, if Territorial assistance is required in addition to the maximum Federal assistance to ensure the viability of the project, a commitment from the Territory (Yukon Housing Corporation) to provide such assistance will be necessary before CMHC can make its financial commitment. CMHC can only act with the cooperation of Yukon Housing."

Now, the problem in Yukon can be explained several ways. A statement of the problem can clearly be found on the last issue of the *Yukon Economic Review*, on Page 53, where it gives the average vacancy rate for all suites in Whitehorse. From the second quarter of 1980 to the second quarter of 1981, it has gone down from approximately 7.5 percent to just under 4 percent. The vacancy rate has gone down considerably, and in the first quarter of 1981 was well below 2 percent, on this graph.

It is clear, and anyone in the private sector will tell the Minister, that building apartments is now not commercially attractive, and the reasons are basically interest rates and building costs — especially in the North, the northern building costs. Now, interest rates are going down slightly just now, but we have seen unprecedented interest rates of above 20 percent, which has caused a severe slump in residential home building and in apartment complex building. Indeed, that particular slump is probably going to get worse, and I would refer the Minister to the lead story in the *Globe and Mail*, on November 17, 1981. This is just after the Federal Budget. The byline is, "Budget to Halt 5,000 Rental Units, Say Builders."

The new Federal Budget, this month, has provided disincentives for builders to build apartments, because of the change in the capability of the builders to deduct, what are called, the soft costs, or the promotional and preliminary costs, as a deduction for a building. As a side light, in the same story, there is reference to the Government program announced in the Budget, which I asked the Minister about in Question Period in a very general way, aimed at producing 15,000 rental units, with the incentive of federal interest-free loans of up to \$7,500 a unit. These loans are to be used in areas of extremely low vacancy rates. I am sure the Minister could convince his Federal counterparts that we in the Yukon are experiencing extremely low vacancy rates, and we could take advantage of that program.

It is interesting that, in the first quarter of 1981, there were two housing starts in the residential area. In the second quarter, there were 34 housing starts, for a total of only 36 starts in 1981, according to the last edition of the *Yukon Economic Review*, which is as of June. Compare that to 1978, where there were 248 starts, three years earlier.

Now, another part of the problem is that the Yukon Government, in co-operation with CMHC, has left the field of building low cost and public housing. Since this Government has taken office, the policy has obviously been, and the record is absolutely clear, that this Government will build staff housing, but will not build low cost housing or public housing. There have been no new programs.

The real problem is in the supply of houses. There is a tremendous pressure on, in the low income area, for the supply of houses. Now, I am going to talk about the cost of those houses. The Member for Porter Creek East will be extremely happy, I am sure.

By the Government's own figures, considering the 1981-82 Operations and Maintenance Budgets for community housing and staff housing. These are the Government's own figures, prepared by the Yukon Housing Corporation, and are divided into various areas. The annual cost for staff housing, after recoveries, is \$2,300 per unit. That is the annual cost per unit in the staff housing area. Going into the other areas, the community housing areas. In the rural and remote areas, the cost to this Government of existing public housing is \$444 per unit, per year.

The Rental Supplement Program cost this Corporation \$1,728 per unit, per year. In Senior Citizen housing, it cost \$1,911 per unit, per year. For the apartments, which are owned and controlled under this Corporation, it cost \$1,307 per unit, per year. Under the Rental Purchase Program of the Corporation, it cost \$2,857 per unit, per year, and in the Low Rental Family category, it cost a remarkable figure, \$369 per year — not per month, per year. That is \$369 per unit, per year. That is the cost to this Government of the existing low cost housing.

Now, I am going to put those figures beside figures obtained just recently from the Social Assistance Plan. In the month of October, 1981, the average rent paid by Social Assistance recipients in Whitehorse was \$263 per month.

This is the Government figure. The average rent, in the same category, for Social Assistance recipients in public housing, was \$125 per month. There were, in that month, 174 families or individuals on social assistance. Ten were in public housing because there is a shortage of publicly-owned housing, in private rental accommodation, \$164. It is significant that the average rent paid by people who are on Social Assistance has gone up, in the past year, from September, 1980, to September 1981, approximately 50 percent.

Now, it is my argument, to the Member for Porter Creek East, and other Members interested in cost, that it is cheaper to the taxpayer for people on Social Assistance to be in public housing. It is cheaper. There is a total cost in the existing programs of \$369 per unit, per year, for public housing. This Government receives, in recoveries, \$125 per month for those units, out of the Social Assistance Program. For those who are not in public housing and who are on the Social Assistance Program, the Government is paying an average of \$263 a month; more than twice as much. Yes, you can make money.

Additionally, there is another benefit, if this Government were to build publicly owned housing, of jobs for Yukoners in construction. There are, I believe now, approximately 600 people in the construction industry in Yukon, and it is interesting that, since 1978, the industry has declined steadily, as builders leave and as the economic slump continues. At the same time, I recommend to the Government that when these Government-owned houses are built, albeit with public funds, eventually, there should be a vocational training aspect to the whole program.

This Government has experienced this with the Porter Creek access road and that is the kind of program that we are talking about. The additional benefits are that there are jobs for Yukoners, and vocational training.

