



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 11

3rd Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, April 13, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

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

CABINET MINISTERS

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

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

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

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

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

(Independent)

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

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

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

⁰¹ **Whitehorse, Yukon**
Wednesday, April 13, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the order paper.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: Are there any returns or documents for tabling?
 Reports of committees?
 Petitions?
 Reading and receiving of petitions?
 Introduction of bills?
 Notices of motion for the production of papers?
 Notices of motion?
 Are there any statements by ministers?
 This then brings us to the question period.

QUESTION PERIOD?

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the government leader. Can the government leader confirm to the House, as Mr. Phelps apparently did to the Chamber of Commerce yesterday, that this government has never had a written agreement with the Government of Canada tying the transfer of land to the territory to the question of a Yukon Indian land claim settlement?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, I can confirm that there has never been a written agreement. That is one of the reasons why we are not at the land claims table at the present time. It is one of the six outstanding issues with the Government of Canada.

As I have said on numerous other occasions, and as we have shown, there is a large amount of documentation that indicates that it was the intention of every minister, until Mr. Munro on November 27th, that land would be transferred to this government, given a land claim settlement. He, on that day, made it clear that it was no longer his intention, nor the Government of Canada's intention, to transfer land. That is one of the issues.

⁰² **Mr. Penikett:** The government leader will know of course that his answer has indicated to me a number of other questions, which I will not ask now; I will ask a supplementary to my first one.

The territory's land claims negotiator is also reported to have said yesterday that the Yukon Cabinet and Commissioner had threatened to resign in 1979 before the federal government would offer the territory a seat at the land claims table. For the record, can the government leader document this account of YTG's entry into the land claims process?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There was no documentation but certainly the threat was transmitted to the minister by our land claims negotiator, and it was done on behalf of the Commissioner of the day, Mrs. Christensen, and the Cabinet members of the day. I understand that Mrs. Christensen is purported to have said that she cannot recall the incident. I am quite surprised at that because I know at least five people who are prepared very quickly to remind her; three of them are sitting on these front benches right now.

Mr. Penikett: From this side I am sure we have looked forward to not only being reminded but perhaps informed for the first time about these things. I therefore ask the government leader if he would be willing to entertain a request to not only have the Council for Yukon Indians appear before the bar of this House or the Committee of the Whole but perhaps also Mrs. Christensen and perhaps federal officials, so that members of this House can get all the facts about this very important development.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, I am completely unwilling.

⁰³

Question re: Cyprus Anvil

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the government leader. We are getting information confirmed by the government leader that the corporate restructuring of Dome Petroleum has placed Cyprus Anvil in the hands of Dome Mines and a numbered company whose real ownership is unclear. To the government leader's knowledge, who really now owns Cyprus Anvil; who is speaking for and making decisions respecting its state of affairs?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know and I do not know how the member opposite expects me to know.

Mr. Byblow: Has the government leader dealt with the federal government yet on this subject and can he tell me whether his government is still continuing its support of the aid package and, if so, is the aid package in a go-ahead status?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The member for Faro seems very anxious to get us to not support the federal aid package. I think I am going to have to someday get into a position where I can ask him whether he thinks this government should support the federal aid package. He is the only person in the world now who is asking this question. There is no question in anybody else's mind that we support the aid package.

Mr. Byblow: There is very little question on this side as to the support of the aid package. Can the government leader answer the first part of my question: has he communicated with the federal government since this development of a restructuring respecting Cyprus Anvil?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have not communicated with the federal government about the restructuring of Cyprus Anvil. That was the answer that I gave the member yesterday; it is still the answer today.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation rental rates

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question to the minister responsible for the Yukon Housing Corporation. In a February letter to my colleague, the member for Mayo, the minister indicated that the board of directors of the corporation uses the rental market to establish rental rates for housing corporation units. Last week, the minister contradicted this by saying rates are based on costs. Could the minister now tell us what the government's policy is in establishing rental rates for Yukon Housing units?

⁰⁴ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** Perhaps the member would refer back to documents that were tabled in this House, I believe, last year. There are a number of different programs under the Yukon Housing Corporation. There are staff housing, public housing, social housing, rental-purchase housing and, subsequently, they are under different terms and conditions, depending on the financing that we have entered into with the Government of Canada to provide the housing that is necessary in the various communities.

I have pointed out that we are attempting to recover our costs, and that is primarily market in most cases. Perhaps I erred in respect to responding to the question that the member put last week, but, to be very frank, it is our intention to recover our costs and, if the market is such that the people can pay, then they will pay what the market bears.

Mr. Kimmerly: In view of the very large share of the market that government units now occupy, especially in smaller communities, is the minister's department now considering the possibility that corporation rents, by remaining high as vacancies increase, may be artificially inflating the private rental market?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, to my knowledge, there is not a great number of vacancies to begin with. I guess it would depend on which community you were referring to, but I do not accept the general statement put forward by the member opposite that there are that many vacancies within our stock of housing.

I concur that, perhaps, in some areas we have a preponderance of housing units and it would seem to me that the policy we have adopted, where possible, to sell accommodation, if there is a need, will, in effect, ensure that there is private home ownership, yet at the same time bring more permanencies to the communities that the member speaks of.

⁰⁵ **Mr. Kimmerly:** I was referring to vacancies in the overall market, not vacancies in the corporation's units. Will the minister undertake to study the situation whereby the rental rates for

government units may be leading the market as opposed to following it?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would be prepared to refer the question to the housing corporation but it would seem to me that we are definitely not ahead of costs, as far as the rental of accommodation is concerned, in most part, depending on the program that is being offered through the communities. In some cases it is a lot less. It would seem to me that, perhaps, what we should be doing is maybe increasing our rents so that the people who have private investment will not be competing.

Question re: Life Skills Seminar

Mr. Porter: My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The minister's department has announced a "moving out" seminar to be held this weekend in Whitehorse for students all over the territory. Could the minister tell the House how much it is costing his department to sponsor this seminar?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I will have to get back to the member on that.

Mr. Porter: On the same subject, to the government leader, would the government leader confirm that the real reason for offering this seminar, at this time, is to make it possible for youth delegates to attend the Conservative convention at taxpayers' expense?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: With your permission, I would like to direct the question to the Minister of Education because this is something that is under the auspices of her department and I think she is in a very good position to constructively answer the question.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I really take exception to a remark like that coming from the opposite side of the House because it indicates to me, and to the whole public, just where these people are coming from. Here we have a constructive program; it is a basic life skills program that they are always talking about, "when are you going to do more life skills training in the schools". We put a program like this on and they get up and make a totally inane comment like that about it. It is absolutely outrageous.

This program is going to help prepare our young people for today's society; prepare them so that they know about credit cards and getting a loan and I really think this member better take a second look at what he has said.

Mr. Porter: Maybe I should pose a second question. The question to the minister then is: will any of the students that will be attending the seminar also be attending the Conservative convention as youth delegates?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have no idea what these students are going to be attending on their own time. They are there to attend this conference about moving out and what they do other than that is none of our business nor is it any of the member opposite's business.

Question re: Justices of the Peace

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

The Minister stated that it is the Cabinet's prerogative to appoint or not appoint a justice of the peace even if that person is recommended for appointment by the Justice of the Peace Council. Since Cabinet chose not to appoint Barbara Hume from Haines Junction, a respected member of that community, is the Minister now prepared to give Mrs. Hume his reasons for denying the appointment?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: As I advised the member opposite, it is a Cabinet prerogative to appoint or not to appoint, period.

Mrs. Joe: Someday I will get an answer to that question. The minister has stated that it is the policy to appoint a JP and train him later. Since these appointments automatically give JPs the power to sign the search warrants, informations, warrants of committal and other important documents, can the minister explain how he can justify this policy of giving untrained people these powers?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I do not particularly think it is a good question. I have already advised members opposite that JPs are not taking on the duties until they are trained and if they cannot accept it, that is their problem.

Mrs. Joe: The minister once again misunderstood my question.

Is it the intention of this government to continue with its obviously partisan policy under the new *Territorial Court Act*?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I do not know what the member opposite is talking about. It is ridiculous.

Question re: School busing

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

Two days ago a representative of the Department of Education is reported to have said that Carcross is the only rural community that has complained that the school transport subsidy is not sufficient. Is the minister or her department aware of the numerous representations made by mail at Stewart Crossing residents that the subsidy is also insufficient for Stewart residents?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not believe that the representation made was that the subsidy was insufficient. The representation that was made from Mayo-Stewart was just that they wanted a bus, period.

Mr. McDonald: I can see they are going to have to spend a lot more time with the minister.

At a meeting on March 25th, attended by the department officials, Mayo resident, Oliver Nelson, Mr. Byblow and myself, it was agreed, as a result of representations made at that time, that the department would review further options to help solve this serious problem. Has the department developed any new options and, if so, what are they?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I was not at the meeting so I cannot really say what the agreement was to do. However, as to the Mayo-Stewart bus, they do not have enough children there to qualify for a bus route and they are being paid the subsidy, as are the families of the students in Carcross. I think that just goes to show that the children are being treated fairly all across Yukon.

Mr. McDonald: I think, again, that the Mayo residents are going to have something to say about that.

Can the minister say what priority she assigns to the provision of school busing for rural students in her list of education expenditures?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The priority I assign to education is quality of education, not busing. In Yukon, the Department of Education is fulfilling its full legislative commitment regarding busing, whether it be in the form of a subsidy or in the form of establishing a bus route. I am sure the member is aware, by now, what those qualifications are.

Question re: Esso Resources Beaufort project

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the government leader about one of his favourite subjects.

Some hired workers on the Esso Resources Beaufort Project have, in the past, had access to free transportation from Edmonton or Calgary on the Esso charter, whereas Yukoners have had to assume their own transportation costs to Inuvik. I would like to ask the government leader what, if any, procedure has this minister's government established to ensure that similar inequities will not find their way into the hiring and transportation practices of employers on Yukon's north coast projects?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We are in the process of developing some criteria for the hiring of Yukon workers on Beaufort Sea projects. We are in active negotiation, at this point in time, with all three companies, Dome, Gulf and Esso, but particularly with Gulf. These negotiations and meetings are on-going and, in fact, are scheduled to resume once again next week. We are hopeful that we will be able to sign agreements with these companies in respect to what kind of benefits are going to accrue to Yukon in the very near future.

Mr. Penikett: I am sure the government leader understands that this is an important issue in that, if employees from Edmonton and Calgary are getting free transportation but workers from Whitehorse are not, that is a southern-hire policy, not a northern-hire policy. In that regard, with reference to the guidelines that he has just talked about developing, is it his intention to table these guidelines in the House and will those guidelines specifically cover transportation costs to the job site?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am in absolutely no position to answer

either question at this point because, as I say, these are negotiations; they are ongoing now. We are hopeful that they will be resolved soon. This is a very important issue. It is one that we have been involved in for a long, long time now. We recognized the importance of it a long, long time ago and I am hoping that we are going to have some concrete results in the very near future.

Mr. Penikett: I do hope the government will look at this transportation issue. What measures is this government prepared to adopt, and I would like to know what the negotiating position is, to encourage north coast contractors to purchase services and supplies through Whitehorse and other Yukon centres rather than through the larger cities to the south; an old problem?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am surprised that the leader of the opposition is not aware of the fact that we have been actively supporting and working with the Yukon Chamber of Commerce and the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce in promoting Yukon business on the north coast. As I have said before, we have been in constant dialogue with the three major employers for a long, long time. We are in the process right now, as the member for Mayo is aware, of doing a study that is going to put together a directory, primarily for these three companies, so that they know exactly what kinds of people are available and what kinds of services are available in Yukon of which they can avail themselves of.

Question re: General Development Agreement

Mr. Byblow: My question is to the government leader again. The government leader has previously indicated that funds intending to flow under the general development agreement, presently under negotiation, will be the magnitude of \$50,000,000 over five years and I would like to inquire where the money, under these subagreements, will be directed? Will it be to new industry; will it be to primary industry; expansion of existing industry; manufacturing? Where is the emphasis of the expenditure going to be?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Surely, the hon. member must understand that that is the very essence of the agreement that we are going to sign. That is what we are trying to negotiate with the Government of Canada at this point.

Mr. Byblow: Can the government leader advise me what is going to be the measure of public input and local control over direction of the funding?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The public input is through this government and what we are hoping to be able to negotiate is local control through this government.

Mr. Byblow: Since the Northwest Territories has signed its renewal of an economic development agreement last December, what exactly is the holdup in the signing of the Yukon agreement?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: As I have stated a number of times, it is the negotiation of the agreement and we are at the same time in the process of negotiating sub agreements that will flow from the major agreement. The Economic General Development Agreement is being negotiated and hopefully will be signed in the near future.

Question re: Social assistance

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question about social assistance.

Yesterday I asked a total of nine questions in order to try to get a definition of residency. Would a UIC exhaustee who is a Yukon resident who has not worked three months in the last 12 be eligible for social assistance if all other criteria were met?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes.

Mr. Kimmerly: Would students never entering the work force in the past 12 months be eligible for social assistance under the criteria?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If the member wants to ask all of these questions answered, I would suggest that he put them down in writing and I will have my department answer them. He is just going through one person after another. I stated yesterday, and I will state again, that my department is fully aware of what goes on in the territory. They are quite willing to look at the situation that anyone is in, and certainly a student would be eligible. It is a ridiculous question and he knows it.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the residency policy in writing, and will the minister give me a copy?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No I do not believe it is in writing. It is a policy that is set by myself and by my department and if the member wants to find out exactly what that policy entails I suggest that he go and talk to the people involved.

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Porter: My question is directed to the government leader.

Does this government intend to keep CYI fully apprised of any agreements which have been reached between the territorial and federal governments on the six issues that have been blamed for YTG's four-month absence from the land claims talks?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, we have given that undertaking in the past and I realize that the member is a communicator; he likes playing with words. They do not go over anybody's head, I am sure. The six issues are the reasons that we are not at the table. That is where it begins and where it ends.

Mr. Porter: Will this government, as a matter of policy, allow CYI the opportunity to examine and ratify any bilateral agreements between YTG and the federal government; agreements which undoubtedly affect the progress of the Yukon Indian land claims talks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a representation, I believe; however, I will permit an answer to the question.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, and I do not believe that the CYI honestly expects to, just like we do not approve and ratify any agreements that the CYI bilaterally makes with the Government of Canada in respect to their funding or anything else.

Mr. Porter: This final supplementary is a follow-up to the question lead by the member for Faro, in respect to the EGDA in the Northwest Territories. The EGDA was signed in December of 1982 and was worth \$21,000,000. The question remains: why is this government so slow at negotiating an economic development agreement with the Government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have heard multi complaints from the members opposite about our negotiations with the Government of Canada. I thought, surely, the proof of the pudding was in the eating. When we received a supplementary estimate for the first time from the Government of Canada, that we negotiated, when they, across the floor, criticized our methods of negotiation, I am not prepared to be second-guessed by them.

We are negotiating an economic development agreement and I am hopeful that it will be one of benefit to this territory. Neither I nor my colleagues are prepared to sign an agreement for the sake of signing an agreement.

Question re: Sexual harassment

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, of which I have given him notice.

A recent national survey by the Canadian Human Rights Commission revealed that significant numbers of Canadians, both men and women, have been victims of sexual harassment. Has the minister's department received complaints of this sort from Yukoners and, if so, how many?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: Just to straighten the member out, it is under the Department of Justice; Women's Bureau.

Yes, we are very aware of the concerns of sexual harassment. Many complaints are received by the coordinator of the Women's Bureau, who refers them to the Public Service Commission. The Women's Bureau and the Public Service Commission are working to develop a policy on the issue.

Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell this House how many of these complaints have been satisfactorily resolved?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The answer to this question is that they go to the Public Service Commission. I do not know of any of them that have come back and not been resolved.

Mrs. Joe: I understand that, as a stage in handling complaints of this sort, the Cabinet appoints a board of inquiry. Could the minister tell this House what criteria is used by Cabinet in making these appointments?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I will have to find that out. I am not aware of the board of inquiry. It would come under the Public Service Commission.

Question re: Occupational health surveys

Mr. McDonald: I have a written question, which I would like to put on the record for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. My only fear is that the question technically lends itself to a yes or no answer.

Two years ago, the member for Whitehorse West requested and received occupational health surveys for the fiscal year 1980-81. I would ask the minister whether he would be willing to table the following:

- a) the 17 occupational health surveys from the fiscal year 1982-830
- b) the attendant inspection reports issued for the fiscal year 1982-83;
- c) the names of ten employers with whom safety meetings were held and the corresponding dates for the year 1982-83; and
- d) the place, time and audience of each of the 15 speaking engagements listed for the fiscal year 1982-83?

"

Question re: Preventative health programs

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources and it is further to the government's previously stated view that preventative health programs are less costly than curative programs. Could the minister inform this House whether or not the department has conducted any comparative cost benefit analyses between, for example, minor back surgery and preventative physiotherapy or chiropractic treatment or similar comparisons?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No doubt they have; I am not aware of it. However, if the member is suggesting that we should get into putting chiropractic or physiotherapy under the medicare system, that is something we will be considering in the future.

