



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 33

3rd Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, November 2, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

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 Phillipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources; and, Government Services

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

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

(Independent)

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

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

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

⁰¹ Whitehorse, Yukon

Wednesday, November 2, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lang: I have a response for question number 14.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have two reports for tabling: The Transport Public Utilities Board and the Electrical Public Utilities Board.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any reports of committees?
Petitions?

Introduction of bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 32: First reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 32, entitled *An Act to Amend the Elections Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that a bill, entitled *An Act to Amend the Elections Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers?

Notices of motion?

Are there any statements by ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Accommodation at Moose Creek

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. As the minister is aware, five people working for the government at Moose Creek campground are worried that three of their number will be unable to find accommodation now that the Moose Creek Lodge is closing down. Can the minister say what action the government is taking to alleviate the problem?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Of the people who the member is talking about, two of them live in the Stewart Crossing area; it is their residence. We hire local people to work on that project and they walked off of the job yesterday. In the opinion of the people of the department, they walked off without cause. I believe that my department has some people up there now looking at the situation and possibly getting a new crew.

⁰² **Mr. McDonald:** Back to the issue for the moment: can the minister say why the persons hired to perform the work by the government, and who were provided room and board by this government at Moose Creek, could not be provided room and board at Stewart Crossing which is, incidentally, not their home community, but is within driving distance of the job site?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is like any other government project — in fact, we do not provide room and board on most projects. We did in this instance because it was in a remoter area, but the people who were hired on the job put their address down as Stewart Crossing in order to get the job and we do not provide room and board when we supply transportation. We supply transportation from Stewart Crossing and they are within the area of Stewart Crossing and they should make their way to Stewart Crossing. It is not up to this government to supply transportation to pick everyone up at their door and deliver them to the job site.

Mr. McDonald: The minister told me this morning that the people in question are to be fired today for expressing worry over

their situation. My question is: can the Minister of Renewable Resources, who doubles for the Minister of Labour, say whether it is this government's policy to fire employees rather than to discuss and reasonably work out their mutual problems? Is it this government's policy to ignore discussion and fire employees when they have missed only one day's work out of their own frustration?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member across the floor is not aware, I believe, of the facts of the situation, and he should not be making those kinds of accusations until he does know the facts of the situation.

There was discussion with these people and the position that the government was put in when the lodge closed down and what we were prepared to do was made well known to them. They refused to go to work yesterday and it is not this government's responsibility for what they have done. They, in fact, walked off the job and quit, as far as the department is concerned.

⁰³ Question re: Business of the House

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the minister who never quits.

Could I ask the majority House leader what the business of the House will be for the remainder of this week and next week and, specifically, is it his intention to ram Bill 30 *Amendments to the Municipal Act*, through second reading tomorrow before opposition MLA's have had a chance to study the bill, much less consult with their constituents and other other interested groups?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The business that I speak to the member on a basis of him being the House leader for his side of the House, as well as the position that I have and responsibility that I have on this side of the House, was that I indicated to him, when we tabled the *Municipal Act*, that I would like to have proceeded today. He indicated to me that they wanted more time. I am very concerned about the amount of work that is on the Order Paper, and I indicated to him that we are prepared to go with second reading tomorrow and that is our intention. Further to that, it is not our intention to ram the bill through the House. We intend to go through it clause-by-clause, if the opposite side wishes to go clause-by-clause through the legislation, and it is our intention to give it due deliberation with respect to the various sections, even to the extent that if the member opposite cannot understand a section, at times, as we have in the past, we are prepared to set it aside for a period of time for deliberation.

Along with that, the *Elections Act* has been tabled. It would be our contention that we will be dealing with that in all probability next week, as well, depending on the order of business and how fast we go through the budget, which is the main priority at the present time. As he knows, we are in the capital budget. We intend to go to supplementaries, then to the *Motor Vehicles Ordinance*, then to the *Municipal Act*, the *Elections Act*, and during that convening period of time, I would suspect that we could also deal with the *Economic Development Regional Agreement*, which is strictly enabling legislation.

Mr. Penikett: Could I ask the Conservative House leader if it is, in fact, a stated tactic of the majority, to push complicated bills through second reading before the opposition has had a reasonable opportunity to study them, and is it their intention to do that in order to limit the possibility of free and open debate on major issues, like the *Municipal Act*?

⁰⁴ Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: I would consider that question to be highly argumentative and will not permit an answer.

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a point of order. I believe very strongly that I have the right to respond to that accusation because he was making some statements with respect to the processing of bills, which I have responsibility for. I believe I do have the right to respond.

Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the hon. member. In the first instance, it is a great abuse of the Question Period to ask

questions which are "argumentative". It is for that reason that I raise this point. If members could keep their questions to specifics, it would be much easier on the Chair in making such rulings. However, I will accept the point of order raised by the hon. member in this case and allow a reply by the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to point out to the member opposite that the idea of second reading is to speak to the principle of the bill. The principle of the bill is very clear and, as far as I am concerned, the member opposite can do his homework. As he knows, there has been a great deal of publicity. He was here for the initial stages of the unproclaimed act and, as far as I am concerned, we are giving him adequate time to respond to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will just caution the hon. members that I will accept no more questions that are argumentative.

Mr. Penikett: Since the government House leader clearly intends to dictate House business, rather than proceed by consultation and agreement with both parties in the Assembly, may I ask the government House leader what possible purpose there is in future meetings between House leaders?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think that the member opposite has been quite successful. I had indicated to him yesterday that I was prepared to go today. We had a meeting and he indicated to me that he was not prepared. I said, fine, we are prepared to wait another day.

Question re: Resource revenue sharing

Mr. Byblow: I have a question of an uncontroversial sort for the government leader dealing with the economy. In the government leader's address to the Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada, he spoke of Yukon's right to resource revenue sharing and, in particular, with respect to the Beaufort Sea.

Could I ask the government leader: what discussions have taken place with the federal government on this subject recently?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Recently, there have not been any discussions that have taken place that have been very specific. Resource revenue sharing has always been a rather nebulous term that has been used both by the federal government and by this government and by the Government of the Northwest Territories, in respect of a method whereby those people who are directly affected by resource development should be compensated for the environment, for any factors that affect them with respect to that development. The Cabinet of the Government of Canada, some time ago, approved and instructed the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to continue discussions with both territorial governments with respect to what a resource revenue sharing policy might be and what it might mean some time in the future.

We have been discussing resource revenue sharing; it has been an issue. Once again, I must caution the member from Faro. It has been an issue but not very specific with respect to the ongoing discussions we have had with the Government of Canada on formula financing. It is a recognized and an accepted fact of formula financing that, should resource revenue sharing become a fact of life at some time in the future, it would of course have a direct bearing on whatever formula might be finally agreed to.

Mr. Byblow: I thank the government leader for the detail of his answer.

¹⁰⁶ In trying to pin down the nebulous nature of resource revenue sharing, could I ask the government leader if it is a position of this government that in any North Slope development Yukon shares directly in resource revenue, such as in oil and gas royalties or some other compensatory revenue sharing regime?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That has not been a condition of development. However, I would anticipate that if we are able to enter into an agreement with Canada with respect to resource revenue sharing, certainly, oil and gas would be included. It would be a very significant number when that time comes, providing that we can resolve the problem of who should be the manager of the resources

and whose jurisdiction those resources might be in. I am referring, of course, directly, now to the *Northwest Territories Act* and the discrepancy in it that makes it clear that the Beaufort Sea, north of Yukon, belongs to the Northwest Territories. The Government of Canada has, in the past, recognized that as an anomaly and has undertaken to amend both acts at some future date. We still do not know what that date might be.

Mr. Byblow: Further to the general subject, when the government leader spoke to the Royal Commission, he made reference to Yukon's right to share, among other things, the risks of resource development. What, exactly, did the government leader mean?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I was talking in the context of responsible government. What I was suggesting to the Royal Commission is my opinion that responsible government means that not only do you benefit from the development in the territory, but you also are responsible for the risks that are attached to that development. There are risks attached to any development. There are risks attached to virtually everything that we do.

¹⁰⁷ What I was suggesting was that it should be this government's responsibility to be accountable for the environment, to be accountable for the habitat, and to be accountable to the people of this territory for all of those risks that might come about as a result of development. Not only to be accountable, but to be the people who take the actions to mitigate those risks to the benefit of the people who live in the territory.

Question re: Orders of the House

Mr. Kimmerly: A question for the government leader. Yesterday, he said, "because a motion happens to say that it is by order of this House, it does not mean that this House is ordering the government to do something". Would the government leader now care to correct the record on that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think I was absolutely correct. Mr. Speaker might wish to correct me on it. He is much more cognizant of the rules of this House than I am. I am confident that there is, in fact, a rule with respect to this very question. It is clear what is an order and who that order can go to, and what is not an order but is only an opinion of this House.

Mr. Kimmerly: It is Standing Order 29(2). In view of the incredible statements made, will the government leader clarify if it is the policy of this government that the executive is responsible to this House, or not?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Each of us are members of this House and are responsible to this House as members.

Mr. Kimmerly: What is this government's policy concerning the executive of the government refusing or failing to obey an order of this House under 29(2)?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would be prejudging what, in fact, would be a ruling that you, as the Speaker, would have to make. Surely, the member for Whitehorse South Centre understands the rules of the legislature enough to know that.

Question re: Job offers

Mr. Porter: I have a question for the minister responsible for renewable resources. On October 27, 1983, on page 506 of *Hansard*, the minister erroneously reported to the legislature that Peter Kiewit and Sons "offered and offered to give to the CYI and a Yukon Indian businessman, business contracts". What evidence does the minister have to support his statement and would he table the evidence before the House?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I stated, on page 507 of *Hansard*, that "they proposed to offer to an Indian businessman in the territory, represented by CYI, to give him a contract for the haul road maintenance". That was an offer. I further went on, further down the page, talking about the proposal for catering, "there was also a proposal to put the camp catering out and they also offered this to CYI. They offered to make a proposal to the 12 Indian bands in the territory." I said, "offered a proposal".

The member across the floor is trying to put words in my mouth that I did not say.

¹⁰⁸ **Mr. Porter:** Since the minister unwittingly uttered his erroneous statement, both Mr. John Lowen, vice-president for Peter

Kiewit and Mr. Willy Joe, vice-chairman for the Council for Yukon Indians, stated there were no offers made and that there was simply the discussion for..

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member is now entering into debate.

Mr. Porter: ... bids in the future. In view of this contradictory evidence, is the minister now prepared to admit to the House that he has misinformed this legislature for the third consecutive time?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I did not misinform this legislature and I did not make an error in what Mr. Lowen has said. I said exactly what Mr. Lowen has said. He made an offer to the CYI, one of the representatives of whom was the member across the floor; he was there. He knows exactly what the proposal was and I said exactly what Mr. Lowen had proposed to the CYI through their representatives to the Indian Development Corporation.

Mr. Porter: In reply to questions raised by myself yesterday, and again in the House today, the minister has made an allegation that I represent the CYI. Is the minister alleging, in clear violation of my privileges as a sitting member of this legislative body, that I am here representing the CYI rather than my constituents?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That is not what I said. I said that when he was talking with Mr. Lowen he was a representative of the CYI. The Indian Development Corporation is a subsidiary of the CYI. It is a corporation responsible to the CYI and, as that, he is a representative of the CYI.

Question re: Yukon Recreational Advisory Committee

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Recreation. The minister has recently refused to formalize MLA appointments to the Yukon Recreational Advisory Committee on the grounds that the recreation act is being tabled this fall. Could the minister tell us how she is currently being advised on recreational issues, given the current lack of representation from some Yukon ridings?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We have a Yukon Recreational Advisory Committee that is presently active. They have just met this weekend to distribute funds and, to reassure the member, I am getting adequate advice and representation. I have not allowed any new representatives to be put on the board in view of the fact that we are tabling legislation and perhaps looking at the makeup of the recreation committee. That applies to this side of the House, as well as to the opposition side of the House.

Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell this House if her refusal to formalize appointments means that the new act will not allow for MLA-appointed YRAC representatives?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I believe it is premature to discuss something like that when a bill is about to be tabled and discussed in the legislature.

Mrs. Joe: Could the minister tell us if the Yukon Recreational Advisory Committee will continue to exist under the new act?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, there will be a recreation advisory committee.

Question re: Agricultural experimental farm

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

Many people have suggested to me that the federal experimental farm, once in the Yukon and now defunct, provided viable information to Yukon's agricultural community. Can we say whether this government has been in contact with Agriculture Canada in order to, again, establish such a farm?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, my understanding is that the ownership of the farm has been transferred to the native band, I believe, in Haines Junction.

Mr. McDonald: I was asking about the generic farm, not this particular farm.

Has the Agriculture Development Council suggested that Yukon itself establish such a farm, or does the council prefer supporting some other method of experimentation to assist farmers and market gardeners?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think I made it very clear with respect to the discussion on the capital budget. We are going to put some dollars aside for the purpose of working with people presently farming to

experiment on various crop rotations. I think that will meet the objective the member has, as opposed to going to a great deal of financial commitment by this government or the Government of Canada.

Mr. McDonald: One very short question. What crops is this government prepared to promote as worthy subjects for study?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would have to take notice on that question.

Question re: Animal Protection Act

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the minister responsible for enforcement of the *Animal Protection Act*, a question of which I have given notice to the Cabinet office. Given the recent experience of a constituent of mine who had some difficulty getting action from various authorities when a neighbourhood dog died on its chain, I would like to ask the minister what government agencies have responsibility for enforcing the provisions of the *Animal Protection Act*.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I should point out that the responsibility for administration of the act is that of the Department of Municipal Affairs. As far as the enforcement is concerned, there are a number of categories which are utilized for the purposes of appointment to enforce that particular act. One is the RCMP, the other is the appointment of a municipal officer or the appointment of a special constable appointed by Cabinet. In the case of the government, at times we have appointed conservation officers and also, I should point out for an example, in one community there is an Order-in-Council going to be processed for the purpose of appointment under that particular act — I believe for the community of Faro — by Cabinet order.

Mr. Penikett: Has the minister obtained an opinion from his staff as to whether or not City of Whitehorse bylaw enforcement officers as well as the RCMP — or in addition to the RCMP — are considered peace officers for the purpose of this act, because, in the case I am talking about, there was difficulty in getting either to respond to the situation.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is my understanding, and I will double-check this, but I believe the municipal officers would come under the category of peace officers for the purpose of this act.

Mr. Penikett: Can the minister indicate for the record if any organizations presently in Yukon have been designated as "Humane Societies" under Section 9 of the act?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Maybe the member should give me notice on that particular question. I will have to take notice on that.

Question re: Student Financial Assistance Act

Mr. Byblow: My question is for the Minister of Education. One of the consequences in education of the current recession, as the minister I am sure is aware, is an increase in adult education activity. Under the current *Student Financial Assistance Act* independent resident Yukoners are disentitled from receiving any form of assistance unless they meet the criteria of school attendance, parental residency or dependants. Can I ask the minister if she can confirm whether there have been increasing enquiries and applications from ineligible Yukoners for full secondary grants?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The increase of incidents in applications of adults applying has not been brought to my attention. I have had one adult applying for assistance come to my office in the past year-and-a-half. The principle of the *Student Financial Assistance Act* was so that we could assist young adults going right from high school to university. As to whether this government will further expand that and fund adults for their education as well will have to be a decision that this government has to make and we will be looking forward to some input now that we have a post-secondary education advisory council. We will be looking forward to some input from that council as to whether we should extend the financing to the adult student.

Mr. Byblow: Can I interpret what the minister is saying as, in light of the current economic recession, the lack of available jobs and with many people having time on their hands, this government is going to be giving consideration to broadening the guidelines for post-secondary grants?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: If that is the way the member for Faro wants

to interpret it, that is his privilege. I believe what I said was that we would be looking forward to some input. We have not had a lot of demand, we have not had a big decrease in demand, nor has there been a lot of demand previously, for us to subsidize adults in their education or their pursuits of education. However, if we find that this is a strong recommendation from the Post-secondary Advisory Council, the the government may be in a position to consider it.

Mr. Byblow: As a matter of policy, could I ask the minister whether this government, that is, the Department of Education, implicitly follows the recommendations of the Student Financial Assistance Committee in monetary awards under the post-secondary grant program?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, we certainly do and it would never, never occur to the minister to interfere with those decisions. The decision of the Student Financial Assistance Committee is the final decision.

Question re: Alcohol abuse programs

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question for the minister responsible for alcohol abuse programs.

In view of the recent statistical arguments, is the minister considering research to establish the cost to the child welfare system of the alcoholism problem?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: I believe there have been some studies done to that end.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask if the minister responsible for labour and labour standards the same question: is there any consideration for research to establish the cost to the labour force in Yukon of absenteeism caused by alcoholism?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No. There may be some statistics kept within the Public Service of the Yukon Territory and there may be other statistics that are available but, no, it is not our intention to have a study done.

Mr. Kimmerly: To the government leader: in years past, the Brass Report spoke about a coordination of alcohol abuse programs. Is there any consideration to a renewed effort in this area?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We are always trying to put forward new initiatives in this area. I want to assure the hon. member, in view of his line of questioning, that I appreciate the opportunity he has given me to reply, in part, to his previous two questions.

We do have programs in place for people who are suffering from the affliction of alcoholism and who are missing work. This government avails itself of that program, as do other employers in the territory.

Question re: Yukon Wildlife Advisory Committee meeting

Mr. Porter: My question is directed to the minister responsible for renewable resources.

I would like to ask the minister if he was present at a meeting of the Yukon Wildlife Advisory Committee on September 8th, 1983?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, part of the time.

Mr. Porter: During the meeting on September 8, with the minister present, the Yukon Wildlife Advisory Committee introduced, and discussed, a lottery system for harvesting grizzlies. Would the minister now admit to the House that he was totally in error by stating to this legislature that he was not aware of the discussions regarding the use of the lottery system to harvest grizzlies in Game Zone Nine?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No. I am not aware and I was not there when it was discussed, if it was discussed. I would also like to raise the fact that the member across the floor is consistently making accusations that on this side of the floor I am lying to the House. I resent that very much.

