



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 6

4th Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, March 28, 1984 — 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 Philipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources; and, Government Services

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

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

(Independent)

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

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

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

ERRATUM

Monday, March 26, 1984

Page 43, left column, eighth paragraph, should read as follows:

The arbitrary amendments to our constitution, the *Yukon Act*, which are contained in Bill C-26 and which are to be imposed by the federal government, I believe violate our democratic right, our sense of federalism, and our notion of respect for all the regions of this country.

Page 43, right column, sixth paragraph, should read as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the other morning I heard our Member of Parliament, Mr. Erik Nielsen, say that the federal measure was unnecessary. Now, Mr. Nielsen did not explain the point but Mr. Nielson, as we know, is an excellent lawyer, and it seems to me that Mr. Nielsen would be aware of the possibility, or aware of the legal arguments, that C-26 may be unnecessary because the Constitution is already clear that French-speaking persons have certain rights in this territory already and that, for example, there is nothing that would impinge upon such a person's right presently to address this Assembly in their language.

Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, March 28, 1984 — 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: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper.

Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have for tabling the "Yukon Teachers' Staff Relations Board Annual Report, 1982-83".

I have for tabling, also, the 1982-83 "Yukon Lottery Commission Report".

Hon. Mr. Lang: On behalf of the government leader, I have for tabling the correspondence, dated May 30th and June 1st, between Mr. Allen and Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have a report to table, entitled "Current Management of Ungulates and their Predators in the Territory".

Mr. Speaker: Reports of committees?
 Petitions?
 Introduction of bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 4: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that Bill No. 4, entitled *Legal Profession Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that a bill entitled *Legal Profession Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 7: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that Bill No. 7, entitled the *Public Utilities Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that a bill, entitled the *Public Utilities Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 20: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that a Bill No. 20, *An Act to Amend the Dental Profession Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that a bill, entitled *An Act to Amend the Dental Profession Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Notices of motion for the production of papers?
 Notices of motion?
 Statements by ministers?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: *Municipal Act*

Mr. Penikett: I have a totally inoffensive question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. Is consideration being given to granting the LIDs a portion of the tax arrears, penalties and interests owing at the time of their incorporation under the new *Municipal Act*?

Hon. Mr. Lang: To be inoffensive, the answer is yes.

Mr. Penikett: Continuing in my defensive way: in this event, is the Government of Yukon prepared to write off the arrears on uncollectable accounts such as trailers that left the community?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is a very specific question. It would appear to me that that would have to be done under the *Taxation Act* and if the property was no longer there, I would assume that it would be written off as an uncollectable.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to ask the minister a final supplementary on the same subject about the problem of tax arrears on squatters under the area we are talking about and, at the same time, ask the minister if he has a position on that, or if that position will be coming under the aegis of the squatter policy that he has under consideration and when that policy may be coming?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If people are squatting without being authorized with the purchase of the land, they still have a responsibility, as the member knows, to pay taxes on their improvements. I would suspect that they should either pay their taxes and, if they do not, the same procedures would apply as would apply to anyone else.

Question re: *Liquor and health*

Mr. Kimmerly: To the minister responsible for the Liquor Control Board: yesterday the government leader said, "I do not believe that there is any sort of correlation or a connection between the mark-up of liquor and the health of the people of the territory".

Is it the policy of the Liquor Corporation that the price of liquor and the health of Yukon citizens are uncorrelated or unconnected?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The Yukon Liquor Corporation has a board, which is called the Yukon Liquor Corporation, and a board of directors. They set their own policies, but they do look at moral issues when they are setting policies.

Mr. Kimmerly: It is clear that the minister is responsible for the general policies of the board.

Is it the policy of the Corporation that the availability of liquor, concerning the number of licences and the hours of sale, is also not correlated or connected with the health of the people of the territory?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The minister is not responsible for what the liquor board does; the liquor board sets its own policy. This legislature sets the legislation that they must govern by.

Mr. Kimmerly: That is quite wrong and I will follow it up. It is the policy of the corporation that the hours of permitted sale on licences in rural communities is uncorrelated or unconnected with the health of the people of that community?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I would have to take the question on notice and find out what the exact policy is that the corporation has.

Question re: *Department of Renewable Resources director*

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

At the present time, the Department of Renewable Resources is without a director of the biological section of the department. Is this position going to be filled and, if so, when?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, all of the positions in the department will be filled. We have had an outside company do a study of the organization of the renewable resources department. Recommendations have been made to us. When we finalize the procedure that we will take, we will be filling all of the positions in the department.

Mr. Porter: The minister has just tabled in the legislature, a document entitled "Current Management of Ungulates and Their Predators". Why does this information package not address future grizzly bear studies, and is there going to be any further studies done on bears in Game Zones 7 and 9?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would suggest that the member across the floor read the package. It is a study in itself. It is a three-year study, and when we get the information from that, we will have more information in order to carry on ongoing studies.

Mr. Porter: I have read it, and it clearly is not a study. What is the purpose of this information package that rationalizes government decision-making and solicits public opinion after the fact?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The purpose of the paper is to explain to the general public, here and anywhere else, exactly what our program is. Contrary to the statement that the member made that we were seeking information after the fact, that is not true. We have held a great many public meetings throughout the territory.

Question re: Incarceration rates in Yukon

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Incarceration rate of inmates in Yukon has always been high, even before the use of the fine options program. I would like to ask the minister if he could provide this House with statistics of the incarceration rate of inmates before and after the fine options program?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this is a question that would be more properly addressed as a written question, but if the minister wishes to answer it, I will permit an answer.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: That is exactly what I was going to advise the member opposite.

Mrs. Joe: The minister has stated in the past that his department is always monitoring the statistics of the high incarceration rate in our jails. Since those statistics are higher than anywhere else in the country, has his department considered doing a comprehensive study on this and other justice problems with the view of improving the justice system?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: That is exactly what I have been telling the member opposite for a while; that I have a steering committee that is looking at a number of different issues throughout justice. On the high incarceration rate, one of the main reasons is the fine options program not being allowed. It was only offered for a very short time before it was struck down.

Mrs. Joe: Last April the minister said that he would, during that session, provide this House with the total cost of persons incarcerated from failure to pay fines in the last fiscal year. Will the minister table that information during this session?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: If we have the figures, yes, I will certainly table them.

Question re: Contracting of government services

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for either the government leader or the minister responsible for government services. There have been significant rumours in both past and present that the government will not only not oppose in general the contracting out of government services, but is actively considering the contracting out of janitorial services. Is the government planning to contract out this service in the next fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have been, over the past two years, looking at what services, in fact, we should be contracting out. Janitorial services are part of what we are looking at. There has been no decision made to contract them out at this point in time. I really do not know, and I am in no position to state, that it will not happen. I can say that there has not been a decision taken to date.

Mr. McDonald: I am not sure whether the minister was referring only to janitorial services or to any other particular government services, so I will ask that question: whether the government is considering to contract any other services that are currently the purview of this government in the next fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have not made the decision to contract out any other services at all. As I said, we have been, and we are continually looking at, the ways in which we can get the work done that is going to be the best advantage for the taxpayers.

Mr. McDonald: For any government services contracted out, is it the policy of this government to institute a fair wage schedule into the contracts to ensure that any efficiency is not effected through wage cuts?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: For any contracts contracted out, the contract would follow the normal procedures already in place.

Question re: Recreation, green paper on

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

The report of the green paper committee on recreation that was so highly praised in this House recommended that a comprehensive arts program be given in the school curriculum, using accredited art teachers and contract artists. Could I ask the minister what action she has seen to take on this recommendation, to date?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We have not initiated a comprehensive arts program in the education system. We have, however, entered into a partnership with the Guild, where we pay half a person's salary and the Guild Hall pays the other half, so that an individual could be

hired to give the students some extra encouragement, as well as the teachers some extra pointers, on that aspect of the performing arts.

We are just taking under advisement other recommendations that have been made.

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

Another recommendation in the same report called on the Department of Education to ensure the provision to all teachers of basic arts information as tools in the teaching of humanities. The minister seemed to indicate in her first answer that there was something of this nature being done: could she indicate to what extent that is different this year, as opposed to last year?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It is not any different this year than it was last year.

Mr. Penikett: Could the minister advise the House if there are any — and if so, how many — full-time art teachers in the Yukon school system, at the moment?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I would have to take that question under advisement. I do not know, just off the bat, how many art teachers there are.

Question re: White Pass and Yukon Route

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the government leader on the subject of White Pass and the transportation loan.

Could the government leader inform the House as to the current status of the one million dollar loan by this government? I ask that in light of the land exchange having recently taken place.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The land exchange was for the million dollars, and it happened prior to December 31st of this year.

Mr. Byblow: I would have hoped that the minister who responded could, perhaps, have given some detail, so I will pursue the detail.

In light of my information, which suggests that the land value does not have a one million dollar price tag, currently, what justification is the government offering to equate the land versus loan amounts?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am more than prepared to give the member some detail. In December, 1983, White Pass agreed to transfer title to the following lands to the Yukon government, in exchange for which the Yukon government would discharge White Pass' one million dollar interest free loan. Those waterfront lands between the Yukon government building and the old Yukon Electrical Firehall, consisting of 102,000 square feet at an agreed price of \$826,000, or \$8.13 a square foot.

The price of \$8.13 is considerably lower than the present market values of \$20 to \$25 per square foot, and reflects the grant to White Pass rail line easement or right-of-ways, including two rail-related structures at no cost until they are no longer required by White Pass.

Rail lines are relocated, as the member knows, adjacent to this building. In addition, White Pass will be permitted to use two unoccupied residential dwellings at no cost to this agreement, although this agreement may be terminated upon six months' notice by the Yukon government if these lands are required for development purposes.

This arrangement also eliminates the requirement for the Government of Yukon to provide White Pass with an added annual payment of approximately \$12,000 for the Yukon government parking lot located on this land.

Two, a group of islands, together with 25 metre access right-of-way close to the Second Avenue Chevron Service Station: these islands consist of 17.4 acres and were assigned a value of \$100,000 or, I believe, \$5.70 per square foot.

The purchase of six blocks of White Pass lands for exchange of others in Carcross, an agreed price of \$74,000, or \$8,200 per acre. This acquisition by trading arrangement will prevent the sale and development of these lands, which are extremely attractive and environmentally sensitive, and ecologically delicate and difficult to service.

Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite needs more definitive answers, I will be more than prepared to provide them.

Mr. Byblow: I must say that the minister has upstaged me on this one.

I wonder if the minister could clarify the third sentence of the third paragraph... but I do have a serious question. In the detail provided — and I must remind myself not to ask the minister for detail — was there any land transaction that took place in the Carcross area?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Just to reiterate, the member obviously was not listening to what I had to say: "the purchase of six blocks of White Pass lands in exchange for others in Carcross at an agreed price of \$74,000 or \$8,200 per acre. This acquisition and trade arrangement prevent the sale and development of these lands, which are extremely attractive, environmentally sensitive, ecologically delicate and difficult to service", and, I might add, I can spell all of those words.

Question re: Cabinet ministers' travel allowance

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question to the government leader, that he also will be expecting.

Yesterday, the government leader was asked what incidentals cabinet ministers had that government employees do not have when they travel. Will the government leader now answer that question: what incidentals are there to justify a \$60-a-day allowance?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will elevate the level of this debate, and get us out of the wallowing swamp with the expense question I believe we are being faced with.

We have a \$60-a-day incidental and meal expense that I take advantage of as a minister when I travel. Incidentals that are eligible to be charged under that \$60-a-day expense are anything that a minister would require for that day. Some examples are aspirins. If I happen to have a headache and I need an aspirin, I can buy that and that would be covered under the incidental expenses.

As well, it includes things like combs, or a newspaper or magazines. I see the member finds this extremely humorous. I am glad to see he does.

Also, gratuities are covered under the \$60-a-day incidental expense: that can be tips that are from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per tip and that, on some days, could run as high as \$10 to \$15 a day — perhaps more. If you are arriving at a location that you are travelling to, you could have a porter who you would have to tip for your bags; you could have some laundry expenses, if you had to have a suit pressed or something drycleaned; or if your shoes needed to be cleaned; then your meals are included in that and the tip for the dinner is included in that \$60-a-day expense and the tip for a dinner could be anywhere from \$20 to \$30, or \$35 for a meal.

I just want to stress that this figure was not something that was picked out of the air. The decision to have an expense allowance of \$60-a-day was not made in isolation or in a vacuum. It was made in light of the experience that past ministers had had when they were travelling, and in light of the current travel and social costs and social expectations.

Whether the NDP believe it or not, it is socially acceptable to have a bottle of wine with dinner if you are entertaining other ministers at dinner. I have, on occasion, asked two or three ministers to accompany me for dinner, so that I could discuss with them new ideas that they were pursuing in their areas of responsibility, so that we could share those ideas. I do not think the public would find it objectionable that we would buy a bottle of wine for that meal.

The deputy Minister of Finance has advised us, and recommended it, and has had no difficulty with the amount of \$60 a day. He has not expressed to us a concern that that was excessive. I am sure the opposition has a high regard for the reputation of the deputy Minister of Finance; that he is a frugal individual and not excessive with the taxpayers' dollars. So, if the opposition wishes any further questions on it, I would be prepared to answer them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we pursue this question, I would like to remind members that questions raised in Question Period — and I am quoting from *Beauchesne* — ought to be of some urgency; there must be some present value in seeking the information during question period, rather than through the Order Paper or through correspondence with the minister of the department.

It occurs to the Chair that, perhaps, a committee of the whole House may be discussing matters relative to the type of question

that has been raised by the hon. member today. If that be the case, perhaps the hon. member would wish to deal with such administrative matters in one of the committees of the whole House, rather than taking the time of the House for questions that would not appear, to the Chair, to be urgent and in keeping with the rules of the Question Period.

Mr. Kimmerly: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, you do not like the question.

In addition to the \$60-a-day travel allowance, do ministers also receive a hospitality allowance, as do deputy ministers?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask a written question, as a final...

Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot permit a written question as a supplementary. I must remind the hon. member that he has used up his questions. If he wishes to pose another question, he may do so, but kindly indicate it to the Chair. I cannot permit a written question as a supplementary.