That brings me to a statement of what our policy is, and what we recommend to the Minister in his Capital Budget. First of all, we are in favour of individual home ownership, as the Canadian dream, or part of the Canadian dream. Families ought to be able to own a home. They want to own homes and they maintain them better if they own them, as opposed to renting them, and the commitment to the community is much, much more. Canadians ought to be able to dream that one day they will be able to own a home. The increasing feeling among young people, even professional young people, is that they will never be able to afford a home. They ought to be able to own homes, and the first plank of the policy ought to be that of home ownership. We suggest that the Utility Grants that this Government has already begun are a good program, and ought to be extended. The principle of sweat labour, if you will, is an extremely important one, and we recommend that the time period allotted to individuals who build homes on previously-owned Government lots be extended, and that the building regulations be relaxed, in order to allow for smaller homes; in order to make the Canadian dream a little more accessible to a few more people. The areas in Wolf Creek or Takhini are a good program in principle, but the time period ought to be relaxed in order to allow for a four or five year construction period for individuals. We are in favour of encouraging co-operatives, and there is CMHC funding available for that.

The second major plank in a Yukon policy ought to be to

make use of the available Federal funds. All CMHC funds can be used only if the Government of Yukon pays its portion: in some cases 10 percent, and in some cases 25 percent — mostly 25 percent. The use of that federal money ought to be available to Yukoners.

The third plank is that, as the private sector has left the public housing market, this Government should build public housing, and rent that to Yukoners, this Government should directly build houses.

Fourthly, as the private sector has left the field this Government should build apartments, and build them with a profit motive. The rents can be commercial rents, if you will. The private sector has left this field, and the need for apartments is so pressing that the responsibility of the Government, in our view, is that apartments be built and rented even to people who are not in the low income category.

The fifth plank is that Yukoners ought to be employed on these projects, and that the projects should have a vocational training aspect. I might add that it is announced through the land claims process that there is a Federal agreement with the Indian peoples to put substantial federal monies into Indian housing; those houses have to be built by someone, and it might better be Yukoners. If our labour force is trained and ready for the building boom, then we will be able to take advantage of that.

In summary, the Capital Budget in this crucial area of basic need, that is, decent housing, is totally inadequate. The Budget contains no provision for building low-cost housing, public housing, and apartments. It is only minor Senior Citizen complexes, which we also support, and staff housing. On the question of staff housing in Faro, I am going to leave comment to my colleague from Faro.

Mr. Veale: The Minister wants to hear it all before he responds. Well, we will give him a chance.

My submission is that one of the most important aspects of the Yukon Housing Corporation, and one of the most important objectives, is the planning function. That is, to plan ahead, to foresee the problems that are coming on the horizon, and to have active plans available to meet those problems. I believe that we are approaching a housing crisis in Yukon this year, and I believe there has been a complete abdication of that planning role which is normally assumed by the Yukon Housing Corporation.

If one just looks at the staff turn-over in the last two years and the long delay this year in hiring a manager, it not only indicates the indecision that the Government has had with respect to the role of the Yukon Housing Corporation, but also places the Housing Corporation in a position of great jeopardy in terms of planning for the future. The Minister indicated in the O and M session, last spring, that they were maintaining the status quo, and that is precisely the case. He indicated at that time concerning the submissions that I had made about the problems with the lack of supply of low rental housing, and things of that nature, that we should wait for the Capital Budget. The Capital Budget really has not responded to the needs that I believe are quite apparent, and are going to be looming even greater on the horizon.

Let me first indicate the areas where the Government is no longer planning, although it once did. It is no longer doing any planning or construction. There is the issue of new home buyers — and they are a very special case, people who are in apartment units right now, who want to get into their first home. With the interest rates that presently exist, and prices being what they are, young people, lower income people, are simply unable to get into their first home, and it clearly requires a response from government to provide some initiative to assist people to get into their new home. We have a number of programs that can be implemented: they can be rental purchase programs, low rental programs, low rental family unit programs. I am talking now about the type of accommodation which is basically townhouse in style, and has an independent entrance; that is a very specific need I think that we have

in Yukon, where families with children simply cannot go into apartment buildings, due to all the difficulties associated with elevator use, and ringing doorbells, and so on, and it is so important to have that style of accommodation available.

The needs are going to be critical in that particular area, because what is happening in Yukon is that there have not been any substantial housing starts, and at the same time, there is going to be a certain number of units actually taken off the market and put into strata-title. To some extent, that may alleviate some of the problems, but it is not going to alleviate the problems for the first home buyer or the low rental housing person, who need that specific kind of assistance.

There is a second problem that is faced in Yukon. In small communities it is very difficult and highly risky for a private entrepreneur to build a number of housing units, except on a one-on-one basis with a particular person who has made a contract to have a house built. In terms of speculative building in small communities, it is an extremely difficult situation and very hazardous for the entrepreneur to enter.

That is a very specific area where the role of government is most important. A good example is that of Dawson City. It has booms and busts, locally, depending on the price of gold, and depending on the tourist season and how active the tourist industry has been. That requires a very specific approach, where the Government plans with CMHC for a specific kind of housing; perhaps it is apartments. The objective may be that those units will only be occupied for a part of the year. That will dictate the nature of the financing, and the nature of the recovery that the Government will have out of it.

The point is that that particular kind of housing is needed in many small communities, as in Dawson. Mayo may be another classic example of those communities where there is a boom and bust cycle, depending on the mineral industry and the tourist activity during the summer months.