Mr. Porter: I take it that the minister does not even read the minutes of meetings that he attends.

In the minutes of the Yukon Wildlife Advisory Committee, dated September 8, 1983, there was an inference made that the native people of the Yukon were responsible for the over-harvesting of cow moose in the Kusuwa West area. Is it the position of the minister that native people are, indeed, responsible for the over-harvesting of cow moose in the Kusuwa west area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I will deal with the first part of his question

first. I read the minutes. That does not necessarily mean that I was at a meeting. I was not there when it was dealt with, if it was dealt with. And, I am not aware of even reading about it in the minutes:

Secondly, there was no inference made that the Indian people were killing off all the cow moose. What was asked of the Indian people was: because we were closing the cow moose season, we would hope that the Indian people would obey the general laws of application and they would not shoot the cow moose. There was no inference anywhere that the Indian people were abusing the hunting privileges that they have.

I should also state, that it is quite often mentioned in this House that we should live up to our side of the agreement-in-principle with the native people. I would also suggest that, perhaps, they should do the same.

Question re: Recreation act

Mrs. Joe: I have another question for the minister responsible for recreation. The minister has stated in writing that a recreation act will be tabled this fall. In answer to my question on October 24, on the same subject, she said "there was a strong possibility, yes." Could the minister now tell us if, in fact, a recreation act will be tabled during this session?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not know where the opposition has been for the last couple of months, because I have been announcing to various recreational groups — the arts group, the sports group, the community groups — that the recreation legislation is going to be tabled. I believe the opposition has already been informed that is going to be tabled. Really, I do not have to send you a note. You are all grown adults; you are big boys and girls, and you have a responsibility to keep in touch with what is going on.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the minister kindly address the Chair.

Mrs. Joe: I have another for the Minister of Recreation. Could the minister tell us if it is the intention of this government to allow Yukon recreation groups time to study the bill before it is debated in this Assembly?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: There has been a public Green Paper on policy of this government regarding recreation, which has been publicly discussed, I believe, for three years. The arts groups and the sports groups and the community groups have had extensive input into that Green Paper. I have attended a few meetings, as Minister of Recreation, gatherings of a combination of all those three groups, at which time we discussed the Green Paper.

The Green Paper Committee came to me with some final recommendations and we have discussed, with that committee and with the Yukon Recreational Advisory Committee who advises the minister in recreational matters — incidentally, there has always been a quorum on that committee when we have met — what we were proposing in the legislation and they found that satisfactory. We are anticipating that we have responded to the wishes of those groups of people with our legislation.

Mrs. Joe: Since some of the recommendations by the Green Paper Committee may not appear in the new act, is it the intention of this government to allow time for those recreation groups to study it?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not understand what the member is talking about. This has been studied, and studied, and studied. The recommendations that were given to us by the Green Paper Committee — which was not appointed by me, it was appointed by a previous minister — who took into account considerations of people recommending names for the Green Paper Committee. I believe the arts person was chosen by the arts group, and the sports person was chosen by the sports groups, and the community representative was chosen by the communities; that comprised the Green Paper Committee. We have implemented their recommendations in our legislation and they seem satisfied with that.

Question re: Native game management training

Mr. Porter: I would like a question to the Minister of Renewable Resources.

In view of the minister's previous answer to the questions I raised, I would like to ask the minister: when will his department

begin to train native people in game management as called for in the agreement-in-principal respecting the hunting agreement reached at the negotiating table? When will that training program start?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: My department has been working with the Department of Education to put together a training program, but I would also like to comment that I have heard quite a bit about us not training native people in this territory. I would suggest to the native people that the first place to start the training would be to become involved in the auxiliary conservation officer force, so that they do get a preliminary feel for the area of game management, and so that we can assess what type of a program that we should really put on for these kind of people. It is our intention to train native people, as is it our intention to train any other Yukoner, to be a wildlife manager or a conservation officer.

Mr. Porter: The minutes of the Wildlife Advisory Committee show that the minister was present at that meeting on September 8, 1983, at 9:20 a.m. and one of the first items discussed was the question of grizzly bears. The minister informs us he was conveniently there for the discussion of moose, but not grizzlies, and the discussions regarding the moose populations did not come until after the grizzlies. Can he clarify the situation?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. minister to be very brief, as the question would appear to be rather broad.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I have stated earlier, I resent very much the implications made by the members across the floor that I would lie to this House. I said that I was at the Wildlife Advisory Committee meeting. I was there for a short period of time. They had already discussed grizzly bears, before I was there. I went there to discuss a specific issue about grizzly bears, which I did, and I then left.

Mr. Porter: I would like to ask the minister if it is normal practice that the minutes of the Wildlife Advisory Committee be given to him so that he can read and understand what the Wildlife Advisory Committee is recommending to his department? Does he usually read those minutes?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I read a great number of papers that are put to me and if I read everything that was available to me, I would never have time for this House, or to do anything else except read.

Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with orders of the day, I would like to point out to all hon. members that the Chair has reviewed Bill Number 102, *An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicle Act*, and Bill 31 of the same title, and has found them to deal with substantially the same subject matter. As Bill 31 has now received second reading, the Chair will not be calling Bill 102 today under bills other than government bills.

We will now proceed to orders of the day, motions for the production of papers.

MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 3

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

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

Mr. Byblow: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Faro that an order of this Assembly do issue for any letters or signed agreements regarding North Slope development jobs, as referred to by the Minister of Renewable Resources on page 506 of the October 27, 1983 edition of *Yukon Hansard*.

Mr. Byblow: I intend to be brief. The motion is quite self-explanatory, it makes a simple request that this government, I am sure, would be quite pleased to honour.

From this side of the House, we have called for job guarantees, among other things, from the North Slope entrepreneurs as a condition for any north coast development. We have argued that if we are to make any decision that will effect our environment, we must know the benefits that we will require in compensating for that decision. I believe, even as late as today in question period, the government leader supported that basic principle.

Clearly, from the point of view of our side, development must be on our terms. One of those terms, in addition to business opportunities and a fair return of resource extraction, has to be guaranteed jobs for Yukoners. Last Thursday, the Minister of Renewable Resources implied that a number of job guarantees existed from Peter Kiewit and Sons. Further, he read from a letter to cite references of those jobs and went further to state that those jobs were turned down by CYI and COPE.

Because job guarantees to Yukoners are a fundamental and critical factor in our position about North Slope development, I am asking the minister to table the document he was reading from, as well as any other documents that express the guaranteed jobs to Yukoners. It has become a matter of some importance that the minister do this. As we heard in question period today, the vice-president of marketing for Peter Kiewit has denied job guarantees to CYI and COPE.

As we have had confirmed by the vice-chairman in charge of Economic Development for CYI, these jobs cited by the minister not only do not exist in any guaranteed form, but require a tendering process to procure along with anyone else. That leads me to believe that the minister was particularly selective in what he read into the record and, therefore, may have left a misleading impression to us about job guarantees. I believe that the entire document ought to be tabled and then we can evaluate the real extent of those job guarantees.

I would simply conclude by urging members to support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I will be even briefer than the member across the floor. I have stated in this House twice that I am not prepared to table either one of those letters in the legislature.

I would also like to correct the member across the floor: I never read from the letter, nor did I read anything out of a letter. I referred to the letter and I spoke about what the letter had referred to. One of those letters was a document of Peter Kiewit and Sons and if Peter Kiewit and Sons wants to release the document to the members across the floor, they are quite free and willing to do so. That is not my position. I will not be releasing their document.

Mr. Porter: I would like to take the opportunity, with respect to dealing with this motion, to clarify the letter that the Minister for Renewable Resources continues to talk about. The letter that he talks about is one which was sent by Mr. Hutton, an employee of the government, to the Minister of Economic Development. It was also sent to the minister responsible for renewable resources. As a result of the receipt of the letter, the Minister for Renewable Resources has taken it upon himself to allege that I represented the Council for Yukon Indians with respect to discussions with Peter Kiewit and Sons. The letter did not ever state that. I have read the letter and no where does it say that.

With respect to the question of job offers that were made, never once in any meeting that I know of did Peter Kiewit and Sons offer Indian people any contracts. They did not, in terms of the meetings I am aware of.

They simply stated that, in terms of the catering aspect of their operation and in terms of the maintenance of the haul road, they were willing to solicit Indian businessmen to tender, like everyone else, for those jobs. Mr. Lowen, vice-president of marketing for Peter Kiewit and Sons, very clearly, on the CBC the other day, refuted the statements made by the minister responsible for renewable resources. He said, "his company could not guarantee anything to anybody because they have yet to receive a permit". I think the politics surrounding the North Slope and the politics that the minister for renewable resources has brought about, is one that is totally distorted and misinformed and completely full of erroneous allegations.

Finally, I would like to state to the minister, for his own benefit, that the Yukon Indian Development Corporation and the CYI are totally distinct, separate, legal entities. The Yukon Indian Development Corporation in no way speaks to the CYI. In no way does it hold itself accountable. The minister has alleged that it is a subsidiary of the CYI. To clearly correct the record, it is not. It has its own board of directors. It is legally incorporated in the Yukon and is a separate legal institution. So, I hope that clears up matters

for the minister and I hope that he would, in further discussions in the House regarding my involvement, be truthful and clearly state the position and not attempt to misinform the general public.

I invite the minister to clear the air up and state that he realizes that. If he wants more information, I could show him the legal documents of incorporation. I would make that offer to the minister.

Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I was not going to rise to speak to this particular motion but, in view of the comments from the member for Campbell, I find it very interesting to sit in this House and listen to the member opposite in what can only be described as talking out of both sides of his mouth, when he stands in this House and asks for job creation, jobs for people of the territory, jobs for native people in the territory. Yet, at the same time, he can attend a meeting — and this motion refers to the proposed agreements or letters — which took place, which he was present at, and he does not deny that he stood there and effectively told the proponents of the North Slope development that no development should take place.

It would seem to me, from where I sit, that the member opposite has a responsibility to inform the general public, which he claims he represents, where he stands. We have made it very clear, during the debate on this particular issue, last week, which the "no development party" voted against, that there could be no agreements signed with the company until they could get a land use permit — successfully negotiate with the buyers of the product, which happens to be off-shore oil rigs — and then such agreements could be entered into on behalf of the people of the Yukon Territory.

It was laid out very carefully. Now, the member opposite might not have been in the House, which is not unusual, when this was stated into the record during the debate on that particular motion. It is very clear that the motion is asking for signed agreements or letters which, at the present time, we do not have. We have had a number of discussions between the government and the proponents, but that is as far as it has gone.

It would seem to me that the member opposite is making a big issue of the fact that he is president of the Yukon Indian Development Corporation and he is no longer a member of the CYI. That is not the principle we are speaking of at all, in any case. The point was, the member from Campbell was at that meeting and he proposed no development on the North Slope. Now, it would seem to me that he has a responsibility with respect to his constituency, depending which one he represents ...

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Porter: I would like to raise a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, proceed.

Mr. Porter: The member has made an allegation that I was present at a meeting with the CYI in discussions with Peter Kiewit and Sons and that is totally untrue. I would like to ask the member to withdraw his comments.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I must obviously rule, as the hon. member must know, that there is not a question of privilege here; there is simply a difference between two members as to allegation of facts, and this does not, of course, constitute either a point of order or a question of privilege. Questions of privilege are very, very serious matters and ought only to be raised in very, very serious cases. Proceed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Maybe I am talking to the invisible man. Maybe he is here one day and gone tomorrow. Well, he made his position very clear in this House with respect to that particular issue. They want more development but they were not for development. We are saying, in respect of this motion, there are no signed agreements and there are no letters. I think we have made our point very clear.

I want to talk about the principle of the motions that we have before us in the House, for the production of papers. I think it is safe to say, and the leader of the opposition will verify this, that any time we have been inaccurate in any of our statements to this House, no matter what the issue is, we have come many times on our own volition to correct the record.

Mr. Penikett: Not every time.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would challenge the leader of the official opposition to point out the time that we have not come back to correct this issue.

I am very concerned about the principles of these particular motions. If you are going to be asking any time that we refer to a document, to any discussions with the government or any correspondence between governments, then I am going to say to members opposite that I will be very reluctant to refer to any of that information at any given time because, as far as I am concerned, if somebody corresponds with me it is private. Just as the member or the leader of the official opposition, in his capacity as the leader of the New Democratic Party nationally, would if I was going to ask for the correspondence between himself and his dear friend Mr. Broadbent. Well, the North Development Party — I am sorry.

It would seem to me, from where I stand, that you should very seriously look at the principle we are asking here. I think we, at any given time, provide as much information as we possibly can on any given subject. But if we are going to be getting these "orders" brought forward to the House for these correspondents and this type of thing I, for one — and I think I can speak for my colleagues — will be looking at saying "I am not going to refer to that information because they are going to be requesting private correspondence between levels of government, companies, and this government", and therefore we believe it would be an invasion of their privacy as well as perhaps ours as a government in respect of trying to do our everyday work.

I think it is fairly clear with respect to this motion: first of all, we do not have a signed agreement; we do not have letters. Therefore, there is nothing really to ask for and I would submit to you that the particular motion in question is frivolous in view of the discussion that we had on this matter last week.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am going to speak only about the principle of the motion. That is, about production of papers and the importance of their production in this particular case.

Last Thursday, the minister read from and quoted what he claimed to be job offers to native people. Now, what is occurring is: certain statements were made in the House and it was stated at the time and it is clearly in *Hansard* that one of the reasons for making the statement is to inform the members of the media the exact phrases and I quote, "I thought I would give some facts and figures to them and also to the media. I would hope that they would publish some of these facts and figures".

He clearly talks about job offers to native people. Now, the importance, is that it is crucial to the public debate that this kind of information be received completely and accurately because, in essence, what is occurring in the political forum is that there is a statement made that development is held up. Why is it held up? Because of the position of Indian people or Indian organizations. Now, in the political forum and the public debate, that is a very, very serious matter. It is crucial that the total package of information, all of the information possible on this issue, come forward. Various allegations are made and they involve, in the public mind, substantial and important inferences. On one side, the inferences are thrown out, on the other side the inferences are challenged and the statements are made that it is not so. This kind of process has occurred many times in the past and it probably will occur in the future. These motions and this procedure in this House are designed specifically for this kind of a problem.

I say that, if very serious inferences and allegations are made, the public deserves to have complete information in order to assess that information and those allegations. What we have here is a quote of a particular part of a document, and from that an argument and an allegation and an inference is seriously made. What we are saying by the motion is the public deserves all of the information on the point. The public, in a democracy, of course, is going to make up its own mind and it is necessary, in order to make up your mind, to be well informed. The purpose, in the parliamentary procedure, for these kinds of motions is so that members, and even more importantly the public, are well informed. Now they are partially informed and partially misinformed.

It is denial of a very fundamental parliamentary principle that

partial information about this kind of serious issue is made here and a denial of complete information. Either that is confidential information or it is not.

¹⁷ Now, the minister is stating it is confidential information, so what he is doing is releasing a snippet or a quote out of a body of confidential information. The principles are absolutely clear: either it is confidential or it is not. If it is confidential, it is absolutely improper to quote small parts of it. If it is not confidential, all of it ought to come forward.

It is futile to debate what it says and what it does not say. It is necessary to look at it and read it and the public should make up its own mind on the point.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. Byblow: I think I will be brief in closing. I am absolutely amazed at some of the comments I heard from the other side. The Minister of Economic Development, in his closing remarks, said that we do not have any letters, we do not have any signed agreements, the whole thing is frivolous and I think that probably tells me quite a bit about what constitutes this government's real position on balanced development policy on the North Slope.

The motion is clear; it is clear in its intent and request on the Order Paper. The Minister of Renewable Resources referred to a letter, he quoted job guarantees from it, he made references about job guarantees.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order, the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have heard at least eight or ten times today the words "job guarantee" and I would challenge any member across the floor to show me anywhere in *Hansard* where I said there was a job guarantee for any member of the CYI or any Indian or COPE member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously, the hon. member, as he knows, has not raised a point of order.

Mr. Byblow: I am sure the Minister of Renewable Resources is quite capable of reading *Hansard* on his own, but, in the event that he has some limitations, I call reference to a citation on page 506, which says, "There are 55 jobs to native people in the territory on that one project, to which CYI said no".

Now, that constitutes a job guarantee, however you want to refer to it. The minister chooses to selectively draw references from a letter and then refuses to table such a document or refuses to substantiate the job guarantees that he would like the people of Yukon to believe exist. It is an abuse of privileges in the House to take a document, draw from it and refuse to let us see it all.

That not only makes a misleading representation about job guarantees, it makes inferences about what several organizations have said and committed themselves to. We have heard from the member for Campbell, we have heard from the vice-president of the major proponent — as the Minister of Economic Development refers to it — we have heard from the vice-chairman of CYI, that what the minister led us to believe in the House about job guarantees does not exist. So let us see the document. Let us take a look at it ourselves and let Yukoners take a look at it themselves.

We are simply calling for the documents relating to the job guarantees that this government would have us believe exist and I am amazed that this government would refuse to table such a document.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Question.

Mr. Byblow: Question.

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 3 defeated

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 4

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

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that an order of the Assembly do issue for a copy of all statistics delivered to the government leader by the

Yukon Liquor Corporation on October 21, 1983.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is probably a simple, uncontroversial little motion.

There has been a debate in the media about this kind of issue and questions in Question Period, but part of the reason for that is that the good information is not available to us all. Now, the statistics that the Liquor Corporation has are generally public in annual reports in any event, and I would be very interested if the government is getting statistics not in the annual report. The point is that now, while the debate is going on, if all of the statistics were made available, the debate in the public and the media would be much better informed than it is now and those seriously interested in the issue would be able to properly research the important questions involved.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sure it is obvious that it is our intention to defeat this motion as well, because I submit to you, that it is a redundant motion in that section 14 of the *Liquor Act* is very explicit and gives this government the specific order that this House is looking for, in that there shall be produced each year an annual report of the Yukon Liquor Commission and it is clear in the act that at subsection (a) it says, "it shall contain a statement of the nature and amount of the business transacted by the corporation during the year", and it also states in the act that, "that report shall be tabled in this House when it next sits, after the end of the fiscal year".