Question re: Purchase of surplus power by Alaska

Mr. Porter: I have an urgent question that was just announced on the CBC noon broadcast. It concerned that the State of Alaska was talking about seriously considering purchasing surplus power from the Yukon. I would like to direct this question to the government leader: is the government leader aware of the desire of the State of Alaska to purchase Yukon power and what is his government's position on the matter?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I must say this is very old news. The state of Alaska has been looking with covetous eyes at the power potential of this territory for a number of years. The chairman of the Northern Canada Power Commission, Mr. Jim Smith, has been in discussions for some length of time, some months, with the State of Alaska about the possibility at some future date of the state purchasing electrical hydro energy produced in Yukon.

The interest has always been there. I believe that what the State of Alaska is looking at, at the present time, is the feasibility of an underwater cable from Skagway to Juneau within the Lynn Canal, with a hookup as well to Haines. Then, of course, the object of the exercise would be a land line, probably from the Whitehorse grid to Skagway, in order to get power there. I must stress that this is very much in the preliminary stages. There have been no deals made, there has been no discussions about costs, or anything else. This is strictly a feasibility study that the State of Alaska is doing.

Mr. Porter: Is it the policy of this government to allow the development of our hydro power for the export market?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Well, number one, it is not our hydro power, it is the Government of Canada's. I would be most pleased on behalf of the people of this territory to take it over, should they want us to do that, and then we will set the policy. At the present time it is not our policy to make.

Mr. Porter: Does the government leader favour the tying of the Yukon power grid into the grid system of other jurisdictions to facilitate the transmission of power?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The best possible thing that could happen to us is to get tied in to someone else's power grid. Surely that is the way that you guarantee that you do have power.

"

Question re: Video display terminals

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the government leader. In January of last year, the Public Service Commission established a committee to study the health hazards of video display terminals, and I asked the government leader this question in November and I will ask him again. Could the government leader tell us what the current status is of this study?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There is absolutely no evidence to show that video terminals create any hazard to an operator.

Mrs. Joe: I would like to then ask the minister if the study is completed, will it be tabled in this House or will it be available to the public?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would have to check with my department to see if the study was done in a manner that could be tabled in the

House. I am not sure whether it could be or not.

Question re: BST program re Stewart/Elsa Highway

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the same minister, and I hope he is as compassionate with this question. In a long term program for the application of BST or chip seal on Yukon highways, can the minister state whether the government is planning to apply this BST on the Stewart/Elsa Highway?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We would not be applying it to the Stewart/Elsa Highway at the present time, mainly because there are more important highways with heavier traffic that we would have to apply it to first. Certainly, it will be taken into consideration during future years.

Mr. McDonald: I am sure we will get into specifics during the debate on the estimates. As far as policy is concerned, in general terms, in terms of applying surfacing to the highways, what is the specific priority of Stewart/Elsa Highway in relation to other highways, and how are the priorities established?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I could not say what the priority is, but the priority is easily established. It is established by the amount of traffic on the road and the use of the road.

Mr. McDonald: I would like to explore that further. My final supplementary is directed to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. Can the minister state when the base preparation for BST application will be made to the streets of Mayo, and can he also state what portion of the town will be covered?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not know how much information the member wants, but I will try to be short. Right now we are looking, in consultation with the community of Mayo, to see whether or not we could proceed this year for the purposes of upgrading approximately five kilometres within the community. Once that is done, I think actual BST would be applied in the following year.

Question re: Northern Air Transportation Association

Mr. Byblow: The member for Mayo did not ask the detail. I have a question for the government leader. A half an hour ago, the government leader addressed the Northern Air Transportation Association and, I must say, I enjoyed the presentation. In part, the government leader addressed the question of deregulation and, yesterday, this government made a presentation to the air transport hearings. Because I am still not particularly clear on this government's position, could the government leader clarify whether this government is supportive of deregulation for the air industry in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is a very difficult question. I think we were about as explicit as we possibly could be, both in the presentation made by the Minister of Transportation, yesterday, and in my remarks today.

We are very concerned that deregulation could adversely affect the level of service in the territory now; that is, coming into the territory and within the territory. What we are trying to do is make sure that our concern is considered seriously.

Certainly, given the experience of some communities in the United States, we would have to say that we cannot support deregulation if it means that services are going to be dropped, or if it means that our services are going to be cut back in a drastic way, as they were in some places in the United States.

So, philosophically, I guess there is no doubt about it: certainly, everyone of us, I am sure, is in favour of deregulation. It is a very difficult question and I think I would be in favour of — and I think the government would be in favour of — deregulation, if we could be convinced that deregulation is not going to mean a reduction in services.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: I appreciate the government leader's answer because, in part, it explains what was appearing to me as something of a contradiction in position.

The government leader stated in his answer, and earlier today in his presentation, he talked about...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member please get to his question, he is now entering into debate.

Mr. Penikett: Oh, come on. He is allowed speeches over there and we cannot even listen to sentences over here.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: I will continue.

The government leader said that this government does not advocate full and ironclad guarantees for existing carriers — and I assume he meant Yukon — but what does he mean when he says that he does not favour or advocate protection to the Yukon carriers?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, we are back to the question of deregulation. Regulation is a form of protection for existing carriers and we are not in favour of existing carriers having any kind of an ironclad guarantee, whereby only they are going to be in business. We feel very strongly that the essence, particularly of the air transportation business, is competition.

If there must be regulations — and now I am arguing the other side of the fence, with respect — what I am saying is that we must make sure that those regulations do not offer ironclad guarantees to the existing companies. Others must be able to get in; there must be a way for competition to exist.

Mr. Byblow: The government leader will agree that the precarious nature of the Yukon air industry requires some form of guarantees to ensure a level of service, and those can be ironclad.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Byblow: I want to ask the government leader, specifically, is it a position of this government that the Yukon air industry is now over-regulated? Is that part of his government's position?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We will be addressing this question directly in a presentation that we intend to be making to the commission in June, when they are going to be dealing specifically with regional airlines. The hearings, at this point in time, are in effect on the national lines or the out of territory lines. We will be addressing directly the regional question, which we view as being quite a bit different and far more critical to us, at that point in time.

Question re: Cabinet ministers' travel allowances

Mr. Kimmerly: A question to the government leader about a matter of substantial political sensitivity. The Minister of Tourism gave a list of incidentals covered by incidental allowances, and the only one not in the list of any other employee would be a bottle of wine. Is the policy of the establishment of the \$60-a-day allowance also to include bar bills?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will answer this question because the member for Whitehorse South Centre asked yesterday what the list was for. Today we came back and we extended the courtesy to him to respond as to what the list was, and he sat there and he laughed. So he asked the question, you give him an answer, and he laughs. When I gave that answer, I indicated to the member for Whitehorse South Centre that it was socially acceptable today, whether he likes it or not, to have a bottle of wine with dinner. And yes, the bottle of wine is included in that \$60 expense. As minister of tourism, I have entertained people for dinner, and I can think of an instance just recently where wine was served at the dinner. My constituents have never indicated to me that that was a problem or that taxpayers should not be paying for that wine at that dinner. I have discussed this with my constituents.

Mr. Kimmerly: I ask the government leader: is there also a double standard for the ceiling on accommodation costs; that is, costs of hotels?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There is no ceiling on the cost of hotels. Our policy, with respect to hotels, is that the Government of Canada enters into an agreement with a number of hotels throughout Canada each year with respect to rates for government employees, including ministers, or anyone who is connected with, or works with the government. That list of hotels, by policy, is approved for members of the government when they are travelling. What an employee does is to make sure that he stays at those specific hotels, and all members do, ministers as well.

Mr. Kimmerly: Has the government leader considered the possibility that if the \$60-a-day allowance were reduced, cabinet ministers would stay at their desks a little more?

Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: I would rule that question out of order as being frivolous.

Question re: MacPass task force

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development on the subject of the MacPass Task Force, and rather than seeking extended detail, I have what could be the requirement for a brief answer. Is the task force now disbanded or is it still functioning? In other words, what is its current status?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is presently inactive.

Mr. Byblow: Is it the intention of this government to resurrect its activity in studying aspects of development in the MacPass region?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If the necessity arises, we would have no problem resurrecting the task force for the purposes of examining that area, just as we have done in the past.

Mr. Byblow: Can the minister tell me whether his government is currently involved with the federal government in any land use planning studies of the North Canol/MacPass area?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not at the present time. We did do a number of studies under the GDA that has expired, under the Department of Renewable Resources. As you know, the Minister of Highways announced a long time ago that they were opening up the placer mining roads, as well as the North Canol Road, early this year, for the purposes of people getting into the various mining properties, and that is one step we have taken this year, which I believe will help a number of the interests that are presently active in the area.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Orders of the Day and Motions for the Production of Papers.

MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Mr. Clerk: Item no. 1, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

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

Mr. Penikett: On a point of order, I believe the government house leader tabled today the documents requested in the motion. Accordingly, I would ask that it be dropped from the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered. We will now proceed to Motions Other than Government Motions.

Motion dropped from the Order Paper

MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS**Motion No. 3**

Mr. Clerk: Item no. 1 standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre THAT this House supports the addition of a home care service for senior citizens and chronic care patients to be established in Yukon during the 1984-85 fiscal year.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am eager to persevere in this motion. The principle of the motion has been raised before. For easy reference for anyone who is interested, I will identify that it was first raised December 1, 1982 at page 326, and again on October 26, 1983 at page 488 of *Hansard*.

When I initially raised this motion, or the principle of the motion, I asked for a report to the House within one year. That would have been before last Christmas.

The motion was amended to strike out that portion about the report. The second time I raised it, the minister spoke about a consultant's report due April 1, 1984. I asked in Question Period yesterday about the report, and it appears that it is postponed to the end of April but, far more importantly, it appears that the minister has no plans to table it.

That is surprising to me, as it is obviously a report about a public matter, prepared at public expense, and prepared in order to lay a foundation for the development of public property. I see absolutely no reason why it should not be tabled in the Assembly when it is received.

The last report on services to senior citizens was done in late 1977 and early 1978. I referred to it a year and a half ago. I am

persisting or persevering in raising this issue because it is a matter of extreme importance to many individuals who are long-time Yukoners.

I had originally made a proposal, and I pointed to an example of a senior citizens' home in Saskatchewan, and the proposal was that the senior citizen home maintain at least as many people outside the home, or outside of residential care, as they maintain beds in the home or people inside the home.

It is clear and uncontroversial that senior citizens, as everybody, but perhaps, especially senior citizens, value their independence. It is a dramatic day for most of them when they move out of their own accommodation — whether they own it or rent it, or whatever, it is their's independently — and they arrive at a point where they are no longer able to maintain it.

There are some fairly simple and very sensible programs that we could establish that would postpone that traumatic day for many Yukoners and, for some, eliminate it altogether. The two most popular outlines of programs are handyman service and a home care nursing service. This involves a fairly simple concept in the case of the home care service; a nurse coming around as required in order to give nursing care for a person in their own home and also a service involving other kinds of household chores; for example, cleaning and that sort of thing. It is a program that is not terribly expensive to establish. Indeed, there can be very strong arguments made that the program makes it possible for people to reside in their own home as opposed to a government financed residence, and it is, therefore, ultimately cheaper. The fact that it is cheaper is not the primary argument for it, but it is a very, very important one.

Now, that proposal was raised a year and a half ago and I would be very, very interested in the minister's response as to what has happened in the intervening year and a half. At the time the then minister spoke about a Progressive Conservative Party resolution that was passed as a motion on the floor, at a meeting of that political party, and it was a resolution to install a volunteer program throughout the territory for people to look after the older folk. It was described exactly in those words, on page 328 of the 1982 *Hansard*.

I am extremely interested in what the government has done about that. A volunteer program is far less desirable than a program employing staff; however, it would at least be something, and I am very interested to see what action has occurred on that policy in the last year and a half.

In the last Session, in October, 1983, I raised the issue again, and the minister spoke about a handyman service and said they were continuing to actively look at that. I am extremely interested in a report on the development of that.

Another issue, which is related, is the seniors' policy at the Yukon Housing Corporation. This was an issue of some political sensitivity in the last Session and the responsible minister, on the last day of the Session, announced an income tax return means test for seniors in Yukon Housing accommodation. I have received complaints about that. There are two people who have not allowed me to describe publicly their particular situation, but I have received complaints to the effect that those people feel that that is a severe imposition on their dignity as persons and as Yukoners. They feel it violates their sense of the law that an income tax return is private, between themselves and the Minister of Revenue, but to no other government department, and especially not local people.

I say that I know, as a fact, that there are people in Yukon, who are paying more rent than they should be paying, or than they can afford, because the refused to submit their income tax return — and they would be eligible — and they are, thus, paying more than they should. That is an additional, related point.

The minister has commented about a consultant's report. He told us about it in October last year. I have asked questions about it. I was specifically interested in any Yukon senior citizens who were able to get employment or casual employment or a contract for employment on this study. I am extremely interested in the study. I hope that outside experts are not digging into our situation here and will give us a report describing what those of us who live here already know. I hope that is not the case. I hope Yukon residents, and especially seniors who are actually employed in the consulta-

tion make the report.

I do not accept for a moment that that is a good excuse to delay it again. A political decision is necessary on this question; the motion is specific for a very good reason. It calls for a political decision. Is the government going to establish a home care service in the next budget year or is it not?

I say it is clearly my opinion that to say, yet again, for the third time, "wait and see, wait until the report is in", is simply not acceptable. We know there is a need. The report will certainly assist us as to the size of the program needed and the scope of the program, but the political decision about whether or not there will be a home care program is the political decision that should be made now. If it is not, it will be too late for the next budget year and it will be put off again, for at least a year.

¹⁴ A program will cost some money, that is obvious. There will be an expense for nursing care. I am perfectly capable of suggesting where the money might come from and where the other cutbacks might occur. I would suggest that a homecare service is a greater priority than one of the executive assistants to the Cabinet. I would suggest that a homecare service is a greater priority than Cabinet clerks, and I would suggest that a homecare service is a greater priority than a \$60-a-day Cabinet travel allowance.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: There is no question that this government is supportive of seniors. The numerous programs that we have initiated, such as the Pioneer Utility Grant, the Seniors Income Supplement and Pharmacare show that we are concerned about enabling seniors to remain in their own homes as long as possible.