Mr. Penikett: I did want to ask about that. I would hope that the minister might be able to get back to me on the first question at some point. The minister, as he indicated, had said that both this minister and previous ministers had indicated that they were at some time considering physiotherapy under the Yukon health plan. The minister has indicated that it will be considered again in the future. Could he indicate some kind of time plan; is that something when the economy recovers or is it a longer-term proposal than that?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, it would be contingent on the economy. The problem right now is that it is very costly and it is something that we do not consider that we should burden the taxpayers with at this time. We recognize the benefit of it and we are fully aware of the benefits to the people. We will no doubt bring it in, in the term of our office, if the economy does pick up.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the minister for his answer. I understand the minister sounds very supportive about coverage for physiotherapy. Could he indicate to the House whether consideration has recently been given, or will be given when they are considering physiotherapy, to provision of chiropractic care as well under medicare; or is that a separate issue in the minister's mind?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That would be a separate issue, but I would have my department working on it in the future because I am interested in having that included as well.

Question re: School busing

Mr. Byblow: My question is to the Minister of Education. Yesterday, the minister told me that the van used for busing Tagish students to Carcross is used for many other purposes and the bus service just happens to be one use but the spokesman for the band has advised that the bus was purchased primarily to bus the students, has been seldom used for other purposes, and that it is running at a deficit. Will the minister make a commitment, in light of these facts, to re-examine the issue of busing Tagish students?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not know how many more times I am going to have to explain this to the member for Faro. I really wish he would come and talk to me about the whole Carcross issue instead of trying to make political "Brownie" points in the House. However, I will try again to explain it to him.

The busing is not the issue. This is not a busing issue; this is a subsidy issue. We are legislatively responsible to pay to the parents

of those children a subsidy because they do not qualify for a bus route; there are not 25 children involved. There are 14 children involved from seven families. We pay the busing subsidy. I went to Carcross in June; the parents were complaining because the subsidy was not enough and that when children were off sick they were not given the subsidy for the sick days. We increased the subsidy; we gave the subsidies for the sick days. Now they are coming back and saying this is not enough to pay for this bus.

The bus does not belong to the Department of Education. The Department of Education pays the subsidy and the parents are at liberty to do with that subsidy what they want to get their children to school. The responsibility of getting the children to school lies with the parents, not the Department of Education.

Mr. Byblow: Could I then ask the minister: has she examined the possible effects of a lack of a busing service for those Tagish students on the attendance of school at Carcross, particularly since some parents have indicated that they will have no choice but to withdraw their children from school?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: If those parents withdraw their children from school, that is the decision they make. They are the ones who make the decision to deny their children the education that they are to get. They are the ones who will ultimately be responsible for the repercussions of those decisions.

Mr. Byblow: Since the transportation subsidy that the minister spoke of was originally \$9 a day and in 1977, there was an increase of 11 percent to the current \$10 maximum per day, which has not kept pace with increased costs, will the minister make a commitment to examine the transportation subsidy policy to determine if those rates are in fact adequate?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I believe I answered that a few days ago in the Legislative Assembly, and I said that it was under constant review. In the event that we did increase the subsidy, of course it would have to abide to the "six and fivve", however it is constantly under review.

Question re: Police Services Agreement

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question to the Minister of Justice. A week after the police services agreement was signed in Ottawa I asked the minister, by letter, for a copy. The minister advised he was not in possession of a copy but would advise me in the future. Is there now a copy of the agreement available to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have not seen it yet, no.

Mr. Kimmerly: When the minister obtains a copy of the agreement he signed will the minister supply me with a copy of that agreement?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members appear to be making representations again, which of course is contrary to the rules of the House. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Kimmerly: Is it the minister's intention to supply a copy of this federal-territorial agreement?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: This is, as the member opposite stated, a federal-territorial agreement, and without both sides agreeing to it being made public it cannot be made public, but you can come up and read it in my office, if you would like, when I receive it.

Mr. Speaker: With there being no further questions we will proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY**MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS****Motion for the Production of Papers No. 1**

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 1 standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 1?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the hon. member for Campbell that an order of the Assembly do issue for a copy of all letters and documents which are quoted from or referred to in the document entitled "Yukoners Deserve a Fair Deal — A Land Claims Information Package".

Mr. Kimmerly: I will be fairly short and simple because this is probably a simple and controversial request and will be no difficulty for the government. I am referring, of course, to this information package called "Yukoners Deserve a Fair Deal". It is about land claims. The government leader has previously told us it is not about land claims. That comment is firmly on the record twice. However, on the front page at the bottom it clearly says "A land claims information package"; this is about land claims.

I have read this document with great interest and, indeed, have commented publicly, partially very favourably, to the document. The summary and the information of the issues and the process on pages five to ten, approximately, is a very good summary and is a welcome addition to the public discussion of the land claims issue. However, the package contains a lot more than that.

First of all, I will deal with the issue of confidentiality. There is a paragraph about that in the document beginning on page three and there is an account of why confidentiality is important and why an embargo of information was put on the land claims process in the past and that is understandable. There is then an account of the federal government and CYI breaching confidentiality and, on page four, a statement that the Government of Yukon "has always respected the confidentiality of land claims negotiations. It has, on occasions, been forced to set the record straight." Obviously, this document is an attempt, by the government, to, in the government's own words, set the record straight. This motion is designed to assist the government in doing that.

In order to set the record straight, the information which the motion calls for is quite necessary. We are obviously talking about a disagreement, substantially between the territorial government and the federal government. I would point especially to a quotation on page 35; it is a quotation from a letter written by John Munro on February 3, 1983. The quotation is, "There was no commitment to the transfer of lands as a precondition of resolving the Yukon Indian aboriginal claims. There is no evidence to support such a contention." That letter was a very long letter and it also said other things.

It is interesting that, starting on page 29 of the document, there is an account given by dates of various letters and statements made by federal ministers of Indian Affairs and there are various quotations. These are obviously quotations taken from larger documents. I say that the government would never want to be open to the charge that they quoted out of context. Obviously, that is so. In order to avoid that charge, it is only necessary to table the complete documents and the motion only calls for that.

"This document is obviously an attempt to put forward a position and the attempt is made stronger and more forceful if the background information is made available to the public. Indeed, it is obviously a controversial area and obviously federal people and territorial people, in the past, have said different things. The intelligent voter is obligated to assess the various statements made and that assessment is only properly done in the face of complete information and good information.

About confidentiality, again, if these comments, these excerpts, can be made public, how can it be said that the other parts of the letters cannot be made public? This is a very simple motion, designed to facilitate and inform public discussion and I am sure the government will have no difficulty in supporting it.

Mr. Porter: I notice the government leader was going to get up and I thank him for giving me an opportunity to speak.

I will be very brief on the motion. I believe that, by and large, what this motion is designed to do is facilitate the process of public dialogue; hopefully, an informed public dialogue on a very serious issue that faces Yukon right now.

This government has always intended that, indeed, they are an open government. This motion gives them an opportunity to show to the public that they are an open government, that they would provide for the members of the public information by which decisions, policies and information packages are put together by this government.

I think that throughout the recent debate on the land claims issue, one point that the government made continuously was that it had received, from previous federal ministers who held responsibility

for the portfolio of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, a commitment to transfer, after settlement or during settlement, land to this government from the remaining portions not claimed by the Indian people.

We have seen a variation of the positions taken since the original statement was made from all of the land in Yukon to what we hear now to be 15 to 20 percent of Yukon. I think there is, without question, an awful lot of confusion surrounding this issue throughout the public and, to a large extent, there is a process of an uninformed debate going on throughout members of the public. So, I think it would be incumbent upon this government, as a responsibility that it has inherited by the mere fact of being the government, that it should make available all of the documents and all of the letters of information so that the public does have an informed, unbiased presentation of all the facts surrounding the issues we are debating today.

With that very brief speech, I would like to say that I will be supporting the motion.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have to tell you that the members on this side are quite prepared to support this motion in the fervent hope that it will allow the members opposite to finally see the light of day, as true Yukoners, and get on side in this battle that we are having, not about land claims and not with the CYI, but about Yukon land and with the federal government. It has been an appalling factor to me that the members opposite have seemed to be diametrically opposed from day one to the very difficult position that we found ourselves in, in respect to the land claims negotiations.

In agreeing with the motion, we have to do so with some caveats, those being that there are documents, and they will be looked at that, that have to be considered confidential and that we will not be able to make public in their entirety. Sometimes, in some of these documents, there will be other matters completely irrelevant to the topics that are being covered here today.

They are going to have to be excised from those documents. We are also going to have to seek and get the permission of other people, third parties, in respect to some of these documents, because the rule still applies that the document is in the possession of both the sender and the receiver. We have to, I think, keep that rule in mind, too.

We are in the process of putting together this package and we would be most pleased to support this motion.

is Motion agreed to

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 2

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 2 standing in the name of Mr. McDonald.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item number two.

Mr. McDonald: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Mayo, seconded by the hon. member for Faro, that an order of the Assembly do issue for copies of all guidelines provided to or produced by the Agriculture Development Council which are utilized by that body in determining how lands allocated for agricultural purposes are to be distributed.

Mr. McDonald: I think I need only speak briefly about this motion. Agricultural land has been, in the past, and promises to be in the future, a valuable public resource. The growth of the agricultural community contributes to the stability of the Yukon economy. It has proven itself in the past. There have been farms and market gardens which have not generated great wealth to the territory but which have supplemented people's incomes and contributed to a way of life many people find healthy and attractive.

People invest time and energy in the land and end up making a long and personal commitment to the territory. Fewer and fewer people in the Yukon are questioning the economic and social benefits of a strong agricultural sector and the general hope is that agriculture will help smooth out the boom-bust cycle plaguing so many small mining communities. It will keep wealth in the territory and provide competition for the high priced imported food.

We must carefully and responsibly nurture the agricultural sector to ensure the success of the industry. This means that the

distribution of agricultural land must be monitored so that its use remains primarily agricultural and that agricultural ventures have a realistic chance of survival. I believe that the institution of the Agriculture Development Council, a council recommended as early as 1975, was a necessary first step; that it should provide informed advice with a Yukon flavour to the government was, and is, in my opinion, a necessary component of the decision-making process.

Nevertheless, Yukon agricultural land is a public resource and its distribution into the hands of farmers and market gardeners is a public responsibility. The primary component of decision-making in this territory is this Legislature and members of this Legislature are responsible to the public for the distribution and allocation of public resources. In order to do that, we must be aware of what our bureaucrats, in this case the Agriculture Development Council, are doing. We must be satisfied that in their dealings with the public, they are acting in the public interest and at the public's will. The rules created for the distribution of public land must be fair and justified and they must be applied in a fair and just manner.

The first step, which probably should have been initiated long ago, is for this Legislature and the public to find out what in heaven's name this council is doing. It seems my best efforts to date have been inadequate to the task. I have spoken to the chairman of the Agriculture Development Council, to farmers in Whitehorse, Dawson and Mayo; I have attended Yukon livestock and agricultural association meetings and asked many questions in this House.

When I speak to farmers around the territory, many of them with applications for agricultural land, they end up asking me what is going on. When I attend Yukon Livestock and Agricultural Association meetings, feverish requests for information are made indicating to me that I know a great deal more than many farming people around the Whitehorse area.

The bottom line is that if I am one of the more informed people in the territory about the activities of the Agriculture Development Council, then public awareness is really riding the low tide.

Many questions have been asked in this House and the minister's responses have been less than encouraging and not particularly informative. In fact, some answers seem so vague and nebulous that it worries me that even he may not be aware of some of the council's activities. Effectively, if the public is unaware of what is going on and the information from this House is thin and threadbare, then land is being allocated or distributed in private.

The minister has said in the past that agricultural development in Yukon, as far as the government involvement is concerned, is just developing. He says that we cannot afford to make mistakes with so precious a resource as it may adversely affect the future of the industry. Hard and fast rules may be wrong and difficult to change. He says we must experiment with the rules for the dispersment of land to ensure that, in the final draft form, they meet our long term objectives.

To a large extent, I agree with all of that. While I do not believe that Yukon's environment and social economic conditions are entirely unique in the world context, there is enough difference to warrant special care in our deliberations. However, the fundamental fact remains: experimenting or not, careful deliberations or not, we are still taking applications for land and approving applications for land. We are still distributing this public resource and until now it has been done without public scrutiny.

The minister has taken a very interesting position in the past on the whole issue of public scrutiny. On March 28, in answer to a question from me, "Can he also state what sort of public review process will be established to review the activity of the Agriculture Development Council and, more specifically, to review each decision of that council?" He replies, "On the last part of this question, I should point out that if we had a public review of every decision made, nobody would really get access and be able to work the land that they have applied for."

¹⁰ I thought initially it perhaps was something the minister felt was better left out of the public view. Shortly afterwards, however, the minister had the opportunity to elaborate on this answer suggesting that he felt, in his view, presumably in cases of large detailed public review hearings and semi-judicial hearings, that the dispers-

ment of land would be held up for an inordinate amount of time. I reviewed my question to see if I had inadvertently suggested that such a grand process should take place in order to fulfill the obligations of public accountability and in all honesty I could not.

I spoke with someone close to the workings of the council who suggested that a public review or continued public assessment of the council's activities really would only lead to bad feelings. I assume that he meant that a great many people not directly involved with agriculture or farming or government would get all upset over conflicts between others which did not concern them. He preferred that the conflicts be resolved in the good old down home fashion, with a talk and a handshake. I appreciate that sentiment and I really do wish that every problem could be resolved by rational people over a cup of coffee.

However, two important factors are left out. The first is that the distribution of public resources requires public accountability. This is a fundamental and, I believe, necessary principle of the modern democratic system; that a bureaucrat and a private citizen do not make binding decisions in private about public resources.

The other important factor is that the council has not been mobile enough to get around the territory to conduct its down home chats. There are just too many people contacting me and my colleagues on this side of the House to express frustration at the lack of information about the guidelines for distributing land and in some cases about the fate of their own applications.

I think there is a demonstrated need to divulge publicly the guidelines and I think this motion, to a degree, will satisfy that demand.

This finally brings us to the issue of what constitutes public accountability. A long-sitting member of this House has said "the accountability, I think, comes to all of us at least every four years in respect to membership in this House, if the member opposite takes time to read the *Yukon Council Act*". It seems — I will not mention any names — clear that he or she believes that the public looks to the Legislature, all of us, as being accountable for the distribution of public assets. Further, this honoured and respected member of this House said, "further to that, there is accountability. The Agriculture Development Council works very closely with the Livestock Association and those people who are interested in getting into the agricultural industry apply to that particular mechanism".

I have already alluded to the questions put by members of the Agricultural Association to their own leadership and to the Agriculture Development Council when it pays its visits to the Livestock Association meetings, many of which I have attended.

There are questions worth answering and I think this motion, if successful, will go a long way in answering many of them. It is clear in my mind that the Agriculture Development Council should continue to advise the government on policy — I think, a very worthwhile task. It would be even more helpful to the whole atmosphere of developing policy if others in our community, people of various backgrounds, could provide the kind of advice necessary to produce really sound policy. It is not only worthwhile that others participate in policy development, it is, in my opinion, their right to participate. They cannot do so if they are given incomplete information about the direction the government is taking through the actions of the advisory council.

This motion asks for a complete set of factors used to determine whether agricultural land applications will be approved. This is a first step. We must know or have access to information about these factors on an ongoing basis. We must be assured that the rules are justified under any given set of circumstances. We must be assured that they are being applied fairly.

I hope the members of this House will consider these remarks and vote for the motion.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I listened with a great deal of interest to the member opposite and I have obviously made quite an impression on him because he quoted me several times, and I just want to commit myself to the member opposite that if he ever says anything of consequence over this four-year period, I will try to remember to quote him as well.

I do not have any problem with the motion. I will provide

whatever information we have. I am a little bit perplexed with the member opposite talking about attending all these meetings and all the problems the people are having. I do know that there has been a number of problems that have been brought forward directly to me and the Agriculture Development Council. They have been resolved and I should point out, further, that I have attended a number of the meetings that he has referred to but he seems to be absent when I am there, so maybe that is a coincidence. I do not want to let it be said in this House or inferred to any member of the public who is reading the *Hansard* that the member opposite is spending every night at an agricultural meeting, because that is definitely the impression that came across from the prepared statement that the member read that obviously somebody else wrote.

We do not have any problem with the motion. I will try to get whatever information we have together and perhaps table it tomorrow or at the beginning of next week and I trust the member opposite will take the time to read it.

Mr. McDonald: Very seldom do I get the last word on any debate, but I think that, in this case...

Hon. Mr. Lang: For good reason.

Mr. McDonald: The minister suggests it is for good reason. I think that his public image would probably decline if I had more opportunities. The minister suggested that if I say anything of consequence in the next four years that he will quote me. I am sure that he does not want to waste much of the next four years quoting me, so I will not hold him to that particular promise.

He suggested, on a more serious nature, that he does not know of problems and I think that the purpose of this motion is to solve the problem of lack of information. In my travels around the territory and in the meetings that I have attended of the Yukon Livestock and Agriculture Association, of which I am a member — and the majority of meetings in the last year I have attended — there were a number of problems which — while not many diverse problems — were aired at the time. I am hoping that this motion will go, to some extent, to help the situation.

If the kind of information that we are getting out of the House during Question Period is any indication, this may not be the end of the number of motions that you may have to face in the future.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to motions other than government motions.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 5

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 1, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 1?

Mr. Brewster: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Kluane, seconded by the hon. member for Hootalinqua, THAT the First Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments be concurred in.

Mr. Brewster: Having been very new on this, in fact, the first I have sat on, I was rather concerned when I first started to see that a large number of recommendations of previous reports were again showing up in ours. However, after talking with a large number of people who have been involved in this, I found that most of them thought that there was a considerable amount of improvement. I can assure you that this committee will continue to try to make this improvement in the next one.

