



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 34

3rd Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

Thursday, November 3, 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 Penkett	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****Thursday, November 3, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

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

*Prayers*

**DAILY ROUTINE**

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any returns or documents for tabling? Reports of committees? Petitions? Introduction of bills? Notices of motion for the production of papers? Notices of motion? Statements by ministers? Are there any questions?

**QUESTION PERIOD****Question re: Canada-Yukon Subsidiary Agreement**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a non-controversial question to the government leader this afternoon. It refers to the March 1982 amendments to the Canada-Yukon Subsidiary Agreement on renewable resources which, in three of its five points, deals with questions of audits. Could I ask the minister, as the minister responsible for internal audits or as the Minister of Finance, if he could give any reason or explanation for these amendments to the audit procedures?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We have run into a problem with respect to audits of that particular agreement. We operated for about two years under what we thought was one set of rules. Then, we found it necessary to change the rules, at this point. What we are having to do is provide audited statements to the Government of Canada with respect to the cost-sharing of these agreements. We are working on that and I am confident, in the final analysis, everything is going to work out just fine. The major problem, of course, is that it directly affects our cash flow because we are not getting the money as quickly as we thought we were going to get it. However, I am confident, and I want to assure the leader of the opposition, that from everything that I have been able to ascertain so far, with respect to the audits, we are going to be able to participate fully in the cost-sharing.

**02 Mr. Penikett:** I thank the government leader for his answer. Perhaps it is appropriate today that I should express my understanding that we should be caught between a change in the rules.

Could I ask the government leader, just to further clarify the thing, with respect to the sums of money that we have received under these agreements and the audits of those funds, if any question been raised by the auditor about the nature of the Yukon government's expenditures? Has that been an issue of dispute or is it just audit rules?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, there has not been one question about the nature of the expenditures. That is why I am confident, in the final analysis, that it is all going to be worked out.

**Mr. Penikett:** One final, brief supplementary on this question: can the government leader indicate if, as a result of this problem, there has been any substantial impediment or blockage in the flow of these funds to this government?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, in fact, what happens is we expend the funds in the normal course of events and then we make claims for that money to come back to us. As I said, in answer to the initial question, this has caused somewhat of a cash flow problem, or it did cause somewhat of a cash flow problem, last spring when cash flow was a problem. Cash flow is not as much a problem, at this point in time, so, although we have not gone back, or relaxed any, in our efforts to get this cleared up at the earliest possible date.

**Question re: Cyprus Anvil**

**Mr. Byblow:** I, too, have a question for the government leader, resulting from some rather interesting viewpoints I read in the local

paper last night by the government leader.

The government leader, at a point, speculated that if someone were to buy Cyprus Anvil it would go into production immediately. Upon what basis does the government leader make that assessment?

**03 Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Common sense. I doubt that anyone would buy Cyprus Anvil and not put it into production.

**Mr. Byblow:** I believe that is a chicken-egg question.

What discussions, could I ask the government leader, has he had with the current Cyprus Anvil officials that may indicate a positive outlook towards a return to full production at Faro?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I was at Cyprus Anvil during the course of the fall and had a very good briefing, from the resident manager, along with my Cabinet colleagues. There is no doubt in my mind that Cyprus Anvil intends to go back into production on the schedule that is now laid out for them, given that the stripping project is completed.

I did not get any indication from the manager that it is possible that Dome would go back into production sooner, but I have also heard some rumors about a number of mining corporations and consortiums in Canada that have exhibited some interest in buying that particular property from Dome. As I said, it would just be common sense that they would be going into production if they were to buy it.

**Mr. Byblow:** I admit that I share the optimism of the government leader.

Besides the standing offer to purchase Cyprus Anvil housing, which I believe may not exist anymore, does this government still have any specific plans of assistance to encourage a return to production, such as previously mentioned in the area of recreation and with regard to the mine road?

**04 Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Oh, yes, all of those offers are still in place. With respect to the purchase of housing, we have not removed our stated intention to purchase housing from Cyprus Anvil when we need it after they are back in production.

**Question re: Alcohol statistics**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the government leader, concerning the alcohol statistics he has and no one else has, are the statistics broken down as liquor store sales and after-hours off-sales from private establishments?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** As I indicated, in reply to the motion that was tabled yesterday, we have a requirement to table, in this legislature, an annual report of the Yukon Liquor Corporation. In that report it is required that there be certain statistics. I anticipate that we will meet the requirements of the legislation and table that report at this session of the legislature.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Has the government considered comparing off-sale figures with comparable figures in other jurisdictions?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** There is absolutely nothing stopping the member opposite from comparing those figures. Frankly, I have not compared those figures.

**05 Mr. Kimmerly:** Does this government have any policy in the area of the extent of off-sales purchases in high crime areas?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not believe that we have any off-sale figures. In thinking about how we sell liquor to our customers from our warehouse, I cannot recall that there is a requirement for them to report back to us how much liquor they may or may not sell with respect to off-sales. I do not think that we ask for that.

**Question re: Wildlife Advisory Committee**

**Mr. Porter:** My question today is for the minister responsible for renewable resources.

The minutes of the Wildlife Advisory Committee, dated September 8th, 1983, recommended that the bull moose season be restricted in 1984 to September 10th to 20th in sections of game zone seven. Is the minister seriously considering the suggested changes?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If we did not seriously consider the recommendations of the Wildlife Advisory Committee, we would not bother having them.

**Mr. Porter:** Further, in the minutes of the Wildlife Advisory Committee meeting, there is a recommendation that cow moose

harvest for 1984 be terminated in Game Zone Nine in the Teslin burn area. Does the minister intend to terminate cow moose harvesting in 1984 for the Teslin burn area in Game Zone Nine?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As stated in this House previously, it is very likely that the cow season will be closed. That is a public statement that I have made on more than one occasion.

**Mr. Porter:** Earlier this year, the Department of Renewable Resources announced the extension of moose hunting season for trappers into the month of January. As the minister is aware, many bull moose drop their antlers by January and the game regulations state that antlerless moose cannot be harvested out of season. My question to the minister is: should a trapper take an antlerless bull moose, would that trapper be in violation of the *Wildlife Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes. While I am on my feet, I recognize that there may be a problem and that is one area that my department will have to investigate.

#### Speaker's ruling

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. For questions of that nature, asking legal advice, they ought to be ruled out of order. I let that one pass.

#### Question re: Health hazards of video display terminals

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the government leader. In January of this year, the Public Service Commission established a committee to study the health hazards of video display terminals. Could the government leader tell us if the committee has submitted any preliminary reports concerning its research.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have not seen anything, to my recollection. I will raise the issue with the Public Service Commission at the earliest possible moment.

**Mrs. Joe:** The committee has also indicated that a questionnaire would be developed for internal distribution. Could the government leader tell this House if questionnaires will also be distributed to other effected groups?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am sorry, I just do not know.

**Mrs. Joe:** Could the government leader tell this House how this government is now dealing with complaints from YTG's staff concerning the health hazards of VDTs.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I was not aware that we had any complaints.

#### Question re: Hiring of crew for Moose Creek campground

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Yesterday, in answer to a question regarding the firing of people working at the Moose Creek campground, the minister said, "a supervisor was on his way to hire a new crew". Will the minister state whether the government is prepared to hire back the fired workers?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Number one, I did not say that they were fired; I said that they quit. They had not showed up for work and they quit. Number two, that would all depend on whether the departmental personnel felt that it was justified to hire them back.

**Mr. McDonald:** That brings me to the next question. Can the minister tell the House whether the department has had any luck hiring a new crew and, if so, will the new crew be given room and board at Stewart Crossing?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not know, I do not run my department on a daily basis. I leave that up to the people who manage the department. Also, I do not know whether they would provide room and board or not.

**Mr. McDonald:** I was hoping the minister would be on top of this serious situation.

Is the minister aware that there is no supervisor, safety or otherwise, on the job at Moose Creek campground while the men are working with chainsaws for at least eight hours a week. If he is aware of that, what remedial action is his department taking to provide for safer conditions for the workers?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Contrary to the statement made by the member across the floor, there is a supervisor.

#### Question re: Homeowners' grants

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question to the government leader in his capacity as Minister of Finance.

At its general meeting, the Association of Yukon Communities retained a resolution on the homeowners' grant deductions, which requested that homeowners' grants be amended to permit individual communities to deduct the grant at source and invoice the Government of Yukon for reimbursement. Since this would eliminate many unnecessary costs and provide the taxpayers with immediate benefits, has the Department of Finance reviewed the legislation in that light and has the government leader discussed possible changes to the legislation with the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We have reviewed, and are in the process of reviewing, the legislation with respect to those recommendations. We have gone so far as to get information from all jurisdictions that we know of that use this type of a system. We are hopeful that we will be able to amend our legislation to make it easier and far more direct for people to get these grants.

**Mr. Penikett:** I thank the government leader for his answer.

I wonder if he could just briefly indicate to the House if he has any kind of timetable for a decision point on this legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The object, of course, would be to try and get the legislation in place for the grants that become eligible next year. I would suggest that, in order to do that, we should have the legislation at the spring session.

#### Question re: Post-secondary education grants

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is to the Minister of Education and it relates to designation of colleges for post-secondary grant awards. Can the minister briefly advise the current procedure to establish a particular institution or school as a designated and eligible institution for grant awarding? This is with respect to institutions that are not recognized or not on the Canada student loans list.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** First of all, just to indicate to the member why grants are refused to colleges or universities that are not designated, the Student Financial Assistance Committee adheres strictly to the legislation and in the legislation it states that they must be designated universities or colleges. If they are not, the grant is refused no matter how many times they reapply.

If it is not a designated university or college and an application for a grant has come forward for that particular college, the Department of Advanced Education will look at the particular college and review their schedule. Upon reviewing their schedule, if they find that the courses and programs are transferable within that province or state or country, or wherever the college happens to be, they will then look to see if other areas in the province or other provinces or other states have designated that college or university. If it has been previously designated, then, usually, the area that is asking the question designates it themselves, if they so choose.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister made reference to the school or institution having been previously designated. Could she explain what that means because if this jurisdiction, Yukon, has not recognized a particular university, obviously there is not a case of designation.

If some other credited area or university has recognized it — say, another province had recognized that college as a designated college — then we would have no difficulty with that because some previous province or state had designated it. We would probably designate it also.

**Mr. Byblow:** I will not enter into debate. Can the minister advise whether government policy to review and designate an institution that is not on the Canada student loan list is the same for another country institution as for one in Canada?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I know that it is the same for the United States. We presently have 73 designated universities and colleges. They had 62 last year. Some of them are in other countries like Germany and France. I do not know if it is a reciprocal arrangement on their part. I am just sure of the arrangement that we have on our part, in Canada. If the member wishes to know, I could bring that back for him.

#### Question re: Alcohol statistics

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Again, to the government leader concerning the alcohol statistics he has and no one else has.

Has there been a community-by-community per capita comparison to determine local consumption levels?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure. I regret that the minister responsible for the liquor commission is not here. However, if he has asking me if I have seen any in the last week or two, the answer is no.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Has there been any analysis to compare sales levels in communities where there is a government liquor outlet with communities with none?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I respectfully suggest to the member opposite that, if he really was interested in the answers to this line of questioning, he would have submitted the questions either as written questions or would have given notice of the questions. He has done neither and I am unable to answer them. I very much regret it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** That is all coming. Has there been an analysis of the figures available to him, but not to me, to determine the extent of off-sale purchases on Sunday?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No.

#### Question re: Game charge

**Mr. Porter:** Again, to the minister responsible for renewable resources. Earlier this fall, a woman who has lived in the Yukon for 67 years, was charged for taking an under-curl sheep in the Haines Junction area. Not only did she lose the meat and horns, but she was fined, her license suspended, put on probation and ordered to do community work. Does the minister agree with the facts as presented?