There are many advantages to having an active Yukon Housing Corporation. The first advantage is the one I have just discussed. It is active in the market and ensures that the needs that are not being met by the private entrepreneur will be addressed. It may be because of high costs. It may be because of interest rates. It may be because of the lack of interest in the construction industry in taking on certain projects without some government initiative to ensure that it will be a successful business deal for them.

The advantage, both to people who are looking for a particular type of housing and not finding it, and to the construction industry, is quite clear. We can stabilize the housing market and the construction market, and avoid a very serious problem that we have seen occurring and which was totally predictable — a pre-pipeline boom. There was a tremendous amount of housing on the market several years ago, because it was anticipated that the pipeline was just around the corner, and that Foothills and other outfits would be buying up these housing units. A number of entrepreneurs were in the market, and building very actively.

That was followed in the next year by an incredible over-supply and by a number of contractors leaving the Territory. It was very unfortunate, because that particular type of boom and bust should have been anticipated by Government, and they should have had supporting programs coming on-stream, just at that time, to ensure both that adequate housing supplies of the kinds of housing that are required would be available, and that the construction industry would have some stability.

In conclusion, the Yukon Housing Corporation is in a state of crisis. The housing industry, on the supply side, is approaching a state of crisis, because if we have many units going on strata-title, and we have problems with some of the Yukon Housing units that are presently available but may be removed from the market in the future, we are going to have a very serious problem. It is simply a planning problem. The financing is available. CMHC is always ready to enter the market, and it is simply a question of having initiative from this Government to prepare those programs.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: After hearing my fellows across the way, I do not really know. One of them says he believes in individual ownership, the next minute he is saying, build more houses by government. What does he mean? I do not think that he has his priorities clear. He was talking about his Party, and I remember when the Clark Budget came down, one of the things that we had was home-owner assistance. What did his Party do? It voted against us. So, where is he consistent?

As far as this side of the House is concerned, I think the Members opposite are painting a very dim picture of a problem that I do not perceive exists. I believe they are using it for political expediency.

I do not think that the housing market is any worse today than it was two years ago. I heard the Member across from me say that when we had lots of houses, we should have looked ahead and built some more. I find that just absolutely ridiculous. We believe that everybody should own their own house. We still believe that the private market is the place to get houses built. We have had several programs to alleviate the housing situation that exists here. When you boil it all down, we believe that private people should be the builders. There was mention made, in the new Federal Budget, it is true, that there are provisions for 1,500 houses with \$7,500 each, free of interest.

I foresee that interest rates are going down, and indications are that they will continue to go down. With this in mind, I perceive that more people will get into the housing market again, and I believe that private industry can look after the housing market. We do not feel, on this side, that we should be subsidizing houses.

When you subsidize houses, you are doing people an injustice, because they come to rely on that, and they do not take the initiative to build their own houses. It is a sad thing when you see someone who retires and does not have any house, and we have that among our employees. That is why we are concerned about the buy-back plan, and why we encourage our employees to build houses, and get out of staff housing. When they are ready to retire, they have a home:

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would just like to stand up and cheer my colleague for the presentation he just gave. I thought it was very well put forward, about housing and the possibility for housing. I just have to say, at least from my perspective, and this Party's perspective, I cannot believe what is being said across the floor.

The Member for Whitehorse South Centre, who just got elected, obviously thinks that there is a bottomless pit of money in government, whether it be federal or territorial. He does not have to stay up until 11 o'clock at night to look at the news. Mr. McEachen is trying to bring the facts of life home to everybody, with respect to the financial situation that our country is in.

I want to go a little further. I am sure that the Member for Mayo, the Member for Campbell, the Member for Tatchun, can explain the situations that have developed since the Yukon Housing Corporation went, very actively, into all the communities throughout the Territory and built many, many homes, at the cost of many, many millions of dollars. The problems that this has brought into those communities — because in most cases there was overbuilding. There was no question that there was a need, a social need that had to be met. But it was more than met. It was met to the point where, in a community such as Watson Lake, an individual may have a home, but he cannot sell it, because there is no market. The Housing Corporation has built so many homes in that particular community that a lot of people say — why should we, when we can get into what the Member opposite wants to encourage, low rental housing.

Now, I believe that the individual has a responsibility as well. We do not want to encourage people to be on welfare: to be continuously dependent on social assistance. When you provide, and further provide, which is what the NDP, and I gather the Liberal Party — because I am not too sure who is speaking for whom here now — want to present to the public, at a cost of

many millions of dollars, and creating further dependency on government. This is one Member of this House who does not believe in that. This Government has gone out, at a great deal of expense, and got various categories of land developed, and is selling it at development costs. The Member from Riverdale South commended the Government earlier today, and I am sure we will use it in the next election, for the land development policies that this Government has undertaken over the past three years.

That is one benefit that we, the citizens of the Territory, have, regarding the cost of building your own home. Mortgage rates appear to be going down, and all we can do is be optimistic that they will continue to fall. It is way beyond this Legislature's capabilities to deal with problems of that kind. If that happens, there is no question in my mind that there will be more building, if necessary. Obviously the Member opposite, for Whitehorse South Centre, just reads his own press clippings and does not read anything with respect to what the real estate agents are doing. Did anyone look at the paper last week? There must have been 250 to 300 homes for sale, at prices in the range of \$60,000, \$65,000 or \$70,000. Now, the point is that there is housing on the market, and it is available. I am not arguing the point that, right now, interest rates are high. If any Member of this House thinks that we are going to be able to deal with the interests of Canada in this Legislature, I am afraid they are badly mistaken, and I would go so far as to say that anybody who even suggests that they can, is not telling the full truth to the public.