We initiated the geriatric and rehabilitation services review, last fall, to determine what services are still needed in Yukon. This government believes in a rational, rather than ad hoc, approach to implementation of programs and that is why the study was commissioned. All senior citizen services will be assessed and planned on the basis of this study and its findings.

A homecare program is one of the program alternatives being assessed in the study process. I must stress, however, the program should not be planned and implemented in isolation from other services if comprehensive services to seniors are to be achieved. The proposed motion seeks implementation of a program during this coming fiscal year. Since we do not yet have the results of the study, it is impossible to indicate what the costs of such a program would be; we do not yet know how extensive the program should be.

For these reasons, we, on this side, cannot support this motion. We, certainly, are concerned about seniors who are in their homes, but we cannot support a motion that would commit us to a program before we know how extensive it should be and what the cost of the program will be. We will, therefore, be opposing this motion.

Mr. Kimmerly: I had asked some additional questions that were not answered. It is unfortunate that the Conservative party motion, passed before December, 1982, was not reported on. I hope that the movers of that motion will question the Conservative convention about what was done; there has certainly been no announcement of any government program and that is unfortunate.

²⁰ In the past, I have presented motions calling for a promotion of a principle in a fairly general sense, and they have both been passed.

This motion is the same principle but it calls on the government to establish a program in the next budget year. If they do not, at the earliest, it will be the 1985-86 budget year. They say they are not going to decide until there is lots of information about other programs and the maximal or optimal scope of the program and detailed information about costs.

We do know what a minimal program would cost. We do know what one person working out of Macaulay Lodge, going around to homes, would cost. We do know that. That is only one person that would be the establishment of the program. The government is obviously not prepared to make the political decision to add a person-year to Macaulay Lodge to carry out a home care service.

The senior citizens of the territory are not fooled; the political language and declarations of support are fine, but one person for a home care service is not excessive. In fact, it would save money, and I am extremely disappointed that the government does not support that, and I will be calling for division on the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Question has been called on the motion. Two members, having risen, division has been called.

²¹ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Disagree

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Ashley: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree

Mr. Falle: Disagree

Mrs. Nukon: Disagree

Mr. Brewster: Disagree

Mr. Penikett: Agree

Mr. Byblow: Agree

Mr. Kimmerly: Agree

Mr. Porter: Agree

Mrs. Joe: Agree

Mr. McDonald: Agree

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

Motion No. 3 defeated

Motion No. 4

Mr. Clerk: Item no. 2, standing in the name of Mr. Porter.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Member for Campbell prepared to deal with item 2?

Mr. Porter: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Campbell that a Select Committee of this House be established, the members to be appointed by separate motion, to study and make recommendations to the House on the proper management of Yukon wildlife resources and that prior to reporting to the House the Select Committee travel to all communities in Yukon to hold public meetings on the question of wildlife management in Yukon.

Mr. Porter: The motion before the legislature here today, I think, is long overdue. The issue of public participation in the formulation of a comprehensive wildlife policy for Yukon is a matter of grave concern to many Yukoners.

The people of the Yukon feel that they have a vested interest in the management of the territory's wildlife resources. From the average Yukoner's perspective, the role of government is simply as an instrument of the people's will. Yukoners do not believe that the government owns the wildlife resources. Clearly, if there is a claim of ownership, it is the public and only the public who can legitimately lay such a claim.

When the government begins to act in isolation of the public when making decisions affecting the wellbeing of the management of Yukon's wildlife resources, the people have a right to become concerned. I can tell you without a doubt that people of the Yukon are concerned about how wildlife is managed in this territory. Not only is the public questioning the logic of recent decisions regarding the wildlife population, but they are asking why there is no comprehensive management policy in place in Yukon with respect to wildlife.

Clearly the motion before us attempts to set out the process to begin to answer that important question. We, the official opposition, place a great deal of significance and value on the select committee process. It seems politicians throughout the country consistently mouth support for the principle of participatory democracy. Here in Yukon, we have an excellent opportunity to allow the citizens to participate directly in that democratic process of government. If this legislature is serious about involving its citizens in its affairs, then I would expect the motion before us to receive unanimous consent of the sitting members.

Not only does the motion call for the establishment of a select committee to facilitate adoption of a Yukon wildlife policy, it also provides to the committee the mandate to travel throughout Yukon. We would envision the committee being able to travel to all communities of the Yukon and hear directly from all people of the Yukon.

²² Upon completion of the community consultations, the committee could also hear from expert wildlife managers in other jurisdictions. Once the public consultation process is concluded, the select

committee could then report the findings to the legislature.

There are some major philosophical questions on wildlife management that have to be addressed. One question that has consistently been asked is: who are the major beneficiaries of the wildlife management in Yukon? Other questions include: should wildlife be managed strictly on a consumptive or non-consumptive basis? What is the value of wildlife in terms of tourism potential? Should wildlife, as species, be recognized to enjoy distinctive rights to co-exist with man, and how would such rights be articulated? Does the public have a right to be involved in the management decision-making process on an ongoing basis, and how would such a process be structured?

On the management level, the list of questions to be answered is enormous, and some of these questions include: what priority should be placed on the major users of wildlife? Should subsistence be a priority or sport hunting? Where does non-consumptive use fit in? In game management, should there be an identifiable dominant species or priority species? What are the consequences of the moose-ranching mentality to overall game management? When should hunting restrictions be imposed? What are the long term effects of large scale predator removal, and should we be moving into a more regional basis of game management? What role should our communities play in wildlife management? Should we, in Yukon, begin to manage wildlife on a sub-zone basis as opposed to the present system of large game zones?

The list of questions that needs to be addressed is exhaustive. I recognize that no one individual, or no groups of individuals, has all of the answers. What is important is that we begin a process designed to answer some of these very complex questions. I would suggest that a public process such as the legislative instrument of a select committee is a very good starting point. There is no question that this exercise in public democracy would carry a substantial price tag; however, I suggest the wellbeing of the territory's wildlife is worth the cost. It is a fact that this government has not been spending enough money on the renewable resources department.

Last year, in the O&M budget, the renewable resources portion of the overall budget was 3.8 percent. Including the capital expenditure recorded last year, it was 4.2 percent of the total expenditures. Further, the crisis that exists within wildlife management deserves a greater share of the dollars allocated for expenditure in Yukon. Wildlife management is one area that the Yukon government states that it has complete jurisdiction over. Surely, if that is the case, it would be expected that the government would manage this area of jurisdiction in a more prudent fashion.

If the government is seen to be incapable of managing competently this one area of jurisdiction they say they enjoy, how do they expect to be taken seriously when they ask for greater devolution of other responsibilities from the federal government?

²³ My feeling is that if we do not invest the money now, we may be paying dearly in the future. The price tag may include physical loss of some of our wildlife species. We should not allow ourselves complacency and think that this could never happen in Yukon: history has proven otherwise.

Throughout the planet, species of wildlife have been wiped off the face of the earth. A federal government television ad reminds us that nearly every day one species or another, in various parts of the globe, are being added to the endangered species list. In many parts of the lower 48 states, there is no longer such an animal as a wolf or a grizzly bear roaming the wilds. Some of our major caribou herds here in North America are in serious trouble because of a multitude of pressures.

I do not believe we should ignore history and conduct ourselves in isolation from the rest of the world. Through the use of today's technology and the communications infrastructure, decisions made in Yukon are immediately transmitted throughout the world. People in Washington are concerned about wildlife management in Yukon; people of California are concerned; the people of Toronto are concerned; the people of Vancouver are concerned; and, most importantly, the people of Yukon are concerned. Is it not about time that this government became concerned, as well?

In closing, I urge all members of this legislature to vote positively

for the motion before us. A vote for this motion is a vote for a better management system of wildlife resources in Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I take exception to this motion and I firmly believe that this government is managing our very, very important wildlife resource, on behalf of all Yukoners, in a credible manner. In fact, in the past few years, we have excelled in our wildlife management techniques.

One only has to point out the recent moose study, conducted in Zones 7 and 9, or the Finlayson caribou herd undertaken in the Ross River area. This work was undertaken by a professional and credible biologist. The study design and strategy has not been surpassed anywhere in North America. In fact, one of our biologists, Mr. Doug Larsen, has been invited to make a presentation of his work to an international conference in Sweden, this summer. Frankly, it is an honour to this government to have Mr. Larsen attend.

I would like to point out to members opposite that we do have guidelines and principles upon which we manage our valuable wildlife resources. For the benefit of members opposite, I will outline them: number one, to manage game species to provide for their continued existence at the carrying capacity of their habitat, while allowing for harvest at an optimum yield level or a lower level, depending on the social benefits sought; number two, to protect and provide wildlife for viewers, photographers and other non-consumptive users, realizing the importance of the tourism industry to Yukon; number three, to manage and regulate legalization of fur-bearing animals on the basis of sustainable yield and to aid the continuing development of the local guiding and fur industries; number four, to ensure the maintenance of all species of animals and birds, in terms of the useful function they serve in the balance of nature and to meet national and international responsibilities for rare, endangered and threatened species; number five, to assist in preventing wildlife from endangering human life or damaging private property; number six, to provide and maintain the land and water resource base upon which wildlife depends to the full extent that legislation and good land use planning allow, and to advise the federal government, which now have jurisdiction over most of the Yukon lands, forests, and waters, on land use and habitat matters.

²⁴ With respect to more comprehensive wildlife policy development for Yukon, I can appreciate that such is desirable and is an ongoing process. I believe that great strides have been made in this regard.

Given Section 17(3) of *The Yukon Act*, and given the progress at the land claims table, I suggest to you that for this government to move too quickly in the development of comprehensive wildlife policies would be irresponsible of us and prejudicial to the land claims process.

I would suggest to the sponsor of this motion that the legitimate wildlife resource rights of the Yukon Indian people is the backbone of any comprehensive wildlife policy in Yukon. We now have an agreement-in-principle through the land claims process that refines the rights of Yukon Indian people with respect to wildlife harvesting, trapping, and management. By virtue of these agreements, certain obligations are placed upon this government as wildlife managers to ensure the objectives of those agreements are met.

I can only conclude that the sponsor of this motion, Mr. Porter, disagrees with the wildlife and trapping agreement signed at the land claims table and that he now wants to set up a public process to scrutinize the provisions of these agreements. I am prepared to consider his request, although his process would not be in keeping with normal land claims negotiating process.

Under the wildlife harvesting agreement for instance, the government will be obligated to ensure that certain quotas of caribou and moose are available to Yukon Indian people. In meeting our obligations, it may well be that in certain circumstances and in certain areas of Yukon, ongoing predator management and habitat improvements programs will be necessary to achieve the objectives of the agreements.

In fact, the three year Zone 7 and 9 experimental predator removal programs will provide us with valuable information to assist in determining the most effective management tool to be used

to ensure that harvest quotas for the Indian people are achieved and maintained in the long term.

Mr. Porter seems to suggest we are not managing properly. I would refer him to his own riding where the Department of Renewable Resources is intensively managing the diminishing Finlayson caribou herd. This herd is vital to the wellbeing of the Indian people of Ross River and area. This herd was declining. However, through proper management and efforts of government, the herd will once again be harvestable.

I have to ask myself if the member for Campbell is at all concerned about the wellbeing of his constituents. In terms of seeking public input in wildlife issues, I can assure you that a tremendous effort has been made since I have become minister. To disseminate information into the public on wildlife issues, we have gone to great lengths, such as publication of numerous resource bulletins, videos, TV coverage, trappers' workshops, study reports, and on and on and on.

In addition, I emphasized to my department that considerable effort must be made to seek public views and comments on wildlife issues. In this regard, over the past four or five months we have held some 25 community meetings from Old Crow to Watson Lake, to Burwash Landing, to Pelly Crossing. Some 671 citizens attended these public meetings and I am encouraged by their success.

The member for Campbell, in sponsoring this motion, suggests to me that he is undermining the credibility of a number of legitimate and sincere interest groups in this territory.

The member must not be aware that the *Wildlife Act* makes provision for the creation for the Wildlife Advisory Committee to provide advice to this government on wildlife related issues and policy. While Mr. Porter may not agree, I happen to respect the integrity of this group and the organizations who nominated the members.

For Mr. Porter's benefit, the Wildlife Advisory Committee has representation from the following: Yukon Conservation Society, the Yukon Fish and Game Association, the Yukon Outfitters Association, the Yukon Trappers Association, the National Firearms Association, two members from the Council for Yukon Indians and two members from at large.

It is interesting to note that the policy regarding the appointment of members to the committee states, and I quote, "The political affiliation of any member, if known, will neither be a qualification nor a disqualification for selection; however, every effort should be made to ensure that individuals recommended for selection are persons of repute in their field since advice will be of value to the Government of Yukon in preparation of policies pertaining to the management and utilization of wildlife resources in Yukon Territory".

It would appear obvious that the member for Campbell, by suggesting the creation of a select committee, wants to develop wildlife policy based on political affiliation. I believe that this is fundamentally wrong for this very important resource issue.

The member for Campbell should review the history behind the establishment of the Wildlife Advisory Committee. In fact, a select committee of this House was formed in the fall of 1981 to review the new *Wildlife Act*. The member opposite may not recall, but his colleague, the member for Whitehorse South Centre, was a member of that committee. As I recall, the committee met for the better part of two weeks, which included a public review process. I also recall that during this process, Mr. Kimmerly, the member for Whitehorse South Centre, insisted that the new act, among his many other suggestions, contain a specific reference to a wildlife review committee called the Wildlife Advisory Committee.

His colleague, in fact, requested that the new act contain reference to membership on the committee and its basic terms of reference. If the member for Campbell was to examine section 139 of the act, he would find that his colleague's recommendations are now in place, thus giving this government a specific review process for many wildlife related matters.

It now seems apparent that the member for Whitehorse South Centre's colleague is trying to undermine both the establishment and the role of this committee, and it would be very unfortunate for all Yukoners if this committee should fall by the wayside, as it has

served a very useful function for the government and people of Yukon.

I would ask the members opposite to seriously consider this motion, and I would ask that they demonstrate respect towards the wildlife advisory committee as members. I firmly believe that this non-partisan group is the most appropriate and logical forum to provide advice to this government for the development of wildlife policy on behalf of all Yukoners.

I must oppose the motion and encourage every member of this House to do the same.

Thank you.