#### Speaker's ruling

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. If you are asking an opinion of the minister, that would clearly be out of order. Perhaps I will allow the hon. member to rephrase his question. However, an opinion asked of a minister is not in order.

**Mr. Porter:** It should also be noted that the woman in question brought the sheep for measurement and it was found to be one-half inch under curl. In these kinds of cases, is there any room in the policy of the Department of Renewable Resources that calls upon the conservation officer to use discretion?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Naturally, the conservation officers should use some discretion. However, the sheep was under-curl. It was an illegal sheep, and we have laws and the laws were followed. If I was in that situation, I would have certainly taken everything into consideration. Perhaps they did take everything into consideration and decided that the charge should be laid. He is asking me to make a value judgment on a situation that I am not aware of and did not participate in.

**Mr. Porter:** Has the minister any knowledge of an individual who may have not been charged under the same guidelines and laws of the *Wildlife Act* for harvesting an under-curl sheep?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No.

#### Question re: Small debt court

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the acting justice minister. I understand that the small debt section of the territorial court is short-staffed at present and has been for two weeks. Could the acting minister tell this House why a temporary placement has not been made to accommodate this essential service?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** I will look into that matter for the hon. member.

**Mrs. Joe:** Since the shortage has caused some serious problems, could the minister report back to this House on Monday to let us know if the problem has been solved and that the small debts court is operating and accepting cases?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** No, not on Monday.

#### Question re: Agricultural land dispersements

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. The minister has made it clear that an unspecified amount of

territorial lands are being dispersed by the government for agricultural purposes. Is the government accepting and approving agricultural land applications for territorially-owned lands within communities?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Not to my knowledge.

**Mr. McDonald:** Perhaps the obvious question under the circumstances is why they are not accepting agricultural land applications for territorially-owned lands within or partially within communities.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I really have no knowledge of how many or if any applications have been put forward within the boundaries of any one community. I do know that the City of Whitehorse is prepared to entertain it and, of course, it would be a requirement of zoning. Zoning changes would have to be made and would have to be done in consultation with the communities, which the members opposite, like myself, believe is important. Therefore, there are a number of steps that would have to be taken in any case.

**Mr. McDonald:** Given the minister's last answer, are the guidelines developed by the Agriculture Development Council for distributing lands within communities the same as those for distributing lands outside of communities?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It would seem to me that, in most part, they would apply. It has not been brought to my attention that there should be any changes.

#### Question re: Yukon Gazette

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a very, very, very serious question to put to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The October 15th edition of the *Yukon Gazette* informed us that the Yukon New Democratic Party had been struck off the Societies Register and "deemed to have ceased to operate in the Yukon Territory". Since this organization filed the required documentation within the minister's department within the prescribed time period, can the minister explain to the House why he has abolished my political party?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** They probably want to put the right name on it: the No Development Party!

No, there was an error, and it has since been corrected.

#### Question re: Alcohol statistics

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Again, relating to alcohol statistics available to the government but to no one else. Has the government studied the recent Northwest Territories' experiments and their influence on total alcohol consumption there?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I realize that the member opposite has a tough time knowing and remembering who is responsible for which department and so on. He has been told the reason why the minister responsible for the liquor corporation is not in the House this week. It was my understanding that he agreed and supported the reason that he is not in the House, and now he is asking all these questions.

I, frankly, will not even take note of those questions. I think they should be submitted as written questions or he should wait until the responsible minister is here.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Concerning government finance, has there been an analysis concerning the effect on government revenue of cutting down the available hours for liquor purchase?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Oh, yes. It is something we have looked at before and we determined that, not from a financial point of view but, rather, from a service point of view, it was going to be counter-productive to cut down the number of hours.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would ask the minister responsible for social services: has there been an inquiry made of the Northwest Territories situation concerning the savings to social welfare agencies of reduced hours of off-sale liquor?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** I am not aware of anything like that, but I would respectfully submit to the member opposite that we are the Yukon Territory and I would like him to ask me questions about the Yukon Territory, not the Northwest Territories.

#### Question re: Carmacks Indian band house construction

**Mr. Porter:** I have a question for the minister responsible for municipal affairs.

The Yukon government has recently imposed a stop-work order

on three houses that are being constructed by the Carmacks Indian Band. I understand that the minister and his officials are attempting to negotiate an acceptable arrangement with officials from the band and the Department of Indian Affairs. Are those discussions presently being held and can the minister report progress?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think the member answered his own question. I understand there are some discussions underway and, hopefully, it will resolve the situation. We are not looking for confrontation; it is safe to say that the National Building Code should be adhered to not only for the safety of the future occupants of such housing, but also for the safety of people who are working close by.

If the member opposite is advocating that the National Building Code should not apply to one segment of the population, I cannot understand that. It does not make any sense to me. It is there for everybody for the purpose of safety and also for the wellbeing of the community, as well as the people living in close proximity.

**Mr. Porter:** The band contends that the land on which they are building is land that will eventually be theirs at the conclusion of the land claims process. Presently, those lands are being held by the Yukon government. Is the minister and his government prepared to negotiate a transfer of these lands to either the federal government or the Carmacks Indian Band?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I should point out that the member opposite forgot to say that one of the houses was being built on a piece of property that is privately owned, at least part of it is on private property and the other portion is on a YTG lot. Obviously, unless the member opposite is prepared to buy the private holder out, there is a problem there.

As far as the remainder of the land is concerned, we are entering into discussions with them and, hopefully, we can come to a resolution.

**Mr. Porter:** The sheep in question could be under-curlled, but the Minister of Renewable Resource has a full curl in his mouth and the little guy from Porter Creek is doing all the snarling today.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member wishing to ask a question?

**Mr. Porter:** The question is: is the minister optimistic that an agreement, with respect to the problem with the band in Carmacks, can be negotiated very soon?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Hopefully, the people with whom we are discussing the problem will be prepared to come to some successful conclusion of the problem. We are looking for solutions to the problem, as opposed to what the member opposite is always looking for, which is confrontation.

#### Question re: Alcohol consumption analysis

**Mr. Kimmerly:** A Yukon question to the minister responsible for social services.

Has any analysis of the recent Pelly Crossing experiment with a liquor outlet been done to learn if the availability of liquor affects the abuse problem?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** If the study is being done, I am sure when it is complete I will be apprised of the situation and will be able to answer that question at that time.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would ask about this possible study: Is the effect on child welfare budgets, concerning Pelly Crossing, being studied?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** Not to the best of my knowledge.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Has the government analyzed the effect of the liquor outlet experiment in Pelly Crossing and crime rates in Pelly for the same periods?

**Hon. Mr. Philipson:** All I can say to the hon. member opposite is that the people are so busy driving between Stewart Crossing and Carmacks now that they are otherwise engaged.

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

#### Recommittal of Bill No. 14

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Pursuant to Standing Order 59(5), I move that the motions for the passage and third reading of Bill Number 14, *Financial Administration Act*, be rescinded and that the bill be

recommitted to the Committee of the Whole for the purposes of reconsidering clauses 40, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 87.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that the motions for passage and third reading of Bill Number 14, *Financial Administration Act*, be rescinded and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of reconsidering clauses 40, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 87.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am requesting the indulgence of the House to reconsider several sections of the new *Financial Administration Act*, which has already been given third reading and passed out of the legislature. I very much regret the necessity for having to take up hon. members' time with these matters, but I think everyone will agree that it is preferable to do so at this stage, while the new act is still fresh in everyone's mind, to ensure that the act in its final form is complete and acceptable in all respects.

The first point pertains to an omission which occurred between the time the bill was approved by the Cabinet and the time it was printed for presentation to the legislature. This refers specifically to Section 87 of the *Financial Administration Act*, which was a consequential amendment to the *Housing Corporation Act*.

Hon. members will notice that the new subsection (2) of Section 17 of this act is essential to preserve the authority of the House to approve expenditures under Section 17(1) in an appropriation act. This requirement is contained in the present housing act and it is important that it be in the amended section. Similarly, the new section 17.1 is necessary in order that the investment provisions of the *Housing Corporation Act* are consistent with the arrangements being made for the Workers Compensation Board.

Without question, the most exasperating changes that I am asking you to consider are with respect to sections 40, 47, 48, 49 and 50. In each of these sections there is a reference to authority for the Executive Council member to invest and to borrow. It has been pointed out to us by federal officers in Ottawa that these sections are offensive because they conflict with the powers of the Commissioner in section 19 of the *Yukon Act*.

It will be no doubt be of interest to hon. members to refer to these archaic and antiquated sections, in which federal legislation obliges the Commissioner, and apparently no one else, to handle the borrowing and investments of this government. It would be positively amusing if it were not so utterly ridiculous to expect the Commissioner to attend to all functions and responsibilities wherever his name appears in either federal or territorial legislation. I need hardly point out as well, that it illustrates in the most striking way possible, not only the lack of understanding of the day-to-day operating requirements of the Yukon government, but also the ignorance, as well as the arrogance, of people half a continent away dictating how we are run our own internal affairs.

My final comment is that we are looking forward with increasing anticipation to the day when authority over the public servants in question will be in the hands of people who have some understanding of what it is like to live and work in the north and sufficient imagination to understand the fundamentals of true democratic federalism.

The changes that we propose in the offending sections are simply to remove reference to the Executive Council member and to deal with those powers and responsibilities in an impersonal way. It will not, in any case, remove from the Executive Council member the responsibility for administration of the act, including loans and investments. I would recommend that the House dispose of this ridiculous matter with as little waste of time as possible.

**Mr. Penikett:** I just wanted to rise and say that my side of the House will be cooperating in this exercise, which is unfortunate. I think it is unfortunate especially because we appear to have been put in this position by the federal officers referred to by the government leader. I understand that they did preview the legislation before it came to this House; previewed it in a late draft and found it satisfactory at that point. Subsequently, after we had done the work and debate and discussed the matter in the House and in Committee they reviewed the legislation and found it wanting. Everybody makes mistakes but one would hope that the people who make the mistakes would, from time-to-time, be held accountable. On this occasion, it seems to us that we are the ones who are having

to suffer the inconvenience and conceivably even the embarrassment of this having happened, rather than the people who might have put us in this position. We will cooperate without any impediment in effecting the necessary changes.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have just been advised by the Clerk that there is an amendment to section 52 that I did not refer to, either in the motion, nor in my notes in reply to the motion. It is sections 40, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 52 that are to be amended. It is the same amendment as all of the other sections.

**Mr. Penikett:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. We would be pleased to deem that a typo, if that is acceptable.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to government motions.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### Motion No. 39

**Mr. Clerk:** Item number one, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

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

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that this House is of the opinion that the placer gold mining industry has played, and will continue to play, a fundamental and important role in the political, economic and social development of Yukon; that this House is of the further opinion that the proposed Yukon Placer Mining Guidelines would have the effect of greatly reducing the level of placer mining activity in Yukon, which in turn would have a serious negative effect on Yukon's economy and; that this House urges the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to refrain from implementing the proposed guidelines in their present form and, instead to adopt measures consist with the principles of land use and protection of the environment that will sustain the viability of the industry and encourage its development and growth in Yukon.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am pleased to address this motion of fundamental importance to all Yukoners. Our position on this matter cannot be repeatd too often or too definitely. Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind; we support the development of placer mining guidelines which sustain the viability of the industry and promote its growth, while simultaneously addressing environmental problems and concerns.

<sup>13</sup> This is a most practical and reasonable approach to the matter of regulating the industry. The role of placer mining in Yukon's development is well-documented and has been eloquently chronicled on many occasions. However, it does bear repeating, if only briefly.

