The Pukon Legislative Assembly				
		25th Legislature		
er 29	3rd Session			
		• •		
	HANSARD			
		x		
	Wednesday, October 26, 1983 — 1:	30 p.m.		

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake DEPUTY SPEAKER — Bill Brewster, MLA, Kluane

CABINET MINISTERS

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

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle Bill Brewster	Hootalinqua Kluane	Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West Leader of the Official Opposition
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow	Maurice Byblow	Faro
		Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre
		Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre

(Independent)

Piers McDonald

Dave Porter

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

Don Taylor

Watson Lake

Mayo

Campbell

Clerk of the Assembly Clerk Assistant (Legislative) Clerk Assistant (Administrative) Sergeant-at-Arms Deputy Serfeant-at-Arms Hansard Administrator Patrick L. Michael Missy Follwell Jane Steele G.I. Cameron Frank Ursich Dave Robertson

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly by the Queen's Printer for Yukon

Mr. Speaker: I will call the House to order. We will proceed with prayers.

Prayers

NTRODUCTION OF PAGES

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the Order Paper today, it gives the Chair a great deal of pleasure to introduce a new page who will be serving the Assembly during this sitting, and he is Ken Kapte. I would welcome Ken to the Assembly, at this time.

Applause

DAILY ROUTINE

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

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have for tabling an "Executive Summary of Position and Recommendations Respecting Beaufort Development".

Mr. Speaker: Are there any reports of committees? Petitions? Introduction of bills? Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers? Notices of motion? Statements by ministers? Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Alcohol rehabilitation programs

Mr. Kimmerly: Concerning alcohol rehabilitation programs: yesterday, the government leader offered us a rather fanciful statistical interpretation. If the per capita consumption is 230.8 litres and there are 23,000 people, the total consumption is 5,308,400 litres annually. If tourists account for 350,000 litres, the total is 4,958,400 or 215.58 litres per capita.

In view of the ...

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member making a speech? Could the hon. member kindly get to his question.

Mr. Kimmerly: Has the minister made a statistical analysis of our expenditure on alcohol abuse programs on a per capita basis? ⁹² Mr. Philipsen: No, we just address the need.

Mr. Kimmerly: Concerning the need; adding the statistics in this year's budget, we treat 1.9 percent, or approximately 2 percent, of Yukon's total population. How does this figure compare with other jurisdictions?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am sorry, I do not know the answer to that question.

Mr. Kimmerly: Yukon's impaired driving rate is three-and-ahalf times the national average. Has this figure been taken into account in formulating government policy in this area?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I do not know whether this question is rightly addressed to me. I would like to say, at this time, in the interest of good questions in Question Period, I would appreciate very greatly if the member for Whitehorse South Centre would simply ask me a question, rather than put me in a position where I feel like I am on trial for something, and I do not know what it is. I believe, if questions were asked of me in a straightforward manner, it would be far simpler for me to answer those questions.

Question re: Joint agreement on heritage rivers

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. In a press release this Spring, the minister announced a joint agreement on heritage rivers which would develop management plans for Yukon heritage rivers in accordance with the "Yukon Planning Act". By the reference to a "Yukon Planning Act", did the minister mean the Yukon Land Planning Act? There is an agreement with two departments of the federal government, DOE and DIAND, and ourselves regarding heritage rivers and, when a river is proposed to become a heritage river, there has to be a plan made on the river of how this heritage part of the river or the whole river will be managed. It will also have to take into account the management plans that are made for the territory. But the actual management plan for that river is something that is developed through the heritage rivers process.

Mrs. Joe: I asked a question about a reference to a "Yukon Planning Act". Did the minister mean the Yukon Land Planning Act?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think I just answered that question — that there is a mechanism in the Heritage Rivers Agreement that there has to be a plan drawn for the heritage river, or for the section of the river that is heritage river. And I also stated that it would have to take into cognizance if there was a management plan done for that area of the territory, it would have to be considered in that plan, yes.

Mrs. Joe: Since the provisions of that act need not apply for the first year even after it comes into force, does this mean that the minister does not intend to develop heritage river management plans for some time to come?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, nor did I say that a land management plan has to be done first.

Question re: Agricultural land protection

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the minister responsible for the soil pedologist. Yesterday, the minister suggested that the policy for agricultural land protection consisted of a provision in the land sale agreement that no subdivision would be allowed. Is there any provision ensuring that whole parcels of individual land will remain agricultural after sale?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am the minister who is responsible for the soil pedologist. If he is addressing the minister responsible for agriculture, he should address it to that minister.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Now that we have it straightened out that the member across the floor is totally confused, I should point out that there is a certain amount of trust between the recipient of the land and the Government of the Yukon Territory. He or she will not get title to that property until they have proven the area within the capabilities of agriculture and have produced a crop. Subsequently, that is the safeguard invested along with the caveat of no subdivision that will ensure that that particular piece of property in question will be utilized for the purposes it has been granted for.

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, who advertises a soil pedologist in every answer. It is essentially the same question. After sale of agricultural land, is there protection that whole parcels of the land — after the sale agreement, after the five years — will not be sold off for other than agricultural purposes?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The question of zoning will come into effect. You have the caveat that they cannot subdivide. They cannot get title for the purposes of anything else but agriculture for the utilization of the property. I do not know what more we can do. If the member opposite has any other brainwaves, I would like to hear them. I think I have repeated the answers to his question at least 10 times during the life of this session. Obviously, in view of the questioning that I am getting, I am probably going to get 10 more questions until the end of the session.

Mr. McDonald: When 1 stop getting different answers for every question, I will stop asking the question. Yesterday, I also asked a question of the minister regarding the government's land assessment policy for farm improvements. Did the minister say, at that time, that the present tax rate charged is fair, in view of the fact that the farmers also have access to the homeowners' grant?

us Hon. Mr. Lang: I refer the member to Hansard and I think that will refresh his memory.

Question re: Citizen awareness program

Mr. Penikett: Perhaps I could try a question to the Minister of Tourism.

In the middle of the summer, we were sent a press release in connection with the citizen awareness theme of the tourism program which contained some data which I would like to ask the minister about. A statement by the minister says that one out of five Yukoners is employed in this sector; therefore, could I ask the minister if that means one in five Yukoners who have jobs or one in five of the adult population? Could she clarify that and tell me what is the source of this information?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I believe the source is economic development and I am not quite sure as to what exactly it represents; however, I could find out and bring it back to the member.

Mr. Penikett: 1 thank the minister for her answer.

The statement goes on to say that, last year, 365,000 visitors came to the territory. I would like to ask the minister, just for the record, a question about the accuracy of that number. Does she believe that this is accurate within 1,000 people or 10,000, or is it only a rough approximation produced by the industry itself or the industry association?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It is a more accurate number than that. I believe it is probably within 100. I am not absolutely positive of that and if I am incorrect in my answer, I will clarify it next day.

Mr. Penikett: The same information package from the minister went on to say that \$51,000,000, or \$200,000 was spent for every man, woman and child in the territory. I would like to ask the minister, again, if she could provide the House with the source of that information, since it seems to be an error, since, according to Statistics Canada, it seriously over-estimates the population of the territory.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It was a typo: it should have said \$20,000.

Question re: Job training for the Beaufort

Mr. Byblow: I have a question I will direct to the Minister of Education, as well.

Yesterday, I raised with the minister the question of training for jobs in the Beaufort and the minister responded, among other things, that we did not have the funding to provide the necessary programs to train people for the Beaufort. I want to ask the minister what steps is she now taking to provide the required training programs for Yukoners to be able to have a better chance at Beaufort employment?

⁹⁶ Hon. Mrs. Firth: I thought I made that clear for the member yesterday. Obviously I have not, because he is asking the question again. In order that we can provide training in hydro carbons or extraction, we have to first of all have a demand for that particular training. We have to have so many people who are prepared to enter the training program. Then we have to apply to the federal government for assistance to put the program on, because through the Canada Employment Immigration Commission, they buy seats to each program. And, if they are not prepared to support us in those programs, then depending on the cost of the program on a daily basis, it could become too expensive for Yukon to handle the costs of it. If the federal government will not fund us and the courses are relatively inexpensive, and we feel that we, the government, can handle them, we could proceed with them anyway. Before the federal government is prepared to support programs, they have to consider them designated occupations and, if they do not consider them to be designated occupations, then they will not fund it.

Mr. Byblow: Does this government know what occupational demand there will be from Beaufort employment? In other words, does this government have any signed agreements for employment needs?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We have no signed agreements. However, we have been in many meetings with Dome and with Gulf, and also with the Beaufort development. We are trying to get from them an idea of what particular skills they will be looking for and what demand there will be for those skills.

Mr. Byblow: I will direct my final supplementary to the acting government leader. Previously, this government stated that five percent of the jobs on the North Slope was good enough for Yukon, and I believe that was contradicted to some extent by the Minister of Tourism who said that a higher percentage would be preferable.

Could I ask the acting government leader what the real position of this government is on employment percentage requirements by this government on the North Slope?

⁴⁷ Hon. Mr. Lang: It is our intention to try to ensure that we get as many jobs as we possibly can. I do not think that we really want to deal with the question of percentages or quotas; what we want to do is to get those people who would like to work and have the necessary skills to go to work there. The Minister of Education indicated yesterday that we have approximately 120 Yukon residents now working in the Beaufort Sea, as well as Norman Wells. I believe it is approximately 90 now, in the Beaufort Sea, who are commuting to and from the Beaufort Sea to their home communities.

I think that speaks well of this government's activity in trying to generate the necessary interest by the oil companies for a commitment to Yukon residents to put them to work. We are going to continue to do that. I would like to see those numbers swell considerably more than they presently are.

If the members opposite support the motion later on today, perhaps we could have that number exceeded by quite a bit more than what it already is.

Question re: Alcoholism in Yukon

Mr. Kimmerly: About alcohol abuse, and with a sole motive of eliciting information, has the minister's department any per capita figures on the incidence of alcoholism in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: If I am addressing this correctly, would this have to do with child welfare; just per capita? I will have to find out if we have those statistics. I will bring those statistics back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this should be more in the form of a written question if it requires statistical information.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am obtaining ammunition for a written question. I would also ask if the minister would take notice of this question: are there comparative figures on the per capita expenditure for alcohol treatment comparing Yukon and other jurisdictions? As a final supplementary, will the minister be making any policy initiatives to raise the public debate on this issue away from non-productive statistical arguments to a debate concerning ways and means in which all of us can tackle solutions to this social tragedy?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: It is, indeed, very difficult for me to stand and answer these questions. Obviously, the member from the other side realizes that I do not sit here with the statistics in a book. I would also like to mention that I believe that the statistical argument is, at this time, being raised by the member from the other side. I would, indeed, appreciate having these questions written and I will definitely have the answers returned.

Question re: Skookum Jim's house in Carcross

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Heritage and Cultural Resources. 1 have information that the Carcross/Tagish Indian Band is applying for funds for the restoration of Skookum Jim's house, which is located in Carcross. Could the minister tell us if her department has funding for such a project?

^{on} Hon. Mrs. Firth: I cannot make a commitment to funding unless I know more details of the application, and I am not familiar with the application

Mrs. Joe: Now that the minister has been given the information on the plans to restore Skookum Jim's house in Carcross, will she instruct her officials to provide them with the necessary information on the government's restoration program?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The government does not have a restoration program. If the band has applied for some funding, they would have had to apply under one of our existing small business and tourism incentive programs. I have not been informed of such an application and I would have to see the application before I could make a comment on whether they will receive funding or not.

Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell us if the Yukon Historical and Museums Association is consulted before decisions are made by her department on restoration projects?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, they are. As a matter of fact, when

people approach me or the department staff regarding the restoration of any particular area in Yukon, we usually refer them to Mr. Hunston who is the president of the Yukon Historical and Museums Association.

Question re: Flying Old Crow residents to the North Slope Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. On September 7th of this year, the government flew 11 residents of Old Crow up to Yukon's north coast at a reported cost of \$8,000, or \$727 per person. Since this was apparently done in an attempt to convert them to the Yukon government's position on development, can the minister tell the House if this marks the establishment of a new policy for dealing

with critics of the government's positions? Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member across the floor can put whatever interpretation on it he wants. That is not necessarily the true one. It is probably an argument that he would use. But the reason I took those people up to the North Slope was to show them what the argument was all about. A great many people were talking for the people of Old Crow, saying what the people of Old Crow thought, and a great deal of those people from Old Crow had never seen the area that everyone was supposedly talking on their behalf about. So I took them up there to show them what was actually there so that they could make some value judgments on their own and could speak knowledgeably when people asked them questions about the North Slope. There was no intention to influence them towards economic development. It was a case that there were certain people who were speaking for them who were not necessarily speaking what they really thought.

Mr. McDonald: I appreciate that the government was probably getting mixed signals from the member for Old Crow. Could the minister tell the House from what budget this money would come, and will it be itemized?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It will come out of the department of renewable resources budget. I could not give the member which vote it would be but it was out of the department of renewable resources.

Mr. McDonald: I hope that the minister will signal it is coming when the budget comes up. Have public funds been used to pay for other such trips for government critics to the Beaufort and will, as the Minister of Economic Development suggested, opposition MLAs be flown to the Beaufort?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The opposition MLAs can go up there whenever they feel like it. It does not bother me. The way some of them talk - especially the member who just sat down, he obviously knows very little about the North Slope under any circumstances, based on some of the remarks that he has made publicly — but, no, there was no other trip that I authorized out of my department to take people up there. The only other trip that I authorized was to bring some people down here to appear before the Project Review Group.