I would also submit to the Members opposite that, respecting the Government's building apartments, we do have one 30-32 unit apartment block being built at the present time, by private entrepreneurs. I recognize the words "private entrepreneurs," across the floor, are dirty words, but somebody is prepared to invest money.

If they put forward the argument that we should maybe be looking at further incentives for people to build apartments, I would say that may be a logical approach to it, and maybe there could be a solution found. For the life of me, I, for one, am not prepared to spend my dollars as a taxpayer, becoming a landlord of an apartment block. Then, at the same time, we have the Members across the floor, questioning and probing, not coming out directly, but indicating that maybe rent controls would be a good thing. I would say that we cannot have it both ways. On the one hand, we are going to have a government-owned apartment block at commercial rents, and on the other hand, we might have to look at controlling the rents. I just find that ludicrous.

We do have a Vocational School, for anyone interested in taking carpentry. To date, we have always had them build a home. This year, there is some other project underway. What the Member opposite is saying, in regard to vocational training for these government-owned apartment blocks, is that they propose, as part of your Party platform, that we will have a vocational school running that. What has that done for the small businessman, and the carpenter who is already qualified? What I am saying to the Member opposite is that you do have qualified people in the construction business who, right now, are building apartment blocks, and are hiring Yukoners. If we went your route, and the Government got into the apartment block business, it would further discourage anybody investing in that area, because the Government is going to go ahead with taxpayers' dollars; it would be very difficult to compete. We are not going to the small business guy to do it; we are going to hire unskilled labour to do the project.

I just look at what they are presenting across the floor, and I think to myself, I do not know who has dreamed up the Party platform, and I do not want to give you any ideas, but I think you had better reassess your position.

Mr. Penikett: The Member for Porter Creek East has, once again, wilfully distorted everything everyone else has said, and then he acts like a great injured virgin any time anyone puts a slightly creative twist on any of his peculiar interven-

tions in these debates.

The fact of the matter is — and I put this as a general question to the Minister opposite, a man who, as a human being I have some respect for — the situation is right now that, as much as we might share his aspiration that people and families would someday own their own homes, many of the people we are talking about, the people who are feeling the need that we are trying to articulate, cannot even afford to rent right now. The idea that in the current market they might be able to build their own home, or hire a contractor to go out and build, is a fantasy. It is not even a dream. It is a fantasy.

With interest rates what they have been in recent months, and temporarily going down though they may well go up, the Minister is reading some financial forecasts. I have been reading some of the same forecasts. People suggest that we may be in a temporary valley, but will gradually climb again in the next little while. In any case, even the current rates are pretty high.

Some of the financial arrangements being proposed to some people are still forty-year mortgages. I submit that if you are going into a forty-year mortgage, unless you are deluding yourself, you are probably talking about home ownership as being pretty close to being mythical in that case. You are in essence renting your home, from the bank or the mortgage company.

The fact of the matter is, and I suspect the Member for Porter Creek may understand, that the housing sector is one of the few sectors of the economy which does, in a community like ours, respond to the laws of supply and demand. There is a demand right now for a certain kind of housing which is in short supply. I say to the Member of Porter Creek East that that concern is urgent, and is here in town. That is low and medium rental accommodation and low price housing — low income housing or whatever you want to call it.

It is quite clear, for all sorts of very sound, free market, free enterprise, financial reasons that the private sector is not going to build that kind of housing right now, or, I may say, in the foreseeable future, without what the Member for Whitehorse South Center referred to as incentives. Incentives are exactly what we are talking about. We are not in fact even talking about new money. I want to get to that point in a minute.

It is an extremely dangerous misrepresentation to suggest that people who, at the present point in their lives, may require a certain kind of house — let me talk about a category of individual of which there is a fair number in this community: the single parent, with one or two children, who is in the work force, but may be marginally in the work force, and in an occupation and in an unorganized non-union job where the pay may not be that great.

That person, even if he or she has managed to save something, which would be extremely difficult in the current circumstances, would have the greatest difficulty getting a mortgage from a bank, and if any Member opposite doubts that, I would be prepared to show them cases. Some of those people are having trouble finding rental accommodation at current rates. Now what is happening is that in many smaller apartment units the mortgages are coming up for renewal, and the lender is requiring as a condition of mortgage renewal that the rents be escalated dramatically.

It is a fact that under current Yukon law it is easier for those landlords, if they wish to raise the rents dramatically over a short term, to evict the people, because less notice is required to do that than there is to give notice to raise the rent. It happens to be a flaw in the *Landlord Tenant Ordinance* as it now operates.

Those people are now sharing accommodation with friends and relatives, if they are fortunate to have relatives in this community. I do not know their numbers, nor do we, with our kind of facilities, have any accurate capability to be able judge their numbers, but I suspect that it would not be too hard to calculate.