Mr. Kimmerly: I concur with the previous remarks. It was interesting, in the last Legislature, that the reports of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments became increasingly forceful as the reports went by. They were always about the same issues, but the members of the committee were obviously getting increasingly frustrated. The Fourth and Fifth Reports in the last Assembly were never debated, which is unfortunate. The committee got off to a new start after the election on the 7th of June and is working productively.

I would use the time of the Assembly to again state that although this is not an issue that requires a great deal of publicity or partisan

or political interest, it is a very, very important issue and it could be and should be, in my view, possibly the most important committee of this House. There is an increasing tendency all over the world to use regulations more and more, and this is understandable, concerning the increasing complexity of society and the complexity of laws and regulations which govern us.

The committee's chairman indicated an improvement in recent months and I concur in that observation and welcome it. This is an extremely important committee and I would urge all members to read the fairly short document with some care.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I want to assure the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, as well as the other members of the committee that I have read the document and read it with care because it is something that interests me greatly.

I want to congratulate them on tabling their first report to this Legislature. I deem it to be very, very important and the work they do is of tremendous help to the government. Their recommendations are taken under very, very serious consideration. I do appreciate, and we all appreciate, the input of the committee by this means. I am pleased to see that the committee is prepared to recognize the fact that we, as the government, have been looking at and acting upon their recommendations in all areas that we can and the improvement that they have noticed, I hope, will continue in the future.

Motion agreed to

Motion No. 3

Mr. Clerk: Item number 2, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 2?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Leader of the Official Opposition, that obfuscations and tautological pronouncements and statements notwithstanding, and subject to all words hereinbefore stated and hereinafter stated, all motions, bills, laws, regulations and other public business coming before this House or any committee of this House shall, notwithstanding any other provision, be stated in simple language and be in commonly understood form.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am going to speak very simply and I will make my remarks short. The purpose of the motion of course is to publicize an issue and to emphasize an issue which I believe, and many members I am sure believe, is a very important issue in political life generally today. I have spoken in the past about democratic issues or the increasing importance of paying attention to regulations and freedom of information and fundamental issues like that which affect our system of government in a real and important way. There are many, many examples all over the world of laws being written in a very cumbersome way and it can be said that it is practically impossible for ordinary citizens to keep up with the body of laws and regulations passed by the government. I agree with that.

Some Yukon examples, I believe, are contained in the *Wildlife Act* recently passed, the style of drafting was very cumbersome, in that provisions were stated under a chapter of the act, or a part, and the parts were all numbered. It was frequently the case that there was a statement that a provision in the law is subject to another part, or an entire part is subject to something else, and what that means is that if an ordinary citizen reads a particular section of the law and relies on it, he may be making a mistake, unwittingly. It is necessary, in order to understand the law, to read the entire act, and the act is extremely long, of course, going into many pages. Recently I have commented about the amendments to the *Territorial Court Act* and I would comment that, where there are substantial amendments to an act, it frequently occurs that a member of the public looks up a law, reads it, believes it is the law, and acts on it and does not read further to find amendments. That occurs fairly frequently. Also, even if a person knows of amendments, it is necessary to go through one act and then another major fairly long act in order to understand the first one. And that is extremely cumbersome and it is a factor which makes laws very difficult to understand.

I came across a debate in the Canadian Senate of Monday, the 28th of March; Senator Roblin talked about the *Income Tax Act*. He said this, and I quote, "If there is anything in the principles respecting tax legislation that we were taught when we were young (perhaps these are all out of date now) it was that taxes should be certain, they should be clear, they should be comprehensible."

There is a further comment about them being reasonable and within the capacity of the text to say which, of course, ought to be repeated as often as possible. He then goes on to talk about the capital gains paragraph and he says, "In the capital gains paragraph, which is section 39, there are 774 words, 28 commas and two semicolons." Mr. Guinness kindly advises that the information in the Getteysburg Address had 267 words and I leave it to you which one leaves the deeper mark on mankind.

There are nine subsections in reference to capital gains and these subsections refer to ten other sections which refer, in turn, to 40 other sections which refer to an entirely different statute. If you want to get your capital gains taxation right you have the five subsections and a reference to 40 other sections and a separate statute to go through altogether. This is an example of the kind of complexity that we find ourselves facing with respect to tax law in this country. Nobody can understand it without a chartered accountant and lawyer at his side.

I am not going to go on with further examples, but it is simple and clear and I say that virtually every member of the public would agree that the laws that we pass ought to be as simple as possible and they must be understandable and in a common form so that the average guy knows what they mean.

Amendment proposed

Mr. Brewster: I would like to move, seconded by the member for Old Crow, that motion no. 3 be amended by: a) deleting the words "obfuscations and tautological pronouncements and statements notwithstanding, and subject to all words hereinbefore stated and hereinafter stated"; b) Deleting the words "notwithstanding any other provision"; and by adding after the words "commonly understood form" the phrase "to the extent practical".

I am not going to make a long speech on this. I had a four page speech ready to make but I decided maybe I should not make it. I think if you look at the meaning of the two words — obfuscations means to darken, or to make obscure, to confuse. Well, that was certainly successful in that motion. Therefore, the amendment sounds much clearer. Tautological — needless repetition of an idea, statement or word. I agree. Maybe we should be looking at the smaller statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should read the amendment prior to hearing any debate.

It has been moved by the hon. member for Kluane, seconded by the hon. member for Old Crow, that motion no. 3 be amended by a) Deleting the words "obfuscations and tautological pronouncements and statements notwithstanding, and subject to all words hereinbefore stated and hereinafter stated"; b) Deleting the words "notwithstanding any other provision"; and c) By adding after the words "commonly understood form" the phrase "to the extent practical".

Mr. Brewster: About the only other thing I would like to say on it is an old saying: that ignorance of the law is no excuse. I think that we, in Yukon, and probably anywhere else, should be making laws, not for lawyers, not for professors, but for the average person on the street and, therefore, I would ask everybody in this House to support our amendment which is quite plain.

Mr. Penikett: Good amendment. Nice speech. We vote yes.

Amendment agreed to

Motion agreed to as amended

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 3, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item no. 3?

Mr. Penikett: Next sitting day, please.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Motion No. 10

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 4, standing in the name of Mr. Byblow.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item no. 4?

Mr. Byblow: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Faro, seconded by the hon. member for Campbell, that Sessional Paper 83-3-9, which contains a letter dated March 3, 1983, from Mr. Harry Allen, Chairman of the Council for Yukon Indians, to hon. Chris Pearson, government leader, be referred to Committee of the Whole; and that representatives of the Council for Yukon Indians be invited to appear before the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of making a presentation and answering questions regarding the land claims settlement process, the substance of the agreements signed to date, and the proposed implementation strategy.

Mr. Byblow: I do expect that the motion before us, that of calling upon representatives of the CYI to appear before Committee of the Whole of this House will be expedited with a minimum of debate and passed and we can get on to the real issue at hand.

Quite obviously, that issue is a continuing discussion of one of the most important, most fundamental and influential developments facing the territory today, the issue being land claims. We have had, to date, a ten year process with significant progress that, late last year, saw a new development whereby this government left the negotiating table. Since that time, we have had quite a flood of literature, debate, presentations from this government about their position on the subject and, as indicated in the document tabled in the Legislature, in a letter from Mr. Allen to the government leader, we had a request of this Legislature to permit a presentation as a means of further education, further dialogue and an intelligent analysis on the subject.

As we heard earlier today in debate on a motion for the production of papers surrounding the land claims issue, this motion stands on the spirit of that debate, in the spirit of a general desire for more information, for clarification of land claims issues. It seems to me there is no doubt, as tripartite participants to the land claims process, this government would want to have this Legislature fully advised and permit the discussion on the developments surrounding the current impasse.

I believe this appearance before the House, as a rational discussion on land claims, would continue and would, in the opinion of this side of the House, pose no problems in the business of the House and, in fact, would dignify the Legislature in a responsible fashion for having entertained a reasonable request from the Council for Yukon Indians, one of the tripartite participants in the land claims process.

I would bring to your attention a current situation in the Alberta Legislature where, later this month, the Legislature will recess for four days, during the course of which presentations will be made to a committee of the whole of that House on labour legislation from a number of witnesses. That Legislature is adjourning to a committee of the whole for that four day period in the course of its normal sitting.

This motion calls for a similar procedure — obviously not as extended — and it is not unprecedented. I do not believe it is in any way difficult to handle or expedite the course of the House's business. I believe only two weeks ago we rearranged House business to accommodate two appearances by representatives of the Alaska State Legislature for what amounted to some very productive and very informative discussions. I believe, in a similar spirit and on the strength of the request made by the chairman of the Council for Yukon Indians to the Legislature, it would be incumbent upon us to not only be appreciative of the opportunity but to seize upon it and expand on a better understanding of the land claims issue that we all want to be part of.

We expect this motion to receive approval; I believe Yukoners expect it. I am sure we would all benefit, so I would seek the unanimous approval so that we could put the necessary mechanics in place.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I rise in my capacity as government house leader. The principle that I first want to speak to is the question of witnesses appearing before the House, no matter who they are or

what they do or what their responsibilities may be.

On March 30th, 1983, there was a request for certain representation to come to this House in respect to a particular bill that was in the process of being deliberated by all members. At that time, I rose and gave a presentation in respect to what I felt the position of the members of this Chamber should be, in respect to inviting members of the public or interest groups or societies, or whatever the case may be.

At that time, I referred to my longevity as a member of the House and when I was first elected, and the procedure that took place at that time was that if anyone approached the Council and asked to appear, the general procedure was that we would use the time of the House and hear the witnesses on the particular topic at hand. Subsequently, I found that the witnesses were using the forum that was presented them in very much of a political manner as opposed to what was intended — to give technical and factual advice to members in respect to what the issue was and how it should be addressed.

I also refer to my time when we got to the point where there were very few invitations extended. We have since had the Minister of Indian Affairs come to this House twice, and twice I think he utilized this Legislature, which I do not think was in their best interests. In fact it was utilized for the purposes of bringing the people of the territory to their knees in the situation that we faced. I refer to Mr. Munro, who appeared here last fall, and I also refer, which you can well remember, the time that the hon. Mr. Allmand appeared and gave us a dissertation on the way Yukon society should be shaped. The only thing he forgot in that presentation, if I recall correctly, is that he did not indicate that he would ever live here to see whether or not the experiment worked.

I also recall when the chairman of the CYI at that time appeared before the House and utilized the Chambers in such a manner that I felt that it was in disrespect to all elected members of the House. I think, if you refer back to the *Debates and Proceedings* of that time, all members would agree that that was not the reason for the invitation because it was brought forward as a confrontation. It was not in the best interest of all people of the territory.

I have to ask members of this House where to draw the line in respect to who will be permitted to come to these Chambers and permitted to speak, and who will not.

I refer to the leader of the official opposition. I would like to formally welcome him back to Whitehorse from Faro. I would like to hear an update on his trip at some time. I want to point out that the questions he asked this morning was: would we have the former Commissioner, Ione Christensen as a witness to these proceedings?

The reason I use this example, and I am not using this in disrespect, is to ask: then where does it stop? Are we going to have the regional director of the Department of Indian Affairs here? Are we going to have one of our crushing companies here to tell us the technical ways of how to crush gravel for the purposes of applying BST? I say it is our responsibility as members to get out and inquire. If there is an issue that concerns the side opposite, they can form their own public committee to hear reports or comments. We could do it on our side of the House. You can approach the minister directly.

It seems to me that there are other vehicles that can be utilized for the purposes of discussing issues with the various groups throughout the territory. I submit to you that the place is not this Legislature; talking about the issue that this particular motion addresses other than the principle of witnesses appearing before the House: the principle of discussing land claims. I heard the former Commissioner, Ione Christensen, on the media this morning not being able to remember a meeting that I attended where everybody, the elected members and her in her capacity of Commissioner, said that if we did not get a memorandum of agreement that was satisfactory to the Government of Yukon we would resign. I recall that when she left public office she was going to go home and paint her kitchen. I hope she has not forgotten that either, because I attended that meeting and I was there and I was prepared as an elected member to resign from the Executive committee and the government leader indicated that this morning in Question Period.

Is this what we are going to have — people coming forward to

this House with perhaps lack of memory, perhaps trying to get on to a band wagon depending on what the issue is for the purposes of using this forum. Or, is this forum for the purpose of the elected members being able to deliberate a particular issue and make a decision on that issue?

It is my position, and I say this from a parliamentary point of view, that the formal proceedings of this House should be utilized for the purposes of deliberating the issues that are before us and that we should be prepared, when we come into these Chambers, to have our homework done, and not ask somebody to appear before that bar to do the homework for us. Each one of us, as elected members, has a responsibility to go out and find out the information, find out what people are thinking, discuss it among ourselves and make a conscious decision as to what is in the best interests of the territory and not necessarily what is in the best interests of a vested interest group or an individual. That is our responsibility as elected members. I say to the member for Mayo that when he reads *Hansard* tomorrow he can quote those words, if he wishes, in some other forum.

It seems to me that the motion before us is on the issue that we are facing with the Government of Canada, it is not with the Council for Yukon Indians. The government leader has, time after time, told members in this House that we have a disagreement with the Government of Canada; it is not with the Council for Yukon Indians. It would seem to me if we accept the principle, which I cannot condone, that witnesses will appear before us in Committee of the Whole, we would have to look at the issue of this motion. I would say to you that it would make more sense to ask the Government of Canada, the leader of the official oppositions good friend, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to come before this committee, because that is where the disagreement is. We have six points that the members opposite obviously cannot support for their own political motives — I do not know what they are and I would be the last to infer what they are — but we have six points outstanding with the Government of Canada. With that in mind and in view of the fact that our officials have met and are going to meet in the future, it would seem to me that perhaps we can work out our disagreements behind closed doors.

²² We are not asking on this side of the House for public confrontation. I think our actions in respect to this particular issue point that out; the fact that when we left the table it was three weeks after that that we said publicly we had left the table because we felt maybe there was a way, without having any political confrontation, that we could solve our problems between the two levels of government and get on with the business at hand. Of course, that was not the will of the federal bureaucracy, and now we are in the situation that we are in.

It would seem to me that if the Council for Yukon Indians wishes to create its own public forum to speak, that is fine; I have no problem with that; I encourage that. In fact, our party is going to have them at our convention this weekend to bring forward their concerns and aspirations to the delegates who are Conservative. I know it will be good news to the members opposite that there are going to be a lot of people there.

It would seem to me that to use the Committee of a Whole for the purpose that the member opposite has indicated, I think, is just opening the door to various other people who want to come forward. As I referred to the comments of the leader of the opposition who wanted another witness, according to the question that was put, where does it end? We could all install telephones in here and turn it into a talk-back show.

I am sure that if you, Mr. Speaker, had the privilege and the opportunity to speak to this motion, there is no doubt in my mind that you, as a parliamentarian, would concur with this: that the House is sacrosanct.

This is why you put your name on a ballot. When the ballots are counted there is a public trust that goes with it; there is a public responsibility to make decisions and not to have these Chambers used for the purposes of their vested interest point of view, their own personal point of view, or whatever the case may be, with all good intentions, or to try to sway for political expediency the decision that may be made on a certain issue that day.

I say to you, as a parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Committee of the Whole should be used for that purpose.

The member for Faro referred to what is happening in Alberta, which I was not aware of, but there is a very fundamental difference that the member skipped over there. The fact was that they were recessing the House; they were not using the formalities of the House. They had a committee of the House for the purposes of listening to people. The member opposite, in his dissertation, and if he refers to *Hansard*, specifically said they were recessing from Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Byblow: No, into Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, then obviously the member opposite gave us improper information, from what the member said.

That is my opinion in respect to the utilization of these Chambers. We have always indicated to the Council for Yukon Indians that we are free at any given time to meet with them. The government leader has made that offer time in and time out and, in fact, we have met with them. The Minister of Justice has made the offer to the president of the Law Society, the legal fraternity, and has met on a continuous basis with them. I have met with the Agricultural Association any time they wanted to meet with me. So, the point I am making is that we are accessible. We are available for people to come forward with their views. I am saying there are forums for presentations; I do not believe Committee of the Whole and the formalities of this House is the place for that.

Mr. Porter: In listening to the member who has just preceded me, I was reminded of a remark that was made by our colleague from Alaska, Mr. Mitch Abood, who said that the moment the politicians get elected they somehow believe that their IQ goes up 400 percent.

On the whole question before us, I think that the primary objective of the motion is one of information; that CYI have undertaken to request, from the government, an appearance before the Committee of the Whole here today so that they can inform the public as to their side of the story of the land claims negotiations, and for the purpose of giving full expression as to the position of the CYI. I would like to take the opportunity to quote from a letter addressed to Mr. Chris Pearson, Government Leader, Yukon Territorial Government, from the Chairman of the Council for Yukon Indians. Mr. Allen writes: "Dear Mr. Pearson, As you know, the Council for Yukon Indians shares with your government a desire to keep Yukoners accurately informed as to the progress of the land claims negotiations, always keeping in mind the need to ... have endeavoured where possible to transform Yukoners' misconceptions and groundless fears into a more factual appreciation of both the settlement process and the agreements signed to date. Nevertheless, despite our best attempts, we find, particularly as of late, that many Yukoners continue to adhere to grossly inaccurate views regarding the nature of the negotiations as well as the 43 agreements signed since 1979. Subsequently we have decided that there exists a clear and pressing need to increase our efforts substantially, and therefore I am writing to request an invitation for the CYI to appear before the territorial Legislature's Committee of the Whole some time early in the next Session." The letter is dated the 3rd of March and it is only at this date that finally the Legislature chooses to respond to the question raised.