Mr. Kimmerly: I cannot resist the invitation, almost, to speak. I was a member of the only select committee to study a substantial bill, in this Session or the last. Indeed, there were five members and I am the only surviving one. I do not know if that is a reflection on the committee or the members or what, but in any event, I did take part and we did hold public hearings on the question of wildlife policy and, specifically, the bill, which established the present law. It was my recommendation, about Section 139, that the board get additional powers than in the original bill, although it was originally a government initiative in the original bill. I rise because I was a member of that committee and I know, from personal experience, the intense interest that Yukoners feel about wildlife policy.

I am amazed, in a sense, at this debate. The member for Campbell took a statesman-like approach, if I can call it that, and presented his reasoning rationally, in a completely non-partisan way and in a very reasonable delivery. The response was somewhat less statesman-like and slightly more partisan — perhaps, greatly more partisan.

The most amazing thing is that there are, perhaps, three major public issues concerning wildlife. They are wolf poisoning and bear reduction; the moose harvest, which is related or probably related; and the Porcupine caribou herd. Yukoners are used to talking in concrete terms. They are used to talking about bears when they really mean to address the bear issue. I think that it is appropriate that we, here, talk about those concrete issues, as well.

The six guidelines and principles are all very well and it is my opinion that there would be little disagreement, in a general sense, about those six principles.

There would certainly be a disagreement about the priorities of each of the six: conservationists and non-resident hunters would probably disagree about the priorities.

The real question in Yukon today, as I see it, is: are those priorities being followed by the government in its wolf reduction and bear reduction program? That is a very, very sensitive, political issue and, in my judgment, it does not undermine the authority or the practice of the advisory committee to hold public meetings about those issues.

A year ago, approximately, the member for Klune put forward a motion about wolf control. Nobody said he was undermining the Wildlife Advisory Board. The minister did not say that, at the time, because he supported it. He says it now because he, obviously, wishes to contain a political problem, not provide the citizens of Yukon a forum in which to express their views. That is inconsistent.

This motion does not undermine the advisory board; this motion recognizes a very serious political issue about wolf control and bear control. The citizens of Yukon are eager to further express their views and it is only politically healthy that they do so. This motion would provide an opportunity for that and I would recommend it to all members for their support.

Mr. Porter: I was not shocked to learn that the member opposite can stand up in this House, in a position of debate, and break the rules of the House and still go unchecked.

I must say that, clearly, I am disappointed that the members opposite will not be supporting this motion and I am clearly disappointed in the Minister for Renewable Resources. He states that his government has six guideline principles but they, in themselves, do not constitute a comprehensive wildlife policy.

That is what this particular motion is speaking to.

I am also sorry that the minister has chosen to use the land claims

process as a crutch to support the inaction of his government. He stated that the adoption of a wildlife policy would jeopardize the land claims process. That is absolutely ludicrous. The land claims process is a process designed to identify rights, not policies, and that is what we are talking about here today in this legislature; a policy of government.

As a matter of fact, I would take the opposite point of view. I would say that the formulation and the eventual adoption of a wildlife policy would support the efforts of the parties involved in the land claims process.

As well, the minister charged that the real intent was to undermine the legitimacy of the Wildlife Advisory Committee. He could not be more wrong. The Wildlife Advisory Committee is a body set up to advise the minister. Clearly, that is recognized, but we also know that this government has a demonstrated practice of tightly controlling the committees they set up. In the instances where it is in their benefit to do so, they simply slough off any of the political charges to the committee to deal with. When a sensitive political question is addressed to them, they say, "Well, we will deal with a certain committee and they will answer it, but I, as minister, do not have the responsibility".

But I put it to you, the Minister of Renewable Resources, that the Wildlife Advisory Committee is not the Yukon public. Clearly, that is the intent of this motion: to involve the people of Yukon in the development of a comprehensive wildlife policy that we all can live with.

I submit that game management in Yukon at the present time is in a sad state of confusion. Leadership and direction is totally lacking in that department of government. The minister in charge, the member for Tatchun, as he should be normally referred to...

May I remind the little guy from Porter Creek that under the rules of this House, under section 6(6) of Order and Decorums, "when a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him except to raise a point of order or a question of privilege".

After all, in terms of wildlife management, it is the people of Yukon who afforded this particular minister the responsibility to manage wildlife on their behalf, and he must be accountable to the people. Democracy does not, as he suggests, exist only once every four years when the people go to the ballot box. The process of democracy is an everyday event in a truly democratic society. If the member for Tatchun believes otherwise, I suggest that one day he is going to get a rude awakening.

²⁹ I further suggest that the member for Tatchun has been totally incompetent, in terms of his management of the department under his responsibility. From the beginning of the sitting of this legislature, the Department of Renewable Resources has been seen by the public as a department in a total state of chaos. There is no need, at this time, to list the numerous events that lead one to this unfortunate conclusion; they have all been heard before, right here in these legislative chambers, and the public is clearly aware of the multitude of inept decision-making conducted by the Minister of Renewable Resources.

I do not blame the individuals who work for the department, who manage the department on a day-to-day basis. In general, those people appear to be well-meaning, qualified individuals, who are dedicated to the professions that they have chosen to undertake. As a matter of fact, I have talked, over the last couple of years, to many of them and, yes, I was at a public meeting in Teslin, at which some of the department's officials appeared. I can tell you, those individuals who were at that meeting did a fine job of representing the Department of Renewable Resources. They did a fine job in explaining what it is that they did in that department on behalf of the people of Yukon.

So often in government you hear the charge that bureaucracy has too much control over the affairs of government. I can assure you this is not the case in the Department of Renewable Resources. The present minister has absolute control over his department, to the point that I believe some members of his staff are afraid to speak out independently on some very critical issues. It is common knowledge that many individuals in the Department of Renewable Resources are in disagreement with the policies enunciated by the minister; however, I believe that they are afraid of the consequences

of voicing their objections in a legitimate public forum.

It is also well known that when management disagrees with the politicians in this government, they are either demoted or sent packing. I ask: are these the actions of a democratic government or are they symptomatic of a government that is moving more to a dictatorial method of exercising its power? I ask the Minister of Renewable Resources, and other members of the government: does not the individual's right to freedom of speech mean anything to you?

To illustrate the further incompetence of this department, I think we only have to review the recent decisions that have been made with respect to the predator prey control program. In Yukon, right now, wildlife management is a relatively new undertaking. Successful wildlife management in Yukon or anywhere else depends on good quality baseline data, acquired over a number of years.

Most of the data on which the government purports to base its current predator control program has been gathered in the last two years. While the government has collected some information on moose populations in southern Yukon and has conducted some follow up research on predation, what has been studied is, in the final analysis, a very small area of the Yukon over a very narrow period of time. Missing from the picture are reliable figures on hunting pressures for the same areas in the same period of time. The renewable resources computer has not, as of the end of February, tabulated responses to hunter questionnaires. These are voluntary forms that are sent out to the hunters to ask them where, for how long, and with what success he or she has hunted.

From 1978 to 1980, hunter questionnaire information was computerized by UBC. Since then, there has been an attempt to adapt the programs for use on computers here in Yukon. According to renewable resources, and this is a direct quote, "Program results will be available by early spring." Although the department has some information from the short wildlife studies conducted in 1982-83, its hunter information dates back to the 1978-80 period. By way of comparison, even the BC wolf control program, which has been condemned by national associations such as The Canadian Scientists and Zoologists and The Wildlife Society of Canada, in addition to numerous conservation groups in Canada and the United States, was undertaken only after a five-year study period of wolves, ungulates and hunting pressures. The BC eradication program is expected to cost up to \$80,000 a year for helicopters, pilots, ammunitions, and snipers, and to date we have yet to receive from this minister the cost of the program to the taxpayers of Yukon.

The wolf-kill program of last winter was an example of crisis management. Moose surveys had revealed the declining moose population and the high calf mortality rate. It was too late to regulate hunting, and decreased numbers of prey make wolves more visible and easy targets. Information released by the Department of Renewable Resources, February 27, 1984, reported the following: in 1982-83, 24 wolves were known to have removed from the area immediately surrounding Whitehorse. The physical condition of these wolves was generally poor, suggesting they were stressed to find wild game and were forced to prey upon domestic livestock and pets.

The professional consensus is that the wolf and grizzly predation does not appear to be a major problem when herd sizes are healthy and growing, but when herd sizes have fallen for whatever reason, the effect of predators will be much more pronounced until their populations have fallen off for lack of prey.

With respect to the grizzly program, in the spring of 1983, a study of moose predation in the Rose Lake and Teslin burn areas indicated that bears, and not wolves, might be responsible for the high moose calf mortality rates. These findings were based on a study of 60 calves; 23 calf deaths in the Rose Lake area and five in the Teslin burn area were attributed to grizzlies, and eight more calves were thought to have been killed by black bears or unidentified bears. On the basis of this information, attribution of 20 calf deaths to grizzly predation, the government has embarked on a grizzly control program, which will see the destruction of 60 bears. The program is being undertaken with no clear idea of what sex or age of grizzly is preying on the moose calves.

31 Although the study press releases refer to the sighting of 38 grizzlies in the study areas, half of them in groups of sows and cubs, there was no indication in government information as to what proportion of these sightings were repeat sightings, or which of the bears sighted were responsible for moose calf death rates.

Although the government press release outlining the predator control program mentioned the percentages of the grizzly population that are to be removed from control areas, no mention is made of the actual numbers of grizzlies in the affected areas. Why? Simply because they do not know the numbers.

In the 1981 renewable resources publication, "A Field Guide to Yukon Bears for the Exploration and Placer Industries", grizzly density in Yukon is cited as being one per 20 or 80 square miles. Since the control program is to affect three percent of the Yukon area, or about 6,000 square miles, the grizzly population in the control areas could be anywhere from 75 to 300. The 60 grizzlies that are to be destroyed could mean eighty percent or twenty percent of the area's population.

Again, we are given clear evidence that the department is undertaking a predator control program with almost no baseline data. We can go on and on. All of this information comes from the Department of Renewable Resources. It is compiled from all of the information that either has been made public or we have managed to squeeze out of them.

All of the economic indicators right now in the territory suggests that mining, the mainstay of the Yukon economy for many years, is going to continue in its current slump for the foreseeable future. That is an area that leaves us with tourism, along with government, as being the stabilizing forces in our economy. In recent weeks, we have been given concrete evidence that tourism may be adversely affected by the government's existing wildlife policies. In a recent editorial, the *Whitehorse Star* reported that they have received over 300 letters from Americans concerning the government's wildlife policies, and everyone knows that the people in the United States make up the largest percentage of visitors to Yukon during the tourism season.

We have also been led to believe that a massive and formal boycott of Yukon is being organized in southern Canada and the United States. The consequences of such action could be catastrophic to the Yukon's economy. We only need to look at the anti-seal lobby to see what the consequences for Yukon would mean.

In Great Britain, for example, one supermarket chain, with over 425 stores, has pulled all of its Canadian fish products off the shelves, and this is in response to the heat brought on by the anti-seal lobby. I ask: is that going to be the future of the Yukon's tourism industry as a direct result of this minister's wildlife policies that have been enunciated in these Legislative Chambers?

I suggest that the implications of such an organizational lobby would decimate the wellbeing of the territory's already beleaguered economy. Is the government prepared to accept the inherent risk of allowing the minister, single-mindedly, to pursue his current predator policies and bring about serious damage to our economy? Is the government leader willing to allow his Minister of Renewable Resources to continue to operate in isolation of the prevailing political realities? Is the Minister of Tourism willing to stand by and let the Minister of Renewable Resources single-handedly snuff out the one bright spot in the territory's economy? I hope not, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you that the business community of Yukon is not interested in a defunct tourism market.

32 Clearly, the government has other options to pursue when they meet, later this week, to discuss this very important issue of not only wildlife matters, but also, possibly, the wellbeing of the territory's economy. I say to the government members, if there are any doubts in your minds, I think that you should immediately cancel the grizzly bear predation program. Any attempts to slightly modify the program, at this point, will not be seen in a positive light by the groups that are concerned about this issue.

I understand the government may have a commitment, made, again, by the Minister of Renewable Resources, to a small number of big game outfitters. It has been suggested to this government that they can compensate those big game outfitters for whatever they

deemed to be reasonable, negotiated, of course, between the parties. That would not, in any way, put the big game outfitters out of pocket, in terms of expenses that they have already incurred.

I think that we should keep in mind that the areas proposed for the bear reduction program are areas where there are presently no licenced big game outfitters. Should a compensation package be negotiated with the outfitters, they would not suffer any loss and could simply carry on their normal activities in those areas in which they are licenced to do so.

In the meantime, this government can start doing its homework and direct itself to gaining a more factual picture of the exact relationship between the bears and the moose populations. As it stands now, the government's information, as I have stated, is totally inadequate. The department has no clear idea as to the definitive numbers of bears resident in the proposed area for the bear reduction program. As a matter of fact, the government's own biologists, on a CBC phone-in show, indicated that the numbers they are using to determine the grizzly population in Yukon were arrived at by extrapolating density figures from other jurisdictions, such as Alaska and the Northwest Territories.

I would like to understand more clearly the dilemma that this government finds itself in over this issue. You only have to look at the recent statements made by the Yukon Fish and Game Association. This organization is viewed publicly as an ardent supporter of this government and past policies that have been presented by the present Minister of Renewable Resources. However, on this issue, even they, the Fish and Game Association, have some serious reservations as to the reckless pursuit of the policies that the minister has taken on.

I would suggest that this issue is so serious that, if tourism in Yukon is affected in a negative fashion, this could very well see the end of this government. Yukon is one of the few places in the world where we have a relatively varied and healthy species of wildlife. This, in itself, is a major reason why Yukon has so many out-of-territory visitors each year. We must endeavour to do our utmost to ensure that, inasmuch as humanly possible, we manage our wildlife resources so that they remain an integral part of our beautiful land.

Not only do we have a responsibility to ourselves, but we owe it to our grandchildren and to their children, as well. After all, we do not inherit the earth from our grandparents but, rather, we borrow it from our grandchildren.

Motion No. 4 defeated

33 Motion No. 5

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

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

Mr. McDonald: Yer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Mayo that this House urges the Yukon government to alter its policy regarding single company towns such as Elsa and to ensure that all communities receive fair treatment.