Question re: Tourism promotion film

Mr. Penikett: Sometimes I think the minister who has just spoken does not know anything about the north slope of this building, but that is another question. I have a question for the Minister of Tourism.

Has the Department of Tourism, in the last few months, commissioned the production of a government tourist promotional film?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, we have. I do not know if it was in the last couple of months; I believe it was in the summer. It was maybe about five months ago.

Mr. Penikett: Can the minister tell the House what cost-benefit assessment she undertook to evaluate the usefulness of such a project before beginning to produce this film?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The film that we had was some years old; I believe it was produced in 1969. The cost of \$75,000 for the new film that the member is questioning was brought to this legislature and we all agreed on that.

Mr. Penikett: I am, probably more than any other member in this House, aware of the production costs involved in film-making and I would like to ask the minister what assurances she has that the project she is embarking on can be completed for \$75,000?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We were given advice by the agency that is doing it and they advised us that it could be done for that amount.

I would also like to mention that we are getting a double benefit for that film, because we had identified some money for travel vignettes to be put on television and some of them can be made from the travel films. So, we are combining the two amounts of money and we are getting double benefits from it. It is very good planning.

Question re: Yukon College Mr. Byblow: I, too, have a question for the Minister of Education on the subject of Yukon College.

The minister previously announced the establishment of a post-secondary advisory council to advise her on matters pertaining to programs to be offered at the school, as well as the direction to be taken by the former Vocational School. Has this advisory council been established yet?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, it has and we will be having our first meeting on October 29th.

Mr. Byblow: Could I ask the minister, then, what cross-section of community interests, as previously committed, sit on that board?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: There are various people sitting on that board. The ones who come to my mind immediately are the CYI, the Chamber of Commerce, and we have various other people with educational backgrounds. If the member would like a list of the people who are sitting on the council, I could present him with that list.

Mr. Byblow: I can procure that outside the House. I want to ask the minister, instead, what mandate this council will have in monitoring the employment needs on the North Slope?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: They will not really have a mandate on employment needs. Their mandate will be in an advisory capacity to the Department of Education to give us some advice on legislative matters, and to give us some advice on how to provide improved skills and improved programs for Yukon College. They will also consult with other advisory groups - the Apprenticeship Advisory Board, for example — and give us some general direction for post-secondary education in Yukon.

The question that the member for Faro is asking will not be a large portion of their mandate; however, I am sure they will be giving us some input regarding that matter.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further questions, we will proceed to orders of the day.

Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with orders of the day, I ould like to remind hon. members of the presence on the Order Paper of Bill 101, An Act to Provide for Freedom to Information. The Chair notes that the Huse has passed Bill No. 1, Access to Information act. As these two bills deal with substantially the same subject matter I would, therefore, order the Clerk to drop Bill 101 from the Order Paper.

We will now proceed to motions other than government motions.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 36

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Kluane, that it is the opinion of this House that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has not taken satisfactory action to satisfy the concern raised by this House in its passage of Motion no. 16 on December 8, 1982, and that this House reiterates the position taken in that motion that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development should now take decisive action to correct the inequity that exists in the Government of Canada Power Rebate Relief Program to Small Non-governmental Commercial Enterprises, by designating small businesses, which service Yukon highways and which provide their own electricity, to be eligible for the benefits of the program.

Mr. Brewster: Last December 8th, I introduced a motion to

have small businesses along the Yukon highways, especially highway lodges, included in the Power Rebate Relief program. This program is funded by DIAND and is now administered by the Yukon government's department of economic development. The small businesses that I am referring to are not eligible for the benefit of this program simply because they are not located in areas serviced by public utilities. As a result, they have to provide their own power plants and produce their own power. As I stated last December, this puts them at a double disadvantage: they must compete with other businesses that do not have to purchase their own power plants; secondly, they do not receive the benefits of this program.

These businesses fill an important role in Yukon's economy. They service the main transportation network that is recognized as the most important infrastructure we have in Yukon today. Without these businesses, travel throughout this land would be risky. During the winter months, it would be outright dangerous. Both the Yukon government and the Government of Canada must do what they can to ensure that these businesses are given the same opportunities as other Yukon businesses. Until the inequity in the power relief program is corrected, the highway businesses will operate at a disadvantage.

Conditions such as this discourage new operators from starting new businesses and make it difficult for existing operators to compete. Without equal application of federal assistance programs to all small businesses outside communities, the highway businesses have no choice but to make up the difference in their revenues by charging more to their customers, or absorbing the loss. I must say, this act is a deterrent to many tourists who travel here each year as well as local residents who occasionally travel throughout the Yukon.

Do these businesses deserve to be treated fairly? I believe this assembly made it very clear that they do, when the members of both sides of this House voted unanimously in support of the original motion last December.

I have been in contact with this government's department of finance and department of economic development. Officials from both departments stated that the department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development had been contacted about the inequity immediately after the motion was approved last December. They all assured me they were still working to have these small highway businesses included in the Power Rebate Relief Program. The problem appears to be in the bed of bureaucracy: Apparently, the proposal is still working its way through the system at a snail's pace. Perhaps this is a sign of the general state of the federal effort of the Government of Canada. This bureaucracy inefficiency must be frustrating for everyone involved, from the politician right down to the recipient of the benefits of these federal programs.

I cannot conceivably imagine why it is taking such a long time to get an answer on this request. I do know this winter may be very difficult for these highway businesses, and every available means of assistance to them will be appreciated. I am asking that the members of this House approve this motion requesting the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to take a personal initiative on this matter. I ask that the members of this House support me in this effort. Thank you.

Mr. Byblow: I want to assure the side opposite that we will be whole-heartedly endorsing this motion. I think the member for Kluane has made a very valid observation that small operators outside a grid system, who generate their own electricity, ought to be treated as equal citizens in the Yukon community. They ought to be able to take advantage of an energy equalization scheme — albeit a rate relief program — just as easily as any other operator who happens to be on a grid system.

I think the member is not only correct on that, he probably underestimated the value of some of these operators to our economic fibre. Many of them, in isolated lodges as he has indicated, on the highway in more remote areas, contribute substantially, I believe, to the appeal and to the service that we, as Yukoners, provide not only to the tourists, but to residents, as well. These operators should not be penalized for their choice to operate where they do and, certainly, on the subject of their contribution to the economy, we feel that the member is quite in order with this motion and we will be supporting it unanimously.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just have a few comments to make on the motion put forward by the member for Kluane.

I would like to put on the record the fact that, in any of the travels that I have done up and down the highway, this question is always raised. I want to commend the member for Kluane for raising it not only once, but twice, in this House on behalf of the constituency he represents. I do know it is very much of a burden on those people who own lodges outside of the grid system and also the responsibility of maintaining their own electricity plants is very onerous, as well.

Just to inform the House as to where it is at the present time, right after the motion was passed on December 8th, of last year, in January of 1983, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was contacted and the request to broaden the parameters of the federal program, that is available in all other areas of the territory, was brought to their attention. Basically, it was followed up a number of times but, as the member for Kluane indicated, it seemed to be shuffled from one federal desk to another within the bureaucracy and nothing was being done.

We have been informed, by officials of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in the last couple of days, that the request has been put forward to their legal department for an interpretation of whether or not these people can come under the parameters of that particular program. So, it would seem to me we are making some headway with respect to this.

I should further point out that it has come to our attention that residential users of heating oil in locations outside of Whitehorse are provided with a subsidy for 1,500 gallons of oil a year. However, at the same time, residential users who have converted to, or heat by, propane receive no subsidy. This is another area where we are approaching the federal government to see whether or not this particular type of user could come under the program, as well.

All I can say, in conclusion, is that we will do everything we can to follow-up on the request put forward by the House and I will ensure that the Votes and Proceedings of today are also sent, accompanying the further request on this matter.

Motion No. 36 agreed to

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: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Motion No. 27

12

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 3? Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, that this House supports the inclusion in Yukon law of a requirement that peace officers be given the power to demand a blood sample from suspected impaired drivers who are unable to take a breath test for medical reasons.

Mr. Kimmerly: I can explain this motion fairly quickly and simply, and then argue for it in fairly short order. The problem is that if a person is injured, or if a suspected injury occurs, or there is some medical reason for not giving a breath sample pursuant to the Criminal Code of Canada, some suspected impaired drivers have found a loophole; or have not been caught by the net of the criminal law.

There is a constitutional question in that the original impaired driving laws are federal and other motor vehicle provisions are territorial. It is clear that, if the federal government legislated in this area, that would be valid criminal legislation and would take precedence over territorial laws in this area. It is equally clear that other provinces have already made moves in this area. There is a very good argument that this kind of a provision pertains to control over the highways, or regulation of highways. Consequently, it is within the jurisdiction of provincial and territorial governments to legislate in this area exactly as we presently do for motor vehicle licensing.

This probably, in the course of a year in the Yukon, would affect very few people; probably three to five people. In a bad year, maybe as many as 10, but that would be unusual. However, because it affects relatively few people is no reason to say it is unimportant. It is a very important area in the consideration of the total issue of safety on the highways and protection of innocent users from drunk drivers.

It is fairly clear, and uncontroversial, that the best deterrent to impaired drivers is a perception, on their part, that they will not get away with it; that they will probably get caught. It is very important to close up all the loopholes in the law. In this particular case, this is probably one of the better known — perhaps the best known loophole in the impaired driving law. It is fairly common and if any members speak to RCMP members engaged in enforcing the traffic laws, they will quickly tell you.

It is fairly common for impaired drivers who are caught and suspected of impaired driving to find any and all excuses that are in any way rational — and, indeed, completely irrational, and novel. It is not uncommon, at all, for a suspected impaired driver, especially if an accident, however minor, occurs, to claim some injury or some pain or incapacity and thereby get to the hospital, as opposed to the police station.

The purpose of this law is to stop that kind of activity and to make it absolutely clear that it does not matter if the person goes to the hospital or to the police station. In any event, it is the public's right to know if a person who is involved in an accident, who a responsible peace officer has formed an opinion of that they may be impaired, is or is not impaired, and it is our right to protect ourselves from those people.

In this particular motion, if we adopt it and subsequently adapt Yukon law to block the loophole, we will not be the first jurisdiction to do it; however, we will be among the more progressive-minded provinces in this area. I submit that, on the general issue, the public opinion and public demand is quite clear and it is very forceful; it is that the roads ought to be safe for innocent use and safe and bare of dangerous, drunk drivers. This law, if enacted, would promote that and would serve to stop, at least in part, the attitude among those who may be caught that if they try various little tricks they may avoid any punishment.

I submit it is a timely and important motion and I urge the serious consideration of all members on both sides.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There are three provinces in Canada that have included this in an act: Saskatchewan, Manitoba and British Columbia. Since they have included them in their act, they have been involved in a great deal of litigation regarding the constitutionality of including it in their act. The federal-provincial ministers of highways and transportation had this on the agenda for our meeting that we held in Edmonton just recently. Unfortunately, the federal minister never showed up. We wanted to have the federal minister have it included in the Criminal Code of Canada so that it is uniform across Canada rather than have each province fighting constitutional battles. Unfortunately, the federal minister felt it was more important to be in Ottawa than it was to meet with his provincial and territorial counterparts.

I am also a little surprised at the member across the floor, who would put a motion on the floor here dealing with the inclusion of blood samples in a motor vehicle accident, for example, or where a person is suspected to be impaired. He has tabled a bill on this in this House, entitled Bill 102, An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicle Act. I am very surprised that, if he felt this strongly about it, he did not include it in his amendments to the Motor Vehicle Act. If he feels that it was a loophole that should have been dealt with, he should have included it in his amendments to the act, but he did not do that. When I instructed my department to make amendments to the Motor Vehicle Act, those amendments will be included, as will a great number of other amendments we will be making to the act. I will be tabling it in this House in a few days, and this motion that the member has put on the floor has been dealt with, and the member will see it when we table our amendments to the Motor

Vehicle Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, now twice speaking, will close debate.

Mr. Kimmerly: In a brief response, I am interested in the position of the government. I take the position to be they are in favour of this measure in principle, and they will be introducing a legislative measure in the next few days to cover it. For that, I am extremely thankful.

The ministers' statements were a little confusing as to the position of the government concerning the jurisdictional or constitutional question. However, I interpret the comments to be that we will do two things and that is: include it in our law and lobby the federal government to include it in the federal law. If both bases are covered, of course, there is no constitutional argument left. For that I am extremely thankful also.

As to the comments about me including it in my bill, I rather strongly expect I will be able to quote the minister in the debate when the time comes as to the effect of private members' bills, and especially my bills, in particular.

is In summary, I am extremely pleased that there is or there appears to be an agreement-in-principle on the motion and I thank all members for their consideration and indulgence.

Motion No. 27 agreed to

Motion no. 28

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 4? **Mr. Kimmerly:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, that it is the opinion of this House that the support systems for Yukon senior citizens should continue to enjoy a very high priority and that, to support self-sufficiency and dignity of Yukon senior citizens, the government should investigate and report to the House within one year on the expansion of support services for senior citizens who reside in private accommodation.

Mr. Kimmerly: All members will recognize that this motion is exactly similar — it is precisely the same, in fact — to a motion debated December 1st, 1982, found at page 362 of *Hansard*.

It is a year, or approximately so, since the first motion and I, as is the member for Kluane, am determined to be extremely persistent on this issue, as he is on his other issues.