I think that we, as a Legislature, cannot be so arrogant as to assume that we know everything on all of the issues that face Yukon. We cannot assume that the moment that we are elected that only we have the ability to have the right to debate and decide on issues that confront Yukoners. I believe that a greater involvement of the people, in any government, has, as its end result, better government. It think that, at one time, participatory democracy was an issue that even this Legislature adhered to and supported.

For evidence of that, you only have to look through the files of appearances of witnesses before the Committee of the Whole. You have had, in the past, people representing the Yukon insurance agencies, Chamber of Commerce, the Yukon Territorial Public Service Association. You have had the president of the Yukon Association of Non-Status Indians, the representative of YNB, the executive director of the YVA, director of the Yukon Visitors Association, the executive director of the BC Hotels, the Insurance

Bureau of Canada. So there has been ample precedent set in this regard that when the Legislature is confronted with an issue of importance, an issue that the legislators deem to be of importance to Yukoners, they have had witnesses appear and give the members a degree of information as to the subject that was being discussed, debated and decided upon at that particular point in the Legislature's history.

Let us make our position very clear: we, on this side of the House, are not advocating, as a matter of course, that this legislature adopt a daily routine of appearances of witnesses before the Committee of the Whole to address every issue that is brought before this Legislature. Clearly, what we are saying is that, when the Assembly is presented with an issue of profound importance to all of the people of the Yukon, such as the question of aboriginal rights, then this Legislature, for the purpose of doing justice to the issue, should sit down with the people who are concerned with the issue, other than this legislative body, and hear their concerns so that, in the end, the decision that we do make about the issue is a better decision.

If we encourage the people of the Yukon to become involved in this form of government, not only will we be giving the people a better form of government, but I think, to a large extent, we would be encouraging the people to have confidence, once again, in government. You only have to go out there and talk to people in the Yukon and everywhere in this country, to find that people have a great deal of cynicism about the role of government and about the responsibility that government plays in people's lives. I think that a progressive decision on this particular motion would give an indication to those people that the government does, in fact, care about them; that the government, in fact, does want to hear their concerns prior to making decisions.

The previous speaker talked about the fear of committees and outside interest groups taking over this Legislature. That was clearly stated in the debate held previously, I believe, on March 30 on this particular subject. I will say the same thing now that I said at that time: I believe that this Legislature, and the legislators that are elected here, are competent enough that no outside interest group, no outside organization, would be able, with or without our consent, take over this Legislature.

Another very important point that the member brought out was that the groups appearing before this Legislature, if we allow them to appear, would use the forum to discuss political matters. Well, try as we might, we cannot escape the fact that issues such as land claims negotiations are political issues. We cannot escape the fact that this very Legislature that we are sitting in is a political instrument of the people. That is why we are elected. That is why we bring the kinds of discussions that we discuss every day before this Legislature because they are issues of political importance. I believe that we have a responsibility to debate these issues before this Legislature and we have the same responsibility on the question of where you draw the line. I think, again, that deals with the competency of the legislators here in the Legislature. We would have to rely on none other than our judgement as to decide which issues should be brought before the Committee of the Whole with appearances of witnesses. I, for one, feel competent that I can make the distinction as to what is of major importance to the people of Yukon and what is not.

Getting back to the question of information and secrecy, I think that is one of the major concerns that has been raised from the beginning about the whole question of these negotiations. There always has been an aura of secrecy about it and I think, by encouraging public discussion between the parties involved at the negotiations, we would go a long way toward allaying the fears, resting the fears, of the people of the Yukon, the public of the Yukon, as to the secrecy that has, from the beginning, shrouded the whole process of negotiations. I see a very important precedent as to the request from the Council of Yukon Indians toward the whole question of secrecy. For them to come before this legislature and discuss openly with us the whole question of land claims and the process of negotiation I think will rest a lot of fears as to what the real positions of the Indian people are.

With respect to the request for information, I think that every

member in this legislature would be well informed as to the presentation that would be given by the Council of Yukon Indians and they, in turn, can take back the information to their constituencies and give that information out as being straight from the horse's mouth, if you will. Many of the people feel that the debate as of this moment is purely a one-sided debate; that we are clearly hearing, continuously, on a daily basis, the government's point of view but, very often, we do not hear the other points of view.

24 In conclusion, I would have to say that, judging from the previous speaker's response, I think we still have to have a serious question raised in regards to the positions taken by the hon. member for Porter Creek East; you have to question the real intent of government. My question that maybe the next speaker can answer is: is the real reason that the government does not want this House to hear the witnesses on this question because they want to monopolize the discussion around the issue in the House, and that they want only their side of the story heard before this Legislature and not anyone else's.

I think, in conclusion to this motion, I would urge all members to seriously think about this issue because it is one of prime importance. The land claims process is probably one of the most important events that will occur in our history. It will impact every area of life; on housing, on areas of education. On the very institution of government there will be impact as a result of the claims process. I think, put in that context, we have no choice but to treat this as a major issue and to give it every consideration that it deserves.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I want to react a little bit to what the previous speaker has said because I agree with him in some things, particularly in that land claims is a major issue.

If I read the letter from the chairman of the CYI correctly, his intent, in asking to appear before the Legislature, is not the same as what is in this motion. The question, I thought, was not land claims, but was this government's participation in land claims and it is a question that does not involve the Council for Yukon Indians.

I am surprised to hear that the members opposite want to hear the other side of the story. They heard the other side of the story. Each one of them was present when the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in this very Chamber, gave his side of the story. It was loud, it was clear and it was irrefutable, it was in writing. It is a document which each one of them has; they have heard that side of the story.

In respect to land claims, they are secret and they will be secret no matter what the wishes of anybody are, because they are negotiations and they cannot be conducted in public. Nothing can be accomplished by trying, at any time, to conduct land claims, or any kind of negotiation, like this in public.

An implied criticism is that it has taken us a long time, or it has taken somebody a long time, to reply to the letter from the chairman of the Council for Yukon Indians. I want to tell you that I do not deem that it is this government's prerogative to determine who may or may not appear before this House. It is a subject that can only be decided by this House and not by the government and not by any individual member.

The chairman of the Council of Yukon Indians, as a consequence, wrote to me. I replied immediately, telling him that I was forwarding that letter to the chairman of committees because he asked to appear before the Committee of the Whole. The chairman of committees, I respectfully submit to you, expeditiously tabled that letter in this House and it is now being dealt with, but it is not true that we have taken an inordinately long time to reply to the letter. My reply to the chairman of the Council for Yukon Indians went out very, very quickly.

Notwithstanding all of these other issues, as a parliamentarian, albeit a short-sitting parliamentarian — if my colleague on my left here is a long-sitting parliamentarian, I guess I am a short one and it is the only time you are ever going to be able to change the long and the short around — I believe that we, as parliamentarians, have to be very, very careful that we do conduct parliamentary business in a proper manner in this House.

I feel very strongly that the days of the Clerk being referred to as

the member for Second Avenue, as I recall you once referred to him — I am very appreciative of the fact that it was the Clerk before me, even — because people who were not elected had the capability of speaking in this House at that time. I sincerely hope that those days are gone forever, because that is not parliamentary procedure.

25 **Mr. Penikett:** Let me enter this debate, not as a short sitting member or as a long standing member, but perhaps as a wide sitting member.

Having agreement from members of the other side on that point, I want to disagree with them on just about everything else that they have said. I do not agree with the member for Porter Creek East or, apparently, the government leader in terms of parliamentary practise on this question. I do not agree with him either in terms of the duties of the Legislature on this question.

I must say I am a little disappointed by the government leader's response. The government leader just now said that is not the government's decision who is to appear before this House as witnesses, it is the Legislature's decision. I agree that that is as it ought to be. Unfortunately, the practice has been in the House, certainly in my time here, that the government has made those decisions. I think that in a truly democratic legislature, I admit that you would not want to entertain very frequently the wishes of an individual member about the calling of witnesses. However, if one was really interested in having an informed debate on the important issues of the day, and if there was a significant number of members of the House who felt that the information and advice of some expert or informed speaker or witness would be valuable, I think that those people who have a respect for democracy and an informed debate would want to have those people recognized.

I say this with respect to the member for Porter Creek East because I have participated in a couple of debates in this House about who should be called as witnesses. I remember one on *The Dental Professions Ordinance*, I believe, it was or some bill of such kind, where the government had its witnesses called — those people who supported its point of view — but fought like crazy to prevent someone who had some information, some technical ability who had a contrary point of view from being heard at all. We did hear that person in the end but I believe that was the last time that the majority in this House was even willing to hear anybody who had anything critical to say about anything they were doing, even if that person had a hell of a lot more expertise than anybody in this House.

The member opposite also says that when we have witnesses we should be hearing the witnesses if they have technical advice not if they have political advice. That is a nice distinction and I am not sure it is one that you can always draw with precision. The fact of the matter is that people who are well informed on a subject tend also to have strong views on that subject. If those views happen to differ with somebody else, especially a group of people who are uninformed, the uninformed majority may well regard the expert minority as being political.

The fact of the matter is, when the member opposite across the road, the member for Tatchun, mutters that is democracy, it is not. Democracy is a chance for both sides of an issue to be heard and those people having heard both sides and heard all the facts that are available to exercise their judgement about the issues. Democracy is not the dissemination of one point of view and then an endorsement of that point of view by a vote. That is not an informed debate nor is that an informed decision.

Let me say this perfectly seriously — the member opposite talks about Mr. Munro's appearance. I must say that I was pretty disappointed with Mr. Munro's appearance. I was pretty disappointed with what he said. I was pretty disappointed about the floor arrangements, and I was pretty disappointed when I found out what had happened here as compared to what happened in Yellowknife. Mr. Munro's appearance in Yellowknife was followed by a question period at which members of the House had a chance to tangle with him, ask questions, get information and in fact to debate some of the questions he had raised. No such opportunity was given us here.

I do not know if any such opportunity was offered this Legislature, but as a member of this House — who is a member of

this House as much as any member opposite — I would very much like to have had such an opportunity. Let me say this with respect; that might have been as good a use of the minister's time as the press conference that he had upstairs. The Minister of Education suggests that I tell him that. I would be pleased to accept that suggestion next time I meet the minister, but since that is the one and only time I have met the minister in the last few years, and the members that sit across there meet him much more frequently than I do — the member for Porter Creek East refers to him as my friend — I must say that this friendship is a pretty frail thing because I only see him when I get invited to meetings arranged by the members opposite.

The member says I agree with what he says. I cannot think of a single thing that Mr. Munro has said about which I agree except possibly I might have shared in some small way some of his criticisms of this government. That would not make me a friend except in the sense in which the enemies of my enemies are my friends.

I want to talk very seriously, not only about this motion, but about the parliamentary point made by the member opposite. He suggests that somehow it would be improper or unparliamentary for us to spend time of this House hearing witnesses. I want to return to this point, but I would remind members opposite that this is not the Palace of Westminster; this is not the House of Commons; we are not 620 some members and we are not 282 members. We are 16 members. We are not so busy, I submit, that we could not from time to time, in a rare while, hear from some people who have something useful to say to us.

The only reason, in fact, I would suggest that we are having to deal with this proposal as a request to appear before a Committee of the Whole is because we have no other procedure for dealing with it. I suspect that on an issue like land claims, all 16 members of the House are interested in this question. I would be extremely surprised if they are not, and I would be perhaps disappointed to discover that any member was not interested in the question.

But even if I accepted the member for Porter Creek East's argument that it were inappropriate to use the time of the whole House to hear such witnesses, I would like to know, from him, what the alternative is under our arrangements. Even though we were given a pay increase some time ago on the basis that we were creating select committees that would be very busy, we do not have a select committee functioning in this House; we have not had a select committee created since the last election. We have no special committees created on land claims or the constitution or any of the burning issues that relate to land claims. Do we have a need for witnesses? Let me say, with respect to members opposite, that we do not include all the wisdom in the territory in this House. We do not know everything about everything that concerns us. It may even be the case — in fact, I suggest it is probably the case — that all information about all important matters that affect us is not even contained in the public service of the territory.

We are not experts. We do not have all the information. On many issues, on many important issues, there are two sides, and there may be more than two sides on the issue. Important questions like land claims require that we, as legislators, be informed. We have not been informed.

Lacking a select committee process, lacking special committees that could hear such witnesses, we have no choice but to propose that they come before the Committee of the Whole House.

The member for Porter Creek East suggested just a minute ago that it was our responsibility to be prepared before we come into this House. I agree. One of the ways we prepare for important debates, presumably, is to hear from people who are knowledgeable about the questions. The problem is, under the arrangements under which we now operate, we do not even get the bills until we are in Session. That means, any information that we need about the legislation, we are required to obtain early in the morning or late at night. We run out of reading time, we run out of research time during sitting. We may not have a bill before us in this Session that has anything to do with land claims, but there is no doubt that land claims and issues relating to land claims negotiations have coloured and dominated the proceedings of this sitting as they have in no

other sitting during my time here. I, for one, and I am sure many members here, would have appreciated not just hearing the other point of view referred to by the member for Campbell, but would have been glad and happy to have had the sum of our information about this issue increased by whatever knowledge the Council for Yukon Indians could provide us.

We have not had such an opportunity in my time in this House. This is a very important issue. The Council for Yukon Indians is a very significant party to the negotiations — the most significant party — a very significant group in this community; but we have not heard from them, as legislators. I think history will probably find that incredible.

The minister opposite says that people have access to ministers; well, they have access to ministers perhaps in private meetings, meetings of which there is no record. That kind of access to the government, that kind of exchange with the government, is irrelevant to the Legislature.

What we are discussing here is not bilateral negotiation or communications between ministers and citizens or groups of citizens, but public input. We are talking about public information put on the public record about matters of public policy, and that is the need of the Legislature, not a requirement of the government. I believe the public should be able to not only see and hear the Legislature but they should also, when necessary, be able to speak to the House.

On the land claims question, I am afraid we have gone through a long period when we had no information; now we are in a period where we are getting one-way information. I say it is not just our job to talk here; it is also our job to listen. It is especially important for us to listen to anybody who could add to our information about the land claims. And who better can do that than the representatives of the Council for Yukon Indians, especially when, given the historic relationship between CYI and this Legislature, they have requested the opportunity to appear.

We have heard the territorial government's view on the issues of the last few weeks; we have heard, perhaps in an incomplete way, from the federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs; we have not heard from CYI, and that is too bad. The member opposite says that the CYI will be addressing the PC convention. Well, that is very nice. We have heard that CYI has requested an appearance before my party's convention as well but the members of this House that the NDP and the PCs do not represent everybody in this territory. It may come as a surprise to members opposite, but there are no doubt citizens out there who would want to put a plague on both our houses. The member opposite says he can deliver chicken pox. I have never before wished to venture to unparliamentary language and suggest that such a disease could emanate from that source but now the member has admitted that that is the principal feature of his personality, we are prepared to accede to that view. We have heard him clucking and strutting many times before in this House, but having suffered from that disease before, I am sure we are all immune.

We have not heard many witnesses in this House; we do not hear from many witnesses. The time involved in hearing from witnesses in our total legislative calendar is not great. It is not a great demand to put on us. If there were an alternative, if we had a special committee that we could hear them in, if we had a select committee which we could hear them in or if we could hear them when the House was not sitting, but we could hear them on the record in such a way that the public could hear the information too, I would say, let us do it, but we do not have that alternative. I am saying, let us call CYI, let us ask them the questions that our constituents are asking us, let us hear their answers to those questions, let us get them on the record, let us hear their point of view, let us recognize that no harm could come from hearing them and, in fact, a great deal of good could come from hearing them on these very important issues. I say that CYI deserves such a hearing and I think the members of this House would be giving them a great insult, and ourselves a great injury, in terms of our knowledge on this issue, if we do not hear them.

Mr. Brewster: I am not going to be too long at this. About a week ago, the government leader offered the services of all of our

land claim negotiators to meet in a private meeting with the opposition. They, to my knowledge, never accepted this. It is quite apparent that they want to do nothing but play politics with this. The only other comment I will make is that CYI are the ones who wanted to keep the secrecy, not the Government of Yukon.

Mr. Kimmerly: Our leader has already spoken about the parliamentary issue and I am not going to dwell on that, but I do wish to generally speak about the issue, perhaps in a more personal sense. Before doing that, in response to the previous speaker, I answer that we are quite prepared for Mr. Phelps and the federal representatives to also appear and our position has always been in favour of increased openness and disclosure.

It has been, for me personally, one of the aims that I have chosen for myself in political life, to attempt to find some consensus or to assist in building bridges in the communities as opposed to building walls.

The member for Porter Creek East talked about the possibility of CYI using other forums; he said they can find other forums — of course, that is true, they can — and he also said that there is a danger of witnesses using this forum as a political platform. I would like to analyze that for just a moment. CYI does not need this Legislature as a forum at all. They can go to the press anytime they wish. They are a body recognized by the federal government and by this government as the representative body speaking for aboriginal peoples in the territory. They are a significant, substantial political force and they do not need to beg for a forum. If they wish to make a political statement they will simply make it and it will be reported and listened to; that is just a fact of life. That is not the major issue.

It may be that when CYI, or the representatives, eventually come — and they will in the future, if not in this immediate session — their statements will have a significant political content and I can even say that it could be put in the most argumentative language possible. For example, assume that they wish to come solely for political reasons, not for informative ones but political ones. I say, even if that were true, then why not bring the politics here, into this Assembly. In this forum, there is the opportunity and the structure, according to parliamentary tradition, to deal with the political questions of the day. That is an obvious statement. Aboriginal land claims is the foremost political issue, in the general sense, facing all the peoples of Yukon and it will be the most important issue in the foreseeable future, regardless of which turn the talks take.