Mining has played a significant part in Yukon's political, economic and social evolution. Placer miners have, for decades, made substantial contributions to our society, to our economy and to our constitutional development. In its formative years, with little or no assistance and against all odds, they built Yukon. They worked the creeks, they raised families, they ran for office, they went to war, they invested time, energy and resources in Yukon; they struggled, they contributed, and they stayed. It is absolutely no different today. Placer miners make the same valuable contributions to Yukon that their predecessors did. Placer mining has contributed extensively to Yukon's economy. Whether a large number of people are employed on a claim or simply one or two individuals are involved, placer mining has always provided employment and is seeing a number of people through the present economic recession. This industry is responsible for the injection of a considerable amount of money into the local economy. It is a fact that placer miners were the only working miners in the territory until the recent partial reopening of the Cyprus Anvil and United Keno Hill mines. All along, placer miners have relied upon local businesses for goods and services. The money placer mining generates has been reinvested in Yukon many times over.

The bulk of the evidence presented at the hearings established that mining activity would drastically decrease should the proposed

guidelines be implemented. For the reasons already stated, this is totally unacceptable as the economic ramifications of such action would be negative and far-reaching.

On a tour of the placer mining claims this summer, the Minister of Renewable Resources and the Minister of Economic Development witnessed first-hand the miners' ongoing struggle to maintain their operations. Fears were expressed repeatedly that the proposed guidelines would force many miners out of business. My colleagues were, in turn, deeply concerned, knowing full well that reductions in the level of placer mining would negatively affect Yukon's economy in both the immediate and the long term.

As a government, we took those apprehensions into account in presenting our position to the Yukon Placer Mining Guidelines Public Review Committee.

As further evidence of our commitment to the mining sector, we have programs in place to assist the placer mining industry: the Northern Exploration Facilities Program and the Improvements to Roads Program are but two. We know where our responsibilities lie.

The proposed guidelines must be reconsidered and a number of related matters reexamined if the placer mining industry is to survive. The regulations finally approved must be acceptable to both industry supporters and opponents. They must be realistic. Intelligent choices are required for the future or a major component of Yukon's economy is at risk.

Our statement to the Review Committee identified two key issues which require examination. Firstly, the legacy problems of existing placer operations must be addressed. The immediate concern is identifying which creeks are suitable for mining and which ones should be reserved for other resources uses. Secondly, we must ensure that our planning and management model does not promote such polarization of opinion and confrontation as has characterized the placer mining question in recent months. We should suggest that our proposed long term planning and management approach will serve well the placer mining and fisheries interests in Yukon.

Many observers have characterized the debate as a fish versus gold conflict. This is an oversimplification and misrepresentation of the issue. The question is really one of how best to plan and manage our resources. We cannot afford to promote one at the expense of the other. Both placer mining and fisheries are vitally important to Yukon's socio-economic and environmental chain. We recognize that the environment must be protected from the adverse effects of mining; however, the guidelines must be practical. They must not be permitted to cripple an industry which has been the mainstay of our economy and whose potential is still great.

<sup>14</sup> I am confident that regulations can be drafted which are acceptable to all Yukoners and I urge all members to support this motion so that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is made aware of our concerns.

Thank you.

**Mr. McDonald:** I think it is appropriate that the House express itself on this issue now that the Placer Review Committee Public Hearings are almost over. The controversy surrounding the proposed implementation of new placer guidelines galvanized Yukon for at least three months this summer at its peak. The issue itself has been on the burner for some time, for some years.

One year ago last summer, after the territorial election and long before the details of the new proposed guidelines were made public, many placer miners in my own riding expressed fear of the much talked about but never seen guidelines that were scheduled to emanate from the federal government.

Rumors hit the creeks about possible guideline changes and, gradually, the miners and a large number of friends and supporters began to realize that whatever the guideline details happened to be, there was going to have to be a fight. There was going to have to be a well coordinated, well researched, clearly presented presentation if they were ever going to sway or persuade federal officials or the, largely innocently, ignorant Yukon public that the value of the industry to Yukon's economy was significant and that the miners operated under some natural and technical constraints, which would not allow some of the anticipated guidelines to be achieved.

In early September, 1982, some placer miners, large and small

operators, attended a public meeting, at my request, in Mayo. As a hardrock, underground miner, I felt that I was in a poor position to really understand the technical difficulties of the placer gold industry and, for that reason, required direction.

Let me just read briefly from an account of that meeting. The message from the meeting was that there are significant problems that face the placer industry, which have nothing to do with mineral prices. Federal regulations governing placer operations were felt to be not only illegal at that time — which was prophetic, in a sense — but also unrealistic. They expressed frustration in not being consulted by government officials regarding the imposition of regulations and, furthermore, they felt that their contribution to the discussions would be valuable as it was only they who actually worked on the creeks.

A great many specific complaints were expressed, including silting standards, the amount of paperwork necessary for making applications, and for what were thought to be unreasonable fishery regulations. Furthermore, they felt that while reasonable water resource regulations were necessary, they disliked working in an illegal environment where policy in force lacked legislative backing.

Placer miners urged the government to make major efforts in the future to ensure the survival of the industry and to ensure that policy initiatives reflect the placer industry's right to exist and to flourish.

That meeting was followed by a series of visits by myself to placer mining operations to gain a clearer understanding of the industry itself, followed by meetings with representatives of the Chamber of Mines in Yukon and Dennis Watson, the then regional director of the federal northern affairs program. I will admit that the subject of my Whitehorse meetings was confined to the politics of the situation and the idiosyncracies of the decision-making process and did not contain a lot of technical content. However, the guidelines were not public and were not to be made public until 60 days prior to the commencement of review panel hearings.

I expressed displeasure at the arbitrary decision, but was told that the decision was final.

When the proposed guidelines hit the public domain, things began to happen. A meeting was called in Mayo, which identified six points and which were to remain main points of contention throughout the summer and into this fall. The first was that the guidelines were illegal, that was a consistent complaint; too much technical information was required prior to the start-up; the bonding provision was unattainable in most cases; professional consultation required in some instances was too expensive; C-class streams with one-sided mining was unrealistic; and, finally and probably most importantly, the effluent standards were unattainable. The miners were prepared to do everything reasonable to protect the environment, including some rehabilitation, but simply could not support regulations or guidelines which would be technically unfeasible.

Many people eventually made presentations to the placer hearings and many issues were presented. Miners and conservationists presented highly technical presentations.

Both groups took their time and did reasonably good jobs and individual miners around the territory spoke of their real life experiences and their desire to stay in business. I believe I would do a disservice to the many points made if I were to attempt to relate them here. Time certainly does not permit members in this House to always fully substantiate a claim and sometimes only the rhetorical points are made. The bottom line is that there is no question that gold mining activity would be greatly reduced as a result of these guidelines. That is unacceptable.

That it would have a negative impact on Yukon's precarious economy, goes without saying.

A federal minister, in our opinion, has to be sensitive to the political reality in this territory and while there may be room for some disagreement on specific aspects of the guidelines, the bottom line is that Yukoners want the placer industry to remain viable and to prosper. We need a sound data base from which to begin development of reasonable guidelines and we need to be prepared to accept innovative solutions to insoluble problems, should they exist. By this, of course, I mean promoting, perhaps, the corridor

concept, the establishment of fish hatcheries or perhaps the encouragement of communal tailings. I could speak for hours on this subject and I will simply end by saying, yes, we support this resolution and trust that the federal minister will demonstrate sensitivity to Yukon's special problem.

**Mr. Falle:** Placer mining in the Yukon is, to me, a lot more than an industry. It is part of the Yukon's culture, it is part of our heritage. Something that Yukon and the people of Yukon hold pretty close to their heart. Gold, I think, to the Yukon is as much a part of the Yukon as wheat is to the prairies.

Most small gold miners are small family operations. There are a few big operations in the Yukon but the main investment in Yukon comes from small family operations. The spinoffs on investment goes around the Yukon many times. I think this summer the Yukon placer miners had placer bucks, they called it, and just about every dollar that was spent in the Yukon, at least in Dawson, had a placer mining buck onto it, just basically trying to show the impact that the investment of the money that came in on jobs as well. Jobs, I think, were something important in the Dawson area. I know of over 100. These people were paid the going rate and as far as I know, the spinoff in Dawson was tremendous.

On the new proposed guidelines that the federal government is talking about, it was very interesting for me to appear before the panel. Before me sat an expert in the environment and an expert in fisheries. There was no mining expert to ask any questions of. To me, that showed exactly what the federal government thought about the mining industry. They seemed to refuse to treat the mining industry as a competing resource. It really makes me worry. One of the things that really bothered me when I was before the Yukon placer mining guidelines committee, I guess, was that, to me, just as an individual plus as a miner, fish and the environment seemed to be held in higher regard than the people who were trying to make a living. It seems to me incredible when a federal government really thinks more of fish than it does of people. There are a lot of people in the Yukon that will be hurt very badly if the new proposed guidelines go through as they were. I certainly hope that the federal government has the common sense and the good judgment to put guidelines forward that the miners themselves can live with.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would like to enter the debate briefly to emphasize a particular point on the subject. I believe my colleague for Mayo gave something of a chronology or history and an assessment of the process on this subject, and certainly the speakers opposite have reinforced the deficiencies of the process that has taken place. The previous speakers have also reinforced the notion that arbitrary imposition of the placer guidelines would have a serious impact on Yukon's economy. In fact, there is even yet some question as to the real extent of that negative impact should the regulations be put into place. It is this arbitrary process precipitating the kind of uncertainty that we are facing now that I want to talk about.

There is an appearance to me that the federal government believes it is satisfying a democratic process by calling for the public input process which we have just undergone. It has declared a harsh set of guidelines to be implemented and, by dictating a compliance schedule to go along with that, it seems to believe that it is softening the blow of the guideline imposition. This process, while having the appearance of being democratic, is actually something much less. The gesture seems to have been more token and heavy-handed than actually and seriously addressing the conflicts that exist in the placer operations as well as in the areas of land use requirements and environmental concerns.

It seems to me that the administration of any regulatory regime should be to achieve a socially responsible balance between conflicting resource values. Placer mining regulations should be designed to achieve a balance between the economic and the social values of the placer industry, of the Yukon fishery and, of course, of any other renewable resource interests. Many of our other renewable resource interests contribute immeasurably to what we often refer to as the wilderness ideal, and it is that ideal which is often the foundation of Yukon's appeal to tourists the world over.

The process that we have witnessed in the last couple of years, in my opinion, has not adequately addressed the required balance that



we must have between the social and the environmental values for our immediate and, of course, our future generations. We must recognize, I believe, the right of people to have jobs, the right to maintain a contemporary standard of living, and the right to promote in the long term the objective of economic self-sufficiency in Yukon. To achieve these kinds of goals in the placer mining industry we must have ongoing dialogue. We must have ongoing dialogue with the miners and we must have a true dialogue, not just a public hearing process with the intention to dictate anyway. We must thoroughly address at the same time those conflicting resource and environmental values. We certainly question arbitrary standards that could, overnight, knock out an industry. I believe that we must work out our problems in a mutually consensual fashion.

<sup>17</sup> We must not engage in the kind of confrontation that we have witnessed. That would mean an ongoing and serious dialogue and consultation, not only with the industry, but with affected levels of government and, certainly, with other interests that are involved, whether they be environmental, whether they be other public interest groups, or whether they be competing resource protection interests.

Neither the industry, nor the economy, nor the environment can stand any severe shocks at any time. The process for any improvements must be conciliatory, they must be thorough and they must be consensual. In this fashion, we could sustain the kind of orderly and responsible social and economic development that the government leader speaks about and that is recited in the motion. It is the kind of objective to which we all aspire. I think that the motion is entirely consistent with this point of view and I recommend that we support it.

**Mr. Brewster:** Placer mining is part of the folklore of the Yukon. Today's placer miners are the modern-day explorers and deserve to be recognized as the best of the free-spirited private enterprisers in the Yukon. The placer mining industry is now facing its most demanding challenge from a bunch of unaccountable Ottawa bureaucrats. Their fight is not only to protect their own personal livelihood but to fight for the right for Yukoners to be able to make an honest, hardworking living without having to be a government employee or relying on government assistance.