Mr. McDonald: My remarks will be quite brief. As you will notice, the wording for this motion is exactly that which was presented in the House last fall. I intend to illustrate why I believe that it must be introduced again.

Many of the arguments have been made before, both in this House and in the press, and between proponents both for the government representatives and the many spokesmen for the town, who speak with one voice. I believe that the reason that has been put forward on the side of the town has been, as I have said before, quite defensible. The reasoning put forward by the government has really no defence but, in fact, there has really been no effort to put up a defence for their policy.

There are essentially three reasons for bringing this motion forward today. One, as I said, was that the resolution passed last fall had altered the original motion by stating that the government would reconsider this policy regarding Elsa, which led people to believe that there really would be some extra effort put in to such a

reconsideration and that, for once, the government was going to regard Elsa as a community in its own right, a community with the rights of other territorial communities under Yukon jurisdiction.

That promise to reconsider, to put it mildly, was a sham. Elsa people assumed that the minister would be going to great lengths to determine what exactly the community was prepared to accept, and what the government was prepared to offer. They found out only recently that the minister had but one brief meeting with the president of United Keno Hill Mines, a representative of the corporative entity in Elsa, not necessarily a representative of the people of Elsa, but nevertheless, I am sure his opinions do reflect those of the community, as well, as the minister did find out. It was surprising for the minister; it certainly was.

Now, that was the extent to which the government, publically at least, reviewed its policy. I am giving the minister an opportunity today to give justification for his refusal to alter the policy. That essentially is the second reason for bringing the motion forward; that is, to give the minister the chance to make some substantive answers to the many claims that he has made in recent months. It may be too much to expect, but I am perfectly prepared to change my opinion of the minister's ability after his speech this afternoon.

The last reason for presenting this motion is to express the very real anger that was felt by the people of Elsa shortly after the minister spoke, some time ago — I think it was in reply to the Throne Speech — when he mentioned the fact that, should the representative of the people of Elsa question an expenditure of funds — the only expenditure of funds to that community — that that was a case of somewhat biting the hand that was feeding it. I am sure, without exception, everyone in Elsa took exception to that line, because they felt that the minister was entirely confused about who was feeding whom. Afterall, it is a moot point, I think, certainly a non-debatable point, that people in Elsa are certainly paying taxes and not getting their fair share in return.

Many people in Elsa have also brought to my attention, over and over again, that this is one of the few self-supporting communities in Yukon, a community that pays for itself. We heard only yesterday the minister talking about the great need of the Yukon government to provide unconditional grants to communities because they could not support themselves.

This community of which we speak is a community that does support itself. This is a community that provides its own municipal services. It is a community in slightly desperate straits, at the moment, when it comes to recreational facilities and, and even though it does support itself for all things such as municipal services, it cannot support the rather larger expenditures — less essential expenditures — as recreation funding, but, nevertheless, necessary for a civilized community of Yukon standard.

I really wonder if the minister knows what sort of effect or impact his off-the-cuff statements have made to people of Elsa in the last while. He should realize that the people — everyone, everyone — analyze his every statement. I regard that as being a rather boring pastime but, nevertheless, that is something that is done in Elsa. They have changed policy there. The company has changed its policy to accommodate some of the criticisms or some of the arguments made by the minister. The recreation association not only changed its policy, but it changed its constitution to accommodate some of the arguments that the minister was making, at one time or another.

I will just repeat, briefly, a few of his arguments. He has essentially made five over the past four or five months. The first is that the silver price is low, the ore reserves are low and, therefore, the company does not have much opportunity to see a bright future and, therefore, the town certainly will not survive. That has been refuted by not only the president of the company, but by the mine manager. Not only that, the history of the community has refuted the minister's remarks. It has been there for many, many years, for decades, and certainly much longer than anybody in this House has been alive.

Some Hon. Member: Yes, two years at a time.

Mr. McDonald: Exactly. The Minister of Renewable Resources said, "Two years at a time". That is exactly right and it

promises to be in existence for the next 20 years, two years at a time.

The argument that the silver prices and the ore reserves are a factor in determining whether or not this government is going to meet its responsibility to its people is a fallacious one, at best. It also brings to mind the issue of whether or not a community in this territory has to justify its existence in the long term in order to receive fair treatment by this government.

The second argument that the minister has made is that because the company has the ability to pay, it should therefore pay the full cost of the services. The company pays its property taxes; it does not shirk its duty to pay property taxes. It pays the various taxes that both levels of government are levying on it. It certainly does its duty, the same as any other company or corporation in this territory does but that, in itself, ignores the essential point as to what the company should be paying for or what businesses should be expected to pay for in this territory.

If we can take the company in Elsa as being a wealthy, affluent company that, because it can afford to pay for certain services, therefore, should pay for certain services, we can extrapolate that down to a community such as Whitehorse where we could expect that recreation services in Whitehorse should be funded by only those who can afford to pay, and we should expect all the major corporations in Whitehorse to pay the shot, merely because they can afford to pay.

I do not think the minister is prepared to say that. If he is prepared to say that, I would sure like to hear him say it. He can say it this afternoon so that we do not have to drag this out too long.

The issue is essentially the government's responsibility to its citizens, and not the government's relationship to a company in a rural area.

The next statement that the minister has made is that Elsa is a company town, and the government does not want to have anything to do with a company town because of a control issue: who has control over the services? Who has control over the property? This is an instance where the company has altered its policy to accommodate the minister's objection. They have agreed that they will turn over any available land to the government or to the recreation association, which has, in turn, altered its constitution to allow for fuller membership, for membership territory-wide if necessary, and they have been perfectly willing to negotiate the operation and maintenance cost of such a facility over the long term.

Another argument that the minister has made is that United Keno is a private business and the government has an aversion to putting any sort of capital funds into private businesses. We should just take a look at what is happening with the tourism funding, and I am sure the member for Faro will get involved in this during the debate on the next motion. We have a list of projects here under the Tourism and Small Businesses Incentives Program, which lists project after project where this government is expending money, in cooperation with the federal government, towards private businesses.

We have a number of hotels and motels receiving \$200,000, \$130,000, \$34,000, \$41,000, \$97,000, \$24,000. This project in and of itself should be enough to refute the minister's claim that this government has an aversion to putting money into private business.

Not only that, but this money is not to give this particular private business a competitive advantage over its competitors, it is to raise local citizens' recreation standards to a level that other communities enjoy.

Finally, is the argument made only last week, which did more than raise a few eyebrows, locally. I am sure the minister will get a full reaction when he attends his convention in Dawson. The last argument was that the government would be prepared to look at some sort of help if the people of Elsa would only move to Mayo. Now, just as a basic comparison of the kinds of funding we are talking about, the capital funding requested by Elsa being negotiated certainly would not amount to the extent that moving an entire town site, from one community to the next, would involve.

There is a letter here from the president of the United Keno Hill

Mines, who was asked to voice his opinion on this particular subject of moving one town to the next. He says that his initial reaction "is that such an action would be a very expensive proposition, both to the company and to the government". I think that that probably goes without saying, but I just thought I would incorporate those comments as corroborated evidence of what we might expect, should the minister have his way.

I will allow the minister to respond, but I would like to remind him that the issue here...

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a point of order. Under the rules, the member opposite is referring to a piece of correspondence that he has. I am asking a member if he would please table it.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to table the document he has been quoting?

Mr. McDonald: Yes, Mr. Speaker, of course.

I would like to remind the minister, before he replies, that the issue involves payment to people, to territorial people. I would like to remind him, too, that this territorial government is always fighting for, and grasping for, jurisdiction over other things over which it does not currently hold jurisdiction, but is ignoring things over which it has jurisdiction. It involves government responsibility to its citizens. I would like to further remind him that the people are requesting fair treatment, not special treatment.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Mayo, with respect to the motion that he has put forward. I want to say, at the outset, that it disturbs me a great deal that the member opposite misconstrues many of the things I have said in the past. I would appreciate it very much if he would accurately quote me, as opposed to attempting to twist the words of what, purportedly, I have said in any given forum or in any given press statement.

I listen to the member opposite stand up in this House, along with his colleagues. This motion means, to the people of this territory, not \$5, not \$10,000, but, if the Government of the Yukon Territory took over authority, through some sort of municipal structure, millions of dollars that the people of this territory would have to pay for the purpose of running that particular community.

¹⁷ That is the bottom line, and I have a lot of sympathy for the people in Elsa and the situation they are in. I have been here longer than the member opposite, and I recognize the historical nature of the community that we speak of. He fails to tell the members of this House that all other programs are available to the people of Elsa, just like anybody else, whether they be in Watson Lake, whether they be in Beaver Creek, or whether they be in Whitehorse: in education, in recreation, in the judicial system, and the story goes on.

What I was trying to do, when I spoke to the president of the corporation that owns that property, was to suggest to him that, if we are going to put in major financial commitments to the actual infrastructure of that community — which dates back 20, 30, 40 years, depending upon what you are looking at — for the purposes of upgrading, perhaps one alternative that should be examined is the possibility of relocation to the community of Mayo.

That, to me, should be examined, from the point of view of all the people in the area and from the point of view of what is going to be provided in that particular area for the purposes of the community. Right now, they are two communities, which are split, so they do not have banking services. If you get enough people involved, obviously, those services are going to be rendered. If there are enough people in a certain area, those services that are not government's responsibility, would be available.

The member opposite refers to a comment about biting the hand that feeds them. I saw this member intentionally stand up in this House and do everything he possibly could to embarrass the Minister of Education. And the Minister of Education, in good faith, at a request from the member opposite, went through cabinet to get the authorization to allocate dollars to repair the physical problems with that school. Did he bring in an alternative for her? No, he did not. He stood here and tried to make political points from a partisan point of view.

I find it very difficult to deal with the member opposite when you

attempt, as I have, to research the question like I said I would. When that particular motion was tabled and it was amended, we said we would review the policy, and I spent a great deal of time and effort on it. Then, the member opposite stood up and condemned us. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if that is the attitude of the member opposite, I cannot be bothered doing anything on his behalf. As far as I am concerned, he is not bringing forward legitimate requests. All he is bringing forward are requests for the purpose of politically embarrassing members of this House.

I have not heard a constructive suggestion put forward by the member opposite. I have been sitting here for the last two hours. I have listened to the member for Whitehorse South Centre talk about a program for senior citizens. He did not say that the possibility is that it could cost in the neighbourhood of \$2,000,000. We had the member for Campbell stand up and say in this House that he wanted more money for renewable resources. I am not arguing the pros and cons, but we are talking another \$1,000,000 there.

The member for Mayo stood up, and he has said privately to people, and I have heard it through reliable sources, that he would be looking for millions of dollars from this government for the purposes of recreational facilities. The swimming pool was the start.

The members on that side of the floor have not stood up to the general public and said, "Look, this is what it is going to cost you — a sales tax, an increase in income tax..." and the story goes on. All I can say is that I am very pleased to see on the Order Paper that we do not have a motion from the member for Whitehorse West and the member for Whitehorse North Centre, because I am sure we could add on another \$5,000,000.

¹⁸ Getting back to the actual topic that we are discussing, the community of Elsa. I went to the effort of ensuring to meet with the president of that corporation when he came up, because of the results of the motion, which I felt the member was legitimately putting forward. He told me two things. He said, first of all, they have two years of proven ore reserves. Secondly, any major upgrading of the community was on hold until they could prove more reserves, and secondly the stability of the price of silver was very questionable.

Now what the member opposite is asking me to do — not me, the taxpayers throughout the territory, including those in Elsa — is to put forward taxpayers' dollars for capitalization of recreation facilities and if the mine closes in a year, which is possible — it closed last year, but the member opposite probably fails to remember that, and the member opposite never stands up in this House and discusses his negotiating skills when it was shut down for nine months because of him — is that what he is asking the people of this territory to do is to invest dollars into a community when, if the mine shuts down tomorrow, everybody leaves.

I thought I put forward a rational alternative. If the longevity of that mine is proven — and I understand the company is doing a major exploration program this year for the purpose of seeing if they can prove longer term ore reserves — I propose to look at the alternative of moving 30 miles down the road and seeing whether or not the possibility of relocation for the purposes of using the community of Mayo was a viable option.

I would submit to you that, in my verbal conversation with the president, he did not discount that. His first initial reaction was that it is very expensive. I am not arguing that. On the other hand, he also has other major commitments that would have to be made if that mine is going to be operating for the next 20 years.

I think the member opposite would agree with me. If the longevity of that mine continues, I do not think that there is any question there is going to have to be a major influx of dollars to upgrade the present infrastructure that exists there. My point was to look and see if it would be feasible to look at moving into the community of Mayo with the idea of broadening the tax base in the community of Mayo, and utilizing those facilities that are there. Within Mayo you have a school that provides education for kids from Elsa, at the high school level. You have a rink that is there that is covered, that could be utilized by probably another 50 or 60 kids, and that would utilize that particular service to a maximum. You have a recreational hall there that can be utilized by more

people if they lived there. You have the infrastructure there, along with the administration building to provide the various government services. You have a nucleus for a community, which can expand.

The member opposite just discounts that. I have a real problem, to be quite frank, in saying that as a taxpayer of Yukon we should put in major blocks of dollars into a piece of property that effectively is private property. The point is that there are very few privately held homes there. All the provisions of the accommodations are provided by the company. When you start looking at these things, I say does the company not have a responsibility?

¹⁰ The member opposite never stood up once and said the company does have that responsibility: since they own the mine, they reap the benefits of the mine. I maintain they do. We help that community through transportation, as far as the owners are concerned; the taxes are very minimal, as far as property is concerned. We allow them to operate in a very free manner, as far as their operation is concerned, and I think we should.

Is the member opposite prepared, if I were to say, today, "We will put \$2,000,000 into the community of Elsa tomorrow", and the mine shuts down five days from now, to guarantee, to write on a piece of paper "I, Piers McDonald, member for Mayo, am prepared to reimburse the people of the territory", because it is a political risk. It is a political gamble with other people's money we are talking about.

I am saying that risk does not have to be taken. I am saying that, perhaps, there is an alternative that I have put forward to the member opposite, who has just dismissed it out-of-hand. I ask him why? Does he not like the people of Mayo? It is a very good question. What does he have against Mayo? I think the people of Mayo would like to see another 30, 40, 50 residents in that community, for the purposes of the social interplay of people, for the purposes of having a community that was that much bigger and that could provide that many more services. A community that small, whether it be Mayo or Watson Lake, is hampered by its size, as far as providing services is concerned. The more people, the more services, the better the quality of life.