I hope the Members opposite, in speaking to this, do not

diminish or belittle this need in the community. It is real. It is a need that cannot be met by the kind of social housing that was built several years ago: the kind of housing built in small communities to which the minister referred, which housing met a real need in some of those communities for larger families, low income families, families where the breadwinner, if there was one in the family, was only seasonally employed. Some of those units, as we know, had design flaws, and were not suited to the community. But, that was an emergency program: a real need that the Government responded to in a very quick way. And it may have distorted the free housing market in many communities. Some of the housing markets, I suspect, in some of the smaller communities, are so fragile that the building of one new house could distort it. We all know that even in this community, the sale of one property in one neighbourhood can change the market, and we all know how that can affect assessments.

It is a terrible distortion to suggest that, when people go into a house where there has been some government incentive to create that house, they are therefore doomed to occupy that house under that financial arrangement for the rest of their lives. That is a terrible, terrible distortion. It is wrong. I have seen, in my neighborhood, time and time again, the usual housing pattern. A family is being formed; they may have lived in a single one-bedroom apartment, gone to a two-bedroom apartment, think about having kids, they may for a while have a family unit which has two incomes instead of one; put a little savings together, get into a position where they can buy or build a house in the few rental-purchase schemes that are available — the odd person has availed himself of that, although there have been very few of those programs. Later in their lives, if they are fortunate enough to have a savings, they may be able to afford an apartment or to retire somewhere. If they are not — and there are many Seniors in this community who benefit from public housing; I do not think there should be any stigma attached to that, or that they should be made to feel inferior because somehow the community is helping to support their housing needs now, because throughout their long hard-working life, they did not have the means or the good fortune to put enough money aside to provide for themselves. There is housing on the market. There are a lot of houses for sale. But I suspect that the houses that are hardest to sell right now are the big ticket houses, the high priced houses. It may be because of the kind of financial pressures which are not only national but international, which have been referred to, are causing people to reduce their housing demands, to lower their expectations with regard to housing.

The Member talked about apartments, and that somehow there were going to be these horrible state-owned rows of apartments. What we are talking about is not an unusual proposition, and it is not something that the Government has not done in the past. It is not something that it has not done for its own employees, on occasion. We are not talking about doing anything new, we are talking about financing arrangements. We are talking about apartments being built by local contractors, and hiring local labour. Let us not be deceived on the question of training. The problem right now is not at the Vocational School, with the Vocational School staff, but I know apprentice carpenters in this town, who are in an apprenticeship programs, who have not been getting enough hours, and so their apprenticeship is in jeopardy.

There are other types of housing, other styles of housing. Log housing, using local materials, where there are very skilled, small entrepreneurs working in that field in this community, who could be training other people to build similar types of housing.

What we are talking about, the principal point, is that we have a Housing Corporation as a vehicle for delivering things, and receiving a considerable amount of federal money: federal money, which is not new money, but exists now in existing federal programs. This Government has land, and, in some cases, it has developed land; maybe not of the type that we are

talking about here, but some of that land can be used for all sorts of things. While we cannot solve the interest rate problem here, there are flexible, and medium- and low-interest rate programs, a variety of types, available through CMHC: programs which we have not taken advantage of. They require some commitment from this Government.

The point we are making is that there is a social need. Ask the Government to examine them, and to examine, as my colleague pointed out, the benefits in employment, and in training, and in the social need. Do not suggest that because a single parent, or some person, because of their income situation, goes into an apartment building this year that happens to be owned by the Government, they somehow will be horribly tainted, and doomed to a life of welfare. It is wrong. Do not suggest that because somebody's grandparent happens to live in social housing, the family name is besmirched forever. Do not suggest that because a kid grows up in a community housing project, somewhere in some small community, he is forever doomed to a life of violence. To suggest that is a horrible, horrible implication, and to even suggest that kind of philosophical bent, and certain kinds of economic assumptions, and social assumptions: these are assumptions which are I think very dangerous. Throughout their lives, people change their housing needs, and change their housing plans. There are people in this community now: working, productive citizens who, because the housing market is tight, not because it has been distorted by the Government, but because the private sector has been unable to meet their housing need, are making, it seems to me, in an unorganized way, but an individual way, a reasonable request of the Government. Not so that they can become eternal dependents on the Government, but on the proper assumption — not Mr. Lang's assumption, the Government's assumption, the enemy of the people — the government is some kind of oppressive instrument — but the Government is their government, the Government is simply an instrument by which the community, the clutch of the people, can do things for themselves. It is one of the ways people do things for themselves, because as individuals they do not have sufficient economic power.

Later, productive, taxpaying members of the community, they return that contribution and help share the burden of other people, who may at some point meet their need, in the same way that we now, willingly, assume some of the cost of providing property for our senior citizens; as we all willingly help provide for the education of all children, whatever the needs of their parents. It is the same kind of principle. They suggest that somehow what is being proposed is some kind of malevolent new innovation. It is a very practical, economic proposal. There is a need that can be identified and further defined. There is a solution to that need. The means to that end are available. We need jobs, we need training, we need houses, and with the will and, as I said, a little planning, the Government can meet that need. Nothing outrageous, nothing fanciful, nothing magical, but something very, very sensible.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I have to reply to the Member opposite in regard to his so-called assumptions which are always correct. If he has travelled around this world, which I know the Member opposite has, and we talk about government housing. You go over to England and you have a look at the townhouses that people — through government actions, as opposed to putting incentives forward, and attempting to encourage the private sector and the individuals to invest, then you have people in dependency on government. That is a known fact.