The proposed placer mining guidelines not only are representative of the type of irresponsible and unaccountable absentee landlord mentality from the federal government that the Yukoners have come to resent and despise, but the guidelines attack the fabric of Yukon's identity. This is not a challenge that must only be met by the placer miners, it is a challenge to all of us. The plight of our placer miners is also our plight. The fight of our placer miners is also our fight.

The problem of being governed by absentee bureaucrats was made very clear to me at the recent Destruction Bay public hearing held by the Yukon Placer Miners Review Committee. In an attempt to show the people that our federal bureaucrats have done their homework, a slide presentation was made as part of the introduction. This slide show demonstrated the techniques the proposed placer mining guidelines were demanding of Yukoners. It is an absolute irony that hardly any of the pictures of this slide show were from Yukon. Afterwards, these public servants were even forced to admit that some of their information was from Europe. Once again, all the expert advice and techniques of how to survive in the Yukon were coming from every place but the Yukon.

Another example of the inefficiency of the federal bureaucrats to respond to Yukon needs became very apparent when the scheduling of the placer mining review committee hearings were first announced. At that time, the complete Kluane-North Alaska Highway was ignored. This is another irony, because placer mining is the second most important economic activity in this region. At last count there were 961 placer claims in Yukon that the review committee was going to disregard. Fortunately, I was able to convince the committee to hold a public hearing in Destruction Bay. I was also able to travel to the placer mining operations in my area and look into their situation first-hand. Wherever I went the same message came across loud and clear. The placer miners were amazed at the discretionary powers of the public civil servant who regulated their operation. The proposed guidelines had not even

dealt with this problem. This discretionary power has been the most controversial aspect of the regulations of the industry. Placer miners themselves want more definite regulations so they are not at the whim of the value judgments made by civil servants.

As the public hearings ground on, it became very clear that the principles behind the proposed guidelines had not been proven to anyone's satisfaction. They assumed placer mining operations are the cause for the decline of existing salmon stock. In my many years of traveling throughout these areas, I have never seen a dead salmon as a result of placer mining. The salmon quota for Alaskan fishermen is going up each year. It does not take much of an observation to realize that the major problem with salmon population is over-fishing in a jurisdiction outside of the Yukon. If the salmon are caught in Alaskan water, they are surely not going to be able to spawn in the Yukon.

In my area, the heaviest placer mining operations are on creeks that drain into the Kluane River. Except for the times of high water, this river is crystal clear. Yet the placer miners are charged with depositing silt into the river. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans is zealously and irresponsibly attempting to fulfill their mission of protecting existing fish stock without adequate consideration for the Yukon fish stock, without adequate consideration of the Yukon situation and the international reality.

<sup>18</sup> Once again, it is ironic that they are attempting to protect the salmon fisheries at the expense of the gold resource, when it is very clear to everyone here that the benefit from this salmon fishery to Yukoners is negligible in comparison to the contributions made by the placer mining industry.

While touring Yukon placer operations in the Klondike area, we flew over the 40-Mile River that winds its way across the Alaska-Yukon border in several places. The placer mining operations in the American section of the river were being worked without a single settling pond in place. The Canadian placer mine operations had to have settling ponds, another irony; the Yukon operation was required to keep water clean that had already been dirtied by the Alaskan operators. This is being done in order to protect salmon that are to be harvested by the Alaskan fisherman. Is this the kind of justice that we can expect from Ottawa?

I have mentioned a number of ironies, but the saddest of all is that the Yukon is being subjected to rigid environmental guidelines by the Ottawa establishment, who have some of the worst records in environmental safety in Canada. Where were these Ottawa bureaucrats and guidelines when the City of Toronto poured one billion litres of bacteria into the Great Lakes, creating a potential danger for millions of people? Where were these bureaucrats and guidelines when acid rain was killing thousands of Canadian lakes? Where were these same bureaucrats and guidelines when the atomic reactors in Ontario were dumping radioactive waste into the environment?

It is hypocritical for these bureaucrats to sit in judgment of us and attempt to close down our placer mining industry when their own backyard is in such a sorry state. If they are doing it here because they think they can get away with it, they have a valuable lesson to learn.

Also, where were these bureaucrats when the Fort Garrison project threatened to take the livelihood of thousands of Manitobans, plus all their fish stock? They appear to have packed up and run for cover.

It is inconceivable to me that any member of this House would vote against this motion. Any member who does not support this motion is not responsible to his constituents.

Thank you.

*Applause*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would like to make a number of comments with respect to policy, as far as the guidelines are concerned. I would like to begin by commending the MLA for Kluane for the very well-thought out presentation that was made and also the comparisons that were made with respect to other parts of Canada, with respect to the fact that they are pouring chemicals, everyday, even right now, into freshwater streams and they have less environmental regulations there than what they are proposing to put into place in Yukon, when we are actually, in reality, talking about

a longer spring break-up. We are talking, actually, more gravel, more soils going into the water, and we are not talking about chemicals or bacteria being put into the freshwater of the Yukon Territory.

Recent indications are that the placer mining industry has been relatively active over the course of this year; in fact, slightly up from last year. The preliminary figures indicate that there are about 240 active operations in 1983, compared to 215 in 1982, which translates itself, statistically, into approximately 750 people employed in this particular industry. I think, with those figures, we can all agree that it is fairly important — in fact, very important — to Yukon that this industry continue and continue to grow.

A major concern to us, as a government, has been the indications — and I would go so far as to say facts — that the industry has been curtailed somewhat because of the threat of the proposed guidelines hanging over the heads of possible new operators. I think it is safe to say that many potential operators have been deterred from investing money in the gold mines this past year, in view of the proposed government regulatory regime that was brought forward by the Departments of Indian Affairs and Fisheries.

Once again, I think there is a basic common principle here, with respect to the question of responsibility, as the MLA for Kluane and, I believe, the MLA for Mayo referred, and that is the basic question of who should be responsible for this particular resource and manage this particular resource. From my perception and from what I have seen, with respect to "the management" by these various federal departments, I think that we could manage it much better, as a government and as a legislature, than it is presently being administered.

<sup>19</sup> The MLA for Kluane referred to a visit that he had with a number of the placer operations over the course of this summer, and I was one of the members, along with the Minister of Renewable Resources, who were also on that tour of the placer mining operations. Now, I am not a biologist and I do not contend to be an expert in the area of fisheries, but it did not take long for me or the MLA for Kluane or the Minister of Renewable Resources to come very quickly to the conclusion that, if the present proposed guidelines were to be put into effect, not only would new investment not come to Yukon but just as importantly present businesses would be put out of business because of the proposed regulatory regime.

I just want to, for the record, comment about the differences in areas. When you have the ability of going around to look at the various placer operations — when you compare Burwash Creek with that of the Black Hill Creek — it seemed totally ridiculous to me to have the requirement that there be a settling pond in Burwash Creek when it is a known fact that, year after year, at least once, if not more times a year, they experience flash floods; in other words, the settling ponds are there today and gone tomorrow and the silt that is caught up in those particular settling ponds will go down the creek in the space of minutes as opposed to an hourly disposition of that particular type of soil. It would seem to me when you compare that to Black Hills, where settling ponds would not even have to be required under law as a requirement, because it is to the benefit of their operation because of the valley and the way it is settled.

Therefore, why I am drawing these comparisons is for people to look at that and say, look, there has to be some flexibility in any proposed guidelines so that we are not bringing unnecessary costs to the operator, which in turn could become prohibitive to the point that they could not operate.

I think the importance we attach to this particular issue is such that five members of the Yukon Cabinet appeared before that Commission and two of our MLAs appeared before that Commission, and therefore I think it represents the seriousness with which we took the hearing process that took place and also the importance that we feel the placer mining industry is to Yukon.

I want to take a few minutes to reiterate the main thrust of the government's intervention before the Review Committee:

Number one, the Yukon Government believes that a reconciliation can and must be reached between renewable and non-renewable resource interests that appear to be set against one another in the concern over placer mining regulations. Both placer mining and fish

are important to Yukon residents and visitors. Both resources contribute to the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Yukoners. The position of our government is that there must be a balanced approach to the management of renewable and non-renewable resources and that such a balance reflect the views of a majority of Yukoners who are not prepared to take an extreme position with either resource benefitting at the expense of the other.

Number two, the Yukon Government is committed to the principle of integrated resource management, which permits gold to be treated as a competing resource. Such a management scheme should be based upon a prioritization of resource values for each particular location according to the respective economic and social values of the different resources present and appropriate trade-offs made. Such a trade-off naturally entails a decision as to which particular resource shall be given priority, and an appropriate mechanism for making these decisions must be in place. In the case of competing resource values relating to the use of water, the appropriate body to make the decision is the Yukon Territorial Water Board.

Number three, the Yukon Government has proposed the following amendments to the *Northern Inland Water Act and Regulations*:

(a) to confirm the quasi-judicial status of the Yukon Territorial Water Board, to legitimize the responsibility of the Water Board to authorize the use of water without a licence and to specify that small placer operations may be authorized to use water without a licence.

(b) to prescribe time limits for each step of the process involved in applying for licences and authorization.

(c) regulations prescribing water quality standards for downstream receiving waters should be drawn up as provided for in the act, thereby eliminating the discretionary powers currently enjoyed by the public servants to set standards arbitrarily.

<sup>20</sup> Number four, the Yukon Government contends that the conditions which the federal government proposes to apply to water authorizations, as outlined in the proposed guidelines, are much too onerous since they would arbitrarily make many operations uneconomical. I want to state for the record that we are adamantly opposed to their introduction in their present form. We find certain aspects of the stream classification, the effluent standards and the fisheries protection measures, to be completely unacceptable.

Number five, integrated resource planning, which has been agreed to in principle by the federal and Yukon governments, should form the basis for decision-making regarding resource allocation, management and use in Yukon. The problems currently being addressed through the proposed guidelines should be addressed through a comprehensive land/water resource use planning process with an emphasis on future opportunities and not legacy problems.

Number six, in order to achieve the multiple resource management concept as the approach to the regulation of placer mining it is essential to consider from the outset wildlife, vegetation, downstream users, compatibility with present or planned water use rather than concentrate solely on fisheries, as the proposed guidelines have done. An essential step to show an element of sound resource planning and management is the establishment of a good data base by the government agents responsible for overall resource administration. In the absence of such data, which is obvious, the introduction of these guidelines is therefore premature.

Another point is that there should be a one-window approach to the regulation of placer mining, with a single arm of government responsible for the administration and inspection of all aspects of the industry, incorporating all resource planning and management concerns of both federal and territorial governments.

We were interested and very gratified to note that, as the hearing progressed, there appeared to be a general coming together of most parties, with increasing support for the kind of commonsense approach to this problem which we advocated in our intervention. Towards this end, there appears to be a general agreement that there were two really distinct problems. First, for the short term it would be necessary to make some tough decisions on resource allocation in those areas where placer mining and the protection of renewable resource values, such as fish, are incompatible. In some areas, for

example, streams are critical habitat for maintaining salmon, and they should be given maximum protection, and those streams with greatest potential for gold production should be given over to the placer mining with minimum protection in accordance with the quality of downstream receiving waters.

These will be political decisions and, of necessity, Yukoners must play a major role in making them. It is in the remaining areas where some of operating guidelines will be required in order to provide an appropriate degree of environmental protection in accordance with the relative values of the gold and renewable resource values present.

The other problem is providing for the future; dealing with new operations and operations in new areas. There appeared to be general support from all sides for a concept of multiple resource uses and integrated resource planning and management. These concepts must be implemented in order to provide the information required to permit the optimum utilization of the various resources present and hence the greatest benefit for Yukoners.