We intend to live up to the legislation that is put before us and to table that report. It will have all of those statistics in it.

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

Mr. Kimmerly: I appreciate that the annual report will be tabled. The point is the debate is going on now. The statistics are available. There is no earthly reason why these statistics cannot be made available now when the public is going to receive them anyway, substantially late. The government talks about extra costs. All we are talking about is the cost of zeroxing a bunch of figures. I will pay for it. It is a small amount of cost. I would say in reply, it is unfortunate that the debate could be better informed and it will not be until well into the new year and that is most unfortunate.

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 4 defeated

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with item 3?

Mr. Byblow: Next sitting day.

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 6

Mr. Clerk: Item 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: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that an order of this Assembly do issue for copies of the agreements between the federal government and the Government of Yukon respecting the four points of contention as outlined by the Government of Yukon's chief negotiator for the Yukon Indian Land Claim in a report attached to the August 4, 1983 letter to fellow Yukoners from the government leader.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have expected the last motions would be uncontroversial and this one very controversial. I hope that all my predictions are wrong.

In explaining the reason for this motion, everyone will be aware that on August 4th a letter went to many individuals in the territory and they are individuals among others who expressed an interest in land claims. It is a letter reporting on the progress of land claims talks from the government leader and an attachment is a letter to the government from Mr. Phelps, the YTG negotiator. In that letter, various agreements are talked about and described in a very, very general sense, and these agreements are agreements between Canada and Yukon as federal-territorial agreements and they are not agreements that involve CYI as a party.

I wrote a letter asking for copies of those agreements. That was August 18th. I received a reply August 30th from the government leader and it says — and I will make the entire letter public if anybody is interested; it is a letter to me but I will table it if that is

satisfactory; it is not a confidential letter — "In keeping with our continuing commitment to respect the wishes of the Council for Yukon Indians, I am not prepared to release detailed land claims information to the public."

Subsequent to that, I spoke to the CYI and I spoke to the vice-chairman in charge of the land claims. I asked if he was consulted about the confidentiality of these documents and he said no, he was not. I asked if CYI had any objection to the release of these federal-territorial agreements, and he said no, they did not. He has allowed me to make that information public.

Two notices of production of papers have already been debated and this is the third. I would make simply and briefly the general point that I made earlier. Land claims is, obviously, an extremely important political issue and social issue in the territory. The public are eager for complete information about what is going on. In this case, these agreements are the result of a land claims boycott conducted by this government for a substantial period of time and the agreements, it is claimed, have enabled the parties to get back together and negotiate again. It is claimed that they answer some very important general questions, which were raised and specifically publicised by this government. The agreements are agreements between one government and another government. When the government makes an agreement, I say the public have the right to know what that agreement about public business is. This is a federal-territorial agreement and it should be public and it should be perused by those serious citizens who are interested in finding the real story.

This is an issue about which there is an extreme amount of confusion and indeed, misinformation in the public domain and the way to make the debate in the public more informed, more informative and more constructive is to release good and complete information about the issue.

I say that where this government makes an agreement with the federal government about the public business of the territory, that should be a public document. It is really quite extraordinary in the parliamentary and democratic tradition that there would be a claim that there is not a right to those kinds of documents. They are government agreements between governments about public business. We should know what is going on in a free and democratic country. That is our right.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There are some other people in this free and democratic country who also have some rights. They are called the beneficiaries of the land claims settlement that is being negotiated between the Government of Canada and the Council for Yukon Indians.

The documents that the member opposite is referring to are connected directly to the land claims settlement. We have exhibited goodwill in this House on prior occasions and we have tabled land claims material that we knew that we could. I have advised the House already that, either this week or next, I will be tabling further information that was requested by this House.

There is absolutely no way that we can comply with this motion, because in those documents, even if all of the information in them is not confidential, certainly, a large part is.

I listened very closely to what our learned friend from across the floor had to say about the confidentiality of documents. I am positive that he said that we should treat them one or two ways: either they are all confidential or they are not. In this case, I regret that I have to say to you that it is my opinion that they are all confidential.

Mr. Kimmerly: It is unfortunate that there is not a good reason given why they are confidential. There was a general statement about the beneficiaries and we already know that the CYI vice-chairman in charge has no objection.

These are agreements between the federal and the territorial governments about public business. We are told they are confidential, but we are not told why, in any meaningful way at all. That is extremely unfortunate and regrettable.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Question.

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 6 defeated

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

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

Motion Number 26

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

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that this House directs the Minister of Justice, pursuant to Section 4 of the *Policing Agreement*, to communicate to the Yukon RCMP that police policy concerning domestic violence should be similar to police policy for other assaults.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is a crucial and important issue. It was recently revealed in the Commons in Ottawa that one woman in ten was probably beaten in some way in her life time. It is an extremely wide-ranging and important issue.

Catch words are "wife-beating" or "wife-battering" and more general words are "domestic violence", and that includes, of course, violence between spouses of whatever sex and in whichever direction, which frequently occurs. It also involves violence against children, a most tragic social problem that is ever too present.

In times past, wife battering was not considered a crime or a social problem. Indeed, it was a point of pride among some men at some stages in our history that they were in control of their wives and that included the resort to violence if necessary. Indeed, it is clear in our laws that that used to be, in fact, a right written into the law. That is no longer the case. We have come a fair distance since that. However, social attitudes and the power relationships between and among people are changing slowly and it is necessary to attack the problem of domestic violence in several ways. I will speak about the major ways.

The most important, I submit, is through services — counselling systems and otherwise — to the people involved, both the guilty party and the victim. And the use of force on occasion, or the police or the justice system, in order to intervene in individual cases where damage and violence is being done.

Recently in the country there are experiments in a change in the policy of crown attorneys or the prosecution function in courts, and the change is really quite an important one. It used to be, in some places, that in a domestic violence situation the victim, almost invariably a wife, was asked if she wished to press charges or not; if she did not, nothing was done. If she did, she signed a private information alleging an assault against the assaultive spouse. The new policy is that that choice and those categories are not allowed to the victim, and the state or the crown intervenes, as they do for other criminal matters, and the peace officers involved lay the charge whether it is requested or not. And this is a very important change because, under the old system, the victim is vulnerable to substantial pressure, generally by the spouse, as to whether she will lay charges or withdraw them after they are laid.

It is almost an open invitation to the assaulter to bring pressure to bear, either physical or emotional, to get out of the criminal charge. Under the new policy, that pressure is, of course, no longer possible because it is the decision of the peace officer whether or not a reasonable charge lies.

That is being experimented with in Manitoba and I am pleased to learn that that new policy is now in place in the Yukon. Many do not know that and I am pleased to take a small part in the publicizing of it. That is the policy of the Crown or the prosecution function in the courts and it involves, in some measure, a policing policy. There are other, perhaps more important, policing policies which are not yet in place in the Yukon.

For an example, if the police are called to a fight in a barroom on a Saturday night, they act very quickly and they remove the source of the disruption and they lay charges if the event is serious enough to do that. That is a clear policy. If it is a domestic dispute, their policy is not clear and, in fact, what they frequently do is ask an assaulted woman, and the children as well, if they wish to go to the transition home, known as Kaushee's Place. This is a new policy

which was only possible approximately three years ago, or so, on the opening of Kaushee's Place. However, it is a way in which the violent situation is changed temporarily into a peaceful one. However, it in essence blames the wrong person. It blames the victim. In the barroom incidents, the criminal or the suspected criminal is hauled away. In the matrimonial case, the victim is taken away at her request. That is most unjust. It should be the other way around. In a violent and potentially violent situation where the police are called, it should be the assaulter, where reasonable and probable grounds exist, who is taken away to jail, in order to defuse the situation, not the victim.

These matters are most often kept private and there is a substantial effort by those involved to keep family violence within the family, and private, because of the substantial public embarrassment for all sorts of reasons. It is the new direction in the law that, where assaults are taking place, the victims deserve the protection that can be afforded by the police and that principle on balance is more important than the privacy principle.

It is also important that the RCMP be directed by their political policy directors, who are responsible to the people and this House, that they be informed that family violence is considered a most serious issue and an issue deserving of more attention than it has had in the past. It is necessary for us, as politicians, to express a public will, and the public will in my view is that we simply will not accept family violence in our society. The victims of family violence deserve our support.

I was very pleased that one of the ministers responsible attended the federal-territorial and provincial conference in October on the *Young Offenders Act*; in the news release after that there is a paragraph about family violence. Family violence received considerable discussion, we are told. I would like to hear more about that.

In the Yukon, we have a transition home which is a substantial improvement over a few years ago and is a step forward that many other communities have not made. The situation outside Whitehorse is slightly more difficult, but the policies of Kaushee's Place are clearly that it is a Yukon-wide service, as far as is practicably possible.

There are also family counselling services available from other — I will call them non-specialized — services, which are professional and also volunteer services. However, the network of support is very incomplete and our job, as politicians, has only begun on this issue and it deserves substantial attention of all of us.

Counselling efforts directed towards assaultive men are badly needed and are in existence in Alaska now. We could take another step in solving this problem by establishing those services.

Also, publicity concerning the availability is, in my opinion, present, but not as much as it could be. More can be done.

All of us, as politicians who are responsible to speak the public mind and verbalize it and publicize it, are responsible to give this question our very serious deliberation. I submit that the motion calls for a change in policing policy, which is part of a larger change which is already occurring. The policing policy that I have spoken of is another step that can and should be made in the territory.

The addition and improvement of services to battered people and those who batter will be an ongoing political issue for some time and it will be gradually and incrementally addressed. It is our duty to make those steps which we can make and to plan, over time, the addition of additional steps.

I thank all members for their attention to my rather long dissertation, but I strongly feel that this is an issue that all of us should spend a little more time in considering.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I am unsure at the present time whether I should really be on my feet. I am a little concerned whether the member opposite is really finished or just winded.

My colleague, the hon. Clarke Ashley, has informed the House on several occasions that he has regular meetings with the officer commanding M Division to discuss matters of mutual concern. On Friday, September 30, 1983, Mr. Ashley raised this particular matter and he was assured that the RCMP in Yukon have a uniform policy in force for all assaults, domestic or otherwise. Therefore,

we on this side of the House feel that this is an unnecessary motion, and we will be voting against it.

Mr. Joe: I would support the motion and I am very surprised that the members across the House are not going to do it.

The RCMP may have indicated that they treat all assault cases the same. That is not the case and it is not happening. I have sat here and watched the response from the other side of the House with lack of respect for what was being said, which indicates a lack of respect for the problems of women in the Yukon, and I have no doubt in my mind that when the women of the Yukon awarded two frozen turkey awards to the government leader and the Minister of Justice, they were well deserved.

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Are you agreed?

Some hon. Members: Disagree.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called.

Order, please. The debate has been concluded in this matter.

Mr. Clerk, would you kindly poll the House?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree.

Mr. Falle: Disagree.

Mrs. Nukon: Disagree.

Mr. Brewster: Disagree.

Mr. Penikett: Agree.

Mr. Byblow: Agree.

Mr. Kimmerly: Agree.

Mr. Porter: Agree.

Mrs. Joe: Agree.

Mr. McDonald: Agree.

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

Mr. Speaker: I must declare then, that the motion has been defeated.

Motion No. 26 defeated

Motion No. 30

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

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that it is the opinion of this House that government officials employed by the Women's Bureau should be instructed to employ themselves on women's issues and that this House regrets the confusion and direction given to government officials employed by the Women's Bureau.

Mr. Kimmerly: Let me say at the outset that I wish to state and to imply absolutely no criticism of the single individual involved in the Women's Bureau because that individual is working under the direction of her superiors and it is direction that is at fault, not the performance of the duties given to that particular individual.

I wish to state even more, I not only wish to not criticize a particular individual, I wish to sympathize with that person who has borne up under a terrible confusion of direction from the top.

The Women's Bureau was established by this government, with federal funds, basically, in October of 1978, after the federal government's initiative, specifically, in February of 1978, as a response to a national plan of action for women in Canada, which is a part of, and a response of, the United Nations' World Plan of Action. In October, 1978, the responsible minister was the Minister of Education. In July of 1980 to January, 1982, the Bureau was transferred to Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Manpower and Labour Branch, at that time, largely because of the labour survey. In January, 1982, it was transferred back to education and, on June 28th, 1982, it was transferred, for the fourth time, to Justice.

In that weaving around, various statements were made by the political directors of the Women's Bureau as to the function and duties of the bureau and it is somewhat confusing, to say the least.

First of all, in the first approximately two years, there was

substantial community input and a draft plan of action was discussed. On November 6th, 1980, filed in this House, there was a plan of action. It is a four-page document which lists and describes fairly well, I think, the focus, goals, or the plan of the Women's Bureau. Very briefly, four main action areas are identified. They are: one, education and training; two, employment and related economic roles; three, the family; four, research data collection and analysis.

That occurred three years ago and it is perfectly valid now to use the stated goals as a measure as to what has been achieved and what has not. Work has been done on all areas — that is absolutely clear. However, due to the political confusion in the direction of the bureau, the achievements are limited.

²⁸ I could go through — as a matter of fact, I will in some measure — some of the political statements that were made. First of all, before the formation of the bureau, the House passed a motion about affirmative action; this was on the 28th March 1979. It was not an order to the government binding the government; it was an urging motion or a resolution of this House. And it was amended by the government to read that this Assembly urged the government to continue to develop its affirmative action program for women within the public service of the Yukon Territorial Government through the Women's Bureau, established last year. Very clearly, the motion and the statement of the government, spoke about developing and continuing the affirmative action program for women within the public service. It was also stated by the responsible minister at the time, at page 273, "The Women's Bureau is currently preparing a broad plan of action for women. This plan includes women in the family, employment, education and training and statistical analysis. Discussions have been held with the public service commission concerning in-house training programs for support staff." So, some information about the goals of the bureau was established then and also a political direction.

Also, on November 5th, the government leader tabled a legislative return concerning the affirmative action program in the Yukon at that time. The nature of it is briefly described as this: the Government of Yukon does not at present have an all encompassing affirmative action policy but, rather, several separate policies. An umbrella policy for affirmative action will be implemented once human rights legislation has been developed and passed. However, this was temporarily stalled by the constitution debate nationally at that time.

It was interesting that, on April 15th 1982, the then responsible minister made a ministerial statement, which basically changed around the focus of the Women's Bureau, and I will refer to various questions which occurred just prior to that ministerial statement.

²⁹ The statement centred around the government policy stated at the time to appoint women in equal numbers with men, wherever possible, to territorial boards and commissions.

I responded to that statement at the time and I said, "I'm going to wait a year and see", and it is for all Yukoners to judge the performance. The numbers of women on these boards have not measurably changed.

There was also a statement of policy and focus that seminars and public education were going to be a substantial goal, a women's resource centre was announced, pamphlets and a review of all Yukon legislation was announced. It was going to occur over the summer, that is, in 1982. I have yet to see the results of that review of legislation, which was clearly promised. A goal was cooperation and consultation with the Public Service, and also an advisory council was announced on that date.

Recently, on the 8th of March, 1983, the responsible minister recognized International Women's Day and he said this in a government news release, "At the same time, the minister announced that the Women's Bureau is chairing an interdepartmental committee to review all legislation, policies and regulations to ensure that they comply with the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*". Now, that is obviously a new addition to the terms of reference of the Women's Bureau. It is interesting that it appears to be an announcement of another review legislation before the completion of the old one.

It was also clearly announced that there was to be a labour study

to study the employment of women in the territory and to work with such concepts as affirmative action programs and to research the nature of the practical result of employment discrimination in the territory.

It is noteworthy to mention that, on April 21st, 1982, just prior to the election call, this House voted for a very clear principle. We voted for the principle of equal pay for work of equal value.

³⁰ Then, members spoke in favour of it. Those who are still here are Mr. Tracey, who was in favour of it at the time; Mr. Falle, who was in favour of it — and, I assume, still is — myself and the leader of the opposition. It is interesting that that occurred just prior to the election. The real reason for that motion, we all know, to our discredit, is that the \$6 an hour minimum wage contained in the same report was controversial to members across the way. This was a convenient way to avoid that issue. However, the legislature clearly expressed agreement in principle with the principle of equal pay for work of equal value.

In the last year, members on this side have asked numerous questions about the Women's Bureau. It is only necessary to look at the *Hansard* index to find all of the questions listed. We have been trying, over the course of a year, to get a clear statement of the goals and functions of the Women's Bureau because it has changed so much and the various announcements over the course of the last five years have left everyone, I am sure, substantially confused.

On November 18, 1982 on the budget debate on the Women's Bureau, this is absolutely clear, when I asked the responsible minister several questions about the functions of the bureau, and I said I was making a list of the functions. I asked for them. The only answers I could get from the minister responsible after repeated, easy, informational questioning, were these: the bureau coordinates women's groups — that is clear; it advises the minister. And, I asked about an employment survey and the minister was not aware of that at the time. The member for Whitehorse North Centre has also asked about the employment survey and the minister was not aware of the status or the nature of that. Later, we did get information that the employment survey was abandoned "due to lack of funds". However, no report or partial report has ever been tabled or released or spoken about. There have been numerous written and oral questions on the issue.

³¹ I would refer only to a few of the recent ones. Speaking about the women in the labour force, on March 30, 1983 the minister stated the Women's Bureau is working on that now — that is at page 72. It is obviously inconsistent information with the previous information given about the labour study. On April 26th, the government leader stated, in response to a question about affirmative action programs, "We work with the Women's Bureau of the Yukon Government with respect to the hiring of the people". It is obviously another function of the Women's Bureau — the ongoing hiring of people. It was on April 27th that the minister realized, or was informed, that the labour study was shelved.