It is placed on the Order Paper, again, a year later, because the original motion, before it was amended, called for an investigation and a report within one year. The debate a year ago clearly indicated to me that all members agreed with the general principles. In fact, the amendment to the motion a year ago even congratulated the government for being in agreement. They are not only in agreement, they are proud of it.

I am glad of that, however, I have waited, in the last year, for announcements and policy initiatives and press releases about this program. I am still waiting because I have not heard any.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Come on now, Roger.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am going to be very interested in the speeches, especially from the member for Porter Creek East, because he is going to tell us about all of the good things that occurred last year. I am going to listen eagerly, because I am eager to hear of them because, I say, in the last year I have not heard of them.

I know there is construction on Macauley Lodge; I know about that. I know there is construction at the Alexander Street home; I know about that. There is construction at Greenwood House, I know about that. But I do not know anything about programs. I know nothing at all.

In the motion last year, I spoke about the use of Greenwood House and I will be very interested in the various ministers' statements about the intended use of that building, because I am extremely interested in the issue. I will be extremely interested to hear about the policy initiatives concerning programming at Macauley Lodge because, in fact, the person-years allocated to programming or involved in a quality of life program in fact have decreased. There is now one part-time person there and the other duties, especially involving social assistance, are taking more time than last year. Effectively, there is nothing at Macauley Lodge in terms of programs. The building is being improved, and that is great. However, the quality of life there has not been improved, and I regret that very seriously.

I spoke about programs that did not cost any money to support seniors in their own accommodation, their own housing, outside of institutions like Macauley Lodge and Alexander Street in Whitehorse, and other places around the territory. And I have listened for any initiatives or announcements about those programs; very simple programs, requiring only a llittle bit of coordination. I again say, those programs are very worthwhile, and are programs involving obvious common sense and do not cost a lot of money, and I regret that they are not in existence here.

I have spoken earlier about the lack of a housing policy specifically for senior citizens; a coherent, comprehensive policy. I am speaking now about a lack of comprehensive policy for senior citizens in the program area, or the quality of life area, involving a support system for seniors staying in their own independent accommodation, and quality of life programs in institutions like Macauley Lodge. Presently, the staff allocations and the policy initiatives are most inadequate and I am extremely interested to hear the ministers talk about the investigation and analysis which occurred last year and their reports as to the new policies that will exist soon.

17 Amendment proposed

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The motion as it now stands implies that we are not presently investigating home support services for seniors. This is clearly not the case. I therefore propose the following amendment: "that it is the opinion of this House that the support systems for Yukon senior citizens should continue to enjoy a very high priority and that to support greater self-sufficiency and dignity of Yukon senior citizens, the government should continue to investigate the expansion of the support services for senior citizens who reside in private accommodations".

I would like to speak to this amendment. I would like to point out the following...

Mr. Speaker: An amendment has been moved by the hon. Minister of Health and Human Resources, that Motion Number 28 be amended by inserting the words "continued to" after the phrase "and dignity of the Yukon senior citizens, the government should"; and, by deleting the words "and report to the House within one year on".

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: To speak to the amendment, I would like to point out the following. The Department of Health and Human Resources is currently initiating a rehabilitation and geriatric service review of the needs and resources available to seniors and disabled persons in the Yukon. Part of the review will assess the levels of home support, such as homemakers and home nursing available to seniors in their own homes. Some of the recommendations from the review will provide direction to the department in the development of programs and policies regarding home support services to seniors. The steering committee for the review consists of representatives from Health and Human Resources, Health and Welfare Canada and the CYI. The first meeting of the steering committee was held on October 6th, 1983. A report is expected from the consultants conducting this study by April 1st, 1984, which indicates that it is not necessary to be told to report to the House

We also are conducting a disability study of services to geriatric and disabled populations. The study will provide the basis for the planning and development of comprehensive rehabilitation services. We have partly addressed the problem at Macauley Lodge, that the member for Whitehorse South Centre was speaking of. We have addressed it in a more realisitic manner. We are addressing the problem of not enough people to look after the people in the lodge in the matter of their health. To that end, we are in the process of hiring three more NHA's. We have added one three-quarters of a man-year for the kitchen help. I am presently investigating the possibility of a visiting order of nurses society be set up in Yukon, and I am looking at a handyman service which would allow people who stay in their homes longer and have people come around and help fix things that they are not any longer able to. ¹⁸ My amendment to the motion emphasizes that investigation of senior home services and other services to seniors is an on-going process which, in my opinion, would then make the motion from the member for Whitehorse South Centre redundant.

Mr. Kimmerly: It is not a bad amendment and I am very pleased to listen to some information; that is, about the handyman service. I would like to lend our support to that initiative and, if the minister requires any assistance, I would be pleased to help. The VON, or the visiting nurses program, is an extremely good program and we support it wholeheartedly.

As to the person-years at Macauley Lodge, I will be extremely interested in the spring budget, to see what is to occur there next year. As to the consultants, I appreciate that the minister does not get another opportunity to speak — although I will be asking which consulting firm or which consultants are doing the study and what are the terms of reference for that study and, also, are the dollars allocated going out of the territory or staying here and, more importantly, are senior citizens involved in actually doing the study and receiving the dollars for doing it? I am aware, and I am sure all members are aware, of very compentent senior Yukoners who know what is wanted and what is practical. I will be interested to know what proportion of the consulting dollars are actually going to them.

The purpose of the motion, really, is to draw attention to the question and publicize the question. I am very pleased at this news about these particular programs. It is a start and we support that start and we are pleased to see it.

Mrs. Joe: I would also like to add my support to the amendment to the motion. One of the common complaints that I had during my visits to the senior citizens home in my riding was the fact that they felt that they did need visiting nurses. And, one of the other complaints was that they did need assistance with regard to someone doing the shopping for them. There were many concerns that they raised to me and still do; but I would like to add right here that the Juvenile Diversion Committee is also contributing some services to Macauley Lodge in terms of community work.

Amendment agreed to

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to raise a number of points over and above what the Minister of Health and Human Resources has put forward, and I would like to commend the minister for the work he is doing in the area of senior citizens and how we can assist with those people who need help, without taking away their pride, which all of our pioneers have, since they were the ones who helped make this country the way it is today.

I would like to just briefly run through a list of programs that are made available — just once again, for the record — because I do think that it is important that the taxpayers realize the commitment they have made through their government to the senior citizens of Yukon.

I recall the other day that the member opposite made a very — if I could use the terminology — snide comment with respect to who was responsible for the Pioneer Utility Grant, and that it was not really any members who were on this side of the House. I want to inform the member opposite on two points: first of all, I was a member of the House at that time; also, so was the speaker of the legislature. I should also point out that governments have the authority to bring in new policies and they also have the authority to change them. We are committed to this particular program and as long as we are on this side of the House we will ensure that it continues.

I should point out that the previous government brought in a number of new programs: pharmacare for seniors, income supplement — these were brought in by the Conservative government of the Yukon Territory. Along with that, there have been a number of major ventures undertaken over the course of this past year which the member opposite touched on very briefly and the Minister of Human Resources indicated, such as the question of Macauley Lodge. A major capital expenditure is being put forward by the government to get this particular facility up to a standard that is acceptable for the 1980's and also to ensure that those people who are there will get the necessary attention, because of their age.

Just to give some background, I think it is important to realize

that when that particular lodge was built it was built with the intention of housing people in the ages of 65 to 75. Of course, since that time, 15 years have passed and all of a sudden these people are in the ages between 90, and in some cases are over 100. Therefore, there obviously have to be changes to the physical plant to ensure that these people can be adequately taken care of.

While I am speaking about the lodge, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the people who do work there. They have a very onerous task with respect to the caring for these people because each individual has different types of problems and subsequently they are dealing with multitudes of problems on a daily basis. I do know, from personal experience, that the people there do put in their eight hour shift; they put it in very conscientiously. At the same time, I think the most important aspect is that they care.

I think it speaks well for the people who are working there and then, in turn, it is very beneficial for the people who are living at the lodge.

There were a number of other projects that have been completed over the past number of years. We talked about Greenwood Place a number of times in these chambers, as the member opposite knows. We have gone ahead and done major renovations to the building siding on the complex. I should reiterate from a non-partisan point of view, it was the Conservative government that brought that forward. I know the member opposite likes to take credit for it, but I should point out that it was the previous government here that gave the decision to go ahead with the facility and I think it is holding everybody in very good stead.

One of the important programs that was lodged through the Housing Corporation, in consultation with the Department of Human Resources, has been the construction of self-contained units in many of our rural communities. I think it is important to note that we have completed complexes in Dawson, Mayo. Watson Lake, and also the native band in Haines Junction has a senior citizens residence there, as well. I do believe that, within the financial limitations of government, we should be doing everything we can to assure most communities that there are a number of people who need self-contained units who are pioneers and, if possible, we should try to ensure that the necessary facilities are available to them.

Also, I think it is important that we note, for the record, that we are in the process of completing a major retrofit for the purposes of energy conservation at the Alexander Lodge. As you know, it has been completely redone on the outside. It is going to be of benefit to those people who are staying there. Also, I think the important aspect in this case is the saving of energy, which is a price tag that the taxpayers would have to pay on a operation and maintenance basis on a ongoing term. It is going to be a significant decrease. I do not have the figures here, but I think it is going to be very beneficial to everyone involved once that particular complex has been completed.

The other program that really touches directly on the motion that has been brought forward is the program that has been undertaken for the retrofitting of seniors houses - private homes - and cost-shared with them to try to get their homes into a situation where their homes can be as energy self-sufficient as possible. As we know, senior citizens in many cases are on fixed incomes, and with the prices of energy it has hit them probably worse than anyone else financially, as far as being able to pay the monthly bills for purposes of fuel, especially in the winter months. This particular program has just got underway over the course of the last three or four months. I suspect it is going to have good impact within the community for the senior citizens. It also, at the same time, is going to provide jobs for people over the course of the next year, which I think also is very beneficial as far as our economy is concerned. It satisfies a number of principals. It is there to help assist our pioneers in staying in their own homes; it will provide jobs; and, it will make us less dependent on imported fuels, as far as the purposes of energy are concerned. So I think it does meet a number of principals that I think all members in this House will agree that we should be trying to overcome if we possibly can.

In conclusion, what I am saying is that the member opposite

dismissed, kind of out of hand, that we were doing these reconstruction projects, and whatever. What I am saying to him is that they are important. I think the member opposite, and with good reason if we had not undertaken these projects, would have been in a very good position to criticize this government for not undertaking these particular initiatives. I do not think that they should be dismissed out of hand because it is going to be of benefit to those people who we are speaking of, the senior citizens of Yukon.

I think, at the same time, I concur with the member opposite in principle that we should be doing everything we possibly can to ensure that those people who have private accommodations stay in those private accommodations. I do not think we need a cost benefit study to tell us it is much more beneficial for the taxpayers if we can, in any method, improve assistance to them to ensure that they stay in their own home as opposed to going into government institutions. Also, I think, from a social point of view, it is very much a benefit to them that they be in their own homes. I have to say that it is not that often that the member for Whitehorse South Centre and I agree in principle, but I have to say on this one that we probably, in most part, do agree. Perhaps we might disagree on the methods of reaching the objectives that we are speaking of, but I think it is safe to say that from our side of the House, we will do everything we possibly can within the financial framework that we have to work within to assist the senior citizens as a segment of this population that we believe built the country. Therefore, we do have an outstanding, ongoing debt to them.

²¹ Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, now speaking twice, will close debate.

Mr. Kimmerly: It is perhaps a little unseemly, I suppose, that politicans frequently try and take credit for all sorts of things, but I want to spend a moment complimenting the member for Porter Creek East for supporting Mrs. Whyard's initiative on the Pioneer Utility Grant and for supporting the federal Retro-fit Program for Seniors at Alexander Street and Greenwood House.

I wish to say, just very briefly, that, in the future, I am going to be looking to various new principles. It is clear that the House will now twice support this general principle and there is, obviously, a continuing investigation into these support services. In the future, I am going to be looking for a statement of goals made by the government in response to the steering committee; that is, a comprehensive plan or policy of adding various programs over time, as they are financially feasible.

I am also going to be looking at necessary information about population trends, as this affects the planning and the facilities for seniors. It seems to me that more and more seniors are staying here and that will affect, of course, the planning for facilities and programs. It is also interesting that there seems to be a movement among communities. It may be that rural Yukoners are moving into Whitehorse in their later years. I have some information which leads me to believe that, and that kind of information, of course, is extremely crucial when planning the programs and facilities in the long-term future. I will be interested in those aspects, among others, of the continuing investigation.

Motion No. 28 agreed to as amended

Motion Number 29

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to discuss Item 5? **Mr. Penikett:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the leader of the opposition, that this House urges the Government of Yukon to consider the advisability of renovating the old Territorial Council Chamber located in the former Government Administration Building in Dawson; and that those Chambers be made available to this Legislative Assembly for the purpose of holding sittings on ceremonial occasions, such as royal visits.