Now the Member opposite will raise his hand and he will argue that principle, but that is a fact. That is number one.

Number two, I say to the Member opposite that I do not like the implications that were put across: that this side of the House does not, and is not prepared to, support the pioneers of this country, because the Conservative Party has proven they are more than prepared to support the pioneers of this country, by the investment that we put in during the last three years. We have made a major financial contribution, because those are

the people we feel have contributed to this country, have chosen to retire here, and we feel we have a responsibility. We have met, for the most part, the need, respecting those people who do have a social need. We have a pool of housing in most of our communities, available for those people who need it.

It is there, and it is being used, and rightfully so. We also do a great deal for those people who need assistance.

All I can say is, when is he going to build me a house? He refers to the White Pass truck driver. He does not really think that the White Pass truck driver, who pays his own way, is important, but he has agreed that that does not really matter. This man gets up at five o'clock in the morning and works until six o'clock at night. They are people who work very hard, and are having a tough time making ends meet.

He says that there is not much of a financial commitment that this Government has to make. That is an inaccurate statement to make. Initially, you have to put up the capital, and then there is operation and maintenance.

The Member from Whitehorse South Centre pretended he was a math teacher for a while there, throwing out numbers left and right. There are so many hidden costs that are incurred that when one analyzes it, I am sure that the figures would be much higher than the ones he used in debate. I think it would be foolhardy for us to get into this type of major, community projects. I think that when major development takes place, we would have to consider it, but right now it is not warranted.

We have enough housing until major development comes along, and when it does, you are going to see the small contractors right out there again. Or, even better, the people who want to own their own homes may have to build them themselves. They may have to work with other people, but it can be done. We have Members on this side of the House who have done it themselves. The majority of people in Porter Creek built their own homes — perhaps in conjunction with friends, but they did it. It is their home, not Mr. Penikett's, or Mr. Lang's. It does not belong to Big Brother, who the Party opposite keeps thinking is going to come along and aid and abet. It is their own home.

It all comes down to one word, and that is pride, and if we can make the land available, which we have done, we can see through the Government of Canada — we have to rely of the Government of Canada, and the international money market, with interest rates going down, that can be continued.

I want to conclude my comments concerning this Budget. I want to make it very clear for the Members opposite. We firstly believe that Senior Citizens are a priority. The Members opposite have not referred to the fact that we are prepared to go with another four-plex this year for our Senior Citizens. I think we fill the need in what I believe to be our social responsibilities, and I do not agree with the NDP, who are prepared to go in and not even really fill a need, to go even further than that, and make the people of the Yukon more dependent on government.

Mr. Veale: I am sorry he is leaving the House. I was going to respond to some of his comments. We have not responded in terms of senior citizens' housing because we feel, at the present time, that those needs are being addressed. There may be more senior citizens' housing required in the future, but there has been a response by Government to that and it has been a good response. There is no question that the pioneers of this country should have housing provided to them at a price that they can afford. I would much rather see Yukon senior citizens retire in the Yukon than retire somewhere else in this country.

To respond to the previous comments, the incentives that our Party is talking about are not the total market intervention of government, holus bolus, although there is always some need for that particular type of intervention to take place, but we are talking more about selective intervention and incentives. It may be incentives for the first-home buyer, and I mean the first-home buyer: the person who, because of the cost of housing, and because of present interest rates, cannot afford that first home. There can be mortgage interest deferral plans which meet those specific needs which are not being addressed at the present time, and that encourages private enterprise

because that person may build a house himself, or there may be private construction companies that do the building for that person. The point is that it is a plan that assists first-home buyers, and it also assists the residential construction industry. It is two-fold, and it can be a very useful program.

The second type of project that our Party would envisage is the type of project where the Government says to a private entrepreneur, we have a shortage of apartment houses or we have a shortage of townhouses or we have a shortage of apartment units of one or two bedrooms, and we will give you this incentive to construct that particular building, and the Government will guarantee the rental of a certain percentage of those units.

So, it meets the public need for that kind of housing, and at the same time provides a solid base for the private construction industry. It is not, in any way, government taking over private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to call a short recess right now.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I would like to call the Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue with the general debate on the Yukon Housing Corporation.

Mr. Falle: I have been sitting over here this evening listening to the critics on the other side.

On the housing situation, we are trying to do something for the people in the Yukon. Number one, this Government is making land available on an sweat-equity basis. If you do not know the policy by now, I will explain it to you. Call it what you want. They work on the land and do the work on the land. The land is going to be theirs in ten years. I call that policy "sweat-equity", in my area.

We have extended the time that is allotted to build the homes, I think, from one year to three years. I do not know if we have, at this time, relaxed any of the building regulations for the outlying areas, but I am quite sure that I can ask the Minister in charge to look into that anyway, because I do think that is one possibility for making it a little bit easier for people to build homes.

We believe that a person should have the opportunity to have a part of the Yukon. It may sound humdrum, but if that person owns a bit of land under title, it gives that person an incentive to build a home, and to become a better member of society and of the community that he is living in.