On this side, what we are interested in is a description now of the goals and the programs that the Women's Bureau has and is involved in. During the last budget debate, we asked those questions; the answers were most unsatisfactory and incomplete. I would hope that this motion and this attention to the issue will serve to inform the responsible minister and ministers that the women of the Yukon are dissatisfied with the lack of attention and lack of political direction given to this bureau. The various goals and program statements are obviously general and vast. The Women's Bureau consists of one person and that person could not possibly do all of the things required of her. Those things have constantly changed over the last five years.

On a constructive note, we are now interested in a statement of the goals and objectives and a reasonable description of the job function of that person. We are interested in the policy direction as to where the bureau is going in the next year and, generally, in the next couple of years, and at the budget debate in the spring all of these questions will be renewed and possibly expanded upon.

³² **Some hon. Members:** Question.

Motion No. 30 defeated

Motion Number 31

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

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

Mrs. Joe: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse North Centre, that this House urges the government to consider expanding training programs for justices of the peace.

Mrs. Joe: I introduced this motion to the House in the hope that I might be able to better describe the reasons why I feel that there should be extended training for justices of the peace in Yukon. I am not doing it because I feel that all JPs are untrained, I am doing it because I feel that there are some very well-trained justices of the peace, but there are some JPs who would require further training to do what they have to do.

At present, the training that JPs have consists of a three-day training course each year. I guess two years ago, there was a time when they used to have them twice a year and they would be followed up by training by the judge while he was on court circuit. It was also followed up by a JP-2 in a community, who would, on his or her own, train the JP-1.

I have asked many questions in the House with regard to the training of JPs and the minister has said very often that they do not train JPs and then appoint them later. I have been assured by the territorial courts that that is not the case, that they are considered to come into a training workshop before they are ever appointed. I have the criteria for that right in front of me where, on the advice of the JP Council, after checking with MLAs and local community leaders and other people in a community, they are asked to come into a JP training course. Only after that period of time, are they allowed to apply to become a JP.

As has happened in the past, there have been at least three people who have been appointed without first of all receiving that training, and that is a fact.

Some. hon. Member: At least three.

Mrs. Joe: At least three, yes. The government leader says, "my goodness", but that is a fact and that is one of the concerns that I have, and it is also a concern of some people in those communities where that is happening.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Be specific.

Mrs. Joe: I can be specific: there was Vi Campbell and a person on the Dempster, I think named John McNiven, and I believe there was one person in Whitehorse.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Not very specific.

Mrs. Joe: They may or may not be specific, but they have been admitted without having prior training.

As a matter of fact, Mrs. Campbell, in Dawson, after she was appointed, was only allowed to conduct weddings and that is because she had not received training before that.

Some hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mrs. Joe: That is right, she was.

What I am trying to impress upon members in this House is the fact that we do need further training for these JPs. The amount of training that we have, at this time, is not sufficient. The training that we do have consists of a three-day, extensive training period and those training periods of three days are very, very good. They are intensive, they are done by professionals, they are done in a good manner and I have nothing against those training workshops.

However, the thing that I am saying right now is that there are not enough of them. The training that comes afterwards is done by a judge on court circuit and judges have said that, very often, they have not found the time to do that training. I believe that the time has to be taken to do that.

³³ We have JP-1s in communities now, who are JP-1s and have been JP-1 for a long time. They do not have the benefit of a JP-2 in those communities to help them with their training, because they do not have JP-2s in some of those communities. Therefore, those JPs remain JP-1s and are not allowed to sit, and that is happening in more than two communities that I know of. What has to happen in a case like that, I think, is that there has to be some kind of intensive training in that community for those people who are JP-1s and also for people who are JP-2s, newly appointed, because you cannot stop learning enough in whatever it is you choose to do, especially if you are a JP.

It has also been stated that JPs do not deal with very serious matters. But, in fact, what happens in a lot of cases, is that there are offences in the criminal code that are dual offences and they may either be a summary matter, which is not quite so serious, or they could be indictable. It is up to the Crown to decide which it is going to be. Very often, what will happen, because they want to deal with it right away, is that they will not wait until a court circuit comes along, they will declare that they will deal with it summarily, and that is done. If you are dealing with the JP courts in the community, the accused is there by himself. He does not have any defense. The only other two people who are in that courtroom at that time are the JP and the member of the RCMP. Very often, what will happen in those cases is that the accused does not have the knowledge to ask for any kind of legal assistance and he is not aware that he can wait until a court circuit comes to that community. There have been cases where that has happened, unknowingly — not intentionally — by the JP, because the information was not given to that accused who was before them.

What I am saying right now is that those training workshops have to be extended in every way. They have to be extended through the workshops that they have in Whitehorse to possibly more than one, or even two or three, and they also have to be taken out to the communities, where they do not have any training workshops at all, whether it is by someone who works in the court system or whether it is done by the judge, or done by some other resource person who does have the ability to go out into the communities to train. It would be a lot easier if a lot of these people could come into town but, as we all know, the JPs in those communities are usually people who have other jobs such as teachers, government workers, or whatever, so they are not always able to come into town.

The other thing that is lacking in those JP courts and in a lot of smaller ones is the court clerk. The court clerk plays a very heavy role in the court. In the past, and also in the present, there are some communities where the JP is the JP and also is the court clerk at the same time. That poses a problem, because you are not able to spend a lot of that time dealing with the person who is before you.

I would also say that there should be further training of JPs to act as court clerks, which is already being done, but should be expanded to include the communities. I think that in the long run we are talking about spending money to do that training and I think that the government will save money. That would eliminate the need for court circuits to go out into the communities as often as they do right now. What also has to happen, at the same time, is that there also has to be some kind of resource person out there in the community who can also deal with the accused, so that that person will be dealt with fairly in the courts, along with being dealt fairly with by the JP. There has to be that extended training and it has to be done as soon as possible. As I said, in the long run, the government will save money.

³⁴ **Hon. Mr. Philipson:** On motion 31, "this House urges the government to consider expanding training programs for justices of the peace", the use of the phrase "expanding training programs" occasions some difficulty for us. Did it mean, for example, expanding the course content to cover a broader area of subjects, or did it mean either increasing the number of persons on each program, increasing the numbers of programs, or a combination of these? We have complete confidence in the training program and its end product, the trained JP. The chief judge of the territorial court plays a major role in this and great credit reflects on him for the success we enjoy here. It is of interest to note that, of the many matters heard by JPs, and there are literally thousands each year, only eight appeals resulted. That surely is some indication of the excellence of the training and the high level of competence of our individual JPs.

If the member's motion is directed at the frequency of the course, it must be remembered that the justices of the peace come from all sectors of the society, with varied experience and varied education, and it is imperative that the training programs reflect this. When the member was a JP, it was customary to have two training courses per year, but about the same time as she resigned, or shortly thereafter, the number was reduced to three courses in two years, or one every eight months, instead of as formerly, every six months. As part of

the restraint measures, the number of courses was reduced to one per year, but with the added dimension that judges on circuit would be available to provide training to local JPs in the community. Whitehorse JPs have always had access to territorial court judges for advice and instruction.

We are more than satisfied that the present arrangements suit us admirably and that, should changes or modifications be required, the chief judge will advise the government of them and we, in turn, will see that they are carried out to the best of our ability. Currently, for example, 23 JPs have been recommended for further training to the level of JP-3. As each individual progresses and completes the training, he will be advanced to JP-3 status and then qualified to act as a family court judge.

In light of our obvious commitment to the training of JPs, we would be most pleased to support this motion.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am moved to speak because it is a matter of some personal interest and commitment to me as well as to the member for Whitehorse North Centre. I think it is appropriate to say at the beginning that the previous government and, indeed, this government, deserve credit for the expansion of this program over the last five years. I freely and sincerely say that. There is, of course, a recognition by both sides that more can be done and more should be done, and I am moved to enter the debate to reinforce why more should be done.

When I go over to the court building, which I frequently do out of session, I am routinely lobbied to ask for a third judge. That has occurred at least twice a month in the last two years by various segments of the judicial system.

On a per capita basis, using the statistics at least for something, the judicial personnel and the policing personnel are way above the national average. It is quite true that the territorial judges, especially, are extremely busy, but expressing the proposition that there should be a third territorial judge is a thing I am extremely reluctant to do, partially, and in large part, because of the use of JPs.

I have been a circuit court judge in the territory here, in my past, and I know the legitimate frustration of communities outside Whitehorse that complain that a judge flies in — or drives in — decides a question and flies back and does not understand the community dynamics very well at all. No matter how expert or fair-minded judges are; they are always going to be criticized for those sorts of things. The JP program, at least in part, solves that and, as far as the work done by JPs goes, we are more than getting our money's worth in a strictly economic sense. More than that, there is a substantially greater community involvement in the judicial system, as there should be.

We, on this side, are strong supporters of the use of JPs and congratulate the government for its general policy in this area. Incidentally, it is a policy diametrically opposed to the policy in every single Canadian province now, which is interesting.

The good services of JPs stands or falls on good training. JPs are lay people and part of their value is that they see problems as common people see them and that is an extremely good feature of the policy of using JPs. However, the JPs themselves are the first ones to say, "We need more training", and they are extremely thirsty for more training. It will make for better JPs and also will attract more people to the job if adequate training is given.

I will not go on longer. I am extremely pleased that this motion will pass and I would recommend an expansion of training dollars in the future, as the motion calls for.

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

Mrs. Joe: The Minister of Health and Human Resources has just indicated that there would be 23 JPs who will be expanding their training to include duties of a JP-3. I think that has been something that has been a long time in coming, although it is a very large number. I am pleased to hear that the members will be supporting this motion and I talk in terms of extending it in ways that I had already described. There has to be more of them.

I would just like to make a couple of comments, and that is with regard to a couple of problems that have been brought to the attention of, not only myself, but to other members of the

communities over and over again. When we say justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done, the thing that very often occurs in communities is that bail hearings are heard in RCMP offices and JPs have been told often that that should not be done. Also, some court hearings have been held in a kitchen or a side room of an RCMP building, and those are just some of the small problems that I would like to let the other members know about. They happen, in most cases, because they are more convenient, but they do not appear to be fair to the accused. Those are some of the big problems to the accused but problems that can be dealt with through further training, as well.

I would like to thank the members opposite for their support in this motion.

Motion No. 31 agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Item number four, standing in the name of Mrs. Joe.

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

Mrs. Joe: Next sitting day.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Motion No. 33

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

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, briefly.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that this House urges the immediate appointment of a qualified Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is an obvious motion and I brought it up in order to debate in some measure the problems with the present minister, although he is not here. I will be extremely brief.

A deputy minister has long been needed and it is time the job was filled.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We are cognizant of the problems, of course. We feel them very severely. I would like to advise the House that we intend to agree with this motion and support it wholeheartedly to the extent that one of the reasons that the Minister of Justice is absent from the House is, in fact, that he is in eastern Canada at this time, in the company of the Public Service Commissioner, and they are, in fact, conducting interviews with respect to the — I certainly hope — potential hiring of a deputy minister of justice.

Motion No. 33 agreed to

Motion No. 37

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 6?

Mr. McDonald: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Mayo that it is the opinion of this House that the moratorium on northern benefits should be extended for one year and a policy be developed within that period which

- 1) recognizes the value of northern benefits;
 - 2) ensures that all persons in Yukon receive tax breaks which correspond to the degree of isolation; and
 - 3) ensures that the value of untaxable northern benefits currently received be maintained and
- that the Speaker forward this motion to the Government of Canada.

Mr. McDonald: I trust that because a motion of similar nature, that was presented in the House, I believe, in 1980, prior to my arrival, was passed and did deal with some aspects of isolation allowances and northern benefits, that this will be regarded as a bit of a motherhood issue by this legislature. So, for that reason, I expect to be reasonably brief.

To put a background on the issue, I think it is important to put the question into perspective. Prior to 1978, special benefits provided to workers in isolated areas were supposed to be counted as income

for tax purposes, but this policy, up until 1978, was never enforced, and it was only until that year that Revenue Canada made the decision to tax these benefits. In the fall of 1979, the Department of National Revenue began a real crackdown on income tax collection practices in isolated areas in an effort to tighten, and to standardize, these practices.

In April, 1980, just prior to the last motion that was passed by this House, there was a joint announcement by two ministers that a moratorium on the taxation of benefits would take place. They issued, in time, a remission order refunding taxes already paid on housing and transportation subsidies for the years 1978-79 and made those same benefits untaxable for the year 1980. Since then, of course, we have had a series of remission order extensions.

In all fairness to the federal government, I think we should clearly enunciate the federal policy and the reasons for the federal policy, so that we can debate it in a fair and open fashion. To that end, I would like to read very briefly from a letter from Allen MacEachen who, at the time, was Minister of Finance, to a member of my own union, which stated quite clearly what the reason for the taxations are. This was one of the first times that such a policy was enunciated and the reasons for it were made clear to a major detractor of the taxation policy.

It reads as follows, "The current relief provided through the remission order results in anomalous treatment of individuals living in isolated regions. Inequities arise in the tax treatment between individuals working for different employers, temporary and permanent residents, and high and low income individuals. Moreover, I believe that the federal tax system should apply uniformly to all Canadians across the country."

He goes on to state that, "The budget decision of one year ago, in 1981, providing for a one year extension of this remission, is mainly to allow adequate time to review the need for and means of providing special assistance to employees at such locations. Nevertheless, all benefits will become taxable as income from employment effective January 1st, 1983. As noted in my budget, government assistance to employees in such locations, after that date, would have to take the form of direct support programs rather than a deduction for exemption from the taxable income."

There are a lot of employees in Yukon — federal, territorial and municipal employees, employees of mines, employees of various other private industry — who receive some sort of isolation allowance.

These allowances, these northern benefits, recognize, to a large extent, the high cost of living in the north — in some cases, 20 to 30 percent higher than in urban areas. By that, I mean that travel costs to visit families outside or to take vacations outside or even to travel the extensive distances within the territory are high and, therefore, remuneration or recompense is paid to employees to make up for that difference.

Fuel costs, of course, are high. The heating of homes during long northern winters, and fuel for cars to travel the long distances between communities, are factors that have to be taken into account, as do miscellaneous living expenses such as the high food costs, the high cost of various retail items, et cetera. The fact that there are long distances between communities, and sparse population, also means, of course, that to provide various services, public and social, recreation facilities, cultural facilities, are all made that much more difficult, given that we desire to bring these standards up to what is considered to be a southern urban standard, in many cases.

I guess it goes without saying, as a postscript, that retail outlets are few in most isolated communities in Yukon, and certainly the selection in Whitehorse is less than that that is available in other urban locations in the west. For that reason, it gives the consumer little freedom of choice and, in fact, limited choice, in itself. But the point to make is that the federal government must recognize that these special allowances, paid to workers in remote areas, are equalizing payments designed to offset the high cost of living in isolated communities. They are not to be considered as benefits that place northern workers in a better position than southern workers. Northern benefits, or isolation allowances as many people prefer to call them, are practical solutions worked out by practical northern

people.

They were developed to promote the recruitment of a stable workforce. To introduce a negative taxation regime would disrupt the free collective bargaining process for union workers by putting pressure on employers to make up the difference in lost incomes felt by their employees. It is important to briefly note that workers in the territory already face declining incomes and, in some cases, controlled incomes, in the face of inflation. People's disposable incomes are declining, the purchasing power is falling, and this proposed taxation obviously will only speed employee incomes' descent.

To illustrate what we are actually facing here, it might be illustrative to mention that in one case — in Faro's case, for example — even under the proposed regime announced by the new federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Lalonde, in early December of last year that, after the phase-in period, workers there will be paying approximately \$2,000 in 1983 dollars per employee out of their incomes. I think that is a fairly significant price to pay to subsidize, in a sense, what the minister's predecessor Mr. MacEachen called direct support programs. The issue of universal application for northern residents, depending on the degree of isolation, which Mr. MacEachen mentioned in his letter, is an issue long addressed in the submissions to the minister and we are attempting to address it here in this resolution. All northern residents face higher costs of living than people in the south and the tax system itself should reflect this. The tax system should reflect the higher cost of living associated with varying degrees of isolation. However, it should accept the current level of tax-free isolation allowances as the basis for developing a universal northern tax policy.

To put it another way, I think it would be fair to say that all northern residents should receive tax breaks, whether it be a tax credit or a personal income tax deduction or the establishment of tax-free benefits, as is the case currently, and should allow or permit the current level of benefits that some workers now receive to continue.

This message, of course, has been passed on to previous ministers and it should be passed on to the existing minister once again.

The use of a tax system to offset the high standard of living in remote areas seems to be effective, despite the ex-federal minister's reservations. The minister's suggestion that their support programs in lieu of tax free benefits be established is, in most people's opinion, unwieldy and ineffective.

It is in the nature, I guess, of this sparsely populated north that ill-defined and, in fact, never defined programs, such suggested by the federal minister, will probably be ineffective in making up the difference in lost benefits. The best figures to date, as an example — the most liberal figures to date — suggest that over the entire north and in all isolated regions in the country, only \$15,000,000 will be collected. That is, as I said, for both territories and all the isolated regions in all the provinces. The revenue would have to spread, in the scenario proposed by the federal minister, very thinly across these regions so as to be practically ineffective in dealing with the loss that would be faced by people who had been taxed.

I guess a lot could be said about this issue, and a lot has been said about this issue. Very little of it would be new to most members of this House. I am trusting that most members, or all members, or the majority of members, will support this and Mr. Lalonde can receive some direction from the Yukon Legislature as well.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Mayo with respect to the issue of northern taxation benefits and I welcome this forum to debate the question. I have a couple of comments that I would like to make to follow up his general observations on the question of northern taxation benefits.