²² Mr. Penikett: Characteristically, this is a modest proposal. We have spent some worthwhile minutes here paying, in a sense, respect to the elderly in this community, and for such a group of young people as are gathered here today it is probably appropriate that we also show some respect for old buildings as well as old

people. I want to share with members a couple of experiences which caused me to want to bring this motion before the House. A while back, I was in Dawson City, in the museum there, looking around - I suppose, for myself, as a former resident, as much as a tourist, which is, I guess the capacity in which I go there now — and I wandered into the part of that building that was the old legislative council chambers there, and I was quite struck by the impact that the place had on me. I was conscious, of course, that I am a member of this House and, in some sense, a part of the continuing historical process that moved with the capital from that city to this city. But, I was also in some ways saddened by the appearance of the place. The members' desks were scattered around the room; the place was in dusty disarray - and I say this in no discredit to the people who were responsible for the building because they have an enormous task and limited means - but there was a kind of awesome quiet and regardable decay about those chambers. We here are very fortunate, and perhaps have one of the most attractive facilities of any legislature in the country. We are the only one we do not know what the Northwest Territories will do --- which has chambers which are very modern, which are not essentially Victorian in design. We have a very contemporary kind of style in the design of this place and 1 am sure all members here are very proud of it. While we have respect for the utility of this place and an appreciation of the beauty of these chambers, I think it is appropriate for us to consider the fate of the former residence of this assembly.

The other moment when I had occasion to think about this question was during the visit by a number of us to the state of Alaska. It was interesting, in that visit, to go into a number of the committee rooms and old senate and House chambers in that place, because those facilities are of similar vintage, perhaps a little older, to the ones in Dawson. But there they are still in use, and going into them you can sort of feel the history. You can feel, almost hear, the echoes of the, I suppose, hundreds of members who have been part of that place, but also have a sense of continuity and a sense of history and a sense of the value of the heritage of Alaska. It made me realize that those people who argue that heritage buildings really ought to be used in order for people to have a good sense and a proper appreciation of them really do know what they are talking about. Personally, not only as a former resident of Dawson but also as a member of this House, I would very much like to see those old chambers restored, not tomorrow or next month, but I would like to see them restored when the means are available. I do not know what programs may need to be called upon. I do not know whether it is a project that, in fact, Parks Canada may want to consider at some point. But whatever, I think it should be done and I think whoever does the project, whether it is the federal government or us, it is a project that this House and its officers should take some interest in. The other moment I want to recall for you is the occasion of the

Royal Visit shortly after our last election.

It was, of course, a pleasant occasion for, I am sure, all members to receive a member of the Royal Family in the Chambers. It also occurred to me, in terms of the images we project to the outside world, that it might have been nice if we could have received such a person in those old Chambers, were they restored. I say that for the following reason: one of the problems I know we have in communicating to the outside world some sense of the reality about this place is the confusion that people have between the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory. There is hardly anybody I run into — and this includes politically well-informed people in southern Canada - who appreciate how old this legislature is, who understand that our traditions, in many ways, are as old as the prairie provinces and, and, in fact, arguably older. There are very few people who understand that this legislature has more than just a dozen years of history or a couple of dozen years of history. There is a lot longer history than that.

I believe that, on certain ceremonial occasions like that, perhaps even for a short summer sitting or for some other purpose, that photographs of speeches or meetings or a visit or a reception in those old Chambers would help project to the outside world, on television or in newspaper photographs, the truth that this is a place with a considerable body of experience and has quite a long history, in relative terms. I think that would not just improve our image, but would improve the accuracy of our image outside. I think that would be a good thing.

There would be some practical problems with having meetings in those Chambers — obviously they had less members than we do; there would not be the same number of desks — but it impressed me that they do have some of the accoutrements of the old Chamber still laying around. It may be that much less money would be required to restore the place than we imagined. I know there are problems with the building itself, but I think, if ways and means can be found to restore those old Territorial Council Chambers in Dawson City, I think it should be done.

I began by saying that I think this is a modest proposal. I believe that and I would urge all members to give it serious consideration. Thank you.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I understand well the emotional thing that the leader of the opposition speaks about. It is unfortunate that we in Yukon do not have the financial resources that, perhaps, Alaska has, because we find ourselves in a position where we have to share our money with our old buildings and our elderly people. As usual, there is never enough money to go around.

I appreciate this motion and I would like to indicate so to the leader of the opposition in the extensive research I have done to prepare my comments to the motion. In speaking to this motion I would like to begin by giving the House some background and historical information on the old Territorial Administration Building, as well as some of the initiatives taken by the government towards the restoration.

The Administration Building — I think I will refer to it as the OTAB Building, because that is what the people in Dawson fondly refer to it as. The OTAB was constructed during the summer of 1901, under the direction of the resident government architect, T.W. Fuller. The building was considerably larger than originally planned. It was decided, during the design process, to add the mining and recording function, under the supervision of a gold commissioner, to a building originally intended only for the administrative function embodied by the central territorial government personnel under a commissioner of the territory.

The net result was a basically symmetrical building, with a division into two vertical components flanking a central staircase and hall.

The administrative function occupied the south wing and the recording function the north.

This represented the fourth public building of Fuller's design to appear in Dawson: a telegraph office and DPW headquarters had been erected in 1899 and the Court House and Post Office in 1900. Originally slated for a site on Front Street, the building was erected, after a last minute change, well back from the river on a newly extended Fifth Avenue. With his Commissioner's Residence of the same summer and the earlier Court House, the Administration Building began to establish an impressive neo-classical vocabulary in the government reserve area.

In the years that followed, the Administration Building was affected by a number of occupancy changes, reflecting a gradual consolidation of government office space within the city and with the decline in population and resources. The Court House was closed in 1910 and the Department of Justice moved to the second floor.

²⁴ The original council chamber took on a new role as a courtroom. Structural modifications included a second storey addition to the south brick vault with staircase and hall access inside the building, and subdivision of a room over the main entrance for library use. During the 1920's the Post Office function was transferred to the building, at first, just for the winter months, and then permanently. This initiated structural modifications to the first floor of the south wing within initial rearrangements in 1924, followed by major alterations in 1937 and 1938, which replaced most of the original bearing and partition walls with a post and beam system to create a large, open workspace. At the same time, a new concrete addition was constructed behind the building to house the boiler room, washroom and a new vault. The following year saw the application of ten-test to the inside of the perimeter walls and tilting of the floors. Major expenditures came to a halt in 1953 with the transfer of the Yukon territorial capital to Whitehorse. Much of the building has since been vacant.

Recent tenants have included a year-and-a-half occupancy of the second floor by the Dawson Public School in 1957 and 1958. That involved washroom installations at the northwest corner of the floor and fire escape mountings replacing corridor windows at the centre of the two end walls. Since 1962, the Dawson City Museum has occupied the ground floor and gradually expanded through much of the second floor. Changes have included a small furnace installation in the south wing and false ceilings throughout the first floor.

The OTAB is historically significant at a territorial and national level. Within the Yukon context, the OTAB represents two primary functions in turn-of-the-century territorial capital Dawson City; the function of the commissioner of the territory and his senior administrative personnel, who acted as senior representatives of the federal presence in Yukon, and the function of the gold commissioner and his legal and technical assistants, who provided a more direct link between the general federal presence and the particular activity of gold mining. Within the national context, the OTAB is of interest as a major architectural work by T.W. Fuller. Fuller's father, Thomas Fuller, designed the original centerblock on Parliament Hill in 1859 and went on to do a series of major works, both in Canada and the United States. He was dominion architect from 1881 to 1897. T.W. Fuller, after his work in Dawson, went on to become dominion architect himself in 1929. The series of T.W. Fuller buildings in Dawson represents a major collection of his works and merits consideration within the context of interpreting the development of Canadian public architecture.

This government completed the restoration of the foundation of the OTAB building last year. Letters of tender have been sent out for the rehabilitation of the roof, which is to be structually strengthened, as well as covered with a period, historic, metal roof. This work, of course, is very complex and painstaking, and I would like to give you some information about the extent of the work.

A good example is to do with the foundation. The foundation skirting extends all around the main building. The finish for the first few years appears to have been simple vertical planking. A pressed tin finish was then added. The pressed tin was of imitation stone pattern. Before the foundation restoration, most of the tin was gone. Plain metal sheeting was used as a replacement and the whole skirting was in very poor condition with many deformed and missing elements. In preparation for the foundation restoration, the remaining pieces of tinwork were coated and stored in the attic. Enough evidence exists to reconstruct the tin skirting. However, it is recommended to cover the existing plywood installed during the recent foundation work with vertical planking, thus giving it the skirting of its early appearance. The tinwork could be applied over the planking at a later date, as funds become available.

²⁵ We will proceed with the roof restoration and will have to review the building for further renovation and restoration. Some analysis has already been done. A draft report has been prepared by employees of Parks Canada and has been examined by the director of the heritage branch. It presents various options to be considered by the government of Yukon and the Dawson City Museum and Historical Society, who is the present tenant of the building. I believe the costs that are being estimated are in the range of \$1,100,000 for total restoration.

The OTAB is a large turn-of-the-century wood frame structure of imposing neo-classical design in the *beaux-arts* tradition. A high percentage of the original fabric survives, both on the exterior and the interior. Many of the significant changes have been more costmetic than structural, involving the repainting or refinishing of original material or the hiding of existing fabric behind new wall and ceiling materials. Even where major changes have occurred, such as the evolution from individual office spaces to a large open work area on the ground floor, enough evidence survives to permit fairly accurate reconstruction.

After extensive analysis of the existing conditions and requirements, we will be able to emphasize the architectural strength of the building. Historical restoration of the council chamber courtroom could be utilized as a community-use room, a special gallery, or for receptions, as well as for the purpose of holding sittings on ceremonial occasions such as royal visits.

The OTAB was designed to meet the requirements of early 20th century office occupancy. We have adopted a flexible approach in the rehabilitation of a significant building in order that we do not destroy the surviving historic factor.

In conclusion, we are extremely pleased to have the leader of the opposition present this motion as it demonstrates his support and confidence with this government's decisions and efforts. *Motion No. 29 agreed to*

Monon No. 29 agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 6, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 6? Mr. Kimmerly: Next day, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 7, standing in the name of Mrs. Joe.
Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 7?
Mrs. Joe: Next day, please, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 8, standing in the name of Mrs. Joe. Mrs. Joe: Next day please.

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 9, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.Mr. Kimmerly: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

- Mr. Clerk: Item No. 10, standing in the name of Mr. McDonald. Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 10?
- Mr. McDonald: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.
- Mr. Speaker: So ordered.
- We will now proceed to bills other than government bills.

BILLS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 102: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 2, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 102, An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that Bill No. 102 be now read a second time.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is a simple bill. It is a non-partisan bill. There are two issues dealt with in the bill and they are basically to, in layman's language, plug loopholes in the existing law. I will deal with the two issues one at a time.

The first one concerns the penalties for dangerous driving. This issue received practical and immediate attention in the Yukon courts during the summer.

26 The chief judge of the territorial court made a judgment in the court and said that in the particular case he was dealing with - and it was a sentence for impaired driving - looking at the record of the particular individual, it was appropriate in the judge's decision that a jail term be imposed. An argument occurred in the court as to the legality of that and it was decided by the court that it was not legally possible to impose a jail term for dangerous driving. The reason for that is that the provisions in the present law are confusing and probably wrongly worded. The provisions are that the penalty for dangerous driving under the Motor Vehicles Act provides for, in one section, either a fine or a jail term, and in a completely different section, it provides for a minimum fine. Therefore a fine must be imposed, either at the minimum or in excess up to the maximum, and consequently a jail term cannot be imposed. The correct wording should be that the penalty can be a fine and a jail term, or a complete rewording of the particular section.

I would emphasize this is not only my legal opinion; it is the decision of the courts and it was agreed, I know from personal knowledge, that no appeal would be brought because the lawyers and judge all agreed at the end of it that the case was rightly decided and not worthy of appeal.

So that is the first principle and it makes sure that, for dangerous driving the penalties are brought in line with the other penalties. For example, for careless driving, where under the present law the penalties are more severe than for dangerous driving.

A second problem involves the situation where a person appears before the court and is sentenced after being convicted of impaired driving. Pursuant to legislation passed approximately a year ago, there is a mandatory suspension of the driver's licence and that operates by operation of law independently of a judicial order. However, it is, of course, possible for a judge to impose a greater suspension.

²⁷ Mr. Kimmerly: In the case where no judicial order is made, in fact, what has been occuring in some cases is the criminal penalty is imposed and nothing further occurs and a particular individual walks out of the court. I am personally aware of one situation where the individual got into a car and was driving away. I spoke to that person as a good citizen and warned him and he claimed, in any event, he was totally unaware that his licence was suspended by operation of law. Indeed, there is no objective evidence to prove him wrong. I submit that for that one person, if he was telling the truth, which is a distinct possibility and should be assumed, and if he were charged, he would nevertheless be guilty and probably an injustice of sorts would be done.

The principle of the bill would provide that upon the conviction for impaired driving, the convicted person would surrender the drivers licence forthwith. It would be a practical way of receiving the suspended licence and also would automatically serve as a notice of the provisions of law which exist. It would, therefore, be an improvement on the wording of the present law and I would recommend that all members support the principal of this bill.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that debate be now adjourned. Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that debate be now adjourned.

Motion to adjourn debate agreed to

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 34

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 1? **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I am.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Health and Human Resources that this House supports the initiatives of the Iditarod Citizens' Committee in its efforts to assist Yukoner Larry "Cowboy" Smith in his bid to be the first Canadian to win the Iditarod dog sled race.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: This motion was introduced in appreciation and support of the tremendous efforts of those hardy individuals who dare to challenge the Iditarod and of the many Yukoners who have offered their support and encouragement. Individual effort by people like "Cowboy" Larry Smith inspired fellow Yukoners and brought widespread recognition and pride to our land. The Iditarod, without doubt, is one of the most challenging events in the world today and only a special kind of person dares take it on. We are fortunate enough in Yukon to have people like Larry Smith who are up to that challenge. "Cowboy" Smith is no stranger to the hardship of the trail. This will be his fifth time that he has entered the race.