In closing, the Review Committee will be hearing final summary statements from each of the registered intervenors on November 8th, and the government will be there at that time to repeat and amplify the position it has taken. We are confident that the Review Committee will be able to make an objective examination of the proposed guidelines and come up with proposals for amending them so that they can be more equitable and rational.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** While I am on my feet, I would like to give some idea of House business for the forthcoming week. I want to notify the House we will be giving second reading to the *Municipal Act* next Monday, and also the *Elections Act* on Monday; we will be dealing with the various bills that are in Committee as well; this afternoon, I expect to be dealing with the amendments to the *Financial Administration Act* first, so that we can clear that particular bill out of Committee and give it third reading later on today.

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

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

*Motion agreed to*

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Mr. Chairman:** I call the Committee of the Whole to order. We shall take a short break.

*Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole back to order. We will deal with Bill No. 14, clause 40.

### Bill No. 14: *Financial Administration Act*

*On Clause 40*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in clause 40(1) at page 22 by substituting "it may be invested" for "the Executive Council Member may invest it".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in clause 40(2) at page 22 by substituting "it may be invested" for the "Council Member may" and by striking out "invest the money".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended at page 22 by substitut-

ing the following for clause 40(4) "(4) An investment held under this section may be disposed of, or exchanged or traded for another investment authorized under this section."

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in clause 40(8) on page 23 by substituting "to provide advice" for "to advise the Executive Council Member".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in clause 47(1) at page 26 by substituting "the borrowing of" for "the Executive Council Member to borrow".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in clause 48(1) at page 26 by substituting "the borrowing of" for "the Executive Council Member to borrow".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in clause 49(1) at pages 26 to 27 by substituting "the borrowing, for a period not exceeding 365 days, of an amount that is considered" for "the Executive Council Member to borrow, for a period not exceeding 365 days, an amount that the Executive Council Member considers".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended at page 27 by substituting the following for clause 50(1): "50(1) The Commissioner in Executive Council may make regulations, for the official operation of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

(a) authorizing arrangements with a bank for money overdrafts, or

(b) authorizing the borrowing of money by the issue and sale of notes or treasury bills in a form, in an amount, at a rate of interest, if any, on terms and conditions and executed in a way he determines."

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended at page 27, by substituting the following for subsection 50(2): "(2) to secure overdrafts under paragraph 1(a), the Commissioner and Executive Council may authorize the issuance to a bank of a security in a form, in an amount, on terms and conditions and execute it in a way he determines."

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in Clause 52(1) at page 27, by substituting: "changes in" for "the Executive Council member to change".

*Amendment agreed to*

*Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended in Clause 87(3), at page 41, by adding the following: "(2) Payments under subsection (1) shall be made out of a vote on the direction of the Management Board under the *Financial Administration Act*, but no such payment shall be made unless it is authorized to be made by that Act or an Appropriation Act".

**Mr. Penikett:** I would not want to have another error occur. It appears to me there is a spelling error in the word "appropriation" in this clause.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes. If it is a spelling error, there is no doubt about the meaning of the word, so I would consider that we should consider that to be a typo, because there is no doubt about the meaning of the word.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

*Amendment agreed to  
Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I should say that these three amendments, the last three that I have here, are as a result of two clauses being missed when the bill was printed for presentation to the legislature.

I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended at page 42 by renumbering Clause 87(4) as 87(5), and by adding the following Clause 87(4): "(4) The following new section is added immediately after section 17 of the *Housing Corporation Act*, "17.1(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act

(a) the receipt and payment of money by the Corporation is subject to the *Financial Administration Act*, and

(b) the investment of money by the Corporation is subject to the *Financial Administration Act* except section 40 of that Act".

*Amendment agreed to  
Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14, entitled *Financial Administration Act*, be amended at page 43 by renumbering Clause 87(5) as 87(6)".

*Amendment agreed to  
Amendment proposed*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I would move that Bill Number 14 be reported out of Committee as amended.

Motion agreed to

<sup>23</sup> **Bill No. 28**

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now return to Bill No. 28, *First Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, page 56.

#### **On Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I think that the minister for tourism on the opposition side of the legislature will recognize the notable increase in capital funding in Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources this year. We had a lot of ongoing costs that we had to build into the budget — things like museum grants and the conservation lab, the tourism displays, library and archives equipment and the public library development. However, we did try to make an identification for a rather large sum of money, the half-a-million dollars for the Tourism Facilities Program, in view of the fact that we do not have an economic development agreement in place at present.

There was some question from the member regarding the \$2,200,000 that was an interim arrangement for some private sector stimulation and tourism incentive in Yukon having an impact on the Economic Development Agreement, and there will not be any detrimental effect on that agreement — which, incidentally, is being called the Economic Regional Development Agreement now; this is the third name change we have had. It was the General Development Agreement — the GDA — then it went to the Economic Development Agreement — EDA — and it is now called the Economic Regional Development Agreement, just to keep the member up to the times with federal terminology.

The \$200,000 that the Government of Yukon contributed to that joint venture was identified in last year's capital budget — a portion of it, and another portion of it is identified in this year's budget. I can give further details for the member if he wishes to know those later on and point out exactly where the funding was identified. I also want to indicate that there is no line item for the Tourism Subsidiary Agreement as we voted it last year; the same circumstances apply to us in tourism as did to my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, with the \$1,000 line item that was identified in last year's capital budget.

Also, I would like to note that the Heritage Department has received considerable funding for some restoration projects and I am looking forward to some discussion about those projects. I look forward to comments from the opposition tourism critic.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am sure the minister also looks forward to comments from my colleagues, perhaps, as well. Yes, I would certainly acknowledge to the minister the substantial increase in this budget and, at the same time, acknowledge the identification of a number of projects that, as they come up in line items, we will certainly have more questions about. In the main I am quite pleased

to see a number of them surface. I am talking about the Robinson Roadhouse and several others which have long since been overdue for the kind of upgrading that is required in tourism promotion.

I do have, in general debate, some questions relating to the tourism sub-agreement that surfaced this past year. Let me place it in this context for preliminary questioning: as I understand, the federal government came up with \$2,000,000 to which this government contributed \$200,000, which it pulled out from its own budget to make up the two-part portion of the sub-agreement. The two-part portion, of course, was the Small Business Incentive Program and the Tourism Marketing portion.

<sup>24</sup> If that is a correct assessment, in general terms, then my question would be how did this government find its \$200,000 to put into the program? I recall last year's estimates having been in the order of \$800,000 with all projects — where the money was to be spent — fairly well identified and, until we go through the supplementaries, we really will not know what got eliminated or how the projects got juggled. Could the minister, then, perhaps identify how this government composed its \$200,000 worth of expenditure to supplement the \$2,000,000 by the federal government in this summer's interim and temporary measure of the Subsidiary Tourism Agreement?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** On page 53 of the capital budget for year 1983-84, last year's budget, there are two items. One is called Dawson Facades, to provide funds for the Dawson facades program, \$50,000; and another item called Tourism Incentives, to provide funds for the creation of the tourism incentives program.

We combined those two allotments to get a total of \$150,000. The reason we took the Dawson Facade one was because it was consistent with the principles and concepts of the tourism incentives program, which was also consistent with the program objectives of the Tourism and Small Business Incentive Program, which is what we called the \$2,200,000 funding.

This year, in the 1984-84 budget, on page 57, the first line item, we have identified a Tourism and Small Business Incentive Program for \$50,000. That, added to the \$150,000, gives us our \$200,000 to complement the federal government's contribution of \$2,000,000.

I just want to further indicate to the member and to his hon. colleagues that we struggled very hard for that \$2,000,000 from the federal government; we had many, many conversations. We also had a change of federal ministers three times while I was trying to negotiate with whoever the Minister of Tourism was federally for some funding. So, we started out, in August of 1982, with the hon. Charles Lapointe and that went to Mr. William Rompkey and the final tag-ends were tied up with the hon. David Smith. Mr. Rompkey is the minister, however, who receives the credit from the federal government for getting this money for Yukon.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would be tempted to ask the minister which minister she likes best, but that is private information, I am sure.

On the subject of the \$200,000 that the minister identified from last year's budget, complemented with some deficit financing from this year to cover for it, I have a further question: last year, the estimates identified \$120,000 for the Tourism Subsidiary Agreement, or the Tourism Development Subsidiary Agreement, which, I think, has after several name changes become an ERDA?

Now, if \$120,000 was identified for the subsidiary agreement expenditure cost last year, and this year it is wiped out of the budget, as such, could the minister tell me how that money then actually got spent? Was it not, as well, incorporated into the \$2,200,000? I recognize how she arrived at the \$200,000, but, somehow, we have an additional \$120,000 for subsidiary purpose. What happened to it?

<sup>25</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That \$120,000 was to finish-up the Canada-Yukon Tourism Agreement. We still have some commitments that had been made from that Canada-Yukon Tourism Agreement. The funding for that expired in March 1982 and this \$120,000 fulfilled those commitments. That \$120,000 was needed to complete the Canada-Yukon Tourism Agreement which was, I believe, a three-year agreement.

**Mr. Byblow:** That is a satisfactory answer. Of a general nature, I want to enquire about the process by which the \$2,200,000 came into being. We discussed at some length in the past about the need

for a general development agreement, out of which a tourism subsidiary would flow. We have heard debate in the House previously about why this is not taking place. There are some unexplainable delays. This \$2,000,000 that surfaced from the federal government this past year was an interim measure.

In relation to the development agreement, the ERDA that is still coming, what impact does the release of this \$2,000,000 this past year have on the negotiations of further tourism money under the ERDA?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It has absolutely no impact. The \$2,000,000 that we received from the federal government was strictly an interim measure and there was never any commitment, on our behalf, that we were prepared to have it subtracted from the ERDA, and that suggestion was never made on behalf of the Government of Canada.

We had identified a problem in Yukon because we were in a state of development with our tourism industry that, if we had halted funding, would have resulted in a trauma to that development. I indicated that to the Minister of Tourism with the Government of Canada and he appreciated our situation in Yukon. It was at that time that he gave us a commitment to look for some funding. However, there was never any arrangement made, or anything indicated in the agreement for the \$2,000,000, to in any way lessen our tourism funding under the ERDA.

**Mr. Byblow:** To completely understand the budgeting process then, can the minister advise me whether the \$2,200,000 is now flowing through YTG's budget and shows itself in the supps or is part of it incorporated in this current budget? If I am understanding the flow of money correctly, it ought to all have taken place in the current fiscal year or it ought all to have been spent in the current fiscal year. The only impact it has on the year in the future is the \$50,000 that we needed to make up our portion of it. Could the minister advise, from a budgetary point of view, where the \$2,200,000 flows in the budget of this government?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The federal government now has a policy that they refer to as "direct delivery". In times past, the federal government, if they entered into an agreement with the provinces and territories to give the government \$2,000,000 assistance — as they did with the Government of Yukon, and we were contributing the .2 million — the funds would have been turned over to the Yukon territorial government to distribute. However, with the new philosophy of the federal government, for direct delivery, they deliver their portion of the funding and the committee assesses the applications and decides which portion of each project they are prepared to fund. The Yukon territorial government, in turn, is responsible for the distribution for the funding for each project for their \$200,000.

So, say Mr. Smith made an application for funding under this \$2,200,000. His application would go forward to a joint federal-territorial committee. At that time, if the application was approved for a certain amount of money, the federal government would write a cheque, once they had received the invoices for their portion, and the territorial government would write a cheque for their portion. In last year's capital budget we had identified \$150,000 for other projects of a similar program nature, so that we were not overstepping our spending authorities, and we used that money to enhance the federal monies. I believe they are having another meeting on November 15th. They have had hundreds of applications to this program; they have expended, they feel, all the funds. However, on paper, there are still certain funds left. On November 15th, they anticipate that they will be distributing the rest of the funding that remains. Therefore, this year we require the \$50,000 to fulfill our commitments to complete that Small Business Incentive Program.