I would like to say, for the record, that I do believe Canada, and that means the Government of Canada, has a responsibility to the North, primarily to Yukon and the Northwest Territories, if they truly believe what they espouse about national unity, equity between the regions, and a healthy economy. It would appear to me that then they have a responsibility to develop a tax policy that will meet the aspirations of northerners' needs and aspirations. I do not think the member for Mayo disagrees with that basic underlying principle that I have just espoused. I think it is safe to say that if

Canada does not recognize it then, in effect, they are saying that the North really does not fit in to the scheme of what we see for Canada and I think it would be not only a tragedy for us living in Yukon, or the Northwest Territories, but for the Canadian economy.

I maintain that if, in large part, the economy of Canada in the future is going to rest with the northern part of Canada's ability to provide the necessary resources in order to help balance the present government economic situation, as well as provide jobs for Canadians, it is, for an example, why we on this side of the House so strongly support the controlled development of the North Slope. We believe it is in the interest of Yukon and in the interest of Canada. We view the question of the taxation of northern benefits, not from a myopic point of view, but from a point of view as Canadians, and not just Yukoners.

I think it is safe to say that we all recognize the cost of living that the member for Mayo spoke of. Things are higher, there is no question. When you take a look at our transportation costs, and you take a look at our energy costs there is also the major factor that we face here — that a lot of people in southern Canada do not recognize — and that is the fact that we get effectively, perhaps, two more months of winter than they do in many other parts of the country, which then in turn compounds our costs, as far as our disposable income is concerned.

10 I think it is important that we also recognize the fact that, at the present time, there are many people in Yukon, in particular, who have no tax credit that the member for Mayo referred to. They have not been part of a collective body, they have no representation with respect to the negotiations of what their wages might be and, therefore, they have not had the benefits that many other groups have managed to select — if I can use that terminology — or managed to negotiate through their collective agreements and been in the situation that the member for Mayo spoke of.

I think it is safe to say that, from this side of the floor, we would prefer that this question not be opened, at least at this time, in view of the recession, in view of the major economic changes that are happening in Canada and that, in turn, are happening in Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

But that question, itself, has been answered. The Government of Canada has opened the question, so we have to look at the political realities of what we are dealing with with respect to northern benefits. I think we have to also be as fair as we possibly can with respect to that particular question, in view of Canada as a whole and the financial situation that they are facing; not that they are facing it only, but what we are facing as Canadians, and our ability to pay our bills on a daily basis, whether it be on a home or whether it be to the government, which has spent well beyond their means. But that bill is going to have to be paid.

So, we look at the question of northern benefits from, I think, a practical point of view, from a point of view of what we can encourage and try to ensure will happen with the Government of Canada and will be the best interests of all people in Yukon and, in that terminology, I guess, I could say the North.

If you look at it internationally, whether it be Russia, whether it be Greenland, whether it be Australia — those isolated areas, in those countries — there are definitely programs or tax credits that are available to people, generally; not select groups of people in a particular area, but, because of the area that they inhabit, because of the fact that the governments have recognized that they want to encourage people to go there to build, to help the general economy of Canada and, more importantly, make their home there. In other words, they make a long-term commitment, not a commitment to move into, say, a bunkhouse for a month and then commute back to Vancouver, but the idea is to make the areas in those particular countries their home so they can develop a tradition, a history, a culture that is going to provide the necessary base and framework for those areas within those countries that I spoke of — Greenland, Russia, Australia — that they can build on for the rest of the country.

The time probably would come, in those particular areas, that maybe that tax credit is no longer necessary, but they see at this time, in the formation of their country, that it is necessary to have that incentive for people to move, as workers — but just as

importantly, to move their families there — and help build the country that they would like to see built. I do not think the member for Mayo would disagree with me when I say that this is what we should be striving for, with respect to what changes will take place in the policy that has been opened for debate.

In the sense of politics being what it is, the question is out in the public forum and there is going to be a decision made, there is no question.

So, I think it is safe to say that, although we agree in principle with the question of northern benefits, we have to ask ourselves, with respect to the way the motion is written, whether or not we can agree with the total context of it.

I have had the opportunity to speak with a number of the members of the committee and they have more or less told me that the basic principle that they are putting forward to the Government of Canada is universality and fair and equitable tax credit, if you like to use that terminology, for the purpose of recognition of any worker in Yukon or the Northwest Territories.

11 It would seem to me to be the fair way to go, so that everybody is recognized. And I think that, in order to reinforce the work that the committee is doing — that was set up by the Minister of Finance and there is a representative from the Chamber of Commerce — I think we should design our motion in that light; of giving them that firmer political support that is necessary with respect to convincing the present government of Canada that, if change is inevitable, the change should go in this direction, as opposed to the present change which is really "do nothing, take the money and run".

Amendment proposed

Therefore, I would propose an amendment to the motion by deleting all words after the word "that", and substituting for them: "it is the opinion of this House that the moratorium on Northern Benefits be extended until the Federal Government recognizes the value of Northern Benefits as a direct means of developing the North and a policy is developed which recognizes the legitimate value to the Canadian economy of providing special tax credits or personal exemptions to all people living in the North; and; that the Speaker forward this motion to the Government of Canada."

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Economic Development that Motion No. 37 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that", and substituting therefor: "it is the opinion of this House that the moratorium on Northern Benefits be extended until the Federal Government recognizes the value of Northern Benefits as a direct means of developing the North and a policy is developed which recognizes the legitimate value to the Canadian economy of providing special tax credits or personal exemptions to all people living in the North; and, that the Speaker forward this motion to the Government of Canada."

Hon. Mr. Lang: Just to go very briefly over the reasons for the change, and I do not expect that the members opposite will have any problems supporting this because it is fairly similar to the motion we passed a number of years ago, is basically to try to give a general principle of direction to the Government of Canada in respect of the changes that they will be considering as far as their northern taxation benefit policy is concerned. I think it is important that we go in line with what the committee is thinking, as I indicated earlier in the presentation of the amendment. What a number of the people I have spoken to are looking for is universality. No matter which part of the workforce you are, you will be recognized in those particular locations in Canada as being in an isolated area and therefore a tax credit or a tax exemption of some kind should be made available.

So, with that in mind, what I am proposing is that general principle — as opposed to trying to isolate, for example, the principle of receiving tax breaks which is corresponded to the degree of isolation. The reason I am saying that is from the perspective that, whether one lives in Haines Junction or in Carcross or in Elsa or whatever the case may be, there should be one tax break, because, administratively, let us be honest, there has to be some continuity, something that is of some standard, and which the general public can recognize and understand in order to be able to take advantage of such an exemption. I also think it safe to say that, if there are going to be changes, we cannot keep part of

the present system in place. As I indicated earlier, from our side of the House, and I think from that side of the House, a number of years ago we all agreed that the moratorium should stay and that there should not be any change in the present situation on the tax system as it now stands.

We recognize now that there are going to be changes, and I think the members opposite recognize there are going to be changes. Those changes are inevitable, and what I am saying and presenting to you is the general principle that a tax credit should be allocated for those people through Yukon and Northwest Territories and perhaps, if the Government of Canada goes that far, the northern provinces, for the purposes of recognizing that isolation. And whether you be a private businessman, whether you be a member of a collective agreement, whether you be the guy that has a service station, or working for the fellow who has a service station, or whether you be a lawyer and you have a secretary, and secretary, we maintain, should have some avenue to be able to have a recognized tax exemption or tax credit for the purposes of recognizing that the disposable amount of dollars we have is limited here in Yukon because of the fact of our high energy costs and our high food costs.

I cannot speak out on behalf of lawyers because, obviously, they know the tax laws much better than the secretary and, therefore, they probably do not pay any taxes at all. I am referring by now, of course, to the member from Whitehorse South Centre, who has his hand up!

In conclusion, what I am saying is, I think we are bringing forward a universal principle that should be adhered to and I think it should apply through all of the North for the purpose of building Yukon and Northwest Territories and making it not only a better place to live. It would ensure that we could contribute to the rest of Canada as far the wellbeing of Canadians are concerned.

Mr. McDonald: I would like to say a number of things about this amendment because this whole issue is not at all new to me.

There have been, in the last two or three years, a number of committees. This recent committee established by the Minister of Finance and called for by the United Steelworkers of America, with one person in Yukon representing us, is only the most recent committee to deal with the northern benefits issue itself. I would like to put it in perspective. There have been lots of committees and they have not always agreed with each other and certainly if, as the minister says, the position of the latest committee is to provide for a special tax credit or personal exemption for all people equally in the north, irregardless of the degree of isolation, then I will state more or less what I stated as a member of previous committees — an argument which, incidentally, carried the day in all previous committees — and that is as follows: the minister mentioned that there is a necessity for one tax break for administrative purposes. One of the reasons is that the administrative hassles of providing a policy which would affect people according to the degree of isolation would be just too unwieldy. Well, it so happens, that there is such a policy already within the tax system to account for the degree of isolation that different employees face in different parts of the country and who live under different circumstances. That policy is in effect now for Revenue Canada for federal employees. It is a fact.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Not taxes.

Mr. McDonald: So, the government leader says "not taxes". The government leader is either purposely misunderstanding what is going on here, or is just generally puzzled.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order, the hon. government leader.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not in the habit of rising when someone else is speaking. I will not have it said that I am purposely trying to misunderstand. I said out loud, "not taxes", and I mean not taxes. I happen to know that taxes are applied universally in this country.

Mr. McDonald: I wish you would rule on his point of order before we go any further, because it seems to me that it is not a point of order at all.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is correct. There has been no

point of order. Does the hon. member for Mayo wish to continue?

Mr. McDonald: Yes, I certainly do. The point I was clearly trying to make was that the federal government has a benefit range which they provide to their employees, depending on their degree of isolation in different parts of Canada. I did not mention the taxation system.

Now the issue that the minister wants to address is universality. The issue, as it was presented in various committees in the past, was that universality would damage the centres for which benefits are already being received. All those mining centres across the north - Elsa, Faro, Pine Point, Giant Yellowknife - which were the first ones in this country to pioneer northern benefits, would all have to pay a price for the suggestion that the minister is making.

The motion, as the minister states, only mentions that special tax credits or personal exemptions be given to all people living in the North. It does not say, I admit, that it should be the same, only that it should be universal. For that reason I could probably, technically, support this amendment to the motion, but I would bring to their attention once again, that those places which require skilled help, and need it to be stable — they do not want a transient workforce — require a certain level of benefit in order to be competitive with similar operations in the south. This has been something that mining companies have over and over again stressed on all those committees.

Ⓐ Their concern would not be met by a universal, equal tax credit system if the equal tax credit system did not allow that the base exemption was the equivalent to what people in these mining companies already get. If that is what the minister's suggestion is, then I wholeheartedly support it. It certainly is the case that in the NWT there have been proponents of such a proposal as both of us are suggesting today, who insist that a basic personal exemption be sufficient to meet the base level which is already being received in mining properties across the north.

So, we have to be very careful that we do not, in our design for fairness — which is all good and well and which I support — that we do not damage those industrial centres which generate the revenue and the affluence which we all enjoy.

There is one other aspect of this issue that I would like to bring to members' attention. It is that the amendment to the motion defines the value of northern benefits as being the means of developing the North and leaves the value there. It does not expand on the value and, for that, I am somewhat worried that the question of fairness, the question of equalizing costs of living for all workers in the country, would not be addressed. Certainly, developing the North is something that the native community and other people in the North have been doing for years and it is not as if northern benefits, in and of itself, is going to satisfy that aim.

The point is that all people face a disparity in cost of living which we would like to address. I believe I did address it in the original motion and I believe that the concerns of industry, of the mining industry and the concerns of other Yukoners were addressed in this motion.

I am slightly puzzled. I will take the minister's word that the committee has come up with a universal policy which could be less than what the industrial centres of the North are already receiving. If that is the case, then I will certainly be communicating my own opinions and the opinions of many of my constituents to the committee immediately. The residents of Faro, I am sure, will be more than just a little bit interested in people representing their so-called interests that would have a taxation policy which might, in effect, cause them to pay severely-increased taxes.

So, as this motion is very generally worded — it is not what I would have liked, but as it is generally worded — we can probably support the amendment.

Amendment agreed to

Motion No. 37 agreed to as amended

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 7, standing in the name of Mr. McDonald.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 7?

Mr. McDonald: Due to the time, Mr. Speaker, next sitting day, please.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

We will now proceed to government bills.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 15: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 15, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Bill Number 15, *Economic and Regional Development Agreement Act, 1983*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that Bill Number 15 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The act before the House simply provides the authority for the Government of Yukon to enter into an economic and regional development agreement with Ottawa. As all members know, such enabling legislation is required under the *Yukon Act* and this type of legislation has been used for us to enter into several previous agreements of this kind, such as the General Development Agreement 1977-1982.

More important than the legislation is the fact that the proposed agreement provides a foundation for the implementation of the Government of Yukon and the Government of Canada's two-part strategy for medium and long term development in Yukon. As all members know, in response to the immediate problems associated with the present recession, our government has undertaken a number of short term job creation programs totalling some \$27 million over the past two years. I think all members agree that the intention is legitimate in that we are trying to meet the immediate concerns and needs of the people residing in Yukon.

The agreement will provide the foundation for us to allow this government, in cooperation with Ottawa, to take a variety of measures intended to enhance and, where possible, stimulate the long term growth and development of Yukon's economy. Officials in our government have been discussing the contents of this agreement over the past year with the federal government and we are in the process of reaching a consensus on the best possible strategy and programs for the development of the economy close at hand.

Unfortunately, I am not able to go into full details of the strategy at this point. I would certainly have liked to — and I will be presenting at a later date — present more details once agreement has been filed as far as the details of such an agreement are concerned. But I would like to make a couple of comments on the various basic ingredients of the strategy we are proposing with the federal government to enter into. We are looking at measures to diversify the Yukon's economy through efforts to encourage business development. We are looking at measures to strengthen Yukon's economy through efforts to eliminate identifiable constraints and, where possible, to resource exploration and development. We are looking at measures to strengthen and further diversify Yukon's economic base through the strengthening of the tourist industry. Also, we are looking at ways and means where we can increase the participation of Yukoners in all aspects of development, primarily through the improvement of training, education and access to job opportunities.

I think we have, as I indicated earlier, reached a consensus with the Government of Canada on these fairly basic objectives, which I do not think anybody will argue with, and we are hoping that we can have an agreement signed by the end of this year. I want to stress that we are in a position, in concert with the Government of Canada, to discuss with the various organizations affected the various proposed subagreements of the general agreement — with such organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, the Yukon Chamber of Mines, Yukon Visitors Association, Council for Yukon Indians and organizations of this kind — so that we can seek ideas for programs.

One area that I want to comment on to the House is the amount we are speaking of. We are talking between \$25,000,000 and \$30,000,000 for a five-year period which, I indicated the other day in the House, is really far below the expectations that I think all

members had when there were figures such as \$50,000,000 bandied around in various circles. Therefore, we have had to tailor our objectives to the amount that we have. It is one area that does cause us concern but, at the same time, we recognize the importance of getting into an agreement so we can get on with the business at hand.

As I should point out one other concern that we have, as a government, and I think the members opposite will share this with us, and that is the question of administration. People talk about direct delivery and various levels of government and, really, one has to ask themselves what does that mean. Well, what it means, actually, in many cases, is a duplication of administration. It is called political one-upmanship, where the Government of Canada comes in and delivers the program, as opposed to the regional government and, in our case, the territorial government, where they already have the administration in place and it would not take that many more people to deliver the program, as opposed to setting up the necessary infrastructure that is required and the cost associated to deliver such a program.

I think we can work out a cooperative type of management with the Government of Canada, but I think we are going to have problems in this particular area. I harken back to the time that we had the CEDA agreement and the Tourism Subsidiary Agreement and it worked very well. Very little of that money was actually spent on administration in relation to the \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 of monies that were available for that particular program.

I think it is something that we, as a government, are going to have to watch very closely and try and keep the Government of Canada to within a very limited amount to be spent for the purpose of administration. Because, the more money that is spent there, the less that is going to be going out for various programs that the general public and the private sector can apply for for the purpose of enhancing whatever economic stimulus that we are looking at.

Therefore, I would just like to conclude by saying that I think it is a good agreement. I know that members would like me to speak until 5:30 and, if I hear a good clap around, I may well make that effort.

Applause

Hon. Mr. Lang: Thank you, thank you. That was from the leader of the opposition. It is not often that he claps for many of my presentations and I appreciate his kind response. Therefore, I would like to conclude in saying it is enabling legislation and it is a necessity in order for us to go into the final agreement. We will table the agreement once we have had it signed.

Applause

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Byblow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that was a nuisance. I am sure that members would not mind if I ran out the clock.

However, to the subject at hand, Bill Number 15, *Economic and Regional Development Agreement Act, 1983*, is, as the minister says, an umbrella piece of legislation. If I understand what he said in his rambling discourse, it will allow the government to enter into some major agreement on economic initiatives with the federal government. I believe we have waited for this bill for quite some time and, I suppose, it is fair to say that it is nice to see a beginning piece of action on this.

As the minister points out, the bill does not contain much of substance, in any descriptive kind of way, about economic initiatives and what might be planned. I certainly would have preferred to hear more from the minister on the very principles and policies that this government is putting forth in its negotiations with the federal government. He alluded to some points. In passing, he mentioned some initiatives this government has taken. I can appreciate that but, certainly, it would be a case of where we would like to debate at some length just exactly what the government is putting forth to the federal government in the agreements and subagreements being planned.

I believe the minister alluded to it and, previously, the government leader has said that one of the goals of Yukon is economic self-sufficiency. If this is the position of government, then we certainly want to know whether this objective is being supported in the planning and development programs being

discussed, being developed, being negotiated.

Again, the economic situation of the territory facing us now is, indeed, severely restricted and the extent to which we, as Yukoners, can broaden the economic opportunity, the extent to which we can expand on the training and provide for the permanent jobs, will be the extent to which we, as a territory, can develop a stable, self-sufficient form for future years.

We would have preferred, and it probably ought to have had, a much clearer statement of economic strategy so that we could continue a debate on economic programs intended by this government.