The member opposite will stand up and just throw that out — no, that is not an option — throw money at me and I will criticize you, that is his objective. Well, I say to you that this is an alternative to what he has been asking, because I sympathize with the present people in Elsa. I do. The member opposite sneers when I say that, but I happen to know people in Elsa and I happen to like them; but I also recognize that they, in many cases, unlike what the member is saying, recognize the historical nature of the community of Elsa and the fact that Elsa is based on one industry, and one industry alone.

It would seem to me that we have a responsibility, as do all members in this House, to look at these motions very seriously and look and say, "Can we do something about it?" The member put a motion forward last Fall. I did take it very seriously. I think the member will agree that I did. I got hold of the owner of the property and had a meeting and I have had one call since then with him. I did not get correspondence, like the member opposite did, as of yet, but I have had some discussions to say, "Look, what are our options?"

I would say to the member opposite that he should seriously look. If the longevity of that ore reserve is proven to be 10 or 20 years, in that neighbourhood, what would be wrong with examining the possibility of relocation to the community of Mayo? Historically, there was a reason. When that mine first started, as you well know, in many cases, the ore was transported out by horses. Now, in 1984, we have a transportation corridor that is 30 miles of well-maintained road, and it is not unknown, in many other parts of the country, for people to commute 30 miles to and from their workplace. So, what would be wrong with it, if it is economically feasible, and that is what is going to be the bottom line; financing.

⁴⁰ The benefits are there: you can see them. You would not have to have a school bus where you have kids on a school bus for a half an hour a day going to and from communities. You would have a relationship there between all the kids on a daily basis, not from just strictly the school hours, but in the evening. So, I think there is rationale for that proposition. I am not saying that it is the final answer. But, I am saying that it should be examined if the mine has

the longevity that the member opposite says it has. I would be prepared to work with the company and the people of Elsa to examine that option, once that is proven.

As you know, in the present situation that exists, and it was in one of the local newspapers that the member opposite loves to quote from, the company has put a number of things on hold because of the uncertainty of metal markets, plus the fact that they have to prove up more reserves. I find it difficult for the member to ask us, the taxpayers, the people of the territory, to go in tomorrow and put in some major capitalization before we are assured of the longevity of that community.

I just want to close by saying that I recognize that the member opposite is bringing forward the concern of the community, at least in part. I want to say that I share their concern as far as their facilities are concerned. I broached the subject with the owner of the property, that they have responsibility, and he assured me that they would take that responsibility on once they get into a situation, financially, to do that. I think he was sincere when he said that.

On behalf of the people in the territory, I do not believe that we can proceed to make major capitalizations with the limited dollars that we have. The members opposite do not even have their priorities straight. It depends on who pops up at what time, as far as the allocation of dollars is concerned. As I indicated earlier, what are we looking at here just this afternoon — and I am glad that we only have three or four hours — a \$5 million dollar bill if we assented to it all. The fact is, and the reality of today is, we have a finite limit of dollars and, if we want to go beyond that, we have a very easy decision to make, and that is to go to the taxpayer and you can spend somebody else's money.

I am saying to you this: we have to look at it from a rational point of view. I believe I have brought forward an alternative. When that time comes, if the company approaches us, we will be prepared to examine the possibility of relocation. In view of what I have said, we cannot support the motion the way it has been presented by the member for Mayo.

⁴¹ **Mr. McDonald:** I would like the record to show that the front bench of the government side applauded the minister's speech, so that we know that this is not a unilateral action on the part of the minister or a single action but is, in fact, an action that is shared by all the people on the front bench and, therefore, in future during an election time, there should be absolutely no guessing as to where the two parties stand; the two parties stand, but not individual's stand.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you would to refer to the minister's kibbitzing as being against the Standing Orders of this House.

The minister just wrote a campaign speech for his opponents — I would like to say, for the NDP candidate but, perhaps, a Liberal candidate will pick up on this and, perhaps, an Independent candidate will pick up on this — because it just provides so much ammunition to run a campaign on in my riding. I say "my riding" because, if the minister will take the time to refer to the petition that was tabled in the House last Fall, he will find that there were a large number of names from the people living in Mayo.

I am not going to rant and rave; I think the minister's intention is to intimidate by ranting and raving. He thinks that he says things that are right just by ranting and raving. That is not my style, it will all come out the same in black and white.

The minister said that the suggestion that I have put forward in the House, and the suggestion that other spokesmen from the community of Elsa have put forward in the House, would cost the taxpayers of the Yukon millions of dollars. He referred to a private conversation that he had with somebody or other — I assume it was his own deputy minister as I did have an on the record conversation with him about this issue — that if I had my way, the government would be putting millions and millions of dollars into the community. That is blatantly false, and taken out of context. What I said was that the community of Elsa should get a fair amount of funding and if all the communities in Yukon were going to get a million dollars for capital funding, then Elsa should be entitled to the same amount.

The minister has said that this would cost millions of dollars. It has never been suggested by anyone who I know that it will cost

millions of dollars. The minister said that it will require spending somebody else's money. That has to be one of the greatest insults to the people of Elsa, who have just been pulsing money into this territory for decades. What they are asking for is fair, equal treatment. They are not asking for more than what towns of an equivalent size are getting. They are not asking for more than what Pelly is getting. They are not asking for more than what Carmacks is getting. Elsa is bigger than both communities. They are only asking for fair treatment. They are not asking for the government to come in a take over municipal services. The minister knows that full well. They have never asked for the government to come in and take over municipal services; never once.

They have been asking for some help in providing some recreational funding for initiatives that the community itself is taking. For example, the company is putting in some money for the pool. The community held a raffle with a yard sale, where they put up money for the pool. The people are going to donate time and labour so that they can put up a major contribution to the pool. And, what they are asking the government to do, is to negotiate some participation. We are asking to negotiate, in the first place, the input of some dollars.

Mr. Lang: Tell the truth.

Mr. McDonald: The minister is suggesting that I tell the truth. He is implying that I am lying. I take exception to that.

My judges are going to be the 250 people at Elsa and I would challenge the minister to go to Elsa with me and we will debate this issue in front of those people, those taxpayers, head to head.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Toe to toe.

Mr. McDonald: Yes. The minister says "toe to toe". He is obviously referring to the fact that I am taller than he is, therefore, he could not match me head to head.

He asked what the company is doing. The company has been doing a great deal as I suggested in many debates in the past. The company will not only be providing municipal services, and promises to provide municipal services into the very long term future, it has been providing the services for the last 54 years. Not only did it build a hospital in Mayo, not only did it build the airport in Mayo, not only did it service the roads for decades, I think the company has been doing its share in terms of providing some benefit to the community. The company, in its own right, let alone the taxpayers who are putting money towards the territorial economy in terms of civic expenditures, local businesses and in terms of paying taxes to this government. What the minister says that such fair play would cost somebody else's money is a real insult.

They have been paying for something for which they have not received any benefit for 54 years and now they want a fair share; not more than a fair share. They are insulted by the suggestion that the territorial government is going to have to go to the taxpayers and wrench money from the taxpayers' pockets against their wills in order to play fair with the people of Elsa. It is ridiculous.

He refers to his longevity in this community and the fact that he has been here longer but he fails to recognize that, while he may have been here longer, and I have not been here as long — only nine years — I noticed the injustice of this situation from the very beginning when I first got here. We did communicate this to our successive MLAs, my predecessors, and unfortunately nothing was done. One MLA suggested that there might be a \$1 million expenditure — in the past — but that was proven quite fallacious.

I reiterate, we are speaking of recreational funding, capital funding for recreational projects. We are speaking of projects that have already been undertaken by the community. Nothing is to be done without the community's involvement, without something that the community has already taken an initiative on. We are not talking about the provision of municipal services in the literal sense at all. So, the minister is quite mistaken.

The minister says that he has good intentions in suggesting that we should move the community of Elsa to Mayo.

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is where the hospital was built.

Mr. McDonald: Yes, the company built a hospital there, too.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The company is going to move there.

Mr. McDonald: He said only if it is economically feasible. I do

not think that we need to bring in bureaucrats in order to establish the expected cost for such an adventure. It would involve moving 150 homes from one community to the next. It would involve developing 150 municipal lots and providing services to all those lots.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is all possible.

Mr. McDonald: The minister asked a rhetorical question about whether or not I liked the people of Mayo. Of course, I do like the people of Mayo. That in itself is quite irrelevant, in any case.

Now, I would like to state some of the Mayo people's reactions to the town moving proposal.

"This has come up in the past, and the minister is not the first person to make such a crackpot suggestion. The Mayo Indian Band rejected it after considerable thought. The Mayo LID gave it considerable thought, but rejected it."

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is not true.

Mr. McDonald: The minister says that that is not true. I will challenge the minister to prove his case and I will challenge the minister to prove my case. I will prove my case if the minister promises to prove his case.

The LID found that it would cost a considerable amount of money. It did not know that if that was what the people of Elsa wanted. I will reiterate that the people of Elsa do not want it.

He also implies that the government has a policy of bringing communities together and I assume that means that if two communities are 30 miles apart, the policy of this government is to incorporate the two. That is ridiculous. Both communities are long-standing communities; both communities have a history; both communities have a right to be fulfilled, in and of themselves.

I would like to refer once again to this issue of biting the hand that feeds it. The minister became quite artificially passionate about this issue. I will get into the issue of the Elsa school funding during the estimates.

I say, once again, for the people of Elsa who, in a very real sense, feed this community more than they are fed. That was an out and out insult and will remain so, despite the efforts of the minister.

The minister again referred to the two-years' reserves and, again, I say that this must be one of the only communities in Yukon that has to prove its long term existence before the government will put any money into it, and before the government will participate in even a minor way.

He referred to the town being closed last year. While it was closed, it still employed 20 people.

I would like to say, in conclusion, that the issue is the responsibility of the government to its people. It is not the responsibility of the government to a corporate entity. It happens to be, at this point in time, that the corporate entity and the people think in concert. They are not asking for something that is outrageous. They are asking for fair treatment. They have put their proposals forward to the minister and to the entire government, which think alike on this issue, in a fair and open manner and in good faith.

I feel that they deserve fair treatment in terms of what they have asked for. It is a fair and just proposition. The government should vote for this motion. If they have trouble identifying desires, they should immediately sit down and negotiate with the people of Elsa, to determine exactly what they can do to help, rather than trying to decide and trying to negotiate what they cannot do.

"**Mr. McDonald:** I hope that they will vote for this motion. I know I certainly will and the people on the other side of the House will as well."

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Ashley: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Disagree

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Disagree

Mr. Falle: Disagree

Mrs. Nukon: Disagree

Mr. Brewster: Disagree

Mr. Penikett: Agree

Mr. Byblow: Agree

Mr. Kimmerly: Agree

Mr. Porter: Agree

Mrs. Joe: Agree

Mr. McDonald: Agree

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

Motion No. 5 defeated

Motion No. 6

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item No. 4?

Mr. Byblow: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Faro that the government of Yukon, in recognition that the history of Yukon includes all regions of Yukon, should alter its tourism policy to include greater support of regions and communities outside the primary Alaska-Klondike Highway corridors and the primary destination points of Dawson, Watson Lake, and Carcross.

Mr. Byblow: The motion is non-provocative and should elicit some thoughtful debate. It has been placed before the House in order to call attention to a concern expressed in a number of outlying communities and regions of the territory. The motion simply calls for a greater support by government towards the development and marketing of tourism opportunities in those areas of Yukon that are outside the Alaska-Klondike highway corridors.

I should note that the motion is not intended to be critical of the development priority being given to the current destination points policy, which, as the motion indicates, recognizes those areas of Dawson, Watson Lake, Carcross, and it should be mentioned that the destination points also include Kluane and Whitehorse regions, as specific areas, as those included in the general corridor concept.

I would say further that there is no question in my mind that tourism development in Yukon has been quite aggressively pursued and certainly quite lavishly supported both by this government and by the federal government. The expenditures of money, for example, under the previous \$6,000,000 CITA agreement signed in 1980, bears testimony to that. I believe, more recently, the \$2.2 million interm funding for tourism allocated last June towards tourism also supports the premise that tourism has been promoted quite substantially.

⁴⁵ That substantial amount adds up to about \$8,000,000. In all of that spending, the guidelines for spending included the requirement for the development monies to go, principally, to the Alaska Highway corridor destination points.

I do not believe that anyone raises much objection to the general principle that developing and promoting tourism in Yukon is important. I would make it quite clear that tourism is clearly one of our existing and ongoing renewable resource industries. It is a major generator of employment, it is a major generator of external revenue for the economy and, certainly, with the current mining industry downturn, tourism has advanced to an economic significance that has never been witnessed before.

Also, in general, I believe it is commendable that the industry and government have been able to cooperate in the planning and the financial support required for the industry to progress. However, to correct the exclusion of some regions of the territory, the current policy begs some alteration and that is what I wish to address.

I think, most emphatically, tourism in Yukon needs a broader and a much more comprehensive strategy and that strategy should address development throughout Yukon. That development must address those regions that are outside the current corridor and destination points policy.

I am sure that my colleague from Mayo will make an illustrious presentation of the rich, historical significance and tourism potential of the Mayo area and I would like to, on the other hand, illustrate some of the historical and tourism potential of the Campbell Highway corridor.

As most of the House is aware, the Campbell Highway, leading from Watson Lake to Carmacks, was completed in the late 1960's to service the mining potential of the Pelly and Little Salmon area

of Yukon. In particular, it was completed to serve the then-developing Cyprus Anvil Mine. Connecting mid-way on the highway is the Canol Road, passing through. It, too, has become an important artery to the rich MacMillan Pass area on the Yukon-Northwest Territories border. To a lesser extent, the highway also serves the community of Tungsten and, of course, many exploration and recreational trails are found entirely along the highway.

⁴⁶ The courses of the highway follows the basic route of Robert Campbell, the Hudson's Bay Explorer for whom the highway is named. Starting from the Liard River, Robert Campbell attempted to find an interior route to the Pacific Ocean, and he was the first white person to this region, in the 1840s. He predated the Klondike Gold Rush by some 50 years.