Other than building a house for everybody in the country, I think this Government is doing what it possibly can, within its means and its budget, to provide homes for any young people who are starting out. Also, the other side suggested that this Government does not care for, and does not look after, its elderly. That is wrong. I was also left with the impression that if a single parent was not able to have a home over their head, this Government was quite belligerent, and did not do anything about it. I personally do not know of any of these that this Government has not helped.

I am a firm believer in free enterprise, and I am a firm believer that a person should have the opportunity and the incentive to be able to build his own home - not a castle; maybe start off with a log cabin. But I can speak for myself when I say that before I would pay \$100,000 for a home today, I would live in a tent. I think if more people would live within their means, the country itself would not be in such bad shape. I am not going to give any lectures on that. We are doing something and we have a plan.

Mr. Fleming: My favorite subject is Yukon Housing Corporation. I have sat across the House for the last seven years, and for the last seven years, I think, I have stood up and belaboured this program, Yukon Housing Corporation, from one end to the other.

This year, I had hoped, looking at the figures, that I would probably be saying something a little bit nicer this time. I noticed that Faro has a fair bit of money allocated, probably for a need. I, unlike the Members across the floor, recognize the need in my community, and some other communities,

where I have looked. But I do not stand up, like some of the Members across the floor, and say that the outlying areas are in need of housing, until I know whether they are or not.

I can tell you I know some that do not need quite so much housing.

Yukon Housing Corporation was probably needed at one time, and served a purpose at one time, in places such as Teslin and Ross River. Over the years, that has sort of gone by the board. The houses are empty. They are nothing but a cost to the public.

If the Members opposite want to go out into the communities and see the people in those communities, and see the real taxpayer who pays the bill, and ask him if he would like to have the Yukon Housing Corporation enlarged and be given a large amount of money to go out and build new homes, I would say they would get a different picture of the whole situation.

I have nothing to say about Whitehorse. I am not too sure what they need in Whitehorse. Maybe they need some sort of program here. What I heard from across the Floor was that there are no homes. It seems to me they are saying it is an overall picture. It is not an overall picture.

If it were possible, I am sure the NDP would name this the Socialist Housing Program, rather than the Yukon Housing Corporation. The money to build houses, no matter where you get it, has to come from somewhere. The taxpayer in the Yukon, or the taxpayer in Alberta, or the taxpayer somewhere, has to pay.

I do not know whether the Honourable Members feel they should just rent those houses cheap enough to just give them away; I hope not.

I, for one, see that that would lead only to a socialist setup, where in the morning you go to work with your little hammer and you help build houses, and you have your cold water and your sandwich, and you go home at night. I am not prepared for that type of a government.

I am still for private enterprise and the freedom that we have had. I know the Members opposite will have some answers to this; there is no doubt. However, I do not see too much wrong with the Budget this year. There has not been too much blown, in the area of putting up more houses where we already have houses.

I think the Government has done a fair job this year, and I would like to compliment the Minister on it, and I will be voting for it.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have always listened with great interest to the Member for Campbell, and I must say that I agree with some of the things that he has said. He did say clearly that he did not know the situation in Whitehorse, and of course, I am speaking as a Whitehorse Member. I might also say that in the past three years I have travelled to every community in Yukon repeatedly, and there certainly are regional differences, or differences in the various Yukon communities. Probably in Carmacks and in Ross River and Watson Lake, the past programs have been substantially less than perfect in the housing area. I would point out, though, that in the community of Old Crow, where the buildings that were built were built with local labour and local materials, according to the local needs, as defined by the community of Old Crow, the program there is an excellent one. The homes are excellent, and the people who live in them have great pride in their homes. It is an excellent program there.

The different communities are obviously quite different. With specific reference to Whitehorse, the need is not, in my opinion, approaching a crisis. As the Member for Riverdale South says, it already is a crisis.

I would also take exception to the statements about Senior Citizens, or the pioneers of Yukon. Never, ever, in this debate did we on this side ever suggest that the programs for Senior Citizens ought to be reduced. Exactly the opposite...

Mr. Fleming: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Fleming: The reference by the Honourable Member is

fine, as long as he was speaking about another Member, but I did not mention Senior Citizens in any way.

Mr. Kimmerly: The Member for Campbell is quite right. I was not referring to him. But there were references to Senior Citizens earlier in the debate.

About senior citizens, I would say that it is my opinion — and the opinion is formed on the basis of talking to the senior citizens in Whitehorse South Centre, and I should say, only Whitehorse South Centre — that the Senior Citizens' Complexes, especially on Lambert Street and Hanson Street, are good programs. It is my opinion that now, in Whitehorse, the Government ought to be planning for additional senior citizen accommodation in the year 1982-83. The Senior Citizens' Complex on Lambert is entirely full, and I intend to be asking the Minister about waiting lists. There are, I believe, waiting lists for senior citizen accommodation. It is an excellent program which we support wholeheartedly.

Mr. Penikett: I will not spend a lot of time on the rather unproductive exchange of attitudes that go on, from time to time, between myself and the Member for Porter Creek East.

I do want to make one point clear. There has been some talk on the other side about incentives to business, and so forth. In the final analysis, what we are proposing is some incentive to individuals to stay, and work, and be productive contributing members of the community, which is what, ultimately, we hope that all people will do.