28 The political debate could occur at secret meetings; it could occur in the media; it could occur in the conventions of all of the political parties, but the best place is in the Legislature which is equipped to deal with all of these questions in a parliamentary way.

As responsible government and as the power and authority and the constitutional development of this government and this Assembly develops, it is obvious that this Assembly is becoming increasingly important as the political forum for the territory. That is right and proper. The representatives of the aboriginal peoples of the territory are asking to take part and to debate with us in an information-gathering session, in a meeting of minds. There obviously are tensions in the community and substantial disagreement. We can say to the other side, "I won't speak to you. I recognize you are there and I will deal with you in one way, but I won't sit down with you, ask questions, answer questions and discuss the real issues".

We have an opportunity to do that here. We have an opportunity to build a bridge in the community, an opportunity to do our part in a political way to achieve a greater consensus in the community. I, for one, do not understand why we do not try.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have listened to the debate here today and I have become quite interested in it.

I can say that because I wanted to have something to say in this forum, this Legislature. I ran for election and became elected so that I could come in here and express my opinions. After I have been informed by people outside of this Legislature, to gather that information the best way possible, I have come here to express my opinions, and after listening to all of the evidence that is possible, to make a decision.

The member for Campbell's first remark was that these people should be allowed to put their position forward. I agree that they

should be allowed to put their position forward, but I do not believe this is the forum in which they should do it. There are other forums. If they want to meet with all of us together outside of this Legislature, I have no problem with it. If they want to meet with anyone of us individually or collectively, I have no problem with that either.

I do have a very serious problem with them coming in here and using this forum for their political platform. If they want to use this forum, they have the same opportunity as any one of us does — to go out and get elected. They should, they should go out and get elected. In fact, we have some here today who represent that group of people. We have one on our side and we have two on the other side who represent those people. That is what they are here for, to express their opinions and their views. I disagree very heartily with allowing other interest groups to come in here and put their positions forward in front of this Legislature. They can do it in any other medium, rather than come here.

We have been accused of only debating the government's position here. That is what this forum is for, to debate the government's position. It is for the opposition to criticize the government's position. We have been very public with our position and I would hope that if the members opposite represent the other side of the argument, that they raise it. That is what they are here for.

So, I believe that what they are suggesting is that they cannot win the argument themselves and that they would like a little bit of help. I do not see that as being the way that this Legislature should conduct itself.

29 There was a remark made by the leader of the opposition when I said it was democracy; that the people, the majority, should rule. Well, that is what democracy is: the majority makes the decision. It is up to them to get all the information available to them, and then make a rational decision. Perhaps that decision is wrong; everybody makes wrong decisions once in a while. We would only hope that it would be right.

I go back to the same argument I used before. If the CYI wants to put their position to every one of us to make sure that we have the knowledge available that they consider that they have, they are obligated, I would feel, to come and put their position to us. In fact, they have put their position to us in a great many instances, and we have been prepared to listen. We have offered them the forum to listen to them; we have offered to meet with them any time that they want to meet. I do not know how we could be more free with our time than that.

There have also been remarks made about all 16 members of this Legislature being interested in land claims. Certainly we are interested in land claims; it is the most important thing going on in the territory today. That does not mean that, in order to become more informed, we have to have witnesses in this House putting their political platform or their position forward. There are other methods to do it.

The leader of the opposition also said that there are two sides and sometimes more, and that is correct as well. And that is also a function of our democratic system; if the general public feels that we have made the wrong decision, the next time an election comes along they are going to kick us out and put somebody else in that will make the right ones.

I think we are following the correct method of running our Assembly. I cannot support the motion, and I believe that the CYI has an obligation, if they feel that the government is making a mistake, to put their information either to the government or to the public and let them make a rational decision. The information has been put to us, we have considered the information, we have put our position forward and it has nothing to do with the land claims except peripherally. Our argument is with the federal government and CYI does not enter into the picture. I will be voting against the motion.

Mrs. Joe: I just have a couple of comments to make. For the record, the member across the House who spoke previously had mentioned that the Indian people had three representatives in this House and I would like to set the record straight that I was elected by the residents of Whitehorse North Centre and I would certainly hope that the member for Tatchun also represents all the people of

that area.

On the motion that we have before us now, I would like to mention that there has to be some clarification of the kind of information that is going out to the public now. I was part of a group of people yesterday who heard the land claims negotiator speak at a luncheon and I was very surprised at some of the information that he was relating to the people there. Not only that, but I understood from some other sources that some of the information was not true. I can go back to an ad that was in the papers during the election that certainly gave wrong information about myself, and that type of thing is obviously happening right now, during the presentations that this negotiator is making.

I think that the kind of information that is going out could be very damaging and I think that, if the CYI were to be able to speak to this House and set the records straight, then certainly the people of the Yukon — and not only the people of the Yukon but the people who are sitting here right now — would be able to hear two sides of one story as we have been saying.

And I think that we owe it to ourselves to listen and we owe it to the people whom we represent, to have those people here.

Mr. Falle: I think the question before the House today is basically: do we allow groups and people to come in and make their representations? I think everybody here has spoken about it, but I would just like to leave you people with a thought: CYI is going to be making a presentation to the Progressive Conservative annual general meeting this weekend, and I would imagine it would probably be the same one as to the House. I would like to, in all fairness, say that I will be looking forward to hearing that presentation, but also, if fair was fair, I would like to hear of the CYI asking Mr. Willard Phelps to make representation to them at one of their general meetings, and I have an idea of what would happen. I have to stand up and be counted on this one. There is no way I can support it.

Mr. Philippen: In answer to the hon. member for Campbell, the request to Mr. Pearson, the government leader, was sent to me and I, being in the position of the chairman of the Committee of the Whole, had to take that under advisement as, in that position, I am to be impartial in this House. That took a little bit of time and, during that time, this has compounded part of the problem as you see it in the amount of time it has taken for this to come before the House.

I think that what we have here before us right now, speaking as MLA for Porter Creek West and not in the position of chairman of the Committee of the Whole, is not a question of whether CYI should come before the bar of the House, but whether we should start allowing anyone who wishes to appear before the House to make representation to this Assembly and then appear. I feel that we are in a position where you cannot, I cannot — and no member on any side of this House can — say this is a very relevant matter and we must deal with it and tell someone else that theirs is not relevant. What is relevant to you, or to you or to me may not be relevant to another member of this House and the converse is true.

What we are faced with here right now is that we have to make a decision, consciously, amongst all of us of whether we are going to start letting this Legislature be run by lobby groups, which is going to happen if we have no control over saying this person can come and this person cannot come. We have collectively and individually said that we are willing to listen to any member, or group, from CYI at any time. I would quite willingly be part of a group of all members of this Assembly, if we could all get together, and meet in any area and discuss any issue with CYI. But, I positively do not believe that by coming in here to do it and opening the door for other groups or individuals to come in and follow them, that we are doing the right thing. That, I believe, is the seriousness of this question before us and I would have to vote against this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Faro, now speaking twice, will close the debate.

Mr. Byblow: I would have sincerely thought that a motion such as this one, addressing the subject that it does, ought to have emanated from that side of the House. I think the frail defense that I have listened to about disruption of the business of the House,

setting precedents for interest groups and having to draw lines of who should be allowed to appear before the House is a lot of rhetoric.

The issue before the House is the subject of land claims. The appearance before the House is the CYI on the subject of land claims. It seems clear that this government has some reason that it will not permit this discussion to take place. The government leader said himself, in speaking to an earlier motion, that he invites discussion; he invites the dissemination of whatever information is possible so that we on this side can have a better understanding of their position at the land claims table, their position relating to why they are not at the table. I find something totally inconsistent: on the one hand to be saying yes, we want dissemination of information; yes, we want discussion; yes, we want to dialogue but, oh, we cannot do it in this House. This is not a special interest group; this is a special case instance. This is the first time in five years that a question of this magnitude was raised before the bar of the House to hear witnesses on the subject.

I heard the member suggest that we should be soliciting other forums to solicit the information that we are looking for. Yesterday, I recall hearing on the radio from a representative of the CYI negotiating team that there was continuing confusion in the minds of many Yukoners by what was being said by the government's chief land claims negotiator. This is not a healthy sign of the ongoing discussion that ought to be taking place. This is not a position this government should be taking to encourage discussion in this subject matter.

I recall, during the last election, an invitation from CYI to the parties running to speak before the CYI. The leader of the opposition appeared; I believe the representative from the government appeared, the member for Porter Creek East but, with him, was the chief land claims negotiator. We have the very simple instance here where we do not have a clear delivery of the information that Yukoners are asking for, that we are asking for, that ought to be taking place in this House.

It is our intention, should the government turn this motion down, for the opposition, the NDP, to invite the CYI and the government's chief negotiator to a public meeting. If this government will deny the opportunity for us to pursue that in this House, we will seek out the other forum that may be possible, though the mechanics are far better to do it in this House and I am wondering why this government is fearful of that. I will want to hear what this government has to say as to the reason it has denied this opportunity, in this Legislature, for this discussion once the debate concludes and the vote is called.

Some hon. Member: Division.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree.

Mr. Falle: Disagree.

Mr. Philippen: Disagree.

Mr. Brewster: Disagree.

Mr. Penikett: Agree.

Mr. Byblow: Agree.

Mr. Kimmerly: Agree.

Mr. Porter: Agree.

Mrs. Joe: Agree.

Mr. McDonald: Agree.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are six yea; eight nay.
Motion defeated

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 6

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Lang.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item No. 1?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the leader of the opposition, that the First Report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges be concurred in and that Appendix 1 of that report be adopted as the guidelines for oral question period in the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The Standing Committee was ordered by the Assembly, on July 14, 1982, to prepare a report on the rules and practices which should govern the Question Period. The committee met five times to discuss the subject.

Upon reviewing the orders and reports from other jurisdictions and studying Speaker's rulings from the House of Commons of Canada, the committee of the House concluded that the rules governing Question Period are written in such a way that many members have encountered difficulty in properly stating their questions. As you know, *Beauchesne* contains a great number of rules written in legalistic language which, on occasion, seem to be contradictory.

Members of the committee felt that a small number of rules which are clearly written should be drafted for use by the House. The result is found in the committee's first report. There is a general statement of our view of Question Period and this is followed by 16 specific guidelines for members of the House to utilize in either asking or answering questions.

There is, in fact, no substantive differences between our recommendations and the provisions to be found in *Beauchesne*, rather the committee has extracted what it considers to be the essential principles respecting Question Period from *Beauchesne* and drafted them in somewhat simpler language along with the motion by the member for Kluane that was passed unanimously earlier today. An essential point to remember is that the committee has not altered the rules of the Question Period, rather it has simplified and consolidated the important rules while leaving out those of a more technical and less important nature.

It is felt that if members accept and follow the guidelines proposed by the committee our Question Period would become far less subject to the Speaker having to make rulings on questions or answers being out of order.

³² A final point is that we are the first jurisdiction we know of to attempt to produce such guidelines and as leaders in this area we do not have the guidance of others' experience. Consequently, we should not be overly surprised if we find the need to amend the guidelines after a brief period of initial use. In view of what has taken place in the past, I hope that this is going to clarify the rules for all members on both sides of the House so we do not encounter the situation that developed in the last Session. For the proper running of the Legislature, I think that once we, as members, accept the rules as put out, we have a responsibility to follow them. Thank you.

Mr. Penikett: It was kind of the minister who just spoke as chairman of this committee to mention the fact that some members had trouble articulating their questions in this House and in the interests of fairness, of course, I want to observe as well that there are other members of this House who have difficulty answering the same questions — even those which are perfectly framed.

However, this is not a debate about the performance of individuals in this Chamber but rather a discussion about the rules under which we operate. Probably, if you like, the two teams in this game have had their representatives examine the rules under which we operated and have found, as the minister has observed, that the ornate, Latinate, legalistic bible which was our reference was an inadequate guide for those of us who were unlearned in the law or who were not alive in the 19th Century.

I think that it is a difficult chore for anyone entering a chamber like this to acquaint themselves quickly with the procedures if the description of those procedures and the language describing the practices of the House is foreign to them. I think it is a practical impossibility for most members, in the short time that we are allowed to serve here, to think that we will memorize *Beauchesne* or any of the other texts on this subject. However, since the time of the legislative day in which we have the most problem with is

Question Period, I think it is a perfectly reasonable proposition that members coming into this House can quickly learn 16 simple rules. I think the virtue of these rules, as they are proposed, are that they are written in simple clear English; they are comprehensible and, I hope, perfectly understandable. I think, if all members accept them today, a brief study of these rules ought to equip us to conduct the business of Question Period in a much more orderly and effective manner than perhaps has been done in recent months.

I think it is true that in time we may discover some imperfections in the text of the rules as they have been proposed to the House right now and I accept the chairman of the committees' prediction that we may well have to tinker with these rules at some time in the future. However, I hope and pray that that time will not be too soon and that we will at least allow this document, if passed, to age a little bit and for us to gain some experience with its operation before we want to mess around with this business again. On the other hand, it may be that this really is the last word on this subject and that we will not change these rules again for another 100 years, though I must say I rather doubt that.

I think, as the member opposite has said, it is an achievement for us to get our basic rules for Question Period down on two pages into one general rule and 16 specific rules. If this method of instructing members works, then we will achieve something which may be useful, not only for this Legislature, but for others in the country.

However, before I make predictions on that score I would want to see how time tests this proposal. We spent a long time in the committee on this. I believe we would not have achieved such quick agreement had it not been for the expert assistance of the table officers of this House. I would, for my part, recommend this proposal to all members of the House and sincerely and honestly hope that the smooth operation of this Chamber will benefit from these changes.

³³ **Mr. Kimmerly:** I wish to speak very briefly — first of all, to correct the member for Porter Creek East, the previous motion was my motion as improved by the member for Kluane. I get very, very few motions through this Assembly and I am very proud of the ones that I do get through. More importantly, I wish to say that the member for Porter Creek East said there were not really any significant differences between the old rules and the new ones to be adopted. I would like to disagree with that as a matter of emphasis. There certainly are some differences and I believe they are important ones and perhaps it is appropriate for me to say, in view of my motion in the last Session, that I believe that these rules will bring the rules more in accordance with the will of the House and the job of enforcing them will be consequently easier and that was the objective of the committee I know, and I believe they have done a good job. I am in support of the motion, of course.

Motion agreed to

Motion No. 9

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 3 standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Lang.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item No. 3.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the hon. member for Porter Creek West, that the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges be concurred in; that the Standing Orders as adopted by the House on March 8, 1979, and including amendments to November 25, 1981, be repealed; and that Appendix I of the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges be adopted as the Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will try to make this as short as I possibly can, and I trust with the love and affection of the leader of the official opposition that we can conclude debate on this motion so that perhaps there could be a short recess.

The Second Report of the Standing Committee is in response to the motion that was passed on the same day as referred to earlier — July 14, 1982. It is normal at the start of a new legislature that the

rules be reviewed and it should be noted that the members have suggested, in the report before you, some fairly minor clarification in wording and re-ordering into a more logical sequence as opposed to the mammoth job that was faced, I believe, back in 1978 with the advent of party politics.

Members will recall that the revisions made at that time were in response to the first House that was elected along party lines and, at the same time, were in the midst of some major constitutional developments; developments which culminated in an executive council comprised of members of this House and responsible to this House. The fact that there are so few changes that are now required in our Standing Orders is a testimony to the work on both sides of the House at that time and the obvious wisdom of our predecessors on the standing committee which I believe I was one of, and I believe the leader of the official opposition was also there.

I would like to point out a number of changes so that people are aware of a few of the amendments that should be highlighted. Section 11: this is a new addition of a new order of business which will allow committee reports to be debated as separate items as opposed to being brought up under either government motions or private members' motions. Since committee reports are normally the product of compromise and consensus between both sides of the House, it seemed appropriate to us that they should be debated in what we could class perhaps as a non-partisan context.

Also, the committee recommended that the deletion of the requirement of seconders be extended from the business of committees to the Assembly when the Speaker is in the Chair. It is our view that this has strictly become a formality and serves very little useful purpose and I refer members to Section 29.

The committee has also recommended that Cabinet be required to provide a response to petitions within two weeks of their being presented in the House. There was agreement from both opposition and government members that citizens who go to the trouble to put together a petition deserve some sort of response rather than simply seeing their petition presented and hearing nothing further on the matter.

So, I give this report to you and all members to consider and would strongly suggest that you support it.

Mr. Penikett: I, too, rise in support of this excellent report. I do want to say a couple of things about the specifics that have been mentioned by the member who just spoke. I agree that many of the changes proposed are minor, but, since they are changes to the way we operate, I do want to comment on some of them.

I think of the proposals in this report, the changes to Standing Order 2, governing the hours that the House sits, was probably the one that caused our members in the committee potentially the most difficulty and I want to say that our concern about this rule was not so much the necessity for such a provision, but about the potential abuse of such a rule. I am referring, of course, to the provision which allows extra hours sitting of the House. We always have to when we are dealing with such situations, look at worse cases and some potential for abuse, but I have had the undertaking of the member opposite that that will never happen as long as he is here. Since, unfortunately, he shows every indication of being here forever, we must accept that undertaking from him as holy writ.

The other thing I want to say about that is that the report also indicates that there will, of course, be consultations between both sides of the House about the implementation of such a rule. I feel bound to mention that in the debate as it is mentioned in the report because, of course, such consultation is not enshrined in the rules. It is, in fact, just simply a practice of the House rather than a regulation.

Standing Order 11 is amended, as the minister says, to provide for a separate item for committee reports. I think that is a thoroughly sensible suggestion because, strictly speaking, that is not government business or opposition business and should have a separate heading.