⁴⁶ We would have certainly wanted to know how the money is going to be spent. These are certainly questions by way of notice that we will be pursuing with the government. Probably, also by way of notice, we will want to know, as well, how the \$2,200,000 *Tourism Agreement*, that was negotiated since the last legislature sat, will fit into the umbrella of this agreement. We will want to know if there are any documents prepared or available to date. Specifically, we want to know what similarities there are in the up and coming negotiations to the \$6,000,000 sub-agreement that was signed some three years ago. Certainly, we will want to question the extent of public input, the extent of management review, the guidelines for the funding and certainly the caps of funding within each program.

The minister is saying that it is nearly 5:30 so, perhaps, for whatever the bill says or does not say, we certainly will be supporting it at this stage and looking forward to further debate.

Some Members: Question

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Motion No. 40 agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 28

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go onto Bill 28, *First Appropriation Act 1984/85*. If everybody would promise to be a good boy later, I will recess to 7:30 — and, girls included.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole to order. We will be dealing with the *First Appropriation Act, 1984-85*.

On Community Assistance Program, continued

Mr. Porter: Yesterday, when we were on this particular topic, I asked the minister responsible if he had appropriated any monies to the community of Teslin or received any projects from the community of Teslin, other than what they have received under the allocation of this budget.

I am informed in the terms of my discussion with the LID of Teslin that, for 1984-85, they have asked for a sewer force drain in the neighbourhood of \$2,400,000; they have asked for a garbage truck in the area of \$25,000; they have asked for, in 1984, \$50,000 for acreage development in the area of Teslin; and, for the year 1985, for \$150,000 for the development of the lots. The acreage development would include design, engineering and surveying. They have also asked for BST for two streets in the community of Teslin, in the amount of \$71,000, for Nisutlin Drive and Nisutlin Road. Also, they have asked for \$45,000 in terms of subgrade preparation for some of the roads there.

Has the minister's department received these requests and what has been the response of the department.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The question of force feed is an ongoing subject with the community. I will make it very clear right now that it is not our intention to go ahead with that project at the present

time, considering the amount of money that is required for such an installation but, and just as importantly, the cost of operation and maintenance once the project was complete. We prefer to stay with the present system we have, in view of the size of the community, because the amount of dollars that is being requested is astronomical.

I can understand their problems, but I still think the community can get by with the sewage adduct that is presently employed, to some extent.

We are looking at further lots and we will be looking at country-residential lots. It is not our intention to increase our country-residential lots for this forthcoming year. We did do six lots this past year: three sold and there are another three available. Maybe in another year's time, or whatever, depending on demand, we may well go ahead with that.

As far as the garbage truck is concerned, it is my understanding that the garbage truck is no longer operable. We have indicated to them that we would be prepared to look at that under the other heading of acquisition of equipment.

⁴⁷ I think this is an opportunity for the community to try to see if they can subcontract that particular work out to some private entrepreneur and see how it works. They have a six-month period. I would prefer to try that to see whether or not it would work for the long term of the community as far as operation and maintenance is concerned. In view of the size of the community, they would be much better off contracting for the amount of services that are required, as opposed to a city the size of Whitehorse. For example, Dawson City does that; they contract it out.

As far as BST is concerned, I indicated that I have no program scheduled for BST, but I am fairly confident that we will be able to apply BST in the community of Teslin in this forthcoming year. As you know, we upgraded a number of the streets to the standard that BST can be applied. I think that pretty much answers the member's questions. We are dealing with a number of line items here in the discussion. I think we will meet most of the objectives set forth by the community.

Mr. Porter: Another area of new development for the LID of Teslin, as opposed to other LIDs in Yukon, was the introduction this year of a municipal employees' benefits package in which there was a package given to the employees which included the long and short term indemnity, life insurance, extended medical and health care.

As I understand it, I am told that the employees are required to pay half the cost of the total package, and the LID would pick up the other half. Can the minister inform me as to how this compares, for example, with the ministerial benefits package received by the ministers of this government? Are the ministers of this government required to put in half the amount of the package that they receive?

Hon. Mr. Lang: You better check the legislation. We are not under any plan of any kind, as far as medical is concerned. I, myself, have taken out a life insurance policy but that is my own prerogative and I paid for that. As far as their municipal package, they must be working it through a private company as opposed to government because we did do a lot of work, and spent a lot of money putting a plan together at the request of AYC a number of years ago. As it turns out, we only had five employees in total in the Yukon who were prepared to go under it.

If you look at the way the legislation has been tabled, it said that every municipal employee shall go under that particular plan. Now, we are doing away with it.

Now we have indicated to the association that we feel we have gone our country mile; nobody went under the plan to any significant amount. As far as we are concerned, they obviously feel it is their responsibility and that is fine. That is where it stays.

Community Assistance Program in the amount of \$4,046,000 agreed to

On Bituminous Surface Treatment Program

Mr. Kimmerly: Where is it going?

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is the difficulty, in some respects, of voting our budget in the fall. We will be looking to the communities to see what they are prepared to have done and we will allocate our dollars accordingly.

As I indicated in the last fall budget a year ago, they were looking at probably a four- or five-year program of trying to get all of these communities up to appropriate standards as far as construction of their particular roads are concerned. Where the real dollar amount does go out of this amount is getting the roads up to a standard where they can have BST applied.

As I indicated to the Member for Campbell, we are looking at Teslin. I am positive that Teslin will be done this year. If there is some reason that it is not, I will definitely get back to the member to let him know what has happened. In view of the fact that the roads have been brought up to that standard, I cannot see any reason that they should not be done.

We are looking at Haines Junction and we will be completing Carmacks. Dawson City will have a certain amount. We will perhaps look at it because of the water and sewer situation there. We will be seriously looking at the community of Mayo as well, and Whitehorse.

So it gives you a broad outline with respect to the communities we are looking at.

Mr. Porter: I understand the minister stated that his department would possibly look at the application of BST to the community of Teslin. However, aside from their application for BST to Nisutlin Road and Nisutlin Drive, they have also requested monies to prepare additional road in the community to the point of where it could take on BST. Would the department consider this application as well?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will have to take notice on that question. If I do not get back to the member during the current session, I will get back to him in writing with respect to that particular question.

Bituminous Surface Treatment Program in the amount of \$900,000 agreed to

On Porter Creek Alternate Access Road

Mr. Porter: Has the minister considered naming this road Lang's Lane?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No. If you recall the debate I was having with the member for Whitehorse South Centre, I recognize that that is a city prerogative and I understand that, in any event, they have named it Mountainview Road.

Mr. Porter: I am sure he is disappointed.

Porter Creek Alternate Access Road in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to

On Dawson City Water and Sewer Repairs and Improvements

Mr. Porter: On the question of the Dawson City sewer and water repairs, it seems that constantly, on a yearly basis, there are monies allocated to that particular project. Does the \$100,000 that we see here represent the final amount that we are going to be seeing paid by this government for those services?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If you have a crystal ball and if all sixteen of us gazed into it, I am sure we would all come up with a different answer. I would submit to you that I would like to think that we are coming to the end of the major problems within that system. There are always going to be some problems in any water and sewer system. However, we have fixed a number of the major breaks. We feel that we have those under control and all I can do is cross my fingers and hope God goes with us; I trust that the opposition feels the same way.

Dawson City Water and Sewer Repairs Improvement in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to

On Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon

Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon in the amount of \$1,300,000 agreed to

On Watson Lake Sewage Lagoon

Mr. Porter: On this particular project, is the minister aware of any studies that have been conducted by his department, or by the federal department of health who have a responsibility in this area, in terms of looking at the question of pollution of the Liard River and its effect on the residents who may live downstream on the Liard?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, in fact, if the member goes back I am sure the information could be provided to him.

The site that was selected initially was turned down by the Water Board largely on account of that and the new site was selected from

a point of view of less chance of any pollution. Also, it was a much better area for the purposes of the topography and subsequently cost us less to put in. So, it worked to the betterment of the community and to the taxpayers in general.

Watson Lake Sewage Lagoon in the amount of \$210,000 agreed to

On Old Crow Water and Sewer

Old Crow Water and Sewer in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to
On Agriculture Development Project

Mr. Porter: I am sure that my colleague for Mayo would not forgive me if I did not stand on this occasion and ask a question as to what is the purpose of expenditure in this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I indicated to the House the other day, in my opening remarks, that the \$10,000 was for the purposes of buying what is termed a junior planter, and also to have some dollars available to do some test pilot projects on crop experimentation in different locations in Yukon. Those projects will be carried out in cooperation with the existing farmers to determine, by region, what types of crops do well in Yukon.

For the member's information, so that if he ever gets out in the wilderness and comes across a strange machine and he cannot figure out what it is, it is a machine that, in this particular case, is a seeder which would rotate and the seeds would be distributed. Instead of having to have a major job creation program of 10,000 people to spread 1,000,000 seeds, you have one machine to spread out a million seeds.

Mr. Porter: On the upcoming Cabinet tour scheduled for next year, is the minister going to take the seeding machine around with him and distribute funds in that fashion?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is a possibility but I would probably be remiss in my responsibility as junior planter with the Cabinet. We would prefer to have a senior planter which would, perhaps, be a little bit more mobile.

Agriculture Development Project in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to

On Miscellaneous Equipment

Mr. Porter: Can we have an explanation as to what is being expended in this area?

Hon. Mr. Lang: In the dollars that are available for sundry things that are necessary for miscellaneous equipment throughout the department. It would be to help out defoggers and that type of thing. It is just a pool of dollars that are available, if necessary.

Miscellaneous Equipment in the amount of \$5,000 agreed to

Mr. Falle: Before you leave, I would like to ask the minister a question about the ambulance service. I see it is \$99,000 and just recently he announced an expansion to the Carcross ambulance of \$100,000. I would like to know whether it is this budget or not. Obviously, I do not think it is.

Hon. Mr. Lang: No. I made that announcement with respect to Carcross and it does come under the ambulance services. The breakdown for Carcross out of that particular section is for a fire alarm system for all the new installations that are being put in. Also, I should point out, for the member for Mayo, in that particular section we do have dollars to finish the exterior of the firehall. I think I failed to make that comment the other day.

While I am on that particular area, I believe Teslin is going to be getting a training room on their firehall for the purposes of the community. I think I forgot to mention that. As far as the ambulance station itself is concerned, it is in the next budget, which is \$50,000, and there is also \$43,000 for replacement of an ambulance in Whitehorse so, in turn, the present one would go to Carcross for utilization in the community.

Mr. Porter: Before we leave this area, and with the comfort of the precedent set by the member for Hootalinqua, I would like to go back to fire services and ask the minister if any of the funds allocated were for the purpose of upgrading the fire service in the community of Swift River?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No. It is my understanding that that was done through the Yukon Housing Corporation, through the fire alarm system which was installed over this past year.

Mr. Porter: Is that the extent of the upgrading of the fire services in the community, a simple installation of fire alarms? Is

there any discussion in terms of putting in fire fighting equipment?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think there has been some discussion of, perhaps, further fire fighting, if you are talking about the fire extinguishers, that type of thing. But, if the member is looking at putting a fire truck in or something like that, no, we do not intend to do that.

Mr. Porter: Not necessarily a major expenditure like a fire truck but, possibly, some equipment for men in the community to use; a possible pump that can be brought in and used throughout the community, because it is not a very big community. If you located a central pump, you could reach almost all the houses in the community.

Hon. Mr. Lang: This really comes under the Department of Highways.

I should point out that there was some thought of putting some fairly sophisticated equipment in the community — and I am going on memory now — but there was advice given to us by the fire marshal that they felt it should not be put in, due to the fact that if it was not done properly it could have a major adverse affect on those people trying to run the equipment. In fact, if you are not very knowledgeable in some of that sophisticated equipment, it can be very dangerous. Therefore, the advice was to the contrary. I do not know the name or terminology, but maybe the Minister of Highways has something to add to this.

Mr. Porter: On the question of roads, streets and sidewalks, has the minister allocated any of the \$200,000 we see there towards the expenditure of upgrading the Liard-Albert Creek access road for the purpose of providing better transportation to those individuals of the community who may wish to use the roadway for the purpose of bringing out firewood in the fall?

Mr. Chairman: My understanding is, and we will let this question go through, but the things that we have voted through, we should not be going back on. Mr. Falle stepped up. I let Mr. Porter step up, but I do not think we should get back on things we have voted through. I will, however, hear Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The last thing I would ever do is argue with a powerful Chairman.

As I indicated, we had approximately \$15,000 to vote. That is a major concern I would be prepared to look at if the member writes me a letter, or gets ahold of me later on in the year when we could have a serious look at it, as I indicated to him last session.

Approximately one year ago we had the same debate, almost word-for-word, and he never did contact me. No one from the community did either. I am more than prepared to look at it, depending on the costs and what would have to be done.

Mr. Porter: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, would we not also have to clear the recovery section under Municipal Affairs?

Mr. Chairman: My information is we do not. You could ask questions about it. We do not have to clear it.

Would you prefer to go back and ask questions on it?

Mr. Porter: Under the Land Development Recoveries, which bring them in a portion of \$2,253,000, that is for sale, largely, we have seen, of lands around the communities. Somehow, I would like to bring up a question with respect to the Carmacks situation and would like to ask the minister: has his department considered selling a portion of land that is presently under the ownership of the government to the Carmacks Indian Band for the purpose of constructing houses?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The request has never been put forward to us. As far as land recovery is concerned, as far as the specific item that we are discussing here, \$2,253,000 is being asked to be voted and we intend to recover \$2,253,000. It is an in-out situation. We borrow the money, we develop the land and we recover the money back.

Department of Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of \$9,858,000 agreed to

On Department of Renewable Resources

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am pleased that we have, again, brought in a capital budget, this \$730,000, of which \$690,000 will be going towards campground development, which goes a great way in encouraging the tourism industry in the Yukon Territory. As you

see written in the detail of your book, we will be dealing with Million Dollar Falls and Pine Creek. We are going to put a protective fence at Million Dollar Falls so that the people will not be falling into the river and suing the government. We are just finishing up the work that we have doing on Pine Creek. We are finishing up, as well, on the two campgrounds in Dawson.

A significant amount of money is for Tatchun/Frenchman park; \$295,000. Generally, one of the other ones that we will be starting this year is Coal River Mineral Springs out of Watson Lake. We will be doing some preliminary work there so that we can apply for it to be a territorial park, as well. It is a beautiful area that some of you probably know, as seen on the telephone directory of a couple of years ago; a beautiful picture of the Coal River Mineral Springs. We have future intentions of having a territorial park in that area.

There is some money for wildlife interpretive signs along the highways in various areas such as The Rafters on the Dempster. Basically, it is upgrading and doing some work on our campgrounds. The funds for equipment replacement are just for general equipment that we use in the workshop and various other places throughout the territory.

Mr. Porter: In terms of the expenditure that we see here, it represents a \$20,000 decrease over 1984-85 in terms of the information that we get here. It should also be recognized that, in total, the department spent \$2,000,000 and \$36,000, therefore representing a more realistic decrease in this year's projected expenditure of 64 percent.

I would like to get into other areas of the department and specifically ask the minister with respect to the wolf management program: last year, there was an extensive program undertaken by the minister.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Point of order. We are dealing with the capital budget and not the O&M budget.

Mr. Porter: On the same point of order, I would like to ask the Chair if I am restricted to simply asking questions on those items as presented by the capital budget and am I being told that, in general debate on the Department of Renewable Resources, I cannot ask questions about the entire operation of the department?

Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding that the O&M relates only to capital expenditures and that is what you want to discuss now.

Mr. Byblow: I am confused. The minister is indicating that the point raised by my colleague for Campbell...

Mr. Chairman: Not the minister, the chairman.

Mr. Byblow: The minister objected to a point raised by the member for Campbell that cited a capital expenditure during the course of this year. It had nothing to do with O&M. The capital supps tabled in the House last week indicate the expenditure of \$2,000,000 and some, and that is, I believe, capital, and that is what I believe the member was referring to. That should not be outside the parameters of debate.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If the member wants to debate the supplementaries, we are dealing with the supplementaries next. This is the capital budget and if he wants to debate the capital budget, it is my position that he should either be debating the capital that we have budgeted here or make comments about previous budgets. But, if he wants to talk about supplementaries, the supplementaries are coming up next.

Mr. Porter: Those comments that I have and in respect of the overall management of the program which fit in with the supplementary estimates that we are going to be receiving later on in the legislative program. I will then restrict my comments to those areas.

Mr. McDonald: I certainly have some questions regarding this capital budget and the campgrounds and parks development.

First of all, a preliminary question. The minister mentioned that the Tatchun Park is going to be given the \$295,000. Is this the entire cost of this park and, if not, how much else is expended elsewhere towards this project?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, it is not the total cost of this park. We have, already this year, budgeted, I believe it is, \$490,000. This is another \$295,000, which brings it up to \$785,000, which is approximately slightly over one-half of the total projected cost of

the park before it is finished.

Mr. McDonald: That answer satisfies me. It leads me to the next question, which is campground and park development and planning.

I guess, to get started, perhaps the minister could give us a rundown of why the government felt that a park of this magnitude would be best placed here and why the government felt that \$785,000 was a necessary expenditure for this park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The reason for the park is because we feel that we need to develop recreation areas in this territory and this is only one of the many areas that we hope to develop. Kusawa Lake, for example, was another one that we have applied for. Over a period of time, we have applied for 12 or 15 different areas for territorial parks.

Tatchun Lake and Frenchman Lake are others. I think the member for Faro can attest that it is a very heavily-used area even by the people of Faro. It is a very nice area for a recreation area and it is central in the Yukon Territory and it is on a road that is highly used by the tourism industry, so it would be very advantageous for us to develop that area.

There are a great many things besides just campgrounds. There are agate showings, for example, in there for rockhounds; there are other areas of historical and archeological benefit to the people of the territory that they can also look at. It is a beautiful area for a recreation area and one that we feel should be developed.

Mr. McDonald: I realize that it, like many other areas in Yukon is a beautiful area for people's use and it would be nice to have this kind of park development elsewhere; however, we are spending \$785,000 so I guess it warrants a little bit further questioning.