**Mr. Byblow:** Very interesting. Extrapolating from what the minister says, the nature of the budgeting process is such that only the YTG's portion of commitment, which is really 10 percent of the entire program — it is a 90-10 sharing arrangement — flows through any part of our budgets. The 90 percent funding towards any project of the federal government's portion is a direct cash injection to the project and does not flow through this budget. That raises a very interesting and very peculiar process, if I could make

that observation. We did not have that kind of a process in the previous agreements, and suddenly we have the process introduced during an interim period of funding. It raises, in my mind, a complete puzzle as to why this must be taking place. Could I put the question this way: is there a particular reason why the federal government does not wish the money to flow through YTG's budget; is there some dissatisfaction with previous project funding processes whereby it has taken this position this time? I realize we are bordering into a debate but it is certainly a puzzle as to why they would go this method this time.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Peculiar was not exactly the word I gave it. However, what I said was not really parliamentary language so I will not repeat it. This process is not peculiar to the Yukon territorial government and Government of Canada relationship. This is the decision that the Government of Canada has made regarding the distribution of their funding to the provinces and the territories and they are doing this all over Canada. Every province which received funding from the federal government for tourism, and I am only dealing with the tourism aspect because that is of which I am most familiar, are all very concerned about this direct delivery process which the federal government has embarked on as well. So it has nothing to do whatsoever with the relationship that we have with them or with our past budgetary abilities or habits. It is strictly a maneuver on behalf of the federal government. They seem to be very conscientious about whether a sign is placed giving the proper funding authority — the credit for the project — and I could go on and on about that, about reasons why they have done it. My personal feeling is that it is strictly political and something that my colleagues across Canada, the other Ministers of Tourism, are all very concerned about and are also expressing much dissatisfaction to the federal government about the process, as I have. However, it was made very clear to us that this was now a fact of life and these were the only terms that the federal government is prepared to give extra funding under.

**Mr. Byblow:** On a purely speculative notion, could I ask the minister if the primary reason for this peculiar funding arrangement is because the federal government has not been getting the recognition that it wants for the project funding that it has given in the past?

» Moving somewhat, in process, to another area, the minister and I have had some exchange in the past relative to the perimeters of this last funding arrangement. The minister has told me that she is of the opinion that the funding is available to the broad total Yukon regional tourism interest. I argued with her that in documentation provided by, in fact, this government, the insistence exists that project priorities are for the same general areas of the territory as have been in previous tourism arrangements. Perhaps we could just clear this up because there is some confusion in my mind. Perhaps in the process, the minister might want to establish the extent to which applications are being accepted in areas other than those four regional areas identified as destination areas.

**Mrs. Firth:** As the federal government makes the larger portion of the contribution, they also like to have the larger say as to how the funding will be distributed and they also like to have the larger say as to the guidelines that the applicants will abide by. The federal government is very adamant that those four regions be included in the application guidelines. There was not much we could do about it. We had a very informal breakfast meeting with the federal minister responsible to discuss the guidelines, at which time the officials from YTG were present and the officials from the federal government. I indicated to the minister that I wanted the ability and the flexibility to distribute the funds within the whole Yukon territory. He gave a verbal commitment that that would be so. However, when it came time to receive the written documents from the federal government, it was not indicated in the written documents. However, the federal government officials from Yukon had been present and so it was more a verbal understanding as opposed to something being written on paper; that if there were applications from other areas of Yukon they would be given the same consideration as the applications coming from the four destination areas that the federal government had pointed out.

I felt that we had done all we could to give Yukon equal

representation. We have had, like I said, hundreds of applications. Any that have come from outside of those four destination areas — I can think of two for example; we had one application from the Mayo area and one from the Faro area — both of them were granted assistance. Those were the only applications we had from those areas. The majority of the applications do come from the Dawson, Kluane and Whitehorse areas.

**Mr. Byblow:** So the minister is saying that the documentation provided by the proponents of the agreement is not as intended for distribution, that the committee has actually been considering other areas of the territory. Perhaps this is a major flaw of the understanding, simply because if the documentation provides information that only specific regions of the Yukon are going to be permitted to apply for funding and now we find out that all of the funding is committed, it has created something of a problem to areas that may have wished to apply but were not given the correct information. It is a mild criticism of the process and I think the minister indirectly has said that the process that was followed in this particular funding arrangement was not either satisfactory or suitable to this government. I gather that the minister is indirectly saying that the method by which the money came and who was going to distribute it was not in a type of consensual arrangement that would have been preferable. Perhaps the minister might respond to the question of available funding for other regional areas, given the nature of the information and perhaps on the process of consensus in distributing the money.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Those were some very interesting comments.

When Mr. Rompkey and I made the public announcement about the interim agreement, we were in Dawson City at the Annual Yukon Visitors Association Convention. We made the announcement at that convention, at which time Mr. Rompkey and I were having a press conference. At that press conference, I indicated to the media, as well as to people observing, that the Yukon territorial government was not happy with the direct delivery system. However, we were not about to refuse the \$2,000,000 because the federal government was making the rules and we had to abide by those rules that we found objectionable and distasteful. So, we were accepting the money, but I indicated that I was not pleased, under those circumstances of direct delivery.

It was also at that time that I asked Mr. Rompkey, publicly, and reassured the media, as well as the public, that Mr. Rompkey had given us a verbal commitment that the funds were for all of Yukon Territory and that there were no restrictions on the funds. They were for tourism-oriented businesses, as well as other small businesses, and they were to apply to businesses all over the Yukon Territory, not just to any or particular areas. It did not mention any areas and Mr. Rompkey agreed.

After that meeting, we did a tremendous job, I think, trying to let everyone know that the funding was available. The Yukon Visitors Association worked very hard trying to make the word public. The media, I believe, in the local newspapers and on the radio, made comments to that effect and I thought that we had done all we could to make that fact known. However, I do not feel we could have actually written it in the applications. That would have been somewhat offensive to the federal government; therefore, we chose not to because the understanding was there.

**Mr. Byblow:** I appreciate what the minister is saying. Probably, just to close the topic, I would note that all of what she says is correct, in terms of the media exposure and the verbal assurances, that this applied to the entire Yukon.

I did have a couple of comments, to me, that, upon receiving applications, the eligibility criteria created some prohibition of proceeding with the application, because it looked like a very slim chance or an off-chance that they may qualify for the funding.

I want to proceed in the general debate to the question of consultation on this year's budget. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, I have reason to compliment a number of the projects and, as we get into the line items, I will have some specific questions. How did tourism establish this year's priorities for expenditure?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We did it after consultation with the Yukon Visitors Association, after meetings with the Yukon Historical Museums Association, and taking into account certain projects that

had to be done that were brought to our attention. For example, the Robinson Roadhouse was brought to our attention by one of our local, very well-known artists. We discussed it with the Yukon Historical Museums Association and they agreed that that, indeed, was a project that was of high priority.

With some of the rehabilitation and stabilizations, we have to take into account buildings that are not going to last any longer; buildings that the government presently has responsibility for. For example, the Ladue Mill in Dawson; the territorial government owns that building and it is still in a state that can be rehabilitated. So, as opposed to it crumbling and costing more money, we have identified some more funding for that building.

<sup>29</sup> The old territorial administration building and Herschel Island, of course, are priorities with us. We have had a lot of comments made to us about Herschel Island from the Historical Museums Association. The tourism facilities program, the private sector stimulation, so that we can continue on with the programs that we have had. We have had a lot of extremely good and favourable comments about these programs. We feel that the private sector needs this added stimulus so, of course, that was a priority with us.

As I said earlier, it is just the ongoing capital costs that we need to maintain the department.

**Mr. Byblow:** The member for Mayo, last night, was expounding at some length about tourism development in this area and, perhaps, I can afford the opportunity today to make some pertinent comments respecting another area.

The think the minister has been made aware of a number of lobbys from my community and area relative to the entire Campbell corridor. I think it goes without saying that it is probably the area of the first white entrance into the territory in that it is named after Robert Campbell who first entered the territory in the mid-1830s. We have some sites between Watson Lake and Carmacks and, specifically, between Ross River and Watson Lake that are probably worthy of retaining; in the Finlayson Lake area, in the Pelly Banks and several other areas along that highway.

I notice in the selection of projects, that the government intends to provide some funding towards upgrading. There is no recognition of that particular corridor, aside from the Frenchman Lake upgrading that we talked about at some length yesterday. Could the minister respond in some measure to that. I believe the Faro Chamber of Commerce made a presentation in 1981 to the then Tourism Advisory Board which, since, was disbanded and, subsequently, in 1982 made a presentation at the tourism conference held last October. They identified some of these areas for development. I trust that the minister must certainly be aware of the concerns of people along that Campbell corridor, particularly since the president of the YVA comes from the region and, I am sure, has articulated this on numerous occasions.

Could the minister respond, in some measure, to the absence of development on the Campbell corridor in the entire Simpson Lake, Francis Lake, Finlayson, Pelly areas?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am well aware of the concerns and I have had many discussions with the member for Mayo regarding this. I have to say that I was very pleased to see the association that has been formed, in Mayo and along the highway, to work in conjunction with the government and the tourism department regarding tourism development in that Campbell corridor. We find ourselves a little strapped for funding because we are so dependent on the federal government. Perhaps I will be accused of making excuses, however, that is not what I am doing; we hope to have plans for all of the areas of Yukon for future development.

<sup>30</sup> But, we found ourselves in a position where we had to do some planning for the Kluane area to go in conjunction with the federal government's proposal to put the road into the Kaskawulsh Glacier. It is always to our benefit, as a government, and to the benefit of Yukoners that we do things in conjunction with the federal government. That is the reason for the extensive expansion in the Kluane area.

The Campbell Corridor will get its turn. I do not know if that is any reassurance for the members but that area, I am sure, will have its turn. We would like to have some idea from the association as to exactly what their expectations are and what they are prepared to

provide to the tourists in the way of commodities. We are looking forward to some discussions with them as to development.

**Mr. Byblow:** I suppose I have to take some assurance from the rather vague promise of the minister to address the Campbell Highway Corridor. I do want to remind the minister that as long ago as 1979, when I first entered this House, I made representation and probably the greatest success of that representation was the creation of a position to represent the Campbell Corridor made on the Tourism Advisory Board of the time. However, that has been since abandoned as an advisory group. It appears that we have actually endured a retrograde step in terms of representation for some upgrading of the historical significance of that region. Again, I would remind the minister that there is, in fact, longer history involved in that area — longer in the sense that it is, in fact, prior to the Dawson era — and that we have significance historically to the Campbell Corridor. I want the minister to know that I will be pursuing this quite actively in direct lobby at this level and certainly with the YVA. In whatever consideration of funding that this government is going to be making in the future, such as perhaps not using all of the money on the Frenchman Lake development, it is certainly that historical development for tourism is required further up that corridor.

While I am on my feet on the subject, there has been substantial appeal for an upgrading of that highway itself, and perhaps the Minister of Highways has had numerous lobbys about. Given the up and coming significance to the area in an economic sense relative to the MacMillan Pass, certainly we are not only going to have that kind of activity, we have already noticed an increasing number of tourists using that triangular route; triangular in that upon entering the Yukon through the Watson Lake area, they will make one trip via Ross River, Faro, Carmacks, Dawson or wherever and take the Alaska Highway route on return. I can speak quite comfortably and knowledgeably about the increase of tourism traffic through that Campbell Highway. It is certainly noticeable and I often get direct comments from tourists about the absence of something to do on that stretch. That stretch is, indeed, a long one. From Watson Lake to Ross River, the first settlement, we have some 260 miles of uninterrupted wilderness, so to speak. To develop a Hoole Canyon historical site is a very valid proposition. To develop further campground facility on that stretch in the Finlayson Lake area is another very worthy proposition.

So I want to make an appeal to the minister that the Campbell Corridor receives some recognition in future funding and that we seriously take a look at what is already happening and that is, in fact, an increase in tourist traffic in that area.