²⁸ We have watched "Cowboy" progress over the years, culminating with a third place finish in last year's hard-fought race. An Iditarod victory by Smith this year will be the first Canadian triumph in the event since it originated 12 years ago.

I am certain that the initiatives of the Iditarod Citizens' Committee will make the trail a little bit easier for the "Cowboy". The members of the committee, and those who support its efforts, are showing their pride for Yukon and should be commended.

I would also like to say that the support of this House goes out to other Yukoners who will be entering the race; people like Bill Thompson, who want to take on the challenge for the second time.

This motion extends to all the people of Yukon, as well as Larry

Smith and the Iditarod Committee. it stands to give notice that this House supports the initiatives of Yukoners and is behind them all the way. This House takes pride in their accomplishments. I would like to extend my best wishes to the Iditarod Committee and urge all Yukoners to be supportive of their efforts. I say good luck to "Cowboy" Smith.

Mr. Penikett: I think we can "mush" this one through and, perhaps, if I can imitate Larry Smith for a few minutes anyway, I shall use very few words in addressing this motion.

A while back, my brother and I, and a fellow pilot, a friend of my brother's, had the opportunity to spend a few hours with a few beers with Larry Smith in a local establishment and spent the evening discussing flying and rodeo riding. It is an interesting combination but, somehow, whenever I think of Larry Smith, ever since, I think of him not only in connection with the Iditarod but also in connection with those other two activities. In fact, somehow, they seem to sum up something about what he represents.

There is no question that we will support this motion. I can only hope and pray that should I decide to enter the Iditarod next year, that all members of the House will express similar support for me. *Motion No. 34 agreed to*

Motion No. 35

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to proceed?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am prepared to proceed with the motion. Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources, that this House supports the position of the Yukon government as presented to the North Slope Project Rewiew Group and urges the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to deal with the two current development applications in an expedient and comprehensive manner being cognizant of the principles of land use planning.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In its presentation to the Yukon North Slope Project Review Group, the Government of Yukon outlined its position and recommendations respecting Beaufort development on Yukon's north coast. A few moments ago, I tabled an executive summary of that position in this House. Before I go any further, I also have just circulated an errata. The photocopy that all members of the House have was a copy of an initial draft. There were some corrections. There are two places on the second and third pages where it says the words "at least". They are not in the final draft. There is also the errata that I have circulated to you. Also, Item Number 12 said "Whitehorse". It should read "Yukon" rather than "Whitehorse". I will table those corrections tomorrow in the House.

On October 17, 1983, you heard me, my hon. colleague Mr. Lang and the government leader all give ministerial statements on this most important matter. Also, you were probably aware that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the hon. John Munro, has given the Project Review Group a two-week extension to consider its recommendations. The new deadline for submitting its interim report is October 31, 1983.

In view of this deadline, and in view of the importance of the Beaufort development to the long-term socio-economic wellbeing of Yukon, we believe it is opportune for the Yukon Legislative Assembly to be on record supporting the Yukon government position.

The passage of this motion will send a clear message to Ottawa and to all Canadians, that Yukon supports Beaufort development on its northern coast, subject to appropriate environmental and socio-economic safeguards.

²⁹ When we presented our ministerial statements on October 17th, the members opposite criticized us for not giving them enough time to do their homework. At that time, the member for Mayo, a self-professed expert on Herschel Island, who obviously has never seen it, suggested that there should be a motion on Beaufort development so that the issue could be properly debated. Well, that happy day has arrived. It is time for the NDP to stand up and be counted and I plan to call division on this question to ensure that they are counted. It is time for the members opposite to forsake the anti-development stance of their national party and to support the balanced development of Yukon's north coast in the best interests of Yukoners and Canadians. Further, I ask members opposite to forsake their support for those southern interest groups such as the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, CARC, who pretend that they know the best and that they care more about Yukon's environment than Yukoners. These outside interests, who live off the government handouts, would deny Yukoners the right to live and work in their own country. It is time for the members of this assembly to tell these instant southern experts that enough is enough.

Last June, at the Northern Resources Conference held in Yellowknife, CARC agreed that northerners should play a lead role in determining northern issues. This evening in Ottawa, they are hosting a tea in order to lobby against any development of Yukon's North Slope. Therefore, it is more important than ever for this assembly to speak out, or such groups will pretend they have the right to speak for us.

It is time for decision-making. The NDP have stated in this House that they would only look at development on the North Slope provided that adequate social, environmental and economic studies are complete, that there be a formal agreement between the various governments and the user groups concerning the protection and management of the Porcupine caribou herd, that land claims affecting northern Yukon be settled and implemented, that the recommendations of the Berger Commission and the National Energy Board against development be considered, that the entire oil reserves of the Beaufort Sea first be proven prior to any development, that proponents of development guarantee jobs and business opportunities to Yukoners or their development applications be denied. After all this, the NDP, in the words of the member from Campbell — who I suspect is in Ottawa having tea this evening with the rest of the CARC people - be prepared to look at development on Yukon's North Slope, but not necessarily support development. What gobbledygook. The members opposite then say that they are not anti-development. You will notice they never say they are pro-development.

The leader of the opposition pontificates about long term economic planning and then proceeds to oppose all long term economic development proposals. The members opposite cannot have it both ways.

The Government of Yukon has long recognized the need for shore and harbour facilities on Yukon's north coast. That need is becoming increasingly apparent. For example, in a Beaudrill vessel barge location report dated October 12th, 13 vessels are listed as being within the Herschel Basin. The position of the Yukon government is that one single permanent multi-use port be developed in accordance with the agreed principles and criteria established in the land claims negotiations relating to Yukon's North Slope and subject to appropriate environmental and socioeconomic conditions.

Surely the members opposite should be able to support that position. Surely by now they recognize the need for shore and harbour facilities for Yukon's north coast. As I have already stated in this House, our support for one permanent port does not preclude our support for the development of temporary or exploratory facilities at other sites along our coast, subject to similar environmental and socio-economic safeguards and provided that the life of these facilities be restricted to the period of their land use permits for exploration agreements.

You have heard, as well, that it is the position of the Yukon government that King Point be designated as the location for the only permanent harbour facility on Yukon's North Slope and that the port facilities be jointly utilized by the various companies with development interests in the area.

We made this recommendation based on wildlife and habitat concerns, the needs of industry, as well as on the socio-economic factors. Considering the two current development applications, the Government of Yukon found that it could support in principle both the Gulf Canada proposal for a temporary hydro carbon support base at Stokes Point and the Kiewit/ACZ proposal for a sandstone quarry, haul road and port facilities at King Point. ^w These are subject to the appropriate environmental and socioeconomic terms and conditions. We are firmly convinced that the environmental impacts associated with these development proposals can be held to acceptable and manageable limits; limits that will ensure the environmental protection of our North Slope.

That is our position and I trust that the members opposite will be able to unanimously endorse it. The motion I have proposed, however, goes beyond requesting support for our position. It urges the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to deal with the two current development applications in an expedient and comprehensive manner, being cognizant of the principles of land use planning.

The latter part of the motion refers to Mr. Munro's news release of July 21, 1983, regarding the development of a comprehensive package for northern Yukon and to a statement given by the government leader in this House, on October 27, 1983. The comprehensive package Mr. Munro proposed consists of four related elements, in addition to land claims. These include a consensus on the boundaries for a proposed national park and some additional progress on its establishment; the creation of a caribou management board, including all three native user groups; the implementation of land use planning east of the park boundary where the principle objectives will be the protection and managment of the wildlife resource; and a decision to focus industrial activities on the North Slope so as to contain environmental disturbance.

The government leader, both by letter and by statement in this House, has indicated to the minister that the Yukon government supports this initiative to settle these long outstanding Yukon issues. We have requested, however, that we be consulted and that our position on each issue within the package be clearly understood. Further, we have recommended to the minister that it would be appropriate for both our governments to jointly announce the comprehensive package.

The Government of Yukon has indicated it strongly supports the establishment of a mainland national park in the northern and western area of Yukon, but firmly believes that the eastern boundary of the park should be determined by the agreed-to land use planning process. However, in order to facilitate the announcement of its comprehensive package, the Yukon government will support the initial inclusion of the Firth River watershed, including a representative portion of the coastline in a proposed park.

The Government of Yukon has also indicated that a development of the land use plan for the North Slope area should proceed as a matter of first priority and that any further development applications relating to Yukon's North Slope, other than the two current applications, be held in abeyance pending completion of the plan.

With respect to protection of the Porcupine caribou herd, we want to work with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, through land use planning, to ensure that the habitat of the herd is protected.

Further, it is incumbent upon the Government of Yukon and the Government of the Northwest Territories, who have the jurisdiction, mandate and capability to manage the wildlife in our respective territories, to work towards a development of a cooperative management system in cooperation with other user groups. Once a consensus has been reached between Yukon and the Northwest Territories, we will be in a position to negotiate with the State of Alaska.

The Government of Yukon is looking forward to the positive response of the minister, with both governments in a paired accord on such a comprehensive package for furture planning, management and development of Yukon's North Slope. We are confident that the Minister of Indian Affairs will be able to approve the current development applications for the benefit of Yukoners, northerns and, indeed, all Canadians.

Thank you.

Mr. McDonald: I would like to begin by thanking the minister for his courtesy in waiting for the member for Campbell to return to discuss this issue in the kind of detail in which we would like to discuss it.

I find it reasonably fascinating that we are having a debate on this subject today. It is relatively familiar to us all, as it is surprisingly similar to discussions in the House last fall, only one year ago. In **Mr. McDonald:** Last November, as you remember, we were prematurely supporting one project and now we are asked to prematurely support two projects; one being Stokes Point, which is the same one the government wanted us to support last November. The only reason we on this side of the House should have to support a port at Stokes Point and the Kiewit proposal is if there were now information which supported that kind of development.

It was clear to us, last November, that while the government side was paying lip service to social and environmental concerns, they intended to steamroll their way past the opposition and ridicule legitimate questioning. What was equally clear to us then was that the economics were not proven. For example, we questioned the economic viability of massive hydro carbon development during a period of market depression, at great taxpayer expense, and specifically the validity of constructing a port at Stokes Point and the marked lack of benefits accruing to Yukon from existing Beaufort development, and the absence of guarantees that benefits would accrue should development take place on our soil.

When we, on this side of the House, suggested that these questions be answered, we were met with hoots and jeers from the other side of the House. I really did believe that the other side had great difficulty accepting the concept of being informed as it makes decision-making so difficult. They were calling for development then without the questions regarding economic, social and environmental consequences being answered. It seems to us that the government is asking for the same thing now.

The government in this House suggested that being informed or wanting to become informed equates with undue delay in promoting development. The member for Porter Creek East has even suggested that people who take a heads-up approach to development merely offer make-work to professionals studying the impacts of that development. This side of the House wants jobs and this is the only side that is calling for full employment, as a matter of fact and as a matter of record. The member for Faro and I know like no others in this House how devastating unemployment can be on individuals, families and communities. We are only prepared to support solid, well-thought out proposals for development and jobs, especially when those proposals involve truly massive public taxpayer expenditures, as is the case with the Beaufort development. The petroleum companies are spending extremely large amounts of taxpayers money through PIP grants of billions of dollars. One project proposal the member for Tatchun wishes us to consider supporting today has already seen the request for a \$110,000,000 interest-free loan from the taxpayer in order to go ahead. So in a real sense we are paying others to give us jobs. I think that there is room for some reflection under the circumstances. We should properly understand the economics of supporting Beaufort development as a whole, and the Stokes Point and the Kewit proposal as component parts.

Let us first put our current deliberations in the context of deliberations over the past few years. It is important, I guess, to note that we are not starting from scratch; that people have reviewed development and non-development scenarios for some time. The MacKenzie Valley pipeline inquiry that the member for Tatchun referred to called for no development. The National Energy Board called for no development and federal DIAND ministers have called for park development. While this, in my opinion, although in itself is no reason for supporting no development for all time, it does give one the urge to pause for a sober, second thought, which is practically unknown to the Minister of Economic Development.

We should also consider our record of benefiting from existing Beaufort development. If we have not received enough benefits, if our record is not good — in other words — then perhaps we should put our efforts into taking a larger piece of a much larger pot. We should set our sights on achieving greater economic benefits — jobs and business opportunites — of the greater economic activity already taking place. I realize that the government leader may feel that five percent of the existing jobs is adequate, but we do not. We are encouraged that the Minister of Education also does not think that five percent of the jobs is enough.

There has never been serious talk in the House about resource

revenue sharing for the development. We should be taking a share of hydro carbon royalties that we anticipate may be paid to the federal government. The government leader, however, seems to want to throw up his hands and suggest that we should make no claim because in the technical, legal sense, the federal government has given our offshore waters to our sister territory. He claims to have given the House a lesson in geography when, in fact, he is lecturing the House on what is current federal legislation.

¹² This is one of those times when you politely suggest to the federal government that Yukon's offshore is Yukon's and the NWT's offshore is the NWT's, within the existing constitutional framework. It is accepted practice and an understandable claim.