With respect to the member for Klondike, who speaks highly of his community's rich and powerful history — and I respect that — I submit that Robert Campbell not only was the first white person to enter Yukon's interior, including the Dawson area, but he compiled the original map work that eventually led to the Klondike Gold Rush.

Along the Campbell Highway is an important water shed, with the headwaters of the Pelly River flowing west, and eventually in the Bering Sea; and the Finlayson River flowing southeast and then north into the Beaufort. Campbell crossed this divide almost precisely where the highway now traverses, and he entered the Pelly, and eventually the Yukon, River systems.

The Highway currently affords an alternate route to Whitehorse, to Dawson, to the Dempster, or even to Alaska. In effect, it sets up a triangular pass through central Yukon. In fact, this route was identified as the Circle B Route on maps previously published by the Yukon government. I have not looked at the new maps. I understand that they are sold out and waiting for a new publication.

There is obviously, from my observation and the observation of other interested parties along the route, an increasing frequency of tourist traffic through that highway. In fact, two years ago, there was a dramatic increase, which has sustained itself through last year's recession in the area. Certainly, we can expect that this demand will increase in the coming years.

I want to say to members of the House that the Campbell Highway corridor is probably a route that most of the members of this House have travelled, and certainly you have, Mr. Speaker, and is a 300-mile stretch of Yukon wilderness that is rivalled, perhaps, only by the Kluane area. It is abounding in wildlife, with birds, with lakes, fishing, rivers, streams, mountains, plateaus, forests and swamp land. The corridor also follows a natural geological fault known as the Tintina Trench. From previous studies, it is the most likely route that a railroad would follow should one come in from the south.

Along the highway from Watson Lake, the first facility is at the Cantung cutoff, approximately at kilometre 87, where private developers have built a gas stop, a garage, a store and a coffee bar. Five kilometres farther is a government camp, Tuchtua, but no vehicle facilities exist for the next 200 kilometres, until Ross River, farther at Faro and 70 kilometres farther at Little Salmon. Carmacks is the final stop on the highway.

⁴⁷ Both Ross River and Faro are 10 kilometers off the highway, each with limited tourism facilities; Little Salmon has eating and sleeping facilities and is located right on the highway; Carmacks has what most would consider full facilities and more being developed.

It is also noteworthy to mention that along that highway a number of campgrounds exist along its entire length. They exist at Simpson Lake, at Frances Lake, Lapie River, at Fisheye Lake, Drury Creek, Little Salmon Lake, at Frenchman Lake and, of course, at Carmacks. There is no question that the sites of these campgrounds are in excellent locations and have quite reasonable facilities with, perhaps, some exceptions, but I will not go into these, at this time.

The highway, with its numerous lakes and rivers, has excellent potential for access to fishing, to hiking, to scenic areas and even to hunting. Of course, these are primarily undeveloped except for some periphery access around the campgrounds.

The major lakes along the area, for the members who have travelled, provide excellent fishing, except, perhaps, for Little

Salmon, which has been commercially depleted and needs restocking. The Finlayson area is a yearly caribou crossing. Coal seams lie exposed in the Ross River area, in the Little Salmon area and in the Carmacks region. Moose are abundant throughout and scenery, in general, is breathtaking, especially — and I am sure the member for Tatchun would agree — the Eagle's Nest Bluff area, overlooking the Yukon River near Carmacks, is splendid. In fact, this would be an ideal pull-up, or something similar, like at Five Finger Rapids, where people can stop and view the panoramic scene. A sign could even, at that site, tell of the historical incident when the steamship "Columbia" blew up on that spot, underneath Eagle's Nest Bluff. Of course, access to the North and South Canol Roads, along that highway at Ross River exposes similar natural environmental abundance.

Aside from the natural richness of the area, an important historical aspect exists, which, for the most part, is hardly known. Still evident today are the remains of the Hudson Bay Trading Post on Frances Lake, dating back to the 1830's. In fact, I was recently advised that a resident in Ross River found the original site of the Hudson Bay Trading Post, prior to the publicly known one today: the original one burnt down in the late 1830's.

40 Hoyle Canyon, Rose Creek, Little Salmon, Van Gorder: all of these historical sites have much significance that ought to be publicized after being protected. In conjunction with the Indian community, a number of these historical sites should be properly protected and, in agreement, possibly developed. There is something tragic happening. The sadness of this is that the artifacts that were originally left in these sites are slowly disappearing with ambitious hikers. The physical remains are slowly disappearing, deteriorating, being ransacked, and generally destroyed. It becomes important to salvage what little heritage we have left for us by the early frontiersmen in this area.

I would submit that it appears logical that Faro will become a centre for the organized development of the Campbell corridor. It is the largest centre, it has the most existing facilities, it is centrally located on the high point and it has the added attraction of having one of the largest mines in western Canada; albeit running at quarter throttle.

Of course, this kind of centralization should not take place to the exclusion of Ross River or Little Salmon, but rather in complement to each other. Faro already has a campground near the community, at Fisheye Lake. It has a transient park for vehicles. It has a large public park and it has a whole range of services popular to tourists. An initiative originally started by the Cyprus Mine a number of years ago is now being carried on by the Faro and district Chamber of Commerce and that is a popular mine tour program. It offers two scheduled tours per day throughout the summer. The Chamber has indirectly hosted hundreds of people passing through the Campbell corridor. As I stated earlier, the numbers are increasing on that route.

An interesting profile is determinable when you study or examine the visitors who have passed through the corridor by virtue of the visits made to the mine. A study of the last two or three years of statistics shows that only about 20 percent of the visitors are from the Yukon. 30 percent are from other parts of Canada, 40 percent are American, and about 10 percent European. Also interesting about the visitors to this area is that they clearly represent the major marketing target areas, where the Canadian government offers tourism and this government, in conjunction with the YVA, are promoting tourism to Canada. The European market is clearly from Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand.

The town of Faro has a five-year capital estimates and community development plan, which of course requires updating at this point, in light of the economic situation. They have identified plans for the development of a tourist information museum complex. They have further plans for parks development, town beautification and tourist campground and nature trails. In principle, they are supportive of further development in that corridor. As well, the historical society of the community is lobbying for a permanent location.

40 Private citizens' groups have investigated along with that a museum combined with a tourism information centre, to provide an

outlet for local arts and crafts as well. They have recognized the potential for organized tours and hikes through the natural and historical appeal of the area.

Historically, the mine has also shown the support of the mine museum concept. Incidentally, the minister may recall that the idea was first proposed in 1978 by a tourism development strategy that called for thematic development of tourism throughout Yukon. The museum concept could easily provide the impetus for continued mine tours and an information outlet. Obviously, what has to be done now is something of a feasibility study to be undertaken and some plans drawn up to develop that theme and that idea and that proposal.

I think what must be said is that the Campbell Highway corridor has a marked permanent importance to the economic future of Yukon. The Faro mine once was, and no doubt will be again, a cornerstone to the Yukon economy. The high level of exploration development in the MacMillan and Howards Pass regions bodes well for continued mining activity in the area. Rail extension to Faro may be a reality some day. Certainly, recent studies of hydro development show that the Pelly and Lapie systems have potential sites.

It is apparent to me that the long term development of the tourism industry should go hand-in-hand with the resource development in order to provide a planned protection and appreciation for the natural and historical feel of the area.

I think, after having said all of that, and have now persuaded the government of the need to address this regional tourism potential, I want to cite a couple of examples of how current policy is handicapping development. The previous Minister of Tourism will, no doubt, recall the kiosk fiasco of a few years ago. Because of the concern by the community of Faro to develop and encourage tourist traffic into the community, the Faro and District Chamber of Commerce undertook, on its own, to actually construct this information display board at the junction of the Campbell and the access road. Now, this was after the Chamber procured the plans from Municipal and Community Affairs, amended them because they were inaccurate — with the cooperation of the then minister — and essentially contracted the erection of that display board.

To be fair, YTG did contribute a \$2,000 grant towards the construction following completion of that kiosk, but it did need some prodding. That kiosk would probably still not be complete if it had been left in the hands of government policy, which restricted it to a corridor concept.

40 There is an interesting aside to that, Mr. Speaker, and it affects your riding. I was visiting your fair community, recently, and talking to a member of the Watson Lake Chamber of Commerce and I was rather surprised at being scolded for my community, Faro, not building kiosks fast enough. Naturally, I inquired and, apparently, got the answer that the Watson Lake Chamber of Commerce was advised by tourism people that Faro was now manufacturing kiosks. Now, that may not be a bad idea, but it was the first that I or anyone in my community heard about it. In fact, it may not be that bad of an idea, if expanded into other useful construction, from a secondary industry point of view.

Another example I would like to cite involves an application by a lodge. It was the Little Salmon Lodge on the Campbell Highway, which applied for some of last year's interim funding, under the Tourism Interim Agreement — that is, the \$2,200,000 that was available. The lodge was led along in a positive fashion through the first stages of the application and I thought that we were breaking ice on this previous corridor policy. However, as the application neared final approval, it was rejected, allegedly because criteria of destination points was not met and the lodge was not in the Alaska-Klondike Highway corridor. Certainly, it needs no imagination to recognize that the closure of the Cyprus Mine has severely depressed the region and there is a heightened lobbying for stepping up the tourism potential of that entire region.

No one is saying that tourism in my region is expected to replace mining, because there is still the fervent belief that Cyprus Anvil will roll again, but there is a need to address the increasing tourism traffic in that corridor and there is some annoyance that most funds are directed elsewhere. I think the minister will agree that the

secondary nature of tourism as an economic base, even in good times, spins off to all Yukon and, certainly, at the same time, strengthens the region through which it is taking place. I believe the same can be said for the Mayo district, but I will let others more adequately address the deficiencies of any tourism development in that area.

In conclusion, I hope that this motion, when approved, will give this government the kind of direction and House support that it needs in order to redirect policy for expenditure of funds available to this territory under tourism. I am sure that it will be an added incentive in persuading the federal government to amend its policy, as well. All Yukon should be addressed in tourism funding. I believe, and, at the same time, in all forms of sport by any government. I encourage support of the motion.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I recognize that the motion is not provocative and that we always have this very thoughtful debate; the member for Faro and myself. I think we are going to have to take a serious look at it and perhaps reconsider our non-provocative motions and thoughtful debate because I somehow get the impression that we always end up debating things at the end of the day and putting the rest of our colleagues to sleep, as they are all looking very comfortable in their chairs.

The member for Faro will be reassured that we will not defeat this amendment, however, I do feel that in defense of the government, that it is necessary that we amend it because it does in some way infer that the government's policy is not providing for a certain portion of the Yukon. It does make a very definite suggestion that some areas such as the Dempster and the Haines Road and the Mayo, Elsa, Keno and Faro, Ross River, Campbell Highway regions have been neglected, and particularly, as the member for Faro makes representation, the areas of Faro and Mayo.

Amendment proposed

I would like to move that Motion No. 6 be amended by deleting the expression "should alter its tourism policy to include greater support of regions" and substituting for it the expression "should continue its tourism policy supporting regions".

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Culture that Motion No. 6 be amended by deleting the expressions "should alter its tourism policy to include greater support of regions" and substituting for it the expression "should continue its tourism policy supporting regions".

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do understand and appreciate the intention of the original motion because we have had discussions in the legislature in the last two years, a couple of times, I believe, regarding the principle of this motion. I think that the motion is not brought forward with the intention of being critical of the government but of making an identification of a concern, again. For the benefit of the members of the legislature, I would just like to stress, and maybe point out, in some ways where not only the Department of Tourism or Tourism Yukon is responding to some of these needs of these areas, but that the whole Government of Yukon is responding to the needs and to some of the tourism promotions.

The marketing efforts in Tourism Yukon are designed to promote generic Yukon and I believe all regions of Yukon are represented and described in our travel guide, of which we print a quarter of a million copies to be sent all over the world.

It has to be remembered that we do have limited funds here in Yukon and because of that reason we have to identify and establish priorities. I think an obvious example of that is in Watson Lake, where there are not enough accommodations. A bottleneck can form, having a detrimental effect on the rest of Yukon.

Faced with the choice of assisting hotel accommodation in Watson Lake versus any other community in Yukon with all other things considered equal, I think it is obvious that Watson Lake would have a higher priority, seeing that it is a visitor attention point.

⁵¹ We have noticed that there is a shortage of hotel accommodation in Watson Lake and, through our Tourism and Small Business Incentive Programs, we have been able to identify it as a priority and to provide some funding in that area.

We have discussed the corridor concept many times in the legislature, the member for Faro and myself, and I keep stressing to

him that, when we have these tourism incentive programs in a joint partnership with the Government of Canada, that it is the Government of Canada's policy to abide by the corridor concept, not the Government of Yukon's. I have said that before and I will say it again. The Government of Yukon provides incentives and funding for all Yukon.

I recognize the shortage of facilities on the Campbell Highway, but I am really not quite sure what the member for Faro is suggesting. He makes the point that there are no vehicle facilities on that highway, past the points that he mentioned, and I am hoping that it is not his expectation that it would be the government that would provide those vehicle facilities. The funding was available to people all over Yukon and, if the private sector or an individual or a company had come to the government requesting funding for a facility along that highway, they would have been just as eligible for assistance as Dawson or Whitehorse or the other points of destination that the member very often mentioned.

I would like to just give some examples of the government financial assistance that was available under the \$2,200,000. That was the federal-territorial Tourism and Small Business Incentives Program and the Yukon territorial government had a tourism facilities improvement program of \$150,000.

A couple of days ago, I tabled a document that outlines the projects and the amounts that were directed to companies and to businesses and I would just like to give some further clarification and amplification of where that money went and, perhaps, some amounts and what it was for.

From Faro, of course, there was only one request for funding and that was for the mine tour the member spoke of; they received an amount of money, \$2,000, to assist with the local marketing adventure. We did not receive any requests from the community of Mayo, from any business people in Mayo, for any assistance under these two programs. Whitehorse received some \$434,000 for local marketing, for the accommodation sector, the service sector, for attraction and wilderness development. Carcross, Marsh Lake and Tagish received a considerable amount of money — \$157,000 — for wilderness tour development and attractions. Haines Junction, Dezadeash and Burwash received \$328,000 for the accommodation sector, service sector and wilderness tour development. Again, that is a route that accounts for Beaver Creek, which is another point of entry. Watson Lake received \$319,000 for accommodation and service sector local marketing. Dawson City received a large amount of money, \$800,000, for attractions, service and accommodations and the Dempster, \$32,000, for wilderness tour development and local regional marketing. Some of the Yukon-wide benefits were \$135,000 for local regional themes and tour marketing and wilderness tour development; things like the Rainbow Adventure Rental, Ecco Summer Wilderness Tours, the Tatseshini Raft Tours, and some winter wilderness adventures.