I was reminded, when I listened to some of the talk the other day, about the story of the gentleman from Riverdale North, I think it was, who lived in the house financed by the Government Financial Corporation. He wakes up in the morning and listens to the government-owned radio station. He eats a breakfast of wheat marketed by the government, rides to work on the government-financed transportation system, gets to work and spends the day working at his government job, goes out for lunch and has a government-marketed beer, spends the evening watching a hockey game in a government-financed hockey area, then walks home on the government-constructed sidewalk, while his neighbor and he argue about who is the stronger supporter of the free enterprise system. It seems to me that it is very dangerous to get tied up in labels.

We were arguing about degrees, it seemed, earlier. It seems to me the government exists for one reason, and one reason alone: that there are needs, and sophisticated complex ones, in society, that cannot always be met by individuals. Governments are simply organizations of people getting together to meet each other's needs. That is all that I will say on the subject, because it seems to me that we are arguing that there is a need, and, definitely, the other side says there is not a need, and the question finally resolves down to that dispute, about that fact.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I appreciate what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I believe that is true. I have listened, with interest, to the debate, and I believe that has been what the debate has centred on. I would like to point out to all Members that we are allocating a fair amount of money, at the request of the Yukon Housing Corporation, in this Budget, to thermal upgrading, in both community and staff housing. I am a bit disappointed that no one in the Opposition was prepared to recognize that as being a factor, because it is a factor in the Budget, and one that everyone should recognize.

Mr. Byblow: I do not wish to enter into the major debate, but I have several questions respecting one item in the Budget, and I assume I am permitted to deal with specific items in the Community and Staff Housing Program.

I would like to ask the Minister, concerning the 24-unit apartment, what degree of consultation took place, with respect to this decision?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: We have had a tremendous amount of lobbying from Faro. We recognized that we had to put some housing units in there.

We have a responsibility to get the best value for the money spent. We have looked at all the options: free standing houses,

row housing or apartments. To fulfill the needs that we want them to fulfill in that community, and to provide the accommodations needed, it has been our decision to go ahead and build apartments, which gives us the best value for dollar spent.

We have had input. I know that a lot of the people up there do not like apartments. But, there are a lot of people who do. It is very interesting that, in that community, we were continually plagued with calls. There were people who were complaining about some of the housing that we had provided before. Now, I am amazed; they want to buy it. When we have this apartment built, we will have other accommodation available, and there will be a choice of accommodation. I have no problem in supporting the idea that an apartment is the best way to look after our needs in that community.

Mr. Byblow: I think I, for one, will be one of the first to compliment the Government for recognition of the need. I think the circumstances by which this need has been addressed are ones that give me some reason for concern.

I think the Minister and I have discussed this at some length, and he knows full well that the problem in my community is perhaps a little different than in most other communities, in that there is not an excess of housing available. There has not been any construction in the area of staff housing since 1977, I believe. As I have, in the past, suggested to the Minister, Yukon Housing ought to have been addressing the problem year by year, whereby this problem would not have reached its crisis proportion now, nor perhaps some of the hostility that has come with the nature of the housing.

I do want to make it very clear that, in recognizing the problem, Government must receive some credit. It is just indeed unfortunate that in constructing a \$1,500,000 complex, they must endure the criticism of the way that the construction is being brought to the community. I suppose I would only ask the Minister, at this point, then, if it is his intention to seek further consultation and advice, with respect to alternatives to the 24-unit apartment?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: On the one hand the Opposition talks about people not making enough money to afford their own homes, and how we should be supplying them houses. Now the other Member gets up and says that, for the people who make \$25,000 - \$40,000 a year, we should supply them with houses, too.

I have one question to ask. What is the matter with those people investing in this Territory? They live in a community with the highest per capita income in the Territory, by far. They enjoy all the facilities, and yet they want the rest of the taxpayers, who have half as many facilities and have to pay for them themselves, to pay tax to give these people who make \$25,000 to \$40,000 a year a home to live in, so that they can go buy their campers and boats, and all the rest of it. Five years later they leave the Territory. They have made their fortune here and they leave. What is the matter with those people investing in their own communities?

If it was up to me I would not even put the staff housing in Faro. We make land available and they are capable of building houses, the same as anybody in Whitehorse, Carmacks, Dawson, Watson Lake, or anywhere else. I do not see them doing it, though. It is a constant harangue from Faro: the Government must give us this, the Government must give us that. It is about time the people of Faro, and especially some of the staff people, started investing in their own community.

Mr. Byblow: I think that the Honourable Member who has just spoken may not have intended to do so, but he has not stated some things correctly. He has asked the teachers of Faro to build their own homes, and I would like to submit to him that there is no land upon which to build any homes, because the Government has not developed any land in Faro upon which to build residential homes. It is a simple as that. In fact, only in this year has Government identified some monies for land development. That makes it very difficult for the residents to construct their own homes. I should point out that there was one residential lot two years ago, purchased by a

teacher who did build his own home, and it is standing there today.

Mr. Hanson: I move that we now report progress on Bill 70, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1982-1983*.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Hanson that the Chairman do now report progress on Bill 70 and beg leave to sit again. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Mr. Hanson: I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the chair.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Mr. Chairman: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 70, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1982-1983* and directed me to report progress on same and beg leave to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted. May I have your further pleasure.

Mr. Hanson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Faro, that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member for Faro, that we do now adjourn. Are you prepared for the question?

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9:27 p.m.