We have not made any serious claim for a share of the revenues. Our percentage of jobs bottoms out at around five per cent. There has been exploration there for 16 to 17 years and well over a billion dollars has already been spent. So, if we were to create a lot of confrontation in the territory, ignore the severe environmental costs, what would our record be if we accepted the Stokes Point and the Kiewit proposals? We do not know yet. We only know that we have not done much so far respecting the real action in Beaufort.

Last year, when the government supported the Stokes Point port, the government leader said that the government had been in constant dialogue with three major employers for a long, long time and, in fact, said on April 13th, six months ago, "We are hopeful that we will be able to sign agreements with the companies in respect to what kind of benefits we are going to accrue to the Yukon in the very near future". That was six months ago. The Minister of Economic Development said only a few days ago that we are still going on the verbal assurances of the employers that Yukon will get jobs and business opportunities.

The training itself for these jobs seems even more nebulous. The Minister of Education has said, "We have been in consultation with the various companies and we would like some commitment and some idea from those companies as to what kind of expertise they are going to require before we can institute those programs. Also, I would like to caution the member that we have great difficulty getting funding from the federal government". They are always cautioning members.

Essentially, what they are doing is admitting that we do not have commitments, but we are still prepared to rush headlong in support of the proposals. I would like to caution members, myself, that development plans from the government's point of view are backwards and it is irresponsible to tell Yukoners that there are jobs and business opportunities when we do not know they exist.

But, we are constantly treated to typically big figures, dollars, jobs, business opportunities, as we were treated to big figures and glorious predictions last year. Yukon Barite Mine in Ross River was supposed to bring in \$3,500,000 and create a substantial number of jobs. It was one of those big figure predictions. When the mine was operating, which was not for very long, it only employed about 12 people, which was less than what United Keno Hill Mines employed when the mine was shut down.

We do not know how many jobs will be at Stokes Point, or could be at Stokes Point; maybe 25 permanent jobs, according to the government leader on April 18th, 1983, as recorded in *Hansard*, though, at that time, he could not positively confirm it.

What about the Kiewit proposal? Kiewit's employment representatives said recently that jobs for the quarry will go to the closest community to the proposed project. That is what they said. They obviously had not read the government's executive summary that they passed out in the House today. The jobs, therefore, would go to residents in the small communities, mainly in the NWT. Nevertheless, we still stand here and talk about jobs, jobs, jobs. Nevermind that the project will cost Canadian taxpayers millions, that the market for the sandstone is remarkably, in my opinion, non-committal, and that a confrontation will likely ensue over the environment.

We do not even have job guarantees from this proposal, yet we are supposed to support the Kiewit proposal, provided we take minor mitigative measures — which we only found out about today in the executive summary — to protect the environment.

It does not make a whole heck of a lot of sense. The Stokes

development falls into a special category. Gulf wants a point now at Stokes and Dome wants to wait until they find reserves. Dome wants to find out if there is enough oil to warrant building a port. Gulf does not want to wait. So, to please Gulf, with no job or business guarantees, we will promote development in a preserve or park, take big chances with the environment wildlife, alienate the Old Crow people despite what the member for Old Crow has to say, and cause serious rifts within our communities, and we cannot even balance it with job guarantees.

It leaves us with one heck of a choice to make. We are told that lack of access to advanced education and training will hinder northern hiring, and we are only told that we are ostensibly in negotiations. We are told that northern businesses will also experience disadvantages from lack of expertise in providing specialized goods and services required by the petroleum industry, and again we are ostensibly supposed to be in negotiations. We have no job guarantees. We have no resource revenue sharing in hand, though we may be negotiating for that. Who knows? The government has not said so.

Many groups, enough to convince four of seven members of the North Slope Project Review Group, insisted that environmental damage will be great. We are supposed to support a position where the economic benefits are not proven and where environmental questions have not been answered. We have serious problems supporting this motion and I must say for the record that we were a little surprised to find the Government of Yukon executive summary position and recommendations respecting Beaufort development on Yukon's north coast tabled in legislature today because that is the first we have heard of an official position from this government. The only reports we had were two government Cabinet members trying to fumble their way through the project review and the press reports of their comments. We did not feel that that was sufficient to make a solid commitment on what and how we felt about this government's position on such an important subject as Beaufort development. Because their real position was only tabled in the legislature today, and because the minister did not show the courtesy to at least give us one day's prior notice of this, then we will probably find great difficulty in supporting this motion

The inclusion of the Kiewit proposal makes it even more difficult, and for those two reasons we would have to postpone our decisions on this important point.

Mr. Kimmerly: There needs to be more said on this particular motion. I want to make it very clear to the hecklers on the other side that we are in favour of development. The real question should not be: should there be development? There is going to be development. We all know that. The question is: how should development occur, on whose timetable and who is going to get the major share of the profits? Those are the real questions; not should there be development but how development is going to occur. Obviously, the development of the Yukon is a progression and things change from year to year. It is absolutely crucial for all of us here not to look only at the short term, and I will even put it as provocatively as I can in political terms: short term jobs are not the only question here. Long term jobs are not only equally as important, they are more important. Let me be very, very practical. If it were a question of 100 jobs for two years or 20 jobs for 10 years - use any numbers you want - 1,000 jobs for two years or 200 jobs for 10 years, which would the government choose, and that is a policy decision about how development should occur. ³⁴ The North Slope and the Crow Flats and the caribou area has been a viable economic area for in excess of 30,000 years for a very small population. It is clear that the population of Old Crow is growing very rapidly. It is clear that the ambitions of the residents of Old Crow and the ambitions of Yukoners for their economic wellbeing are growing and changing. It is absolutely crucial that we, in this House, take a long term view, as well as a short term view, and balance those and make responsible political decisions for the benefit of all of us.

Let me talk just a little bit about the attitude of the Minister of Renewable Resources in his promotion of non-renewable resources and short term; again, over the interests of renewable resources. He talks about the caribou and he used this phrase: "We will work with the federal government". He is going to work with the feds in the one area where he has jurisdiction. What we should be doing is paying very, very close attention to the habitat and lifestyle of the caribou so that a caribou harvest can not only be maintained but increased and increased in economic importance to feed, in future years, the children and the grandchildren and the children yet to be born in Old Crow. The Chief and Council in Old Crow are very cognizant of that consideration.

For that minister, the Minister of Renewable Resources, the development and exploitation and use of renewable resources should come first and non-renewable resources second. Clearly, in the greater political spectrum, all of those things are balanced and it is our party that is balancing them in the most responsible way for the ultimate good for all Yukoners.

The government has recently spoken about the stability of the economy and to get away from a boom and bust economy. They have talked about diversity in the economy and their practical policies are the old line, clearly a boom and bust cycle. The development of the Beaufort is a boom and bust, temporary development. Even in the official positions, they are promoting a temporary development, even where it may interfere with the long-term renewable resource and, more especially, the Porcupine caribou herd.

The concept of Herschel Island has been spoken about. That concept was floated as a trial balloon, not supported as a specific proposal, and the real reason for that is to smoke people out on the real long-term policies of the development companies and the government. The Minister of Renewable Resources said, and I heard him. although it was not on the record, he said a moment ago, "So you are going to build a bridge to Herschel Island". Now, it is quite obvious that the consideration of a road in the North Slope is a very important consideration.

The development of proposals clearly say they are not asking for a road, so why do we need a bridge?

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: On that point of order, I did not say that we wanted a bridge. I said that the member opposite from Mayo wanted a bridge to Herschel Island. That would be the only way they could utilize Herschel Island.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously the hon. member has not made a point of order, as I am sure he is aware. He is simply stating that he has a different viewpoint than another member in this House and, therefore, are quarreling over allegations of fact. Perhaps we could keep points of order to points of order.

Mr. Kimmerly: Our position is that the specific proposals and the obvious long term implications of those proposals and especially the long term interests of the residents who live there or near there should be weighted more heavily than the government is doing. Our position here is that we are in favour of development, we are in favour of jobs; indeed, of full employment. The development of especially the North Slope should occur at the speed and according to the timetable that especially the residents of Old Crow want; that the consideration of the caribou habitat, and not only the protection of the herd but the enhancement and the commercial development of that herd be promoted; that the development occur in as stable a way as possible; and that Yukoners be trained for the expected jobs there. We say, if it takes a delay in order to train more Yukoners so that ultimately more Yukoners are going to be able to take advantage of jobs in the far north, then so be it. The considerations which are most important are the long term stability of the Old Crow economy, of the Yukon economy and the ultimate benefit to the maximum number of the people who live here. Members on the other side will try and continue to say we are anti-development; that is just wrong. Our position is in favour of development in an orderly, stable way, taking into account the legitimate land claims of the people and the long term renewable resource interests.

¹⁶ Hon. Mr. Lang: I am just going to rise and make a few comments. I would like to begin by saying that I have never heard so much rubbish at one time in one place to such an audience. On one hand, he is for development and on the other hand he says but,

but, but. The point is that the facts have been laid out very clearly, that a decision has to be made with respect to those developments here within the next week or else they will not go ahead. We accept that as principle. You know that as fact. Maybe Mr. Fulton told you otherwise ...

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Would the hon. member kindly address the chair.

Hon. Mr. Lang: But, Mr. Speaker, the point being is that a decision has to be made within the next week if we are going to have those projects go ahead over the course of this winter. The member for Whitehorse South Centre, said 'but land claims'. I think that probably one of the more positive aspects with respect to the support that we are giving towards these developments is the fact that the land selection has been made for the Old Crow area, and the area that we are speaking of does not affect those land selections. So, that is positive.

The other point that has to be made, with respect to the caribou and the continuation of the Porcupine caribou herd and, for that matter, the increase in that particular herd, is that those people who have the knowledge in that area have said that those particular developments could go ahead with some restrictions. So, that is number two that has been taken care of in your arguments.

The other point with respect to the question of caribou and the management of caribou is that we have already had development 'on the North Slope' in Prudhoe Bay and the Porcupine caribou herd has not decreased; it has increased. That is fact — not from Tom Berger. This is fact, biological fact. Further, I think it is important to note that it was stated in this House when we had the representatives from Alaska here as visitors and we were discussing the possibilities of developments on the North Slope in Alaska.

They talk about the environment. If we do not permit some on-shore development, we are looking at a situation where all those developments are going to be off-shore. I am a layman in the world of environment, and I accept that, similar obviously to my colleague for Whitehorse South Centre, It seems to be, though, that you would have much more control over what was going to happen if it was on land as opposed to in the ocean. So, from an environmental point of view, it would seem to me, for the exploration of the oil and gas in the Beaufort Sea, that we would be much better off having a temporary facility which Gulf is applying for.

To correct one point — well, I could correct many points of the member for Mayo — but at any rate, one point for now. The member indicated that the Gulf application had just been put forward for that particular facility on Stokes Point. That is not correct; it has been there almost two years. This is the second season that that application has been put forward. We missed last year. The bulk of the dollars, the bulk of the jobs that would have been provided, in the temporary facility they were going to put at Stokes Point, has gone off-shore in the McKinley Bay area, Northwest Territories, and off-shore.

So, Yukon has missed that opportunity, at least in large part. When we take a look at Peter Kiewit and Sons application, the members opposite talk about long term planning and I want to quote from the leader of the opposition, who has not said much so far in the debate.

³⁷ On October 18th, 1983, "I want Yukon to get back to work, all of it, and I want our government to lead the way". That is a direct quote.

Then the member for Mayo, my hon. colleague for Faro, said, "We recognize the need for job creation, we appreciate that. Finally, this government recognizes the need for long-term planning. In some measure, I believe we have persuaded this government that economic stimulation by government is necessary where the private sector cannot and will not respond". This was stated by the member for Faro on October 18th, 1983.

You have, in the Peter Kiewit application, the application for a land use permit. We have been told in no uncertain terms that if that application is not granted they will, in all likelihood, lose their market off the Alaska coast for the purpose of building the offshore islands.

Where will that money go? That is the question if this particular

project does not get the necessary authorities to go. Well, the members opposite are obviously, if they do not support this motion, saying that money should be expended in Japan — because that is exactly where the caseons are made — if those companies drilling off the Alaskan shore do not get the opportunity to use this sandstone.

It would seem to me we have another plus, from the point of view of long-term. The contracts can be negotiated. You have a minimum of 20 years of life for that particular quarry that will not just service the Alaskan coast for the purposes of making these islands, and will help our balance of payments as Canadians but, also, it will provide for us, as Canadians, the further utilization of our own Canadian resources for the purposes of building our own islands off the Beaufort Sea.

When you start taking that into perspective, you start looking at 600 jobs between the two facilities. Six hundred jobs — the size of Faro for construction purposes — 350 jobs for operation and maintenance once it has been constructed. When you start looking at those figures and an investment of \$200,000,000, I think we, not only as Yukoners but as Canadians, have the responsibility to look at such a project and support it.

I say that on the understanding that there will be a requirement for socio-economic agreements with this government and the federal government, under the present federal legislation, that will ensure that Yukoners and Canadians will get the jobs that are necessary for that project.

When you take a look at the position that is being put forward by the side opposite, they say, "We want development", but, with all the caveats they have got, they know — they know full well — that it would not go ahead. So, they have satisfied two objectives. They have spoken out of both sides of their mouths so they can speak on behalf of the people who are unemployed, and they can go back to their policy-making convention of the Conservation Society, CARC, or whomever makes their policy, and say, "Well, we managed to put our oar in and stop it", so that they appear to be serving both constituencies.

Well, I think that is dead wrong. I think it is dishonest. I think the side opposite has a responsibility to look at that project from the point of view that, environmentally, we have had the necessary expertise to say, "Yes, it can go ahead. Look at it financially; we believe it is in the interest of Yukoners", and go ahead and support such a venture.