The other proposal in Standing Order 25 about the conduct of votes. I think it is a very sensible provision, especially where we may well have situations where members here want to have an opportunity to not be in a position where they have to vote on a measure in which they may have previously declared a conflict.

Standing Order 29 is one the member slipped over nicely; that is the one about removing the requirement for seconders of motions. He will recall, as I recall painfully, that we debated this in 1979, during the time when I was a one member caucus and I lost the debate to him then. I have won it now, now that I do not need it, but I am grateful all the same for these victories, though it is late.

The member says he is generous. It is sort of like getting a Christmas present in June.

Standing Order 55, allowing for us not to get into a messy situation where the opposition might deny the necessary unanimous consent so the Minister of Finance of the day can give the budget speech, I think is a thoroughly sensible improvement and will allow us to introduce the budget bills without any potential disruptions.

Standing Order 67, about petitions, the minister mentioned that. I think, the change here is an important improvement. We not only do away with this silly business of what was known before as the "prayer", but it also provides for some mechanism for the government to have to, if you like, respond to a petition, especially if it may have had a lot of work put into it.

The member also indicated that the committee had done a lot of work; I think that is true. I am not normally any more a member of this committee, but was a substitute member of the committee. This committee has been a very busy committee in the past and will no doubt, again, sometime in the future, have to deal with such important and controversial and divisive issues as pay and pensions and such things like that. I want to say, having said that, that I am extremely glad not to have to be party to those discussions and I commend the permanent members of the committee. I say I commend them. Perhaps I compliment them in advance for what they shall have to suffer on those two questions.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

We will take a recess until 5:00 and then we will continue with the *Second Appropriation Act*.

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

Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84 — continued

Mr. Chairman: We were on the *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, on general debate on Education, Recreation and Manpower, page 32. Is there any further general debate?

Mr. Byblow: I guess the Minister is probably not in a position to provide any detailed information and there is opportunity later in the budget to perhaps discuss this — or perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I might need your advice.

I do have a number of questions surrounding the current status of the relationship between this government and the contractors who put up the Old Crow School, including the road contract. From recognizing that that specific project is not in the budget, it may not be possible to discuss that at this point, but perhaps the minister, by way of notice, could, at some point later, address the situation respecting the court case over certain costs and so on. I will leave that as a matter of notice.

The first issue I want to finish discussing, properly introduced as far as the mains go but continued as far as questions go, and that is the whole subject area of busing policy.

Through Question Period and through discussions in the past couple of weeks and certainly from the problems brought to the attention of the minister in two specific areas of the territory, namely the Carcross-Tagish situation and the Mayo-Stewart situa-

tion, it appears that there is a real situation where students' education may be affected by the simple fact that the ability to attend school is not available. From a policy point of view, I know the minister has made it clear from her answers in Question Period that she is adhering to the legislation; that the subsidies are in place where bus service is not permissible because of numbers. I think my colleague for Mayo and I have made the suggestion to the minister that perhaps we have to look at the policy again; policy insofar as reviewing either the subsidy or a review to ensure that some mechanics are put in place that will permit students whose education is jeopardized to be attended to.

36 Rather than pursue it at this point, perhaps I could gain some response from the minister and just address the policy aspect of it?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: To respond to the first question regarding the road and Old Crow school, I believe those questions would be more appropriately addressed in Question Period. They are not in this budget and they are not in the Department of Education any more, so the questions would be best addressed to the minister of public works and, I believe, the minister of government services.

Regarding busing policy, as the member indicates, he seems to have an understanding about the legislation and the legislative responsibilities that the government does have for busing and for subsidies. I would like to think that the member for Faro does not feel in some way that the Department of Education is solely responsible for getting children to school. I think I have indicated to him before that our budget, because of the amount of money that goes towards staff salaries — that includes teachers and so on — we already spend over a million dollars a year in busing, well over a million, and programming seems to be where all the large demands are. The large demands do not seem to be in busing. I think parents and teachers and the Education Council and school committee members have to sit down and set some priorities; is it that the priorities should be in the quality of education, and the very sophisticated delivery of education that we have in Yukon today, or are we going to start putting more money into busing?

The policy of the government is that we are concerned about the quality of education. We are certainly reviewing the busing policy, particularly in the subsidy areas, to see if it is economically feasible. However, we do pay that subsidy to the parents; if the parents do not feel it is enough, they should be approaching the government. As I said, they are only approaching us because they are saying that it is not economically viable to run the van. It is up to the parents, not the Department of Education, to find a more economical way, and if they cannot, then they can approach the government to have the subsidy increased. In the Mayo-Stewart situation, they have approached me and they have asked for a bus; they have not asked for an increase in the subsidy. They have not mentioned subsidy to me. And I am sure the member for Mayo will want to make some comments about that. They have approached me in regards to a bus, and all they are saying is that they want a bus and they want it put on that Mayo-Stewart route.

I really think that parents are prepared to assume this responsibility. The members may not agree with me; however, I feel that, with the episode in Porter Creek East when the parents found themselves without a bus, it was a turmoil and it still may not be completely resolved. However, I have heard some favourable comments and we have been monitoring the situation constantly and the parents seem to have adjusted to that and the children have certainly adjusted to it.

I would like some recommendations from the members opposite as to what they think our priorities should be. Should the priority be in busing children to school, or should we continue to deliver the programs that we have been delivering?

37 **Mr. McDonald:** I have a few comments I would like to make and I think there will be a couple of questions emanating from those comments and perhaps the minister would care to elaborate on her remarks.

She said today in Question Period that she believed that the quality of education was a high priority and gave this House to believe, I believe, that it took priority over busing as a line item in the budget. I think, this afternoon, she has reiterated that belief, yet the concerns of rural residents are such that they would require

reworking of these priorities. In rural ridings, as I am sure the minister is aware — as I am sure every rural MLA is aware — there are special problems which plague rural students and which are outlined in a more eloquent and complete manner in the Sharp Report. That in itself, I think, should cause the government to rearrange priorities, to a certain extent, in favour of rural students.

Now, the problem that the people of the Mayo-Stewart Crossing area face, and especially the parents in Stewart Crossing, is that they are not in a position to take advantage of the special services, the various special programs that are offered in the larger urban schools. They have a problem just, in Stewart Crossing's case, getting to school in the first place.

Now, Stewart Crossing is, I think, for all intents and purposes, an established community in Yukon. It has been around a long time; it was once a community which served the ferry crossing between the highway from Mayo and the Klondike Highway. It has been around a long time. The residents there have been living there for a good long time. A bus service has been established in the past between Stewart and Mayo. This is what I have been given to believe by some department officials and, in fact, there was some question as to whether the diversified agreement for transportation of students included this particular Stewart-Mayo run. If that was the case, then certainly there would be no doubt that this route was covered.

The minister suggested that parents should possibly assume the responsibility for transporting their children to school in these cases, the cases which are apparently being chosen by the department as being special cases not warranting the full bus service. She suggested the Porter Creek East was, somehow, comparable to the situation in Stewart Crossing and Mayo, where the students would have to travel 35 miles one way to get to school in the mornings.

38 There is some question, as the member for Faro mentioned, that the transportation subsidy was not enough to meet the costs of providing the bus service. I think that there is no dispute by anyone that that is the case. There are approximately six families, at \$10 a day: that is \$60 a day to get somebody to travel four single trips, four times 35 miles. That clearly, in my mind, is unreasonable to expect and I think that that, too, would justify at least a review — which the minister has suggested the department is doing on an on-going basis; at least a review of the busing service policy.

As I mentioned, I think, in question period, there was a meeting of members of the education department: Oliver Nelson, the regional director for Indian Affairs; two representatives of the Mayo Group Home Society; Mr. Byblow and me. It was held to discuss the school bus service between Stewart Crossing and Mayo. I believe that the deputy minister adequately outlined the government position, which has only been reiterated over and over again by the minister; the regulation that there must be 25 students for a bus, and that it is, for all intents and purposes, at least in the near future, a hard and fast rule, and that there is a subsidy in lieu of service which recently was increased to \$10 and that, essentially, the government was unable to subcontract this particular route because it was felt that Diversified Transport, in its umbrella agreement, had the option to run this route.

At that meeting, Oliver Nelson, the regional director for Indian Affairs, stated that Canada had statutory responsibility for native children, and that in Yukon the federal government had decided to purchase educational services for these students by incorporating the costs in the operating deficit grant. The position taken by the representatives of the native Group Home Society and by me was essentially that there are special difficulties in rural ridings for students to achieve a certain level of education and that we would not like it to be exacerbated by this problem of school busing. For residents of the rural ridings, at least, it often happens that getting the students to the school in the first place is one of the largest hurdles to cross, let alone putting the student in front of a computer terminal. If we are to think about rearranging priorities and all, we should think about getting the students to school.

It was suggested at that meeting that Government of Yukon could not possibly be expected to provide a certain baseline service for every resident in the territory. There was no question that the people at the meeting agreed with that.

39 However, it was felt by, I think, a majority of the people at the

meeting that Stewart Crossing did not represent just any old community in the bush which expected a certain base-line service, but rather that Stewart Crossing was an established community which had the service before and it had reasonable expectations that it would have the service again. It was felt, I think, at that meeting, that in certain instances like this where there are established communities which do not receive a bus service currently, but have in the past, and where the subsidy service is inadequate to the task of providing these students the transportation they require just to get to school and open a book, let alone get to the school and take part in all the special education programs which we would like to see in most schools but which we obviously cannot afford in some schools. I understand that Mayo does have a computer terminal; unfortunately the students in Stewart Crossing are having a heck of a time to get there and stay there.

I believe that the Minister is well aware of the predicament that these students are labouring under at the moment. I am sure she knows that many of them are being put temporarily into various homes. They are in some cases being shunted around from home to home in order to be able to live in the community in which the school is located, as a stopgap measure in the absence of the bus. In saying that, as I see the Minister has been writing copious notes on my brief presentation, I would like very much to hear what she has to say about that before 5:30.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: In view of the lengthy response I am going to be giving and in view of the time — I think we are going to get into a very interesting philosophical discussion about parental responsibility — I would just move that we adjourn until 7:30.

Mr. Chairman: We cannot do that, but I will recess until 7:30 this evening.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue on with the Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The member for Mayo was talking about buses in rural areas; special deals for rural students is what I believe he is after. He was prepared to give up his computer. I would like to start the general debate off on this whole issue regarding busing and busing subsidies.

First of all, I will indicate a cost to the member so that he is aware that we have already recognized the special cases of the students in the rural areas. The cost breakdown I have to educate a student in the urban areas is approximately \$3,470. To educate the students that the member is asking about, costs \$7,615 per student. The only reason I am giving these figures is to indicate that the department and the government has recognized the special circumstances surrounding the rural students and that we are already trying to make a greater effort in this area to give them a so-called "special deal".

As for the subsidy itself — that is exactly what it is, it is a subsidy; it is not a total cost — we are not paying the whole cost to get the child to school so, obviously, the parents are going to have to assume some financial responsibility as well getting the children to school.

⁰² The department is examining the costs to see whether it is economical and we have looked at various other methods and just did not have extra funds at the time. We spend close to \$80,000 in busing subsidies and we just did not have extra funds to identify for that area. I hope the member for Mayo does spend some time with his own caucus discussing busing, particularly with the three caucus members who are from the urban area and the other members who are from the rural areas, and see what his own caucus members feelings are regarding this. What happens is that if you do give special deals to children in one area, some in another area have to give up a little because everybody cannot have everything. We just do not have enough money for everybody to have everything. The demands are great; the dollars are few.

The member made mention of students being put up in homes. The government also pays subsidies for this so if a student does have to stay with someone else, the family is given a subsidy to

assist with the cost of that.

I would be interested to know what the member's philosophy is, how he feels about it. Does he feel that every child should be bused to school and that the government should assume the cost for that? What cost, where do you draw the line? Do you draw the line or do you just take it that the government is going to bus every child to school, and make do with what monies that are left for the programs.

We have tried to decentralize; we have tried, in adult education, to put community learning centres and Apple Computers in more of the outlying areas so that that facility is available. We have two mobile units — or will have two when we purchase the second one for adult education. We have established the senior grades in Teslin. Every community wants a special learning assistant. Every community wants grades 10, 11 and 12. I would like to know from the member opposite, where do you draw the line? What advice are you going to give this side of the House when it comes to setting the priorities in education and establishing who is going to get what?

⁰³ **Mr. MacDonald:** I think that the minister made a number of points, some of which I will address, and some of which I will defer to our caucus spokesman, as to general priorities and general interpretation of the party policy, which I am sure she cannot possibly expect in total from me.

She referred over and over again to rural residents getting special deals. I believe the innuendo was that the rural residents are already getting a very special deal. The subsidies provided, to the extent that they are provided, are generous already. She also suggested that I was calling for special deals. She also suggested that I was prepared to give up the Apple Computer in the Mayo school; something which is manifestly untrue.

I was saying that rural people want their children to at least attend rural schools, and at the same time, enjoy the family setting which most children in our society feel they are entitled to. They already find themselves at a disadvantage. The Sharp Report indicates that rural students are having trouble making the distance through the educational system in comparison with their urban counterparts, their urban counterparts being so much more numerous and therefore, justifiably, the cost is less.

⁰⁴ The point that I would like to reiterate is that the people in that rural riding expect that the government will realize this baseline service will, perhaps, cost a greater amount. There is the fundamental principle of allowing students to attend a school without making it more of an inconvenience than already exists to attend a school, let alone all the special services that are the status quo in some schools in the territory. The point that she made earlier about parental responsibility: the parents of Porter Creek at least realized when they lost their school bus that it was not just a matter of inconvenience, and it certainly was a safety problem, but they showed responsibility by getting their children to school in some manner or other.

In Stewart Crossing, I believe, it is more than just an inconvenience. It is economically, financially impossible for them to provide a daily service with the subsidy that the minister quotes. Sixty dollars times 187 days is \$11,220.00 per year. It is financially impossible for them to provide that daily service, so obviously the subsidy does not meet the requirements to provide a bus or a van or any mode of transportation.

The people of rural communities would like a baseline service which includes the opportunity to at least attend a school and maintain a family setting to which they feel they are entitled. The minister asked how far I will be prepared to go to assist every child in the territory to be bused to school. I have already suggested once, and I believed that once was enough, that I did not expect that every rural child should be sent to school. If a person, or a family, makes a conscious decision to leave the traditional busing routes, the traditional educational services that are provided currently in the territory, realizing that leaving those areas would necessitate very expensive measures to maintain certain basic services, it is unreasonable and unrealistic to expect that they would be provided the super service of a helicopter or whatever.

⁰⁵ Earlier, I was making the point that Stewart Crossing is an

established community; it has received this transportation service before. It was, according to department officials, covered under the general diversified transport agreement; they had a reasonable expectation that this service would be provided on an ongoing basis and that is essentially the position that they are taking. If the minister would like to direct some questions on general education policy, then she should direct them to the member for Faro.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not want to offend the member for Mayo, and that certainly is not my intention; however, I do want to set the record straight and say, again, that there are nine children, and these people want a bus. They are not even talking to me about the subsidy; they are talking about a bus and they want a bus, period. There is no discussion about increasing the subsidy. We could increase the subsidy to \$100 a day, and I am sure they would not be interested because they want a bus. They said they did not care what it costs; they want a bus.

We are not going to give them a bus for nine children; we are going to pay them the subsidy. A subsidy is exactly what the word means; it is some assistance; it is subsidizing the parents. That means that the parents are going to have to assume some responsibility also. I find it incredible that the member goes on about how people cannot afford things but the government can afford everything; that is not true, we cannot afford everything.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am going to enter the debate at this time and talk about the same general issue but in, perhaps, a different way, to, I hope, bring a different perspective to it. In answer to the minister's previous comments, I would like to say that at the beginning, at approximately five o'clock, in response to our questions about priorities, she invited us to comment on the question and make suggestions. It was at that point that I decided to enter the debate and it appears in the last ten minutes or so we are simply catching up to the stage we were at at five o'clock.

It is my view that it is the minister's responsibility, ultimately, to set the priorities. I am sure she will not disagree. However, we welcome this opportunity, at the invitation of the minister, to make a few suggestions on the issues.

About busing: the minister referred to my colleague from Mayo's remarks and asked Mr. McDonald to speak to the members of the caucus from Whitehorse. I can assure the minister that that process occurred some time ago and, as expected, there is a difference in emphasis or a difference in priority between urban members and rural members. I can speak on it very easily. I suppose my riding is the smallest in the Yukon, geographically, — not so in population — and there is really no busing problem. In fact, there are complaints concerning the extremely young children and daycare children as it is, especially in the winter, a long way to walk. However, it is a very minor problem in the developed parts of Whitehorse.

Our problem is more with the quality of education and the access to the school system, not in a transportation sense but in a cultural or, I will call it, an academic streamlining sense in that the people to whom the service is not provided for whatever reason — and I am not commenting on the fault of either the student or the school — the problem is more of a psychological or a cultural nature or a quality of education nature than it is a transportation problem.

It is a fairly long build-up, but my point is that, in the Mayo area, obviously the priority is busing. In Whitehorse, the priorities are probably substantially different and that is not surprising. My suggestion is that the overall priority, when the minister speaks of a priority in the Yukon, should be particularized and there should be a statement, objective or a priority policy that in rural areas the provision of service priority ought to be busing. In urban areas the provision of service priority ought to be quality of education or, perhaps, the cultural difference is in many communities but not all communities.