<sup>31</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We are in the process, within the Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources, of doing some organizational analysis of our department because it has been brought to our attention by the member opposite and many other people about the growth of tourism in Yukon and which direction it is heading in and is it too rapid and it is not controlled. There are many concerns. I have concerns personally, since I have been Minister of Tourism, as well. So we have requested that an organizational and functional analysis of the department, in conjunction with the Yukon Visitors Association, their relationship with us, that this be done. We also have been successful in acquiring a position called a Tourism Planning Officer; it was a position that was previously seconded to us by the federal government and then, once the Canada Yukon Tourism Agreement expired, the position also expired. The federal tourism offices located here within Whitehorse were quite prepared to hire this individual; however, we were able to get some funds together to hire the individual ourselves and the person I am speaking of is Akio Saito who has done a tremendous job in Dawson and he has been out Carcross way, Kluane and, I believe, if he has not been out Mayo way, he is planning that. However, I have a feeling he may have been out that way already. The member from Mayo is nodding, so I believe Akio Saito has been there as well. So, we are taking some positive steps in that direction as to the development of tourism all over the Yukon and identifying strategic historical locations with historical value.

I have to make one comment, however, that the government

cannot do this alone. We need private sector support; we need the private entrepreneur to give us support in providing facilities and so on for the tourists, and we have not been having a lot of requests from any individuals for assistance for planning any particular facilities in the areas that the members are speaking of. However, I am sure that will change once the Mayo association comes forward with some proposals, and again I will say we are looking forward to that and we are hoping that there will be some private enterprise interest in developing this particular area.

**Mr. McDonald:** I would like to bring to the attention of some members that the evolution of the North Central Yukon Tourism Association, as it technically is called, and the Silver Trail Association, which it would like to be called, made a conscious decision some time ago that, whereas they would like to have the Campbell highways corridor represented. They felt that because of distances involved they would have to confine their efforts to what they consider to be a self-contained area, which is essentially the Stewart Crossing, Mayo, Elsa, Keno corridor. They lowered their sights considerably. It was not an easy decision to make but, nevertheless, they felt that that was about as much as they could manage for the time being.

I believe they have applied under the *Societies Ordinance* for recognition, and they have now just received it. The constitution has been returned to them.

They expressed some concerns during their funding meetings. One concern which was mentioned by a gentleman by the name of Chris Sorg, who is a director, I believe, of the Yukon Visitors Association, is that it is common practice for the tourism department to encourage the development of tourism plans. The concern that people had was that the tourism plan might be a little bit too restrictive for their needs but they felt that, if funding would be more forthcoming if they had such a plan, then they would have to think twice about it and perhaps go along with the flow, so to speak. They felt that perhaps, while they would not want to be locked into any plan that they did not feel entirely comfortable with, they still wanted their share of funding.

<sup>32</sup> That is one concern that they have. Perhaps the minister would have something to say about that. The other concern that they expressed was the chicken-and-egg syndrome, in a sense; the desire for assistance, the desire to get something going with a recognized lack of tourist flow at the moment. Whereas it is a problem for government, it is equally a problem for private sector people who would like to invest in various projects. Obviously, the person who invests first will be taking more risks than people who follow in that person's wake.

Their second concern was that, perhaps, they would have a very difficult time taking advantage of any serious consideration from government departments because of the fact that they have not organized to the extent that already tourists are flocking down the highway in droves. Certainly everyone in the association was optimistic enough that they felt there was plenty for tourists in the Mayo-Keno mining districts to see.

There were some extremely good ideas presented by a variety of people. United Keno Hill Mines, for example, for the first time to my knowledge, offered mine tours to tourists and offered to sell silver bars to tourists. The placer miners offered to let their operations be laid open to tourist scrutiny. They offered to make some land available for campground development on their placer claims. The Keno Community Club was quite excited about the prospect of getting tourists in on a regular basis and, in fact, the whole area, Mayo included, had more or less come to the informal conclusion that perhaps a circle route within the constituency would be possible with plenty of sites and plenty of attractions.

The only problem, of course, as the minister has mentioned privately to me — which I certainly recognize and which everybody in the community reasonably recognizes — is that there are some basic facilities in Mayo which are lacking. The most basic of all is a restaurant and, perhaps, the number of hotel rooms required to take tourists in on a larger scale. In effect, they felt that they might not be given enough consideration because there are not a lot of tourists flocking into the area at the moment, though they feel there is plenty for the tourist to see and do. There are certainly enough

tourists to fill the campground but that is not quite enough for most people's liking. Those are two basic concerns, and I am wondering if the minister has any comments to make about those.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I can appreciate what the member is saying about plans and making development plans. People who do not necessarily have the expertise in that area can find it very intimidating and very threatening and it does become a chicken-and-egg situation because a plan is never made and the funding is never given because there is no plan. However, I always feel that every good businessman has a plan when he embarks on a business and, hopefully, with the tourism development officer being able to give them assistance, I would encourage the Silver Trail Association to establish a plan of development within that area. We are in a position, also, where we have to justify development to the government that we are looking for some funding from. We all know that the federal government loves plans. We would encourage the association to progress with some plans.

It is interesting to hear what the member for Mayo has to say about Keno and about the efforts of the people because, when times do get a little tougher, I think people become more aware of the resources that they have around them and they become more creative and more inventive when it comes to making money, making a living and feeding their families. Maybe that will be good for tourism in Yukon. Maybe that will be good for the evolution and the advancement of tourism in Yukon. All I have to say to the member, is I would encourage the Silver Trail Association to pursue their plans and we, in the Department Tourism, will give them whatever assistance we can.

**Mr. Byblow:** I want to enter into a brief line of discussion, because the minister brought it up indirectly in one of her comments. It has also been one that plagues the industry, so to speak, and that is with respect to the extent of government assistance in business opportunity relating to tourism.

I call to attention the situation that has developed in Dawson, where this government created some very lucrative grant monies — this is in the past — for hotel expansion, justified because of the need for space to accommodate tourists who were coming and were not able to have enough places to stay. Quite similarly, as historically the ski chalet was constructed primarily with funding by government, it is another case where an uncomfortable situation has developed relative to interfering in the marketplace for those entrepreneurs who are in the similar line of business.

I am wondering if the minister, in the personnel that she has available, is exploring within the community, with the industry at large, just the extent to which government takes the step into providing free monies in those areas of tourism growth development that may create conflict, in the competitive sense, with private entrepreneurs?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We feel, as a government, I think, that we do not want to be perceived as interfering with private sector development and growth. Rather, that we are assisting them and encouraging and supporting where we can.

The free funding, as the member refers to it, the grants are something that we have to use as an interim method. We do not have the ability, as a government, to provide small business loans, which is a preferred method of assisting the businessman, definitely. Our philosophy gives us much difficulty with a grant system many times, however, I would prefer to use that system, as opposed to having nothing. We are certainly, as a government, pursuing the small loan to business.

I would just like to discuss this with the member for a minute. I was at the Alaska Visitors Association Convention this year, in Valdez, Alaska — I went right after our Cabinet tour — and I found that very interesting. I was there with my deputy minister and had not been at the meetings for very long, about 15 or 20 minutes, before I realized that I was probably the only elected representative within a room of about 350 people. It was quite obvious from the discussions and the avenues they were pursuing that there were no government people there, other than representatives of the Alaska DOT, as they refer to it, the Department of Tourism.

I found it extremely interesting to listen to the resolutions that were presented, the various concepts and ideas that the businessmen

in Alaska had, who have, incidentally, been very successful with their tourism development. The ideas and concepts they presented, as to the relationship between government and the private sector, they felt, were purely a supportive relationship, as we in Yukon, here, feel, as well. I think I got some ideas from that, perhaps, we will pursue. However, our Yukon Visitor Association was also present and their ideas that they have been relaying to us, as a government. I think we will have to keep in touch and act in the supportive way that we feel we should be.

**Mr. Byblow:** I guess it could be a subject of indefinite debate as to the extent that government should be taking part in development of those facilities that are to encourage tourism. On the one hand we want to encourage the growth and development of our facilities and, on the other hand, we do not want to interfere with the private enterprise opportunity to allow for the kind of initiative that comes from the private sector on its own and ought not to be interfered with.

I want to raise with the minister one point on the subject. Has this government clearly delineated those areas in tourism development that it should be involved with through incentive money and those areas that it should not? I suppose, to refine it a bit, I would suggest that one way to do it is to take those enterprises that are strictly commercial. For example, it would appear to me that hotel enterprises are strictly commercial. Private enterprise exercises and that developed in Dawson, probably should not have taken place in the form of direct grant assistance. It has interfered with the private marketplace of those competing businesses that have made it on their own. I know the minister appreciates the dilemma of that sort of thing.

Quite similarly, the Ski Chalet fits into almost that same mold. I agree with the minister that perhaps that the answer, in fact, is either low interest or no interest loan money. I think business would probably prefer that. Direct grant money often gives it a very false economic base and it subsequently, within a year or two or three, finds that the average marketplace forces cannot support it and it goes under and the whole exercise has been for naught.

I am wondering if the minister could respond in the sense of trying to describe those areas that government ought to be involved with, ought to be providing incentive money for, and those areas that they probably should not. I would suggest to the minister that in the remote wilderness aspects of tourism development, the government should be in the forefront. They should be developing boat ramps, they should be developing wilderness trails, they should be developing remote historical sites, and so on. Those are distinctly and unquestionably, categorically government initiative, because private enterprise will not touch those things, because they are not really commercially viable for the most part.

Would the minister respond in an effort to try to delineate its developing philosophy as to where it steps into the marketplace and where it does not?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That becomes a very complicated problem.

Businesses today, as we know them and as the member opposite, who has business experience, I am sure is well aware of; people from the old business school feel today that businesses have an easy go of it. There are all kinds of grants available and the government gives them assistance and they can have some high-falootin' government person come in and tell them exactly what they have to do and they do not have to struggle and fight. However that is society today, that is life. Everyone from the old school thinks that people today have it much easier. I do admit that the comments the member made about the false economic base that grants can give that impression. Also, the fact of the competitive edge and how hard businessmen worked in times past when they were establishing their own businesses and their own businesses were growing and developing. But the businessman today, I believe, because of society today, maybe requires a little bit more support than in the past. They still work just as hard. However, things have changed. Development has changed and business practices have changed.

<sup>35</sup> I feel comfortable that, as a government, we are not getting involved in the wrong aspects of supporting the private sector. We certainly try to keep in touch with the Yukon Visitors Association, keep in touch with the industry, so that if we are planning a certain



program to assist the private sector we discuss it with the industry first to make sure we are doing the right thing, so that we are not getting involved in something we perhaps should not be getting involved in, such as we follow with the heritage aspects. If we are planning on having a bit of extra funding to direct to some restoration project, we consult with the Yukon Historic & Museum Association. I think, because we are so small in Yukon and because our population base is small, we have few people to draw from and I hope that we would be able to keep control of that kind of problem so that we do not end up having a huge problem. I do not wish to make any comments about the Ski Chalet or about the situation in Dawson because that happened before my time.

I hope that, as the Minister of Tourism and as part of the Government of Yukon, we can see that the government keeps on track with their efforts to support the private sector as opposed to interfering with it.

**Mr. Chairman:** At this time, I think we should take a short break.

#### Recess

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

**Mr. Byblow:** This side does not object to beginning proceedings.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am all by myself. I do not want to go ahead if I am all alone. Okay, we will go ahead then.

**Mr. Chairman:** We shall now continue on general debate on page 56 Tourism, Heritage and Culture.

**Mr. Byblow:** The closing comment I would make relative to the debate prior to the break is that, whatever policy and philosophy government is developing with respect to participating in the commercial marketplace towards tourism development, I think the point must be taken into account that funding made available should not be made selectively. In other words, when monies are made available for specific purposes for commercial enterprises, it is probably a far better situation universally if such an opportunity were made available to all competing interests. That would, to a large extent, eliminate the kind of controversy that surrounds selective handouts. That would be my closing remark on that.