I think there is another point that has to be made here. We do know this, for example, that COPE is actively opposing that particular development. You have to ask yourself why.

¹⁸ Now, have you given it any thought? I ask this in theory to the members opposite. Do you know why? They do not want any King Point. They do not want anything on Stokes Point, for environmental reasons. They want it on the Northwest Territories' side. There is no doubt that the NDP opposite would support that because environmentally, I guess, that is safe. Now that does not make much sense or rationale to me.

The member for Whitehorse South Centre had the audacity to stand up and talk about the people from Old Crow. The government leader was in Old Crow and he talked to the people who were there in Old Crow on several occasions. The Minister of Renewable Resources has talked to the people in Old Crow. Most importantly, the MLA for Old Crow is in this House. We had the very sad misfortune, over a period of a four-year term, from an elected MLA for Old Crow who embarrassed the community of Old Crow and the people of Old Crow, of having to sit on this side of the floor until we said enough was enough. Now, it would seem to me the member for Whitehorse South Centre is saying, "we are going to support whatever the ex-MLA for Old Crow says", as far as Old Crow is concerned. It would seem to me, that we should be listening to the MLA for Old Crow who stood up in this House a number of days ago and said under certain caveats development should go ahead; the caveats that we as a government, as a caucus, have developed. But no, the member for Whitehorse South Centre and the member for Mayo, God bless his soul, have said "no", Grafton is right and everybody else is wrong. It would seem to me, when you take a look in relationship to this total package, we have a development

that could be very, very benefical to Yukon. And, we have the members opposite trying to find any reason at all to say we disagree with it.

The member for Mayo who stood up and said well, we cannot vote on this motion because we have not had enough time to analyze it, and the member for Whitehorse South Centre who stood up and said well, we need more time for everybody else to make a decision except ourselves; are these the reasons they are giving to this side of the House for saying we cannot support that? I do not think it is right. I get criticism from the member for Mayo, as a minister of this government. I want to raise one point, as far as the North Slope is concerned and Herschel Island. He said we should put the port in Herschel Island. Now that makes a lot of sense if you are in the bridge building business; go to the quarry, take the sandstone down the road to the bridge and then go over to Herschel Island and put it on the barges. What I am saying is that I think the member should do his homework before he speaks.

I want to say this, with respect to the projects that we have on the go here, I think it would be very much in the long term benefit of Yukon and the people of Yukon, native and non-native alike - and I find it interesting that the member for Campbell is gone this week; absent, legitimately, I understand, for the purposes of discussing the prospects of the Yukon Indian Development Corporation - if there is no development and nothing is on the horizon and we are not, this government, prepared to foster the climate that is necessary for people to make investment, there is not going to be much point in a Yukon Indian Development Corporation.u9 The side opposite has been asking questions here for the past two weeks of my good colleague, the member for Porter Creek West, the Minister of Human Resources, on how can we open up the doors to more social assistance. I say to you, we as government, if those policies — which will never be introduced as long as we are on this side of the floor — were to be brought into effect, you would have to find money somewhere; that means development. That means people working, people paying their bills, and not being subjected to the largesse from the member for Whitehorse South Centre, who would like to be the government so he could hand out money here and hand out money there.

39 As the Minister of Renewable Resources said, you cannot have it both ways. And you cannot. I am sure the member opposite probably believes a person could be half pregnant. Well, I am saying to you that a decision has to be made for a development that could be of major consequences to Yukon; of major consequences to people that the member for Whitehorse South Centre represents: the truck drivers, the people out there who are looking for work, the guy who is trying to pay for his truck, the guy who is going to be unemployed within a month over at Whitehorse Rapids. These are the people who are going to be looking for work. They are not looking for welfare that the member for Whitehorse South Centre pretends or hopes they would. They are looking for jobs. They are looking to mind their own business, buy a few beers on Friday night, and go out with their friends; not be dependant on government. So what role does government have to play? The role they have to play is to deal in the public interest and say is that development in the public interest.

But, no, the side opposite gets a long distance phone call probably collect and probably paid for themselves — from CARC, from Mr. Fulton from northern British Columbia saying "no development". I think the side opposite has to take a stand; are they going to be representing CARC, all these splinter interest groups, as a party, or are they going to look at the public interest? Those people who want jobs, those people who would perhaps like to expand their businesses and create more jobs, for more people, for the young people of this territory: that is what you have to look at.

I take a look at that side of the floor and I think, look, you have a responsibility. I am saying that this motion to pass today, if it was unanimous, would carry a lot more weight than if it was split down the middle. I am saying to the member for Faro, who stood up in this House and talked about the recession and the hardships that the people of Faro were undergoing when that mine shut down, and which is still shut down, don't you have a responsibility to perhaps some of those people from Faro who have been forced to move to

Whitehorse or Carmacks to say, look, here is an opportunity that if the socio-economic agreements are such here we can go ahead with the development? Do you not?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I would ask the hon. member to address the Chair once again.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I believe all members in this House have that responsibility. Not the responsibility to one segment of the population but the overall public trust that was put to us a year-and-a-half ago during the election.

Surely, when you talk about native people to get involved in business — and we know them all — the Minister of Renewable Resources, myself, the member for Kluane, the member for Whitehorse South Centre — we have worked with them all, we know them. They are looking for work, too. There is an opportunity here for Yukon, and for Canada, that if it is dealt with right, handled properly, it will be in the interest of Canada and Yukon. The motion there is very clear. We should be supporting in principle the projects that have been put forward, with environmental guidelines and socio-economic agreements to be put into place when the time comes.

I say to the members opposite, you have a responsibility, you have a responsibility to the people of this territory, and if you do not vote for this motion, then I submit that the side opposite cannot stand up and say that they are for development. They are going to have to stand and be counted and say to the general public, we represent two or three interest groups and that is where our interests are, because I think there has been enough evidence given in the general terms that have been brought forward with respect to those projects that it is in the best interests of Canada and Yukon.

In conclusion, all I want to say is that we would appreciate their support on behalf of all Yukoners because we believe the motion could help the cause of making the federal minister make the right and proper decision on behalf of Canada and Yukon.

Mr. Byblow: I had hoped that I would not have to rise because my colleagues for Mayo and Whitehorse South Centre did such a masterful and intelligent and rational job of explaining why this motion was untimely. The member for Porter Creek East, who, I believe, doubles under the pretense of economic development minister, has prompted me to my feet.

I want to take the high road and perhaps add a new dimension to the debate, but I must respond, in some measure, to some of the things that have been said. There seems to be some provocation from the side opposite that we, on this side, should be making clear our development stance. We have made it clear. Yes, we want development on the north coast. Yes, we want development on the north coast. Along with that development, we want to have some real economic developments come to Yukon. At the same time, we want some very real issues of the north coast addressed while those economic benefits are accruing to Yukon. Yes, we want more than ever the public interest to be protected and I wonder if the Minister of Economic Development even knows what that means. We want revenue sharing, even, and we want honest, up-front answers of why this government is running with these two applications at this time.

Seriously, I want some answers. One of the answers has to come in the area of employment opportunities. I submit that the employment opportunities do not exist as claimed by this government. In fact, I would submit that this government has been so inconsistent, so vague, so noncommital about jobs that the average Yukoner does not know what the truth is, what jobs are up there.

I do not think this government knows what jobs will accrue to Yukoners. The facts have not been laid out clearly, as the Minister of Economic Development would have us believe. I heard him on the radio, the other day, talking to a northern affairs critic by the name of Mr. Fulton. It was also the day that Mr. Fulton totally devastated and humiliated the Minister of Economic Development on their ill-researched and contradictory posture on the Beaufort. I remember the minister telling Yukoners over the airwaves about all the wonderful jobs that would come to the truckers of Yukon if the Stokes development went ahead.

Well, Gulf's application does not even call for a haul road and I wonder where these trucking jobs are going to be accruing on the development that he refers to, unless he thinks that the truckers are prepared to drive over the ocean or be airborne.

I want this government to address the economic reality that they have not negotiated adequately on the whole development question of the Beaufort. I submit that they have failed miserably.

⁴¹ My colleague from Mayo made reference to \$1 billion being spent in the Beaufort and that, in fact, is correct. More than that has actually been spent since the early 1960's. Worse than that — or perhaps better than that, it depends which side of the fence your philosophy is coming from — most of that money is our money; Canadian money, taxpayer money. This government accuses us of not doing our homework. Gulf has used \$900 million worth of PIP grants — that is, petroleum incentives grants — close to \$1 billion worth of these incentive grants, and I say that is Canadian money, that is our money. That is a 100 percent right-off on the exploration mechanics of how the money is given out. In fact, I recall a couple of years ago they were collecting 110 percent and they were actually making money on it, but that loophole is plugged.

I want to ask this government where is our piece of the action? I submit that these two applications are literally begging for crumbs of the actual story that is going on in the Beaufort development. We do not have any guarantees for whatever puny returns that the minister may have us believe. Whatever returns that we have in the form of employment or business opportunity completely overlook the whole Beaufort development scenario. What is happening up there is a story of development that is geared with big bucks to big companies for big time production. I submit that what we have before us today is hardly a representation of what we ought to really be involved with. I think we are being blown away with empty assurances and absolutely no guarantees. No commitment. No real economic benefits to Yukon. That makes this government subservient to the big oil interests with no reasonable concern for the average Yukoner, as much as they would have us believe it. They are in here trying to delude us that there is some massive employment scheme for ordinary Yukoners that are going to exist on these two projects.

Today we had some executive summary tabled and I want to call attention to a case that came to our office not very long ago, someone who is employed in the Beaufort. This person, employed by one of the oil rigs, had her 10 days in and 10 days out and was charged a return airfare deducted from her payroll. That is the northern hiring policy of this company. There is no northern hiring policy, I submit. Sure, you may state that in sections 11 or 12 you have a northern hiring policy, but these companies are not observing it. You have to demand these things. You have to have them in place if you are going to talk about jobs for us.

The Minister of Education said yesterday that there were 120 Yukoners employed in the Beaufort and that is nice. Today we had that figure corrected; that in fact it was 90. That is good. We have accepted that figure as now correct. All is well and good. We want to see employment. We want to see development. I want to put this to the government: these 90 jobs represent this government's piece of a \$1 billion exercise in the entire Beaufort development. We are talking Beaufort. We are talking 90 jobs that this government claims to have encouraged to be put into place.

⁴² I think that is pathetic and disappointing. If I want to break that out at all and try to assign the value that this government has accrued from the billon dollar investment over the past 20 years, that is for every \$11 million of development, we have one job today.

The Minister of Economic Development talks about Stokes Point rivaling Cyprus Anvil in its economic impact and the employment opportunity. Only moments ago he talked about these applications, and I want to ask him who is really going to believe this? Government, by its own calculation, claims 90 jobs from a billion dollar investment, a sorry record of participation and negotiation that it has had over the years to encourage the employment. Who can believe, with that track record, that we now are going to have some massive employment as a result of Stokes?

On top of that is the Cyprus Anvil comparison. I know this government's attitude about Cyprus Anvil. When the mine was running full-bore, their attitude to the community of Faro was one that made me stand up in the House repeatedly to remind them of their neglect. The community of Faro, where people live and work at that mine, who were being denied standard government services, got the wonderful gift from this government of its liquor store. When the mine was closed and the community was crumbling, this government's attitude was, well, if the mine cannot run on its own, there is really nothing we can do and no way was this government going to take any participation in the re-opening of the mine; "no way, shape or form".

That tells me where this government's development strategy is. It is, in fact, a series of contradictions and inconsistencies, and really does not tackle the main issues of the situations, and I think this motion is another example. What it amounts to is that what we have here is a situation where this government makes an arbitrary decision to allow two half-interested, multi-nationals to perch on our north coast with no rhyme or reason to total development, no job guarantees, no development plan, even, and this government calls that decision responsible. Then, it has the audacity to suggest that there is some sort of balance development going on. Balance development seems to mean a one-way street for this government.

The Minister of Renewable Resources made reference to southern interest groups. Who does he think is up there now? It is not Yukoners, it is not this government and there is hardly anything there for Yukoners under what this government has put in place under its ability to negotiate for terms and references of employment and economic opportunities and business opportunities along with it.

I brought to attention the other day the Senate committee recommendations which stated that we do not have the training going on to really get in on the Beaufort action. I submit that this is still the case. I think if this government was really serious about getting into the real action in the Beaufort, then it would be having in place an inventory of requirements in employment, it would be signing agreements with the industrial interests about hiring requirements, about hiring needs and it would be getting on with the job of preparing Yukoners for the real jobs that are there.

Again, I think there is some whistling in the wind going on if we are trying to lead Yukoners to believe that there is some kind of Cyprus Anvil opportunity for Yukoners out of these applications, in a guaranteed way. It is not so.

43 This brings to mind something that the member for Mayo made reference to, and that was specifically the Kiewit application. If we are to believe that this government's piece of the action is going to be a five percent ratio of employment out of those 300 jobs then we are talking about 15 jobs for Yukoners. And the hon, member for Mayo already made the point that, in their submission to the review panel, they have made it clear that they are going to be going to the nearby communities, the local communities, for whatever hiring needs they may choose to put in place. That does not mean Whitehorse, that does not mean Faro, that does not mean Dawson. I think that has to be made clear. Already, we have had mentioned that the Kiewit application is using \$100 million-plus of Canadian taxpayer dollars to even get off the ground. Then why are we not doing it, I would ask the government leader, who seems to raise the question? And the member for Porter Creek East talks about caissons; that we must be supporting caissons being constructed in Japan. I say 'hogwash' to the minister, because we are the ones who should be manufacturing the caissons. When I say 'we', I am talking about Canada. If we are talking about public interest, the national interest, then we should be developing the manufacturing sector, the manufacturing sector that will compete for that kind of material.