I understand that the park itself is going to entail the construction and development of the extra campgrounds. The minister suggested that there is a highly-used road eight kilometres from the park, if I am not mistaken. I am wondering whether or not the minister has any information that would convince anyone that the park will be used, even though it is adjacent to a highway.

Perhaps, beyond that, he could tell us what the Yukon Visitors Association's input was in this park development.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I suggest that the member for Mayo ask the member for Faro whether the area is used or not and whether they would like to see it developed. I can assure you that the people from Carmacks want to see it developed. The Yukon Visitors Association want to see it developed. The people from anywhere on the Klondike Highway would like to see it developed. What they want to do is keep tourists here for a while, and not have them drive through in one day. That is the reason why we are also developing the Moose Creek Campground and that is why we have concentrated an awful lot of money in the last year on the expansion of the campground in Dawson City.

We have not done very much in campground development on the Klondike Highway between Whitehorse and Dawson. It is now time that we developed that area as well. That is where the major part of the tourist travel is going in recent years.

Mr. McDonald: The minister repeated, in so many words, that the park development was beneficial to people in Carmacks. I am wondering to what extent that is true. We do know that there is a road that was adjacent to the park itself. I am wondering what information the minister has that people will stay in that park. I am sure the minister knows that common sense would tell us all that putting large parks throughout the territory any place does not necessarily hold tourists in the territory. Does the minister have information that in fact tourists find Carmacks a satisfactory destination point, or do they travel beyond Carmacks in their daily travels.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I find it incredible, listening to the fellow across the floor. Obviously, he does not know very much about the tourism industry. The road we are talking about is not adjacent. The park runs between the Campbell Highway and the Klondike Highway along the old river valley with the Frenchman and Tatchun Lakes in it. It has a road going right through it that joins the Klondike Highway and the Campbell Highway and it runs right through what will be developed as a territorial park. No park,

except perhaps someone who is going to Kluane Park or to Nahanni Park, is a destination area in most cases. It is something that the people stop and see when they are going through. We are not building national parks here, we are building territorial multi-use parks.

In the future, there will be hiking trails; there will be cross-country skiing trails. It will be developed as a park that not only will be used by tourists, it can be used by local people, and that is why I say that it is very beneficial to the Carmacks residents, to the Pelly Crossing residents, to the Faro residents, and it is also central in the Yukon Territory and it joins two highways that tourists will be travelling, so it is advantageous for the Yukon Territorial Government to build a park in that area to try to keep some of the people around for a day or two longer.

Mr. Porter: In summation, I hear the minister stating that the park is designed to attract tourists and visitors to a particular area and that he would see that the establishment of a park being in the long term strategy of bringing tourists to that particular area of the Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, exactly as the proposal was to put the park in Carcross that the people in Carcross turned down. It was to try to bring people to that area. It is the same reason why we would develop Kusawa Lake Park, just to try to bring people to the area, keep them there for a day or two, so they spend a couple of extra bucks. That is the name of the game in tourism.

Mr. Porter: Will the minister not further agree that the attraction of tourists to a particular area would result in substantial benefits locally to those businesses that operate in the tourism field?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Nice try, David.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is fairly obvious what the member is trying to get to, and he is alluding that I am trying to line my own pocket. Yes, that is the reason why we want them there.

We want them there for the people's benefit, so that people can work and we can provide jobs for people, and we can develop the tourism industry. You know, the accusation is always made, I guess, that every dollar that goes into a businessman's pocket stays there, but 95 cents of it goes out into someone else's pocket. It takes a businessman to bring the money in and if the member is alluding to my trying to line my own pockets, why I am quite willing to sell my business to him or to his Indian Development Corporation any day of the week.

Mr. Porter: In conclusion of that particular point, is the member still an operator of a tourist-related business in the area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I am an operator. I am an owner. I do not operate it, but I do own.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: And not only that, but it is declared.

Mr. McDonald: I would like to get back to this but there is a line of questioning that I think emanates from the minister's recent statements. The minister said, to paraphrase, that the purpose of campground development is to bring people to an area and keep them there a little bit longer; bring tourism to the area, benefit the businesses, create jobs, create tourism in the area, and I personally believe that those sentiments are admirable.

However, when it comes to the Mayo campground, things seem to be slightly different. When I approached the minister to discuss the possibility of expanding the five to six lot campground in Mayo, which is, incidentally, the only campground east of Stewart Crossing, the minister said that there was nothing there, that we did not really have anything to offer the tourists. Yet here we are talking about something which is completely revolutionary, in a sense, of bringing people in for the purposes of enjoying parks in and of themselves. Can the minister suggest why a place like Mayo, Elsa, Keno, the whole district east of Stewart Crossing, is only able to keep its six lot campground, which is, incidentally, eroding into a river; keep that, and watch at the same time the tourism dollars get plowed away and salted away into very, very large park developments in the neighbourhood of \$785,000?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is all relative. I want to contradict the statement that he made that I said there was nothing for tourists there. I never made that statement under any circumstances. What I said, and what I have said, is that I have personally visited that campground on more than one occasion in the summer time. My

departmental people have also visited on quite a few occasions to check the numbers of people who are using the campground. Even the six site campground, which, incidentally, is a fairly nice campground, one that I would not mind staying in, is not even fully utilized. It hardly justifies building a new campground in an area where the existing one is not utilized.

I am fully in agreement with the member that we would like to develop tourism, and so is the Minister of Tourism. We would like to develop tourism in that area. They have now formed a tourist association in that area, which the Minister of Tourism will be working with. I certainly am quite prepared, when there is a need, to put a campground in there, and to make it a major priority to have a campground in that area.

Mr. McDonald: As the minister is prepared to flatly contradict me, I am perfectly prepared to, in all justice, flatly contradict him about the utilization of that campground. As a resident of the area, I know for a fact that people do use that campground and locals used that campground regularly. The point that I was trying to make before, however, was not that particular point, but that is a good point that I can make, too. The point that I was making before was that the utilization of the so-called park development at Tatchun is zero at the moment because nobody is going there at the moment. We are talking about large park development, which the minister suggests will bring tourists to the area and will keep them there. People will come there, not because there are any historic sites or various sights to see but will, in fact, come there because they want to just be there.

On that principle alone, surely we can accept that we might want to develop at least satisfactory campground facilities in an area such as the entire Mayo-Keno-Elsa district.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just wanted to make a point here, and I think the member for Faro would bear this out, that the Frenchman area, as far as the possibility of a park and campground is concerned, was put forward by that community quite a number of years ago and, incidentally, on a continuous basis. So, it is not strictly there to serve the people of Carmacks; it is there to service the people from Faro, as far as the local clientele are concerned.

To say that we should not have the nice multi-purpose type of park in that particular area — halfway between here and Dawson City — and get a day to two days more stay of tourists, I think is very nearsighted on the member for Mayo's point of view. I think that the member for Faro would bear this out. It is ideal for the community of Faro to get a nice type of installation in that particular area.

Mr. McDonald: The minister, for some reason, wanted to misquote me. I did say, previously — and I am sure the Minister of Renewable Resources will bear this out, if he remembers — that we like to encourage that kind of park development and we like to encourage it elsewhere. We are talking about a division of dollars here and we are talking about an expenditure of \$785,000. As I said before, the only campground facility east of Stewart Crossing is one six-slot — actually it is five-slot, six-slot if you use the public area in front of the urinals — site. So, what we are talking about is a very small campground and the people of the area, as the minister knows and as I have let him know and as I am sure people in the area have let him know, the campground itself is not adequate; it simply is not adequate. People do use that campground. People feel that if there were more slots, more tourists would come.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I want to clarify two things: number one, the campground in Mayo is not over-utilized, it is under-utilized. It is very seldom ever, ever full. Number two, there are two campgrounds in the area that we are developing this territorial park in that are now full all the time. The member for Faro can attest to the fact that the Frenchman Lake campground is almost totally useless. In fact, his community is one of the biggest complainers about that campground. If one would take the time, I could pull *Hansard* out from last year and we can raise what the member for Faro said in *Hansard* last year.

I would also like to say that, regardless of what the member for Mayo says, it takes money to develop a territorial park; it takes money to develop campgrounds. When he can show me that there is a need for a campground in the Mayo-Keno area, I am quite

prepared and willing to go to my Cabinet colleagues and have a campground put in that area.

Mr. Byblow: I think the member for Faro has been prompted to his feet by the ministers opposite, in the hopes that the member for Faro will correct their confusion on matters regarding the proposed Frenchman Lake campground.

I want to confirm that some of what the ministers are saying is correct, but there is nothing in contradiction to what my hon. colleague for Mayo is saying. The people of Faro have made a request for improved facilities at the Frenchman Lake campground. The facilities at the Frenchman Lake campground have been improved in the last couple of years and, yes, it is correct that the people of Faro have requested improved facilities.

I think what the member for Mayo was making as a point was that we have had an arbitrary decision of an expenditure of ordering \$750,000 in an area of Yukon, and unlike what the government leader suggests, rather undemocratic, and this is the point that was questioned.

I want to talk about the Frenchman Lake campground for a moment. The minister indicates that the campground will service a large area because it is at the crossroads of two major highways. The minister says that the campground will serve the adjacent communities of Carmacks, Faro, possibly Ross River and, perhaps he mentioned some other. I want to ask the minister why did he feel the need to build a park facility with three additional campgrounds beyond the one that exists? Three additional campgrounds, in other words quadrupling the available campground space in that particular area to the exclusion of other areas that are equally as suitable and would serve as great a tourism purpose, such as the campgrounds that the hon. member for Mayo refers to? Why that big, this time, now?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: A very simple answer: what we have now is over-utilized. We need new campgrounds in that area, as the member himself has even admitted. We do not have over-utilized campgrounds in the area that the member for Mayo is talking about. As I stated, when and if we can find that we do need to build there, we are quite prepared to build there. We are now building between Whitehorse and Dawson to try to upgrade the campgrounds on the Klondike Highway and that is a program that we will be continuing.

Mr. Falle: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Falle, would you sit down, please. Mr. Byblow.

Mr. Byblow: The minister has really not given me an answer as to why he has built or is proposing to build a campground with 60-70 spaces when, by his own statistics, 20 or 30 would have done and the additional cost that is being incurred on the development of that facility could now have been used to upgrade campgrounds that are so sorely needed in other areas of Yukon and that is not to the exclusion of future development of the Tatchun Lake and Frenchman Lake campgrounds.

I want the minister to justify to the House now why that great expenditure to the exclusion of other campgrounds. Why not a phase-in process at Frenchman, as well as the development of some critical campgrounds in other areas of the territory?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: When a member stands up to speak, I wish he would say the truth. I did not use any statistics that said we only need another 20 or 30 sites. Nowhere did I use those statistics. What I have said is what we do have is full to overflowing. We need new campgrounds in that area. We need campgrounds for the people of that area. We have people camped in gravel pits all over the place in that area.

The member across the floor does not even know how many camp sites are going in there. I do not know how he can stand up and say four times, or two times, or five times — what we are developing are small campgrounds; we are not building great big monstrous campgrounds, we are building little campgrounds with 10, 15 or 20 sites in them so the people will not be all crammed together in one campground, and so that they can utilize that vast area there, a very enjoyable area, that will probably keep them there for an extra day or so. That is the name of the game; that is what we are doing. And when we are finished that one, and we feel we have enough done in that area, we will also move on to the others.

This is not the only campground we are working on. We are working on quite a few of them.

Mr. Byblow: Is the minister trying to tell me that he is going to have 60 or 70 stalls in the Frenchman/Tatchun Lake area filled to capacity in the next year when the construction is completed? Is he trying to tell me that that is going to be filled to capacity, and is that his justification for going ahead with the total, full development now? I do not completely understand the minister's justification and rationale.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am really surprised. The member across the floor calls himself a businessman. We are only going to build what we need today. We need two rooms on his hotel so we are only going to build two. He is full every day but he has only got one extra guy walking in, so he is only going to build two rooms, rather than utilize what you have to make it more efficient by building enough for an extra two or three years or five years down the road rather than build what we need today, and then go back tomorrow.

The members across the floor continuously talk about economic development and long term planning, and then when you do something that is long term, they criticize. I wish the members across the floor would make up their minds where they are coming from.

Mr. Byblow: I think I would like to tell the minister where we are coming from and where he certainly is not coming from. He just tried to cite business statistics, and I just heard him, moments ago, trying to sell his hotel. I would not use some comparisons of a business in his arguments for justifying a campground.

The minister talks about long term planning. Well, that is what we talk about, too. And when we talk about long term planning, we talk about planning that takes place over time serving the greatest number with the available dollars and facilities that we can put in place.

Now, the minister has not persuaded me, or anyone in this House, that three-quarters of a million dollars at its disposal is best spent in that particular location.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Believe it.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, we have been trying to believe this government for a long time and we cannot even get them to table documents ...

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Byblow: I still want to hear from the minister. Mr. Chairman, am I to sit down?

Mr. Chairman: No, you are not. That is enough of this heckling. Proceed, Mr. Byblow.

Mr. Byblow: I want the minister to tell me, clearly, why he is building 60 to 70 sites in the Frenchman/Tatchun Lake area to the exclusion of required campground facilities elsewhere in the territory.

In terms of planning, you can do all of these things over a length of time. You can develop the Frenchman Lake requirements because, yes, I agree with the minister that it is over-facilitated or under-facilitated right now for the need — and perhaps in this recession year it is not, but the need will be there. Yes, the minister has to upgrade Frenchman Lake and, yes, expenditure in that area is good expenditure but, at the same time, we have just heard the arguments that there are other expenditures for other campgrounds in the territory of a more critical urgency.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Who said? In who's opinion?

Mr. Byblow: We have just heard the member for Mayo cite the need for a campground in that area and I can cite, to this government, the need for a campground improvement at Tutshi Lake which is also over-used and on many nights does not have adequate capacity and, yes, does force people into the gravel pits and into the community, which is another improvement that has to take place.

I am suggesting to the minister that expenditure in the Frenchman Lake area is certainly in order, but I want him to justify the three-quarters of a million dollars that he is putting there now, to the exclusion of other sites.

Mr. Byblow: At the same time, perhaps he could answer why it

was done so undemocratically as well. To my understanding, there was no consultation with the band, there was no consultation with YVA prior to the decision and that is quite confirmed. I want the minister to justify on the one hand the expenditure to the exclusion of other sites and to the nature of the development in its undemocratic fashion.

Mr. Falle: I believe I am going to let the minister answer this one.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member across the floor should have his facts right before he starts standing up mouthing off. He is wrong. There was consultation. There is a need for the campgrounds. We have a staff of people who deal with campgrounds. The member for Mayo can stand up and say he needs a campground, the member for Faro can stand up and say he needs a campground. We have a staff of people who deal in campgrounds. That is their job. They know where the campgrounds are needed. We build the campgrounds where we feel they will be of the most benefit.

The member for Faro also knows that this year, and that the statistics of the Department of Tourism will bear me out on this, that there are a lot more motor vehicles going along the highway. There are a lot more campers on the road every year. Those campers need to stay in campgrounds. Those campgrounds need to be developed on roads where the tourists go. We do not need to develop campgrounds on roads where the tourists do not go. We need to develop them on roads where they do go. We have to put them where the demand is and where the use is. We do develop campgrounds in other areas in order to facilitate tourism in the area, but when there is a campground there that is under-utilized, it does not justify another one. As far as Fish Eye Lake goes, that is not a campground. There is a campground at Drury Creek. There is a campground down the other way, towards Watson Lake. We are not concentrating on minor campgrounds. We are developing major campgrounds throughout the territory at a distance apart where tourists can utilize them.

Mr. Porter: On the question of consultation, I would like to ask the minister: did he consult with the chief of council of the Carmacks-Fort Selkirk Indian Band prior to making a decision to install an upgraded campgrounds and also develop in the park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes.

Mr. Falle: As far as undemocratic goes, I do know that one of the sites was in Carcross, in my riding, and it was very democratic. The people there just basically said they did not want it and Mr. Tracey listened to them. He was democratic. The people in Carcross said no. That was no.

Mr. Porter: Just to bring the members back to the debate, we are talking about Frenchman Lake and Tatchun Lake and the proposal there.

In terms of the campground, did the minister's office offer the Carmacks Indian Band a contract proposal to slash and to upgrade the roadways into the park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I do not believe we offered them a contract proposal. We did guarantee them that we would provide work for the local people in the area. We would not guarantee that the Carmacks Indian Band would get exclusive work. We said that we would hire the labour within a twenty-five mile radius of the campground and naturally, the majority of the labour are native people, and it is the majority of native people who are now working on Tatchun and Frenchman Lake campgrounds.

Mr. Porter: If I understand the minister, and to be very clear for the purposes of recording this, there was no contract offered or discussions of a contract to the Carmacks Indian Band for the purpose of slashing and clearing and upgrading roadways in the park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Not to the best of my knowledge. I do not believe there was a contract offer. There may have been some discussion about a contract but, to the best of my knowledge, there was no contract offer. My major concern was that the local people worked on the project and it is local people who are working there.

Mr. Porter: Did the Pelly-Fort Selkirk Band also ask the minister for funds for the campground which is situated near their community?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would just like to, for the record, make it clear that we are talking about the development of six campgrounds in the territory. I have been sitting here for the last 35 minutes listening to a discussion of one specific campground and, for the record, I think it is apropos that it be read into the record that we are talking about the major development of projects at Million Dollar Falls, Pine Creek, Tatchun-Frenchman Lake, Yukon River, Coal River Mineral Springs and Kusawa Lake Campgrounds. I think it is really important that the people of the territory who may read these votes and proceedings, who may read *Hansard*, recognize that what we are talking about is the development of a number of campgrounds in this territory, not just Tatchun-Frenchman Lake.