Particularizing the priorities, I believe, assists in making decisions ultimately about the line items in the budget and, ultimately, down to the dollars and cents.

As an urban member, I can easily see that it is appropriate that more dollars be spent in a mathematical way on rural students than on urban students. The minister, I am sure, is very well aware of the Sharp Report and is aware that students could do a lot better if

they stay home with their families and in their communities. I would like to ask some questions in a very general way about the priorities in the urban areas about provision of service or, specifically, about the availability of education to students. I use the word "availability" in a very general sense and would talk about truancy problems, perhaps juvenile court problems, cultural problems and special needs problems for various individuals.

Because the minister asked for comments, I make the comment that in downtown Whitehorse an increased priority is needed for making the school experience culturally relevant, especially for native children, in order to correct the overall problem that I say exists; that the dropout rate among native children is substantially greater than among non-native children. That ought to be a greater priority than is busing in the urban areas.

Perhaps it is not so in the rural areas, I do not know. Also, the real availability of education to special needs children ought to be of greater priority in the urban areas, than is busing. Those are my comments and they are more comments than questions. I welcome the minister's invitation to make them.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I would like to thank the member for Whitehorse South Centre. He knows his comments are always appreciated, and his suggestions are always appreciated. It is very gratifying for me to be able to have some exchange about the quality of education. However, busing is an outstanding issue with the member for Mayo.

I did invite suggestions from the opposition because I feel that it is part of the opposition's responsibility to advise the government and give suggestions. I think we receive it well on this side of the House, when we get it. However, when you have six individual members of the opposition each asking for something else, it makes me throw my hands up and say, "What can I do?" You cannot make everybody happy. For the member for Mayo, I can tell you that we have not identified any extra monies in the budget for busing subsidies, so therefore, we will not be able to increase the subsidies this year.

I would like to invite the members all to tell me whether they agree with parents keeping their children out of school; threatening the government, holding them to ransom, in order to try to blackmail the government into putting a busing service on for them. I do not agree with that. I do not think that children should be withheld from school. I think that it is ultimately the parents' responsibility. I am not the one who dresses the kiddy every morning and takes him to school. I pay the parents to help with the cost of transporting that child to school, no matter where they live.

I am familiar with the Sharp Report and I am interested in the member's comment regarding the cultural sense of education, and that it should be a culturally relevant experience. I think it should be an intellectually relevant experience for children, also, and not only for native children, but for all children.

It is not the philosophy of this government to keep statistical information differentiating native, and non-native children, and as to whether the drop out statistics are higher in one group than the other. We provide an educational system that the federal government approved of. The education system is to service all children of the Yukon Territory. We treat them all alike and equally.

I have to say that the department and the government have been consistent in their philosophy, and that they have identified the differences between rural and urban education needs. They have had the philosophy that children did better when they were in their own communities, and I think that we be proud of the number of rural communities that do have the senior grades in them. In Carcross we have adapted the school curriculum with local programs. There are so many local programs that we are wondering now if too much time has been spent on local programs. The school committee and the parents are complaining that they feel their children are below average in reading and writing. They are also coming back to me and asking to have French put in as well. How are we supposed to keep these people happy, when they keep coming back, constantly, with demands for more? They do not recognize that the department is trying to assess and evaluate whether the children are progressing, and keeping up with other parts of Canada. They keep asking for additional programs.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: About the truancy problem, juvenile court, special needs children: the member from Whitehorse North Centre yesterday was talking about having special classes for the children, and I had indicated that with our mainstreaming philosophy, we were not really of the idea that you would segregate a group of children like that, and not keep them in the mainstream with other children. I can say the detention homes have teacher services. We do have the two instructors at the Correctional Institute and we have made a big effort to have the programs that are provided at the Correctional Institute be consistent with and have some linkage with Yukon College, so that when they are discharged from the Correctional Institute they can follow up with their education in some consecutive manner at Yukon College.

I find the whole concept of rural versus urban quite interesting. I was at the annual general meeting of the school committees, and I know the school committee from Carcross was not present and I do not believe the Mayo school committee was present either, but I am just going on memory; I do not recall them being there. The rural school committees have never indicated to me that busing was a high priority; however, if they would like to bring that to the department's attention, we are certainly interested in looking at it, and we are certainly interested in evaluating the economic feasibility of the costs of the busing subsidy. It comes to a point, Mr. Chairman, where we have to decide whether we are going to continue it as a subsidy and increase the subsidy or are we going to pay for the whole cost of transporting that child to school.

Mr. Kimmerly: Again, the minister asked for a comment about a parent's responsibility so I am going to give her a comment and I would like to say that this is my personal view and I have not discussed it with the caucus. It is my belief that the *School Act* ought to be changed and that school should not be compulsory as it now is. I emphasize that is a personal view. I would also say, as a comment about that, and it is the same general issue, with budgetary implications, that I was almost incensed, in the personal sense, with the problem in Whitehorse recently whereby there was an attempt to close the video game centres during school hours. I do not agree with that at all. If the children are so attracted to them, the video games ought to be moved into the school and adapted to teaching methods, as opposed to being simply a recreation device.
 10 That, also, is a personal view.

I wish to say though that I also believe that if children are attending school, they should attend regularly. And I am not talking about a *laissez-faire* attitude where the children come and go as they wish — a policy I am very strongly opposed to. If children are going to school they should abide by the rules and the proper discipline in the school which is necessary in the school setting, and I am not advocating a *laissez-faire*, children-rule-the-school-completely attitude at all. And I do not wish to be misunderstood.

In my view, the responsibility for very young children ought to be with the parents and I support, in the general philosophical sense, the intent of the existing legislation about the responsibility of the parents. The real problem is in drawing the line; for example, if there is one child on the Yukon River and there is no road, are you going to provide a teacher or a helicopter? Obviously that is financially impossible. If there are 20 children in a community, obviously it is a different matter. Somewhere the line must be drawn.

There should be some flexibility, I believe, and I sympathize with the minister and the member for Mayo who are both caught in a very difficult situation about Stewart Crossing; also, the situation in Tagish. The budgetary implication ought to be that the responsibility ought to maximize the freedom of parents and also of older children, and I am not able to draw a line specifically as to younger and older children. The experts would probably be better at that. The minister asked for philosophical comments — I hope that helps.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do appreciate the member's comments. I find some of them quite interesting and I did not realize the member for Whitehorse South Centre had so many innovative ideas. It is interesting about the videos in schools. I think just the idea of computers is the idea of the videos and we can tell by the great interest shown by the children that they are extremely interested in

computers, and everyone wants to have one. Our government leader has a computer, too, that he can play with. A lot of adults are interested in computer technology and it does develop very good hand-eye coordination, and people do learn, and they learn very quickly, and they seem to retain what they learn through computers.

11 I appreciate the member indicating to me that he seems to understand that there is a problem with drawing the line, and I would thank him for those comments.

Mr. McDonald: I have had a few minutes to cool down a little bit, maybe intentionally on the part of the chairman. I thought that, at some point, we had to bring this back to the rather mundane but serious issue of a box on four wheels. I think that the minister is waxing poetic about all sorts of technological marvels, but I am still talking about a van.

I am happy to see that there is an admission of parent complaints. I am sure the minister is becoming more candid and maybe more meaningful as a result. The minister wondered whether or not busing is a problem in rural ridings. Well, I guess my only recourse is to unleash the Mayo-Stewart residents on the minister and her department — especially the minister — because I would like to correct the record on a number of points and make a number of comments.

I know that the minister has been very firm in establishing her position at the moment. I get the definite impression that anything I can say will not change that but, in any case, for my own satisfaction I would like to make a number of comments.

The minister said that she did not want to offend me, or suggest that I was, perhaps, mentally unstable or incompetent, about the views expressed by the Mayo constituents about the subsidy and whether or not the Stewart Crossing residents wanted a bus or a subsidy. I admit that the minister was not at the meeting on March 25, which her officials attended, but I would like to correct the minister as to the statement that Mayo residents have been making. I would like to quote from a letter written by Oliver Nelson, Regional Director of Indian and Northern Affairs. He wrote a letter, as I did, shortly after the meeting, to clarify positions taken at the meeting for our own purposes. In that letter he says, "Given these circumstances..." — referring to the text of the letter — "1) I understand that you will review..." — speaking to Mr. Davie — "the 25-student minimum limit with the view of lowering its minimum. Further, the \$9 per diem per family will be reviewed for the possible increase and 3) the final option was to review your government's tender options for the school bus services to allow for private tender to respective communities."

As I said this afternoon, Mr. Davie did not give any other commitment, as I understood, as to changes of government policy but that certainly reviews were in order.

To correct the record, Oliver Nelson did say \$9; I believe it is now \$10, just in case the minister feels that that is worthwhile jumping up to correct.

The people in Stewart Crossing do want a bus if a bus is available and they would be perfectly happy to have a subsidy if that would be sufficient to provide some sort of transportation service. The minister made an off-the-cuff comment that I should realize that the government does not have all the money, — that is rather a simple-minded statement but, nevertheless, I certainly concur with that — that the parents have to share. I believe it is an arbitrary decision that certain parents should share beyond the school tax that they already pay. Obviously, it is a question of priorities, as the minister has clearly established only moments ago, and I am sure she is not going to be changing that. In any case, as a human statement of what the residents of Stewart Crossing would like, it is essentially that they would like the children to get out of their own beds in the morning; they would like the children to go to school being taught by competent teachers and they would like these same children to travel home at night, be with their parents, eat dinner at home and enjoy the normal life that most other students in the territory take for granted.

12 That is a simple statement. It is a question of priorities, whether or not the government wants to adhere to it. Others are chomping at the bit to get into the debate so I will leave it at that, depending on what the minister has to say.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Really, the member for Mayo does not have to get huffy in the healthy exchange of constructive criticism and ideas in debate. He is getting all red and huffy and excited.

I think I am getting an idea. Since the member has mentioned Oliver Nelson's name twice — who is Oliver Nelson? Oliver Nelson is the regional director of Indian and Inuit Affairs, and I have a feeling that Oliver Nelson is probably going around saying something that maybe is not totally correct from the comments that were made to the departmental staff at the Carcross School Committee meeting last night — or the Carcross public meeting — where a comment was made that Indian children could have whatever they wanted as long as it went towards education. It did not matter what the cost was, as long as it was for Indian children. The member seems to be quoting Oliver Nelson regularly and if these are the kinds of things he is saying I can see why people are concerned and upset.

We do not get any more money from the federal government for Indian children than we do for any other children and if the member for Mayo does have this close relationship with Oliver Nelson, maybe he should approach him and see if the federal government is prepared to give us more money for native children. The federal government gives us money, but it is for the education of all children in the territory and they agreed to that. The federal government agreed to that system, and so did the Indian people.

Mr. McDonald: I am sure that other people would like to jump in.

Obviously, given what has been stated in debate so far, including this afternoon, this whole Oliver Nelson issue is a complete red herring. I have not suggested anything that the minister just suggested.

I want the record to show that the government leader is butting in and suggesting that I raised Oliver Nelson's name.

I would like to reiterate, for their benefit, that I used Oliver Nelson in his capacity as a witness at the meeting to state what he believed were the results of the meeting. I am sure the member for Faro will concur I used that statement because I do believe the statement that I read out. If the minister would like to call into question the truth of the statement, she is also calling into question my own personal view of the statement. If that would be the case I would like representatives of her department to make a statement as to what they felt happened at the meeting.

This whole issue of Oliver Nelson, as I said, is a red herring. The minister suggested that he is a special friend of mine. I am sure he is a very nice fellow. We do not have many dealings; we did discuss the federal government's position, the Department of Indian and Inuit Affairs' position on this issue, but as I said once before to the director, I felt that this was a territorial issue as the Yukon government has jurisdiction over education and I think he respected the position that I took.

Therefore, I am not really sure where the minister is coming from; she is obviously fighting little battles but I am sure it is not necessary in this world.

Mr. Penikett: I am not sure whether I am entering a problem fraught with red herrings or dark horses, but let me see if I can put a question to the minister which she has invited by her remark that she gets no more money from the federal government for Indian education than she does for non-Indian education. Would the minister be prepared to tell the House exactly what money she does get from the federal government for Indian education?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No, we do not know what that number is. The government leader is indicating to me that we get a sum of money and we can find out what that sum of money is if the member so wishes.

Mr. Penikett: For some years now I have been trying to find out from various sources what this sum of money was that the territory gets for Indian education. I had hoped, before the government leader advised the minister, that I might get a number tonight but I see I am going to be out of luck.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think, perhaps, I should clarify something here. I am just going on memory, but I believe it goes back to 1967 where there was an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Yukon that there would be no monies

specifically earmarked with respect to "one segment of the population versus another" as it was in previous years. As far as I know, that has not changed. The monies that are allocated are allocated through the normal negotiations through the Government of Canada so it is not that Mr. Penikett's kids are worth so many dollars as opposed to Mr. Brewster's. I think there is good reason for that. I think that the information I am providing here is accurate. If you go back in the proceedings, between 1974 and 1978, I believe it was in 1976, there was a document tabled in the House at the time explaining the whole situation. If you can find some time in your busy schedule, you can perhaps ask the Clerk to see if he can find that.

Mrs. Joe: Last night I had mentioned that I had gone to a meeting as a member of the Whitehorse Juvenile Court Committee and I had talked about some of the things that were said at that meeting. I brought the notes that I took that night and the panel discussion was "Our Present Education Policies Contributing to Juvenile Delinquencies". The panel was composed of the education department, the police, a judge, a parent, a student, a probation officer and some other teachers.

The discussion had to do with crime and education and some of the things that were happening in the schools. We found out that, in a period of less than a year, there were 63 cars stolen by young children under 16 years and that there were 112 thefts. These statistics were given to us so that we would have a general idea of the number of children who do get into trouble. We had all of these people get up and talk on what they thought the problems were. We had one student there who had said that there were a lot of drugs in school and it is a fact that there are a lot of drugs in school. It is a fact that some of the kids are selling drugs and other kids are buying them; that is a known fact.

The other thing that came out of the meeting was that a suspension that is given to a number of children is no big deal. Usually the kid is glad because they are not being punished; what is happening to them is that they do not have to go to school anymore because they are suspended and they are glad. They would probably go down to the game centre and play with the videos.

I would like to mention some of the comments that were made. One person there, who was not with the school, said he thinks that juvenile crime is the school's fault and there was an awful lot of school kids sent to human resources. What happened in a lot of cases, because there were no facilities here for those kids who got into trouble, was that they were sent to outside wilderness camps.

There were comments made by someone from the human resources department saying that schools do fail and that one of the reasons for that is that schools do not change with society; that society keeps going and things change but the schools do not. Children change; the things that happen in the schools stay the same.

There were a lot of different things that came out of that meeting. One of the teachers who was there said that schools are for education and I agree that that is why they are there. The person who said that said that when you have three bad kids, you are not going to be spending any time with those kids because they are just a problem in the school. He also mentioned that the schools were understaffed and that they needed money and more personnel and that a large number of kids were "hyper" and very hard to deal with, so that he not only had to teach them but had to deal with some of the problems that they had. Very often, because of the big problems in school, they get burned out.

One of the government people had spoken about the program that I was talking about last night, an alternate class, to deal with some of these kids to at least try to help them get through to grade ten, where they could go into the vocational school. One of the things that did come out of that meeting that night was that, in vocational school, the majority of kids who were trying to get into upgrading were kids who had been suspended from school and not allowed to come back.

So, there is some kind of failure in the schools where kids are not getting the proper help that they need to get them through school. There was a lot of indication that teachers did care for kids but there was not enough of them around to do things for them.

The thing that I am trying to say is that there is a problem in the school as far as crime goes; there is a problem in the schools as far as trying to get the kid through school successfully. You talk about mainstreaming and special programs, and that we do not treat anyone any differently, whether or not there are problems; I do not think that I would agree with something like that because we have special needs programs for people with special needs. I think that if you have a group of people in school who are not keeping up with the main stream of the other children who are doing well and going right through the grades and graduating, then you have to pay special attention to those children. It is the responsibility of the government to try to get those kids through school. I am not saying that the parents are not responsible either, because they are; we are not to say that they are not to blame because sometimes they are and sometimes they are not.

I would like to make it very clear tonight that there is a problem there and if you do have special problems, you have to be able to look at those problems and you have to deal with them accordingly. I do not go along with the belief that we treat everyone the same. You have to treat people differently because people are different.

I think that all of the different ideas that came out that night from all of the different departments told me a lot; that there has to be some kind of communication within the departments of the government and that those governments have to look at those problems very seriously because they do exist. I think that, in the long run, it would save a lot more money because the kids who are dropouts are kids that usually get into trouble and kids who usually end up in the jail. I think that we have to look at those problems now before they get worse and cost more money. I would like to hear some comments from the minister about some of the comments that I have made.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will start at the end of the member's comments, because she did mention it twice about treating children differently. I think she has misinterpreted what I was speaking of when I said that we were treating children equally. I was talking in a general financial sense. I was indicating that we did not like to treat children unequally, however, I have never made an inference that we do not recognize the individual needs of children. I think that it is quite evident in our educational system that we do recognize the special needs of children; just in the fact of the numbers of special education teachers we have, and the various areas where we have the special education teachers located. We have 15.5 remedial tutors located in various areas in the territory.

Discussion can get extremely philosophical about education, and how education has evolved to where it is today; whether it was better when we were going to school, or whether it is better now, or whether it is changing with society or not.

I believe that it is changing with society. I do not know if it is keeping up with the rapid changes coming to society. I think we are trying, and making a big effort to keep up. I do not know if the educators, departmental staff officials, or if the children can keep up. All too often we forget the speed at which children are changing, and maybe they are not changing quite as rapidly. Maybe we should try to slow down a bit, and adapt to the child's needs, and the speed at which he is prepared to change and to evolve.