The question has been raised about why Kiewit is where they are in an effort, Johnny-come-lately, to do a quarrying operation. I would suggest that they are there because they could not get a land use permit on the American side of the north coast because their regulations are in place and their attitude is simply "let us go to Canada, they have not got their act together yet". The results of the test holes are not proven and, on the Kiewit operation, we do not have a viable market in place. I am talking about the general economic viability of the operation. It is still on a shoestring.

Certainly, with respect to the environmental concerns, the job

guarantees, the land claims, the caribou herd: all of these questions have not been adequately addressed. In fact, in their submission to the review panel, Kiewit said quite clearly that they would be making 20 one-way trips, 40 two-way trips, through the middle of the Porcupine caribou calving herd, and the Minister of Economic Development talks about, "Oh, the caribou love the Alaskan pipeline". You find me a picture where there is anything but a bull at those pipelines. You have not seen a cow or a calf at them. I leave it there.

If it is only for the ridiculous application we have from Kiewit, we could not support this motion. We want development — and I repeat it — we want development. We want responsible development. We want it in the public interest, and we want it with some socio-economic guarantees. We want some ironclad assurances that we will not be left with a decimated environment, a bankrupt enterprise, no jobs and all the money that has been invested being in Calgary, Toronto or somewhere else. That is what we are talking about. This government has not given any assurance that this cannot happen or will not happen or is not taking place.

We seem to be talking, making reference to the member for Old Crow and the people of Old Crow. I would be really curious about what this government is telling the people of Old Crow, who are, like their member in the legislature, clearly undecided. The member's position is clearly different from the economic development minister's position just stated, who is saying, "let's build, let's go, let's give it to the southerners, let's side with big business, let's go, go, go''. And that is not the position we are hearing from the people who inhabit the area.

44 We are not against development. We are for it, responsibly, timely and balanced. This government is clearly not putting this position forward. I think we talked about the Kiewit application. Perhaps I could talk a bit about the Gulf application, having already alluded to it.

There is some concern there. In light of Hybernia and the tar sands, it is clearly recognized that the Beaufort oil may very well not be competitive for another twenty years. Certainly we recognize the need to establish known reserves in the Beaufort. Certainly we favour the development necessary to produce those required statistics. We have to recognize that the whole effort in the Beaufort may never come on stream and it may go the way of the Alaska pipeline. That is an observation, it is a possibility. But the real point is that the Stokes and the Kiewit applications have nothing to do with the entire conceptual approach to the Beaufort. In fact, one of the reasons that Gulf is after Stokes, and this was stated to the review panel, is because they made a mistake calculating the ability of their CDU, their conical drilling unit, in its ability to moor at McKinley Bay. So they needed another place to park it. Somewhere here we have part of the ill-prepared effort that this government seems to be supporting.

The marketable quantities of oil in the Beaufort are not yet known and certainly we must continue in our efforts to determine the extent of those reserves. We do raise the question of what it will cost to produce a barrel of oil, and certainly the estimates range in the proximity of \$40 to \$50 per barrel. Of course, as I said earlier, that puts Beaufort into the market in about 20 years. That is not the point. The question is what is in it for us? That is the question. Ninety jobs out of a \$1 billion investment to date and no trading going on to even increase that figure? No package in place to assure that it takes place? No signed agreements?

Come on, what are we talking about? This government has said it is happy with five percent. In other words, out of every 100 people, we put five to work. Out of every 100 people, that is, that go to work in the Beaufort. I submit that this is unacceptable to properly represent what our interests are and what we should be asking for in the entire development question.

This government talks about supporting enterprise and business. I would ask this question: is it the position of this government that the taxpayer subsidize multi-nationals to the tune of 100 percent — because that is certainly what we are talking about — in oil exploration under the PIP grants, to bring oil, as my colleague from Mayo has already said, to an already dwindling and flooded market place with nothing in it for us? Where is our piece of the action or

the bigger action? That is the question I am asking. What has Kiewit and Gulf at Stokes Point got to do with it? Are they advocating that we subsidize the export of our non-renewable energy resource to foreign countries with no return to Yukoners, no resource revenue sharing agreement, no guarantees of jobs, no training programs to put some people into place? We know it; if the big oil companies did not get the PIP grants, the handouts, there probably would be no development on that north coast.

My question, again, is what has been our piece of that action? Ninety jobs? Come now. I think that is why this government is grasping at the Stokes and the Kiewit straws.

45 They have been poor negotiators in the total development of the Beaufort question. Their confrontational style and their obstructionist attitude have really shaken Yukon's credibility and the total Yukon development scenario in terms of getting a piece of that action. I know what the negotiation abilities of this government are. I was with the Cyprus Anvil story and I know what took place. And we know how this government can negotiate, as in land claims. I think that this government has failed Yukon in the Beaufort and that is what this motion is all about. That is what this motion is all about. It is a last-ditch initiative, unsound, unplanned, uneconomic, and of no benefit to Yukon. We on this side had the decency to listen to the arguments that they presented for over half an hour in the past; I would respect the reciprocal courtesy. I think it is unfair of this government to be telling the people of the Yukon that there are genuine guaranteed opportunities out of these applications and in the Beaufort. I think the job availability is not clear. I do not think it is telling us what really is going to be the economic opportunity to Yukon because it is not there. I think it is abrogating its responsibility to balanced development.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I find it very difficult to rise today because I would be very, very upset if I thought it would add in any way any credence to the irresponsible dribble I have heard today from members of the opposite side. You should be commended. If I did not know better, I would think that these members were a lobby group from the Northwest Territories, and if I were the members from the opposite side of the House I would be searching out all issues of *Hansard* and burning them, because you are going to be held, Mr. Speaker, responsible for some of the things you have said here today when it comes to development.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I am wondering if the hon. minister would address the Chair, as it would appear in the record that I am doing some very terrible things up here.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Anybody who can stand up and make such an irresponsible statement as to the employment record of this territory and this government in Beaufort and stand there and say he is not for development of the north coast, knowing full well that the people employed on the north coast are being hired from the place that they are working in - which is the Northwest Territories these people are unable to see that COPE is against this proposal because they wish that development in the Northwest Territories, and if the members opposite are so short-sighted that they cannot see that their not supporting this motion and having unanimous consent from this legislature to give absolute support to the federal minister for development of the Yukon north coast for Yukon people. The members on the other side have decided that they are for development but not this development and not the next development. I find it incredible that I have had to sit and listen to the members opposite today. And I want to go on record right now that if they stand up now and say they are for development after what I have heard, they are all hypocrites.

I will now sit down.

⁴⁶ Mr. Falle: I, too, was not planning on saying anything today but, I am sorry, I have to.

I was trying to make some real sense out of exactly what they were saying. The hon. member for Faro sounds like "if I cannot have all of the candy, I don't want none, so don't bug me". That is what it sounds like. I really do not know where you are coming from.

Every time I hear the NDP stand up they say "social, economic and environmental". That seems to be the problem. It has not been studied enough. Well, you heard our minister say it has been studied for two years. Social problems; that is the Old Crow problem. We are trying to face it, we are trying to get some work for the people there, we are trying to get work for the people of Yukon. But it does not make any difference. If that is not social, I do not know what it is.

Environmental, well, I think that the hon. Minister of Economic Development took the people up to Old Crow — I think it was 11 people he took up — that was the first time any of them had been there. The member for Old Crow has been to Stokes Point three times in her life and it was this year when she went up there with them. I mean, the environmental damage up there may stay for a long time, but it is not going to hurt a lot of people. What my point is, is you cannot build a road without moving a tree, so, if the tree has to be moved, at least clean up the edge of the road. It may not make a lot of sense to you but I would like to see some development going on.

The next thing I hear is "job guarantees". The only people who I know who have job guarantees are the civil servants.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Even in British Columbia?

Mr. Falle: Even in British Columbia. There is not one private company that I know anywhere that has job guarantees. If you do not pull the weight, get out. I mean, that is the way it is and that is the way it should be. Who is asking for a job guarantee? If the oil runs out, what is the sense of being there? Move, go someplace else, do not sit there!

I mean, I do not know where you are coming from. I really do not, it is beyond me. I have to agree with my colleagues that I am for development, but. Well, the "but" is too big for me to swallow and I am not going to get into any more. I think I have heard my colleagues say what I want to, but this job guarantee, socioeconomic thing, as far as I am concerned, is a bunch of drivel.

Mr. Brewster: I also was not going to get up and speak on this, but I am completely amazed. I think, in the year-and-a-half that I have been here, this is the worst hogwash I have heard yet.

Number one, we have the member for Faro over there, who screams and hollers that we are going to use some government money. I wonder what has been put into Faro for the last year to keep Faro going? The member from Elsa, there, talks about non-development things, and he has been brought in by a place that developed a mine. It really amazes me that the two people who are more concerned about development in Yukon than anyone are turning around and voting against development.

I have been here for quite a while and I am really, really thankful, when I think back, that when Elsa tried to start and when Faro tried to start and Whitehorse tried to start that you people were not in charge, because I just want...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member kindly address the Chair?

Mr. Brewster: I think it is a colossal farce.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have to have my final say here.

The members across the floor say, "Come on, let us get the vote over with". We called for question after their first speaker spoke and there were two of them standing up who wanted to speak and now they are saying, "Let's get the vote over with".

Well, we will get the vote over with and we will have recorded just how much the members across the floor are anti-development. They call themselves pro-development. I suggest that the NDP stands for "no development party". That is exactly what it stands for; no development. That is what they want; no development. They talk about all the weird and wonderful jobs that we should develop in this territory, and we hear it constantly from members across the floor. When two multi-national companies stand up and apply to this government and to the federal government for projects that will produce 350 jobs on the North Slope of the Yukon Territory — the majority of those jobs to Yukoners — and, for every job that is created, there is at least one-and-a-half to two spin-off jobs that go to Yukoners.

v For example, just take Finning Tractor alone. Kewit's proposal, in just Finning Tractor alone, would produce 15 jobs in Whitehorse because of Kiewit's proposal on the North Slope. Fifteen jobs in Whitehorse from one company. These members say no, do not do that, there is no benefit to the Yukon Territory. I find it absolutely

incredible that those members across the floor can stand up and speak like this. It is absolutely incredible. Premature support for what? There has been development going on in the Beaufort Sea for the last 20 years. It has been studied for 20 years. There have been environmental studies done. We have studies 10 feet high in our records for the Beaufort Sea and for the North Slope. He is suggesting that the development should stay where it is. There has been \$1 billion spent already and what have we got out of it. We have not gotten very much out of it. That is exactly why we have this motion on the floor today. We want something from the Beaufort development. We want development on the North Slope of the Yukon Territory so that we can get Yukoners working. We want the money in our coffers, not in the NWT's coffers. We want some benefit from the resources that we feel that we own, regardless of whether the members across the floor feel we own it or not. We feel that we own it.

The members across the floor, their party, supported Bill C-48 in the federal parliament. They supported it. That bill that took 25 percent of our oil and gas resources away from us, right off the top. It took 25 percent of our ownership of resources even if we obtained ownership tomorrow. If we obtained ownership tomorrow we would only get 75 percent because 25 percent was voted away by members like those across the floor. That is the type of people who we have in opposition to this; people who do not want to see jobs. They would like to put a fence around the territory along with the rest of the welfare people of the territory and along with the conservation society and Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, and a few others of those who want to turn this whole territory into a vast national park, but not let anybody in to see it, either. That is the type of people who we have. They stand up every day and question the Minister of Health and Human Resources about why we do not have welfare for this and why we do not have welfare for that. Where is the money going to come from? It is going to come from some money tree out there somewhere, I guess. It is not going to come from anything else. It is unbelievable. I find it absolutely incredible that that kind of people live and work in this territory and actually claim to represent the people of this territory.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed? Division has been called. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly poll the House. Hon. Mr. Pearson: Agreed. Hon. Mr. Lang: Agreed. Hon. Mr. Firth: Agreed. Hon. Mr. Ashley: Agreed. Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Agreed. Hon. Mr. Tracey: Agreed. Mr. Falle: Agreed.

Mrs. Nukon: Agreed.

Mr. Brewster: Agreed.

Mr. Byblow: Disagree.

Mr. Kimmerly: Disagree.

Mrs. Joe: Disagree.

Mr. McDonald: Disagreed.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are nine yea, four nay. Mr. Speaker: It would appear as the yeas have it, and I will declare that the motion has carried.

Motion No. 35 agreed to

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to government bills.

Bill No. 14: Third reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill 14, entitled Financial Administration Act, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 14 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 14 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 14 be now passed and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I will declare the motion as carried and that Bill No. 14 has passed this House.

Bill No. 22: Third reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that Bill No. 22, The Business Corporation Act, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 22 be now read a third time. *Motion agreed to*

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that Bill No. 22 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 22 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I will declare that the motion has carried and that bill no. 22 has passed this House.

May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that the House do now adjourn. Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

The following Sessional paper was tabled October 26, 1983:

83-3-22

Executive Summary of Yukon Government's position respecting development on the North Coast (Tracey)

For the second secon