I do not think the minister intends to respond. I would like to question another area.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I just want to say that that is our goal — to make funding available to all competing interests and not to be selective.

**Mr. Byblow:** I want to raise a question relative to the heritage portion of the department, or the heritage aspect of the department. To a large extent, a number of the projects identified are of a heritage and cultural identification in that they are restoring and rebuilding historical sites. The minister is certainly quite aware of the problems relating to ownership, relating to jurisdiction and relating to responsibility in Yukon of historical sites that are outside the purview of territorial lands administered by the territory and I am wondering if the minister can update us with respect to federal discussions on any areas of historic sites?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I really do not have an update to give the member for Faro. We are working on heritage legislation and we do have a policy paper that has been made public, with the policy of this government, regarding the heritage legislation. That is presently being perused by the Yukon Historical Museums Association as well as the general public. It is available to whomever is interested in reading it. Through the Yukon Historical Museums Association, we are continuing some discussions regarding the concerns that the member for Faro has over federal jurisdiction, not only of lands and buildings, but of artifacts, and so on. Hopefully, when we have our own legislation, we will be in a stronger position to enter into some more serious negotiations as well as in the future. When we have our own heritage facility and we can accommodate some of the artifacts I mentioned, we will be able to have a stronger position.

**Mr. Falle:** I would like to ask the minister, in general debate, if she or her department has given any consideration to putting the Selkirk stabilization, Hootalinqua stabilization and Robinson House

stabilization out for public tender?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am not sure what the member means. I have a general idea. The actual labour is done by people who are looking for employment. However, there is some supervisory requirements needed because of the technical aspects of restoration. So, if the concern of the member is that local people are used as a labour force, we do use local people.

**Mr. Falle:** No, that is not my concern at all. Fort Selkirk stabilization is \$180,000, and that money is to be spent, I believe, in stabilizing the old buildings. It is very likely that it did not cost that much to build, but that is not the point. The point is \$180,000, is a lot of money to stabilize an old building and I think it might be more advantageous for us to turn around and see if we could put it out on contract. I do not know.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It is an interesting point the member for Hootalinqua makes. However, when it comes to stabilizing these old buildings, a lot of very fine, technical expertise is needed to ensure that the building is restored to its former appearance and so on, as well as the fact that it is going to be durable, as well as the fact there are some preserving techniques that have to be taken into account. So we have not pursued the avenue of tendering it out. I do not know if we would have anyone in Yukon who would have that particular expertise because our heritage director within the Department of Heritage and his staff provide that technical advice.

The member for Whitehorse South Centre had asked a question about the Carcross Indian Band asking for some assistance with renovations. I believe all they really requested was the technical expertise that we have. As the member for Hootalinqua is asking regarding tendering this work out, I have to stress that technical expertise is critical when it comes to restoring old buildings.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Further to what Mrs. Firth has said, the work on Fort Selkirk, to date, has been done by the Department of Renewable Resources for the Department of Tourism. We hire crews out of all the communities every year and there are only maybe one or two actual government employees. In fact, usually, even the manager on that project is on a contract basis with this government and with the department.

As Mrs. Firth has said, there is a great deal of expertise needed in restoring buildings. They are restored to their original concept and to their original construction and it is very time-consuming. I can assure the member for Hootalinqua that, if it was contracted out, it certainly would not be done any cheaper and would probably be done not nearly as well as it is today.

**Mr. Falle:** Is it the government's opinion, or their goal, to stabilize the buildings and have them in their original condition, such as, use the same wood, the same floor? I do know the roadhouse at Hootalinqua is run down, dilapidated, and the best thing to do is take a bulldozer and pile it over and burn and put a new one there. That is my opinion, if you are going use it, because it seems to be rotten wood and it has been there for many years. It is pretty hard to stabilize something that rotten and gone.

I do not know about the expertise, but I do know if you are going to do anything to that building to make it useable again, you are going to have to use new lumber and, with \$65,000, you could build a darn nice one.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I appreciate what the minister for Hootalinqua is saying; however, the value of that historic building is the value of it being original. His point of view is a point of view that some people pursue when they are developing some tourism attractions.

In Yukon, the decision has been made, in conjunction with the Yukon Historical Museums Association and with a great deal of the public input that we have had, that we do have these buildings in Yukon that are of stable enough condition that we can restore them and rehabilitate them and that we then have even more for our value. It is very difficult to put a value on something of great historical significance and it is also very expensive to restore these historic buildings.

Personally, I would not like to see them bulldozed down and rebuilt, because we would lose the historical significance of them. So, I just want to reiterate that I appreciate what the member is saying and I appreciate the cost factor. I do realize that it is very

expensive to restore these buildings, however, we are restoring them for their historic significance.

**Mrs. Joe:** I just have one question I would like to ask of the minister and that is, if a person or a business is applying for funding to do some kind of work on their business or their building or whatever, is there a requirement for the residency of that person who is applying for funds? Does he have to be a resident of Yukon for a certain period of time?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am not exactly sure about that. I can come back next sitting day with an answer for the member. I cannot say, positively, one way or the other.

*On Tourism Small Business Incentive Program*

**Mr. Byblow:** As I recall the estimates from the year previous, we did not have this identified as a particular line item and the indication under the description of the line item is that it is the incentive program from the year previous. Perhaps the minister could just put my thinking in correct perspective as to what the incentive program is.

<sup>38</sup> Also, when will it materialize?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** As I have said before, this is the \$50,000 to add to the \$150,000 to make the total \$200,000 to add to the \$2,000,000 that the federal government gave us.

**Mr. Byblow:** Quite clearly, the money is not for a program currently in place; it is for a program to carry the funding.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** None of this money will be spent until after April 1st. The program is currently in place. However, this funding will not be expended until after April 1st.

*Tourism Small Business Incentive Program in the amount of \$50,000 agreed to*

*On Tourism Facilities Program*

**Mr. Byblow:** Could the minister briefly elaborate on the specifics of the program?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** This is the program I have been talking about for the private sector stimulation. The guidelines for this program will be comparable to the guidelines of the Tourism and Small Business Incentive Program we had in conjunction with the federal government. However, we definitely will not be having a restrictive clause in it as far as destination areas. So it will be for all Yukon.

**Mr. Byblow:** Have the details of the program been prepared and, if not, when will they be available? I realize that the funding does not materialize until April 1st. When can small business look forward to the details of the program in print?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have to consult with the Department of Economic Development because they also have a program that will be similar to this for small business and we would like to work with them to arrive at guidelines that are consistent so that we do not run into any conflicts. So, we hope as soon as possible to have the outline of the program and the guidelines available for the public's perusal.

**Mr. Byblow:** Will the minister consider our previous discussion about marketplace conflict of government grants when she considers the details of this program?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes.

*Tourism Facilities Program in the amount of \$500,000 agreed to  
On Museum Grants*

**Mr. McDonald:** The \$45,000 mentioned in the 1984-85 estimates; can the minister tell us whether this funding is for grants for museum start-up and, as well, is it for grants for capital projects which would enhance the structures of existing museums? Further to that, I would be interested to know — in the purchase of museum artifacts — at least in one case a person has come to me to ask whether or not museums or the government purchases artifacts and I am interested in knowing the process by which that kind of decision is made.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** This \$45,000 allows funds for capital projects and for the purchase of museum artifacts. It says that right in the description of the line item. It is also for start-up or reopening of museums. For example, I believe we will be reopening the Old Crow museum in 1984, which has not been opened for the past three years. Also, we will continue to put some monies towards capital improvements and the grounds, upgrading of displays,

improved care and storage of artifacts, and the project priorities are established by each individual museum's association. So we look to them for establishment of priorities and where they want the funding to go. The museum associations are very heavily involved in the expenditure and identification of the funding. We will be having on a staff a museums advisor who, I believe, will be here in January. This was approved in the past O&M budget for Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources. This individual will be going to the museums in the outlying areas, giving them some expert advice as to how to run museums, but will definitely not be involved in running the museums in the particular areas.

We feel in the department that each area has its unique qualities and we would not like to interfere with that. However, we would like to assist them where we can in the operations of a museum.

<sup>39</sup> *Museum Grants in the amount of \$45,000 agreed to*

*On Travel Film Prints*

*Travel Film Prints in the amount of \$25,000 agreed to*

*On Conservation Laboratory*

*Conservation Laboratory in the amount of \$11,000 agreed to  
On Highway Point of Interest Signs*

**Mr. Byblow:** Can the minister advise whether or not there is a particular regional thrust on the development of signs?

Currently the highway signs are identified as to the number of the highways and there are some tourism indicator signs throughout Yukon. What type of signs are going to be developed this year?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have identified approximately 30 new sites along the Alaska Highway and Klondike Highway South. We are anticipating developing some other sites all over Yukon. I believe we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 90 signs. It is quite an extensive sign program. The locations are decided upon in conjunction with Parks Canada and with the Yukon Visitors Association, and with other government departments such as Highways and Renewable Resources. It is a very extensive program. It is not done by the government alone.

*Highway Point of Interest Signs in the amount of \$80,000 agreed to*

*On Ladue Mill - Dawson City*

**Mr. Byblow:** Having spent \$70,000 last year, is this now the conclusion of the project?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, it is not. This \$25,000 is mainly for some work around the foundation and sub-floor of the building. We would like to restore the building one day to a useable state, which would mean a very major expense for the interior restoration. However, the government did not feel it was a priority at this time to make a building that could be turned into office space. We would like to stabilize it so it does not deteriorate any further.

*Ladue Mill - Dawson City in the amount of \$25,000 agreed to  
On Old Territorial Administration Building*

**Mr. Byblow:** I have two questions. The minister can probably answer them at the same time.

Will this do the entire work required to renovate that facility and are we to anticipate the commissioner's residence on this line item next year?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, this will not at all do the whole facility. This is for some landscaping work that was done as a result of damage when they did the foundation work. If the member recalls the motion we spoke to I said the total cost of the restoration of that building would be approximately \$1,100,000. We have not spent nearly that.

*Old Territorial Administration Building in the amount of \$25,000 agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, due to the hour I would move that we report progress on Bill Number 28.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would move, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

<sup>40</sup> **Mr. Speaker:** I will call the House to order.

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

**Mr. Brewster:** The Committee of the Whole has reconsidered Bill Number 14, *Financial Administration Act*, and directed me to report the same with amendments.

Further, the Committee has considered Bill Number 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.

**Bill No. 14: Third reading**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I request unanimous consent to waive Standing Order 59(3), in order to proceed with third reading of Bill Number 14, at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare that unanimous consent has been granted. Proceed.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill Number 14 be now read a third time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared to adopt the title to the bill?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 14 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill Number 14 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare that the motion has carried and that Bill Number 14 has passed this House.

I would like to advise the House that we are prepared to receive Mr. Commissioner, in his capacity as Lieutenant-Governor, to give assent to certain bills which have passed this House.

*Mr. commissioner, Doug Bell, enters the Chambers*

**Mr. Commissioner:** Please be seated.

**Mr. Speaker:** May it please your Honour, the Assembly has at its present session, passed a number of bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the Assembly, I respectfully request your assent.

**Mr. Clerk:** *An Act to Amend the Workers' Compensation Act, An Act to Amend the Society of Management Accountants Act, An Act to Amend the Yukon River Basin Study Agreement Act, An Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act, Certified General Accountants Act, Access to Information Act, Financial Administration Act, and The Business Corporations Act.*

**Mr. Commissioner:** I hereby assent to the bills as enumerated by the Clerk.

*Mr. Commissioner leaves the Chambers*

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

May I have your further pleasure?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would move that we do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

*The House adjourned at 5:20 p.m.*