Mr. Porter: I would like to repeat my question to the minister. Did the Pelly Band ever approach the minister for funds to use on the campground located in the community of Pelly Crossing?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, there was a mention made, I believe, at one time when we were there about the campground there. What we have done in that area is turn the existing small, little camping area there, which is actually the bridge head where we did have some tables and barbeque sites, and such, over to the Selkirk Indian Band. We told them that they could have it, because it was our intention that if they did not take it, we would close it down.

As I stated earlier, we are developing major campgrounds at areas along the road where tourists would enjoy stopping. We cannot afford to keep the small campgrounds that we have operational. It costs too much money to maintain little three and four stall campgrounds in the areas. We have to develop major campgrounds and the three or four stall campgrounds or the ten-stall campgrounds in the communities, we would hope that local entrepreneurs would pick up the slack and develop their own private business.

Mr. Porter: So the minister is stating that, in terms of the Pelly Indian Band, they have never requested monies from his department for use on the campground near Pelly Crossing. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Not to the best of my knowledge, they have not. As I said, there was one person who mentioned it to me that I can recall. There may have been some contact with the department, but I am not aware of it.

Mr. McDonald: To correct the record one little bit, we are not talking about one campground, we are talking about three campgrounds at Frenchman-Tatchun Lake. We do, of course, realize that there are all kinds of campgrounds going up. The problem is that we feel that a preponderance is going up at Frenchman-Tatchun Lake.

Now, the minister failed to answer a couple of questions that my colleague for Faro asked and perhaps he would care to do so now.

With regard to consultation with the Yukon Visitors Association, perhaps the minister could just tell us briefly when and how this consultation took place. I believe that the minister suggested that it had taken place and I would be interested to know just when and how it did.

Mr. Chairman: We will recess for 15 minutes after Mr. Tracey has answered this.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I did not state that consultation had taken place with the Yukon Visitors Association. He threw the consultation with the Yukon Visitors Association in with the consultation with the Indian band. I said consultation had taken place. It is not obligatory for the Department of Renewable Resources to consult the Yukon Visitors Association as to the best spot for a campground. The Department of Renewable Resources is quite aware, in conjunction with the Department of Tourism, where the traffic is and where they need to be developing. I am certain that the Department of Renewable Resources, who have the responsibility for campgrounds, know much better where the campgrounds should be than the Yukon Visitors Association does.

Mr. Chairman: We shall recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole back to order. We shall continue with general debate on Renewable Resources.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I recalled a letter I had from the YVA in support of the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Park, and during the break I talked to my deputy minister as to whether we had consulted the YVA, and he informed me that, yes, we have. Some of my people had gone to the YVA and they are very happy with the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Park proposal and they are in full support of it.

Mr. Byblow: I think the minister is quite correct in the way he put it just now. The question was whether or not he had consulted with YVA prior to making the announcement of the go-ahead for the Frenchman Lake project, and I think that is correct as well. YVA was not aware of many details of the project until after they were announced, at which point they invited the minister's department to make a submission to the YVA and that took place and the details were explained.

There are a couple of details that I would like to know about that project. As I understand it, there are going to be three additional campgrounds in the Frenchman/Tatchun Lake area in the proximity of 15 to 25 stalls apiece. The road through, as the minister explained, follows the corridor or river basin of that valley. My question to the minister on a specific is: what type of entrance information is intended for that park? Will there be attendants in the park? Will they be at one entrance location? Will the information be distributed from that point, or will this be taking place from Carmacks? In terms of administration and surveillance of the park, what are the planned personnel and details of that?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think the member should be aware that we are not, right at this time, putting the total park in there. Number one, we have to get a land transfer from the federal government. Number two, there is a great deal more development that is necessary in order to call it a territorial park. What we are actually building now is campgrounds, but those campgrounds are all part of the total park complex, or will be ultimately, when it is finished. Ultimately, the headquarters for the park, if and when we complete it and get all the land turned over, will be in the neighbourhood of the Five Fingers Rapids area.

If there is any maintenance facility required for the park, it will be at the Campbell Highway end at Frenchman Lake because there is power available there.

That is ultimately how it will be designed. There will be a park headquarters overlooking the Five Fingers Rapids. That will all be part of the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Park, which will be a very, very excellent tourism development area.

What we are concentrating on right now is building the campground facilities that are needed for the Klondike and Campbell Highways.

Mr. Byblow: What the minister describes sounds like a very elaborate, and what should be a fairly appealing, park over the long term. Perhaps I could enquire of the minister a timeframe relative to the total package. We are talking about \$750,000 being spent on campground upgrading. This obviously does not include park headquarters. This obviously does not include some of the intended trails and wilderness exposure facilities. What is the \$750,000 going to be spent on and what timeframe are we talking about in terms of the total project?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The three quarters of a million may involve some trails. I do not exactly know if it will now or not. But we have, as I stated earlier, a very good rock outcropping in that area with agates that rockhounds are after on a continuous basis. The major expenditure that we are incurring right now is not campground development, it is road development. We have to upgrade the road in order to facilitate the development of the campgrounds that are necessary. So, regardless of what the members think — that we are spending a great deal of money on campground facilities — that is not true. The major cost is in the road upgrading. Ultimately, as I said, the total project will cost about \$1,500,000 and that will include all of the trails, it will include a bridge that is necessary on this road and it will include the park headquarters and whatever else is necessary. What we are concentrating on right now is only campground development and access to them.

Mr. Byblow: The minister now refers to the total project being \$1,500,000, which obviously includes the headquarters and the

total development of the park in terms of its wilderness exposure vis-a-vis trails, hiking and so on. With respect to those facilities required for the traveling public, are the facilities like laundry facilities, gas and oil facilities, going to be located in the park or is that intended to be a business service provided out of Carmacks?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We do not put business facilities in any of the proposed parks. That is private enterprise. What we are providing is a campground area, remote park area, something that the people can enjoy, multi-use, and we expect the businesses in the area to garner the benefit of it, which they will pass on to all of their employees. Ultimately, 95 percent of it goes back into the economy in some manner or another. That is the long and the short of it. We are not in the business of supplying business facilities in a park. The member for Faro himself is going to benefit greatly from it, no doubt.

Mr. Byblow: I would be curious how, in Faro, that I would head for Frenchman.

Could the minister give me an idea of the approximate acreage of the total park. Now, he described earlier that it is, in effect, a triangular shaped, longitudinal structure of boundaries. Can he give an idea of just how much acreage or hectares it is going to encompass?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, all I could do is hazard a guess. It is approximately 20 miles long, I would think, in total and an average of a mile and one-half wide. Probably, thirty-five or forty square miles at maximum.

Mr. Byblow: Can the minister indicate if, at this time, there is no problem in this land becoming a park? I am asking that in light of any potential land claims or other encumbrances on the property.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, there are some areas in the Tatchun-Frenchman Lake area that are lands claimed by the native people. That land is excluded from the park and does not form part of the park unless the native people want to put it into the park.

The access through any of the areas, as members may be well aware, has to be guaranteed. There is already a road through there and access has to be guaranteed through the native land. Whether they want to develop their land — which, incidentally, is a great chance for the native people in the future, if they want to develop businesses — they have their own private land right in the park that they can develop.

But, yes, there are some problems with parks. As I said, we have to get the land from the federal land and, in order to do that we have to develop a management plan for the park, a master plan for the park, and all of that will have to be done before we can finalize the development of the park.

Mr. Porter: The Carmacks Indian Band has just recently signed an overall agreement-in-principle with respect to aboriginal rights in Yukon. Part and parcel with that, the agreement-in-principle concerned itself with specific land selected in the Carmacks area. Can the minister clarify whether or not some of the land selected by the Carmacks Indian Band falls totally within the boundaries of the park? Does the park, in some instance, totally surround lands selected by the Carmacks Indian Band?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, it does, but it makes no difference. They are guaranteed access to the park the same as we are guaranteed access to their land. The road is there and we are guaranteed access through it. It is no different than if you or I owned a plot of land out in the 'boonies' somewhere and they decided to build a park around it. That land still is private property.

Mr. Porter: In the consultative discussions that the minister says he had with the Carmacks Indian Band, was that particular point one of contention and has the Carmacks Indian Band accepted the fact that there is going to be a park and have they supported the concept of a park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, there has been consultation and, yes, they have accepted it. As I told the members earlier, the majority of people who are working on it right now are members of the Carmacks Indian Band.

Mr. Porter: In the minister's view, does the creation of a park surrounding the private land enhance or downgrade the value of the real estate that is within the boundaries of the park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would say that it greatly enhances the

potential for the land that the natives have claimed in the area.

Mrs. Joe: I am just going back to some information that the minister had given us on what was in the park area or the campground, or whatever he prefers to call it. He mentioned that there were archaeological areas in there, along with some historic sites.

The question I would like to know is if, in fact, the minister did have prior consultation with the Yukon Historical and Museums Association with regard to those sites or areas within that campground? I seem to remember, at a meeting in Carmacks last spring, I think it was, that there was concern from some of the members of that group that they were not advised or consulted prior to the announcements being made by the two ministers at that time. I would just like to know if they were, with regard to those archaeological areas and the historical sites and, also, if he could tell me if there is any provision for the protection of those archaeological areas and historical sites?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I will answer the last one first. Obviously, if we are creating a park, we are protecting the area.

²⁰ We also did consult with the native people. The native people have given us some of their concerns regarding one area where we planned to have a campground. There was some study done on that area. I believe that they have moved the campground to facilitate the concerns that the native people had in that area.

There has been a great deal of consultation going on, regardless of what some people have heard, or whether they think there has not been. There has been a great deal of consultation.

Mrs. Joe: I was asking, with regard to the Yukon Historical and Museums Association, if there was prior consultation with that group? I also asked what provisions they had for the protection of those areas? He did not answer me.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There will be, as I stated earlier, a master plan drawn up. At that time, we will be dealing with the archaeological area. We are not dealing with the archaeological areas right now; we are dealing with campgrounds. As I said, if we have a territorial park there, and when the boundaries of the park are finalized, when we are dealing with the master plan, all of the archaeological areas will be looked at as well. Meanwhile, how can you protect an area more than to set it aside as a park?

Mrs. Joe: I would like to know, if the minister can tell me, what consultation he has had with any archaeologist with regard to any potential sites in the campground area at this time. Is he consulting with them first, to find out if those areas are there?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I believe that my campground development people have consulted with the archaeological people. I could not guarantee that, but I am fairly confident that they have. The issue has been raised and had to be answered.

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the minister. The minister suggested, when answering a question put by my colleague from Faro, that perhaps not all of the campground slots in the proposed campground would be used in the immediate future; we had to look and plan ahead. We had to look two or three or four years down the line when we are developing these campgrounds. This is what long term planning is all about.

If we look at the Mayo campground for example, is the minister suggesting, by not expending funds in the Mayo area, that, after having looked two, three or four years down the line, they may still see no value in expanding that campground?

Some hon. Member: Good question.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We have identified an area in the Mayo area where we will ultimately put a campground. If the land has not already been set aside, it will be set aside for a campground. That does not change the fact that there is no demand for the campground at this time. There is not enough tourist demand to facilitate putting a campground in the area. As I said, and I will say it again, when there is a demand, we will put a campground in there.

Mr. McDonald: Of course, as many times as the minister stands up to state that the campground is not utilized, I will stand up and say the campground is utilized and we can both continue to vocally disagree with each other. I certainly will not get tired of stating my case.

The minister said that in time, a plot of land near Mayo will be

allocated for a campground. Can he say what plans the department has for that particular piece of land: where the land is, how many slots they are planning there and whether the land is near water, some of the specifics?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No. I do not feel that I should make that statement right now because I do not know if the land has been set aside yet and by making a public announcement, maybe someone else will decide that they need the land worse than we do. As far as what the specifics are for development, that is something that is done with the park planners and it has not been done to this date.

Mr. McDonald: If the minister does not want to announce, in general at least, where the land is going to be, can he announce what they are planning in the way of park development? What size of campground are we looking at? I am looking for something that is a little bit more specific, because in all honesty, I find it very hard to believe that the minister is being serious when he suggests that there will be a campground there in the near future, so I would like ...

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Is the member across the floor calling me a liar?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. McDonald: The minister does all he can to incriminate himself. I do not have to say anything.

Just to tie this one point down, then, even though Mayo is one of the biggest ridings in the territory and even though it only has a five-and-a-half lot campground, it, in the next couple of years, will not be receiving any funds for development of a campground, or campground expansion, because there are other funds in the neighbourhood of \$1,500,000 which are going to suck up the money so that such a campground expansion cannot be done. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Obviously the member across the floor does not listen. There is no sense in me saying any more about it.

Mr. McDonald: I got the answer I needed.

We have just dealt with the one campground. It has taken up one-and-a-half hours. Let us get on to the next campground.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I must have to insist that this talking back and forth across must stop. Let the speaker speak when he is up. At least let him have the floor.

Mr. McDonald: We are, of course, planning to spend here \$730,000. If the minister thinks that this is a waste of time — I am not saying he does, if he does — in one hon. member's terms, I have a problem with that.

First of all, the Moose Creek campground was announced as being developed. Is there partial funding for the Moose Creek campground and can we identify any of that funding in the \$730,000 and, if not, is the funding that is already received the total funding that is going to be allocated for that particular project?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, there is no money in this budget for the Moose Creek campground. I could not say one way or the other whether there will be any future money for Moose Creek.

Mr. McDonald: By that, is the minister saying that the current project for Moose Creek is going to be completed under the current funding that is being allocated for it?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Maybe I should get a colouring book out for the member across the floor; yes.

Mr. McDonald: I will not take any cheap shots. I will confine my questions to the matters at hand. The minister mentioned the Million Dollar Falls. He mentioned that there will be a protective fence to protect the government from being sued by people who might fall into the lake, or something. Perhaps the minister could tell us how much this particular project is worth?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is somewhere in the neighbourhood of approximately \$75,000 to \$80,000.

Mr. McDonald: Is the \$75,000 to \$80,000 just for the fencing?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, there is some trail development, as well.

Mr. McDonald: The Pine Creek Lake Campground, the minister suggested, there was work finishing; is this the end of a large project and, if so, how much did the project entail, in total?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, that is the finalization of a larger project. If he wants to know the figures, he should consult his last

year's capital budget.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McDonald, are we finished with general debate? You seem to be going on to specific projects.

Mr. McDonald: Yes.

Mr. Byblow: I have a general debate question because it may be excluded once we get into the line item.

My question to the minister stems from the reference that major developments are the six groupings of campgrounds, as identified on page 53 of the capital budget book. Given that these are the developments which are receiving the majority of the funding, are there other campground that are receiving specific initiatives in upgrading?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, that is in the operation and maintenance budget.

Mr. Byblow: Am I correct in assuming that, of the \$690,000 being spent, all of it is towards these six groupings of campground projects?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I should correct myself. We do have in here approximately \$100,000 for upgrading and maintenance on various other campgrounds in the territory. The six that you see outlined there are the major campgrounds that we are working on. The money that is budgeted for other campgrounds could be spent on any campground in the territory, depending on need.

Mr. Byblow: In the case of budgeting \$100,000 for campgrounds at large, at this time, is the government aware of where those initiatives are going to go or is that going to be an ongoing decision as the season approaches for their use?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I just answered that question.

On Campground and Parks Development

Mr. Byblow: I wanted to ask a specific question on the Kusawa Lake campground. That is, obviously, a case of upgrading what was a campground that was ruined in a slide. Can the minister advise the amount of expenditure being spent and to what extent is the upgrading going to take place? What restoration, in terms of numbers of campsites, condition of road entrance and through roads, is taking place?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The restoration work that will be done on the campground — approximately two-thirds of the site is useable — is do some maintenance work, divert the creek and put it into one channel, and clean the road through there so that we have access into the area. Some of the campground will probably never be used, but the majority of the money needs to be spent in order to stabilize what we do have there; build a channel and put the creek into a channel.

We have spent very little of that money because what we are doing is having an engineer look at the mudslide area to see if it is likely to be sliding again. None of the money will be spent until we are confident that we will be able to upgrade that area and have a campground there for some time, rather than have a mudslide come down and take it out again.

Mr. Byblow: The minister anticipated my next question, so I would like to ask him a question about the Coal River Mineral Springs Campground. Is there anything beyond campsites that is intended for that facility?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There are no campsites intended for that facility. It is to do a site study and look at the whole area and try to put together a proposal of how the whole thing should be laid out, and where campgrounds should go, if they do. What it is, really, is planning.

Mr. Byblow: Is the Coal River Mineral Springs Campground the only one in which initiated planning is taking place of the six?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, but all the campgrounds are planned before they are ever developed. Million Dollar Falls has already had a plan. Pine Lake has already had a plan. The Tatchun/Frenchman plan is continuing; part of the plan is done. There has been a plan for the Yukon River Campground at Dawson. We are working on a plan for the Coal River Mineral Springs. There is already a plan for Kusawa Lake.

Campground and Parks Development in the amount of \$690,000 agreed to

On Resource Planning and Wildlife Equipment

Mr. Porter: Can we have a more specific breakdown as to the areas of expenditure in this particular section? What, exactly, are we talking about in resource planning?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We are talking about things that are needed in the campground and in the renewable resource area. We are talking about a trailer to haul heavy equipment, tables and chairs and stuff that we need around. We are talking about money for replacement of outboard motors, some laboratory equipment, a couple of replacement snowmobiles, big game bear traps, and things like that.

Resource Planning and Wildlife Equipment in the amount of \$40,000 agreed to

Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$730,000 agreed to

On Department of Tourism

Mr. Chairman: We will now turn to the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources on page 55.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: In view of the time, I would move that Mr. Chairman report progress on Bill No. 28.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Penikett: I would move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Brewster: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 28, *First Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I would 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 9:25 p.m.

The following Legislative Return was tabled November 2, 1983:

83-3-31

Re: Yukon Hydro (Lang)

W.Q. No. 14

The following Sessional papers were tabled November 2, 1983:

83-3-25

Transport Public Utilities Board: Annual Report 1982/83 (Tracey)

83-3-26

Electrical Public Utilities Board: Annual Report 1982/83 (Tracey)