I appreciate that he has to fit into that society and live in that society. I think we are trying and making a big effort to prepare children for that through the mainstreaming philosophy itself, so that children are exposed to each other, and to children at both ends of the spectrum. All children are exceptional. At one end they are exceptional in the sense that maybe they have some physical or psychological difficulty, or slowness. At the other end they may have that intellectual ability that has become a little more advanced than others. They may still have physical handicaps or problems like dyslexia, or something.

We realize that all children are exceptional, and that each one is individual and has to be treated as such. I would have to appreciate the position the teachers are in, in a room full of children. They have so much information to give to those children, and so little time. It must be very difficult. Everybody has to work forwards. Parents have gradually let teachers assume more responsibility for the children, and teachers have rebelled and said, "We are not

babysitters, we are educators and we want to teach children. We do not expect to teach them manners and when to blow their nose and when to say please and thank you." They are still left in that position, because parents do not always do it. Parents are not always able to or available.

My, and this government's, position, and the position of the department, is that we are prepared to listen to parents. We are prepared to listen to the input the school committees have. We are prepared to meet with them. The education council advises us constantly. We are prepared to meet with the teachers, and have some input from the teachers. I think in Yukon we are at an advantage because we are smaller. We can try new things. We do not have as many children to work with. We could maybe set some standards for other parts of Canada. We could try some new things and be innovative and be inventive. In some areas, we have probably already done that, like the native language program, for instance. I think we are far ahead of other places in Canada with our native language program.

¹⁵ I have read the minutes that the member brought to my attention. I did not, of course, find half the information that she has given me from the minutes which she kept herself. I appreciate that these people had a very good exchange of ideas. I would make some comments about some of the other things that the member has indicated as concerns.

I believe, yesterday, there was a comment made about teachers passing children — and this will take into account the children who are causing problems and disturbances in the class — and they were passing them just to get rid of them. I believe that is called "socially promoting" children and apparently the junior high teachers have expressed a concern about this; that they are concerned that this may be happening. Next year, we have identified, along with the education council and the Yukon Teachers Association and the Department of Education, to do an investigation of this and see if it is really happening.

I still would like to caution the member regarding the children whom she is talking about. I do not believe that crimes are the school's fault entirely. I just wanted to set that comment in the record. I really do not like the idea of segregating children into a special class. Perhaps, a modified method of mainstreaming is ideal — and I have had other people talk to me about this — where children, for most of the day, are mainstreamed and then, for some special lessons, they would be separated and you could identify your exceptional children with exceptional learning abilities and maybe they would have some extra time with special instructors. Perhaps the children whom the member is concerned about could also have some special time set aside. However, the idea of completely segregating those kids does not appeal to me that much. I would reiterate, we do have the special teacher services in detention homes and, of course, the instructors at the correctional institute.

Mr. Chairman: Before you answer, Mrs. Joe, I think we will take a recess for about 15 minutes.

Recess

¹⁷ **Mr. Chairman:** We will now call the Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue with the general debate.

Mrs. Joe: I just have a couple of brief things to say. I want to clarify one thing. I did not say that crime was the fault of schools, it was said by a person at that meeting.

The thing that we were talking about, socially promoting students, was a term that was used that night and I think it was a very serious concern. The people who were there were very surprised that that was actually happening, although there was some suspicion that it was. I am glad to hear that the minister is going to be looking into that.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is that the minister talked about the children that I was concerned about and I have a major concern about those children, but I would also like to clarify that I am concerned about all of the children, not just the kids with problems.

Another comment that was made that night by one of the teachers

who had been teaching in the Yukon for quite a number of years, was that the kids should have more say in the school system. I wondered whether there was any mechanism whereby they could do that through student councils, or whatever. A few years ago, a group of us so called experts were trying to find out why kids were getting into trouble. We were all sitting back and trying to decide ourselves why it happened, until one day somebody said, "Why don't you ask the kids". So we did. I think that we learned more just from sitting there and listening to them in an hour than we had in each meeting we had every month. I wonder if the minister might tell me if there is some sort of mechanism where kids do make some kinds of decisions in regards to the school system?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not know whether the member opposite remembers, I did meet with the student council from F.H. Collins, and it was the practice of the minister to meet with the student council once a year. I really do not feel that that is often enough and I certainly open the invitation to the student council at F.H. Collins: if they have some concerns that they wish to present to me, I am available for that. I have been looking at that whole aspect of student participation and we are certainly open to pursuing that avenue. It is just something that I have not reached yet on my list of things to do, but I am getting there.

Mr. Byblow: It seems to me it was about 5:00 p.m. this afternoon when I raised a question on busing and it is just short of 9:00 and I am getting a chance to raise my second question.

Before I do, I want to, by way of summary, talk about or raise and correct the record on the issue of Oliver Nelson. I think the issue is not so much one of the gentleman himself, the issue is one of the responsibility for Indian education. And as the Minister of Municipal Affairs pointed out, the history of this goes back to 1967 and we do have on this side, in fact, in my hands, a copy of the document that he referred to, tabled in this House in 1977. In fact it is sessional paper no. 1977-38 and it is called "The Legal Basis for Yukon Territorial Government Policy re Education of Status Indian Children". It is quite explicit that in 1967 it was the desire to change the policy that was in place regarding the delivery of education service to status Indian children; that it would be better to eliminate the payment by the Government of Canada on an annual per-pupil basis on behalf of children who were federal employee children and Indian children when incorporating this into an operating deficit grant.

¹⁸ This was an agreement that was, in fact, put in place. The agreement that was established between the federal and territorial governments, respecting education, did make the point that Yukon had certain obligations to provide the same level of educational services to natives as that which existed in 1967 and, further, that to increase the service in accordance with the date that the agreement was signed, which was, in fact, in 1973.

The point that my colleague was raising was that, in the Mayo-Stewart busing issue, there was a busing service at one time, and because it was an established community, there is the question of whether or not the obligation continues. That is part of the point my colleague was raising. It is certainly not something that we are making an issue about, but it is part of the argument that my colleague did raise.

I think, in the whole matter of the busing question, there is something that has been missed in the summaries that my colleagues have given about an examination, in a policy-way, and then putting that policy into some practical application between the rural areas and the urban areas. There is distinctly the question that in certain rural areas, getting to school is a very basic problem and it has nothing to do with the level of service or the level or quality of education comparable in the city schools or in the urban areas. I think this is what we are simply asking the minister to re-examine: the regional aspect regarding busing. It is all very well and good to say that you have established regulations and legislation that should govern certain minimum requirements of numbers of pupils and whether or not that establishes a bus run; that is the current policy.

We are saying that, in the instance of Mayo-Stewart and in the instance of Tagish, we have a special needs situation that you only find in the rural areas and you only find in certain regions.

²⁰ I suppose I can draw the comparison in some way to the creation

of a new suburb in a municipality. A number of people will move to an area and pretty soon municipal councils are asked to provide road service and street light service and pretty soon you recreate that area into the level of service that the downtown core may have. I raise this in a comparative way to bring up the situation that we are facing today here in Yukon, and that is the evolutionary development of the busing situation. I want to draw some reference to my personal experience, which in a way can be compared to what we are facing here today in the Yukon.

Some 50 years ago, I went to school, too. It was in a rural situation and there was the issue of busing. Busing was not provided but it became an issue. Through the requests and insistence of parents, eventually a bus came into existence. I think we are facing the same sort of situation in the Tagish area where we have what you might call the development of a community, a request by parents, a level of education that is not being met, the simple scenario where we have certain circumstances that warrant a re-examination of the whole busing question.

That, in some ways, puts into perspective what we are asking of the government. I could then carry on into some response to the minister's invitation identifying just where this party is coming from. Certainly, I want to make it clear that we have some very clear and firm positions regarding where we think education is heading and how education ought to be delivered. We do believe that all Yukoners should be afforded the opportunity and the means to achieve their right to education, which we consider to be a basic human right. We must permit an opportunity for students to reach their maximum potential. We believe that the education system must be democratically controlled.

The minister talks about the input of parents, the input of YTA, the input of senior students, the input of the public at large. I think this has to be respected. That is a basic democratic principle in the delivery of the education system.

²¹ We believe in the rights of individuals to education. That would include the handicapped and the disabled. Certainly, as we get into line items, we could have specific questions on that. It is our belief that in the delivery of education, we must also respect the democratic principle, the civil liberties, and human rights that must be brought out in education. It is the responsibility that we all have. Certainly our education system has to contribute to that.

Basic literacy is a fundamental objective, and certainly life skills, ability and development are something else we all believe in. I think a very good point was made by one of my colleagues that in the urban areas of Yukon, there are a different set of priorities that have to be capitalized on, that have to be delivered. In the rural areas, there are different priorities. And certainly the priority in the rural area is to get to school. I think we must insist that Yukoners leave the school system with a positive feeling about their abilities and with a realistic sense of their future in today's society.

The minister talks about the innovations in the school system, the attention to the areas of problems; the delinquency, the crime, drug problems. I think we have to accept that we are talking about something that requires an interrelativeness, an interaction with more than just education. I think I made that point yesterday. I will not spend any time on it.

There is the need to keep the school current in the sense of materials, teaching aids, books, and so on. The minister raised the matter of computers. That is certainly an area that we have to be moving towards. The minister remarked about the government leader having a computer to play with. I would like to say that I have one, too, but unfortunately I have to say that my family has one, and I do not get much time at it.

I think that in the area of developing the individual potentials of students, we have to make sure that the teachers are adequately prepared, in particular, to the Yukon situation through orientation. Certainly they should be given adequate instruction to identify learning difficulties that students do have. We believe also that family life education should become part of the school curriculum in consultation with the school committees and parents. We wish to ensure that a Yukon curriculum be a continuous development. It would recognize the academic and the vocational needs of Yukon students, and ensure that they have the skills when they do leave

school, to meet their either short or long term goals in life, particularly in the labour market.

22 I think one of the emphasis of our position in education is a requirement that there be an emphasis in Canadian history within that curriculum. Having spent some time in the classroom, it is one weakness that did exist several years ago. There have been some attempts to upgrade that but it is still an area that we distinctly are weak in — the area of developing a sense of understanding and appreciation for the country in terms of its history, its politics and its civil democracy.

We also adopt the position that daycare should eventually be part of the educational system. There should be a transfer of that responsibility. We believe very strongly in parental and local influence and control in the education of children. The minister and I have addressed this and we are going to be looking, from previous discussion, at meeting this dialogue head on by public input in the near future. I would expect that the minister will continue the policy of this government, which we concur in, and that is to have school committees participate as much as is practicably possible towards the responsibility for hiring, for curriculum, selection and development, and of course, we would also like to see some participation in any discretionary portions of the budget where they can exist without having to influence government policy and change current programs.

Certainly, the authority in education must be vested in the minister. She is ultimately responsible. Curriculum development must also emanate from the department and a responsibility for developing the budget has to remain there as well until we have a different method in place. Certainly, through the discussions that will be emanating from the communities, we will have to re-evaluate the degree to which school committees are going to be participating in that aspect.

Bargaining with teachers, disciplining of students, the whole area of instruction is distinctly a responsibility of teachers.

As my colleague has pointed out, it is our party's position that corporal punishment be ended in the schools. I feel quite strongly about this. Having spent a number of years in the classroom, I find it very difficult to understand the need to actually strap a student. A good educator does not require that recourse to maintain discipline or to deliver instruction in the classroom.

23 I think I will stop at this point and hope that the summary I have provided will help the minister in the development of educational policy and direction. I am sure that she does appreciate this sort of input and certainly I want to say, in the event that we should get into line items shortly after this, that I have thoroughly enjoyed the discussion that has taken place since we began this yesterday; it is a most fruitful exercise and I hope this continues.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: My colleague to my left, Mr. Lang, is being intellectually stimulated by the discussion tonight; I would like that on the record.

The member for Faro brings up some interesting points. I do not think that I have given any indication tonight that this government is completely closed to the options of looking at the subsidies and looking at the busing situation. For the 1983-84 budget that we are going to be discussing this year, since the department had just re-examined the subsidies, had just given an increase and had just made that allowance to pay for the sick days, as was not the practice, we felt that perhaps that would tide us over the next year. However, it has been indicated to me, by the opposition, that we may have to look at this again and, from the public demand that is growing, we are probably going to have to look at it for the 1984-85 budget. We will examine that, and I can assure the member that we have already identified the regional requirements and the regional aspect of it. We do set priorities according to rural or urban areas.

I find very interesting the comment the member made about evolution, about communities growing, about demands growing, and it was interesting that at that time the economy was also growing. That is not happening now; the economy is not growing, in fact, it is standing still and bottoming out. However, those demands are still growing. The demands are still growing but the money is not coming in and the economy is not growing. That is what I say; the demands are still there but the dollars are not.

In making decisions we try to prioritize. We found that we were put in a position where we had to prioritize, and we did not have to prioritize with programs, which I thought was extremely good. We did not have to use one program against another and say, well, are we going to have French Immersion or are we going to have Native Languages. We were not put in that kind of a predicament.

I did not think the busing would be considered a program as such and I did not think it would be such a potential issue as it seems to have become. However, I have given a commitment that we will be re-examining the subsidies as we do on a yearly basis anyway.

I find education a subject that we could talk about forever and ever, and the more people you have involved, of course, the more extensive the discussion becomes and the more varied the subjects.

On the comments made about the computer courses and the teachers being qualified to handle these new technological advances, I would like to indicate to the member that the Department of Education and the Yukon Teachers Association have identified an in-service course for the year 1983-84; in-service of teachers in computer as a major professional development activity. I hope we will be addressing that particular concern and I hope the teachers will find that course very stimulating.

24 I think we are constantly reviewing the BC curriculum that we follow in Yukon and trying to adjust it and adapt it to Yukon so that it does have a stronger Yukon flavour and Yukon identity and I cited various examples in the last budget debates.

Regarding corporal punishment, the member has made quite clear what his caucus' opinion is about corporal punishment. It obviously is not the same as the general opinion of the Yukon Teachers Association, the school committees, the education council, the principals and the vice-principals association. They did do a year-long study and they have a lot of public input and the regulations that we have now in place are a result of that public input and of the recommendations of all those people.

Daycare being part of the educational responsibility, I find interesting because kindergarten is not even legislatively our responsibility yet. Of course, you could imagine the hue and cry if we said we do not have legislative responsibility for kindergarten and there will be no more kindergarten. Before we look at daycare we have to look at kindergarten and get that all straightened out.

I do hope that the member is sincere when he says that they have developed some priorities on that side of the House in education.

Just to sum up, I find it interesting, having heard from all the members now and from the past debates from the member for Campbell, who is not here tonight, and the member for Whitehorse West, that the opposition has — just like the parents and like certain interest groups that come to the government — their special interests. One wants a bus and the other is concerned about special needs and another is concerned about cultural experiences. I know the member for Campbell is concerned about a learning assistant from the last budget debate.

The member for Faro is looking at daycare and the government's responsibility, and the member for Whitehorse West, I believe, had some concerns about liberal arts and his own personal experiences with liberal arts programs. I find it interesting they are always talking in terms of more, and I am just not in a position where I am at liberty to say I can give you lots more.

We have to sit down and examine what we have, which is what I have been trying to do along with the assistance of my colleagues and the department officials, and from the public. What do we have now? Where is education going in the future? Are we just going to continue these programs? Are we going to look at the programs and see if some of them perhaps should be discontinued? Maybe they are not fulfilling their purpose.

What I am asking for is not to ask for more; help me identify what is working, what is not working. Where do we set our priorities? Different priorities for urban and rural areas was a very constructive idea, and we are aware of that. We have already pursued that avenue and we are starting to look at that very strongly.

I would just like to say, to finish up, that I do appreciate the input from the members opposite. I appreciate their comments. I appreciate the concerns of the member for Mayo. He has a

constituency to look after and he is the one who gets the political pressure from it. He always has the minister to blame, though, so I only ask for some understanding on his part.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to respond, fairly briefly, to some of the comments just made by the minister. There was a very responsible suggestion and a policy about including daycare in the education system as the facilities are all there and it appears to be a growing area and a thing to come. The response was that there was not even legislative authority for kindergarten. We do not want the minister to get off that easily.

If the minister wishes the legislative authority for what the department is doing, and we totally support that and even say it is wrong to supply a service without the legislative authority and the authority ought to be obtained very quickly, we will vote for it; we are in favour of it; bring it forward and we are in favour of getting the Department of Education authority for kindergarten. We are also in favour of adding daycare and if the minister wishes to do that, we will vote for it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: *(Inaudible)*

Mr. Kimmerly: That is not an excuse. Also, in the same vein, I would like to comment that the discussion was fairly wide-ranging and philosophical; not about dollars, specifically, and I think that is entirely appropriate and was constructive and probably it was intellectually stimulating for the member for Porter Creek East. He needs a little stimulation from time to time.

The priorities that we identified in the last two hours are fairly extensive and, as summarized by the member for Faro, amount to a complete education policy. Next year, we look forward to the same sort of statement of priorities from the minister and we will wait all year with bated breath for that. Before sitting down, I would remind the minister that I gave her notice of questions on November 9, on page 88, and I will be asking those questions about the dropout rates under the line item of schools.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I recognize this has been a very stimulating evening for everyone who's still awake. I would move that we report progress on Bill No. 5 and beg leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the house to order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Philipson: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I move that the house do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honorable Minister of Justice that the House do now adjourn. Are you prepared for the question?

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

1