⁵² I would also like to illustrate some of the areas that other government departments participate in in the promotion of tourism, and this happens all over Yukon. We do not identify any particular areas.

In the area of highways, for example, there are many, many millions of dollars spent on all of the Yukon highways, in particular the Alaska and Klondike Highways and the Haines Road. The Campbell and the Dempster Highways have millions of dollars spent on them. The Canol Road, North and South, the Atlin Road, Tagish Road, Boundary Road, the Stewart/Keno Road and the Cassiar Road.

We have also been funding historic sites and museums and promoting museum development and historic sites development, not only in the Dawson and Whitehorse areas, but also in the Teslin, Burwash and Keno areas. We have promoted historic site development in Dawson and on the Yukon River in the Pelly area, and also in the Carcross area.

We do have a large number of campgrounds that are provided by the Department of Renewable Resources. Campbell Highway has eight campgrounds; the Alaska Highway has 15. Haines Road has two; Kusawa Road has two; Aishihik Road has two; Atlin Road has two; the South Canol Road has two; the Klondike Highway has 11; the Dempster Highway has three and the Mayo and Carcross areas

each have a campground.

The total area of wilderness has not been identified by the member for Faro, and I think the department has been very diligent in identifying this as a tremendous potential for tourism in Yukon. We have participated with the wilderness groups, cooperatively, and given them some assistance to compile and publish a brochure called "Yukon Summer Adventures" that will be available this year for canvassing the States and some European countries.

We also have another new initiative in the government that we discussed in the last O&M budget, I believe. The tourism development officer, who is situated in Dawson City at present, is available for assistance to all communities that are contemplating promotion of tourism and the development of tourism facilities. That is another initiative that is Yukon-wide.

Also, I think that Tourism Yukon, through the development officer in Dawson, and the deputy minister and myself, have worked very closely with groups like the Yukon Visitors Association who represents industry and many, many cross-sections of tourism associated individuals — also, the Klondike Visitors Association. We are looking forward to working closely with the newly formed Silver Trail Tourism Association and assisting them in their future endeavours.

Just to conclude, I would like to appeal to the members opposite to support the amendment, because we are identifying the needs. The Government of Yukon has not abided a corridor concept. We are continuing the tourism policy supporting all regions of Yukon.

Thank you.

« **Mr. McDonald:** I came prepared for two kinds of debate today, one following the tenor of the member for Faro's speech and the other was to take the combative position, depending on the minister's position.

I would rather not take either of those positions. I am not terribly sure whether the amendment is what is required in my riding, for example, to really make the motion meaningful. What the member for Faro was asking, of course, was for both the federal and territorial governments — hoping that the federal would take lessons from the territorial government's encouragement — to pay more serious attention to the corridor areas, and specifically made mention of it this afternoon.

Their requiring more serious attention implies greater activity and the work continues in those. What we were suggesting is that steps must be taken to do more; however, the minister suggests that the steps they are taking is perhaps doing more, and I honestly do not know, although I see some minor evidence of that, whether the continuation of the present policy will be what we are expecting.

There are a variety of areas that I would like to touch on, which the member for Faro touched upon as well, which flow entirely to the jurisdiction of the territorial government; one being the nature of the campground problem and the other being the nature of highway signing.

The campground development is, of course, an issue that has been brought up in the House before and we have taken quite solid positions on this issue. The minister responsible for campgrounds has made his position known regarding the campground in the Mayo riding and we obviously differ as to the necessity for upgrading that particular campground.

There is one area that I would invite the ministers to clarify and that is the area of highway signing. As the ministers know, this has been an area that has incited a lot of attention in both of the communities of Faro and Mayo/Elsa/Keno. I will lump those together for the purposes of this debate, for obvious reasons. The fact is that the territorial government may not heed the concept or may not totally want to follow the concept of the tourism board but, nevertheless, that is the policy that is being followed and that is the policy that the member for Faro and I would like to see altered in order that more tourists enter our areas in order to provide a more stable economic base.

« The area I would like clarified would be the area regarding highway junction signing. On July 23rd, 1982, in a letter that I am prepared to table if requested, the Minister of Highways said that highway junction signing was tourism's responsibility. Then, approximately eight months later, or so, the Minister of Tourism

said that highway junction signing was, in fact, highway's responsibility. To date, there has been no determination either way, regarding the placement of highway signs at junctions, whether they be commercial signs or whether they be signs...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As the Minister of Highways, I did not say that highway junction signs were the responsibility of tourism. Any letters or any conversations I have had have expressed the opinion that it should be developed in conjunction with tourism. All other highways signs are a function of highways and so is highway junction signing, except that tourism should be involved because it is for the tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously, as the hon. member knows, he has really not raised a point of order, at all. He merely has a difference of opinion with another member as to allegations of fact.

Mr. McDonald: Thank you for admonishing the minister on his conduct. I am prepared to table both letters to prove my case and I do not think anything more has to be said on the matter until the proof is on the table, in front of you.

A year's discussion has taken place on the issue of junction signing: no signs have been erected. There has been the suggestion that an information kiosk, which the minister privately said to me was his preference, be erected at Stewart Crossing, for example, as an alternative to private signing. Yet, at the same time, there seemed to be some conflicting signals from other departments. I have a letter, again which I am prepared to table, from the Minister of Tourism, encouraging ideas on private signing. So, I think a policy clarification on this issue would be quite helpful, under the circumstances.

I would like to take the opportunity, in this discussion, to sing the praises of the efforts of some people in my riding, who have gone a long way in promoting tourism development in the area. They have decided that it is best that they organize a lobby group to provide greater liaison, greater leverage, in their opinion, and in my opinion, with various authorities in Whitehorse, in order to be heard more effectively.

The area about which we are talking is equally beautiful in comparison with any other area in Yukon.

« I am sure the member from Klondike would be quite prepared to agree that the area around the Ethel Lake junction is quite a beautiful area. There is a campground there with a boat ramp, fishing for lake trout, arctic grayling, and there can be seen big horn sheep and upland caribou on the mountain south of the lake.

The Minister for Tourism interrupts to say that the minister is from Dawson, but I think the minister takes his car past the Dawson turn-off on his way to Dawson, pretty regularly, I hope.

The first community in the riding is a community, not a highway camp, but a community established initially as a ferry crossing. At that point, the new, what is now to be called, Silver Trail breaks into the riding and digs deep into the riding.

The road itself was built in 1959, from the Elsa and Keno areas. Prior to that time, the ore from the Elsa-Keno area was taken by sternwheeler riverboats and barged to Stewart City, which no longer is accessible to the public but which is located at the mouth of the Stewart River, 60 miles downstream. The ore was then transferred to larger steerwheeler river craft and barged for its trip to Whitehorse. Another interesting fact, for the member for Dawson, is that the SS Keno, on display in his fair city, was one of the boats used on this route.

The Stewart River valley is also a site that really should not be missed. It boasts many scenic views and, in the 20's and 30's, there were a large number of farms along this route to support the mining population and the livestock that was used for transportation, at the time.

There is a graveyard and an old Indian village on the banks of the Stewart River and I understand there is interest in resurrecting it, under the auspices of the band. I think the band would prefer to provide the effort and resurrect it under their careful eye.

The town of Mayo was established in 1903. It was formerly known as Mayo Landing and this was, essentially, a place where silver ore was stockpiled. It was originally a junction spot for a few

families engaged in prospecting activities. The Mayo airport is also, in a sense, an historical site. It is one of the first airports in Yukon, built by a company in Elsa, as I mentioned previously.

As you go along, on what the Silver Trail Tourism Association would now like to call the Silver Trail, rather than the Stewart-Keno Highway, you reach the Minto Bridge, which, as two ministers, at least, will know, I had some trouble signing, a couple of years ago. Nevertheless, this was, at one time, the site of a small settlement. It was flooded out, in the early 50's, but there are small cabin sites, which can be seen on higher ground on the north side of the Mayo River.

The Silver King claim, as you come into Mayo, was first staked in the 1980's and, as you go through the entire area, you can see the remains of mine shafts and old mining communities, which are, without question, a fine tourist attraction.

⁵⁷ The town of Elsa was, of course, established by the Fairgold company of 1929. This town is ironic, and I am sure the Minister for Education is quite prepared to verify that.

Keno City was originally established in 1921, eight years prior to the original establishment of Elsa, and it does have a pretty good mining museum, the only one in the territory. It is at this spot that we can go more deeply into the riding. You can enjoy a repast at the local cafe, and enjoy the beautiful scenery of the mountains surrounding the area.

In any case, the tourism association recognizes the great value of the attractions in the area to the tourism industry. They are going to be making every effort possible to promote those attractions. I would not like at all to downplay the activity that has already taken place by this government.

There has been some funding to my knowledge for a paperback book regarding Mayo's history and that funding we expect to come through for this fall. We were promised such funding. In the last few years there has been some funding allotted for the maintenance of the Keno mining museum and that is certainly a laudable effort. Of course, the Keno mining museum is looking for significant funding to upgrade its facilities to more acceptable levels. There of course is money scheduled this year, I understand, for a pamphlet on the area, which unfortunately took considerable lobbying on the part of an organized lobby group. The fact that the organized lobby group itself had to lever for this funding is, in my opinion, very unfortunate. Nevertheless, that may be a fact of life with this government and in this town.

I am hoping that the suggestion by the minister to continue this policy will in fact be an ongoing increase in activity in the areas off the tourism corridor. If that is how we could translate her meaning, then we could support it. There is simply no way of determining, however, whether or not that is the case.

Mr. Speaker: Question has been called on the amendment.

Hon. Member: May I address the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: Oh, I am sorry. I asked if there was any debate and no one rose. Here again we have a situation where I have called question on the debate. However, I will, for the last time, permit the hon. member to speak on the amendment, but I do wish that if members wish to speak they would please rise. It makes it extremely difficult and, I might say, embarrassing for the chair when these situations arise. Further, if members will not rise, I will not be able to recognize them.

Mr. Byblow: Thank you. With respect to your comments, I would respectfully respond that I do not wish to prevent anyone from speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I must advise the hon. member that perhaps if he would consult his rules of parliamentary procedure he would then understand that he would not close debate by now speaking.

Mr. Byblow: I stand corrected. I did want to address the amendment, in order to respond briefly to some of the comments of the minister in her remarks awhile ago. I want to say to the minister that I appreciate the spirit in which she presented the amendment even though I do not agree that the amendment expresses, from my point of view, the position of this government.

⁵⁸ As the minister has presented the motion, she has stated that this government should continue its support of regions other than those in the corridor concept.

That implies that we accept what the government is currently doing in these regions is adequate. I want to say for the record that I would like to see more. I raise the point that in the summary of the projects to which funding was given in the \$2.2 million this past year, it is difficult to identify projects outside the corridor as receiving any significant amount. I recognize, for example, the Faro mine tour received its \$2,000; however, \$2,000, as a percentage of \$2.2 million is less than 0.1 percent.

I think I want to say that while I do not agree wholeheartedly that this government has an acceptable policy of supporting regions outside of the corridor destination points, I want to say that I appreciate the spirit in which the minister presented her comments and amended the motion and will, therefore, support the amended motion. I want to advise, therefore, that I am recommending to our caucus to support the amendment.

The minister made reference that the marketing policy of this government includes all regions of the Yukon and I will concur with that, and that, in fact, all regions have access to the marketing facilities and promotional literature that is put out by this government.

I want to note that I will also recognize that Watson Lake was not on the original destination points policy, and, by the fact that this government has recognized it, we could argue the point — and I am arguing in the government's favour now — that Watson Lake is one of those regions outside of the destination points; however, it is still in the Alaska Highway corridor.

The minister made reference to the fact that in the Campbell area, or even the Mayo area, or the Dempster area, anyone could have applied for money, and I am going to address that for a moment.

That is not the case, because when the applications were received by potential subscribers for money, it was quite clear in the application that the priorities for funding would be under the basis of this destination and corridor policy, and it has not been made known to me that this government has separate application forms and, if so, I would stand to be corrected.

⁵⁹ Certainly, on the argument that anyone could have applied for it, that was not adequately advertised or presented. I will also recognize the comments of the minister that other departments have made contributions that help the promotion of tourism, certainly in the wilderness area. Again, I would submit that more can be done outside the main corridor but that is a matter of debate.

I think, in conclusion, I have already indicated that I am recommending to our caucus to support the amendment; however, I want to draw the caution that I believe the government, in continuing its policy of supporting regions outside the corridor, will have to demonstrate to this side that it is prepared to do more than it is.

Thank you.

Amendment agreed to

Mr. Kimmerly: I recognize the time is short. I will be extremely brief; more brief than I had intended originally. The debate so far has been interesting and has centred around the regions of the Yukon. I would like to briefly add a thought at the end about an overall marketing strategy in a general sense.

I would like to see two things occur on the marketing strategy: firstly, that we market wilderness as opposed to marketing the gold rush. I am talking about an increased effort and an increased direction in that area. Secondly, and I will state it very briefly, the potential for tourism of the native history, the current native population and native products is only scratched on the surface. There is a substantially greater potential there, and I would like to see a direction in that area as well.

Thank you.

Mr. Porter: Like the previous speaker, I will attempt to be brief as well. What I have to say largely supports my colleague from Faro. I think it is interesting to note that when you examine the tourism and small business incentive program, which was a joint venture between the Yukon and federal governments, you will quickly see that no money was spent in the community of Teslin. I know of two cases where applications were sent from Teslin.

⁶⁰ As a matter of fact, both applicants were for the expansion of

existing services, primarily in the accommodation and service area for tourism, in terms of delivering services with respect to meals, gas and lodging. Those applications were rejected, under this program. You can understand why individuals were upset, upon receipt of their rejection, when you look at some of the projects that were funded: Oscar's Electric Repairs; windshield repairs, extinguisher service; Carcare; Yukon Auto Service, Moose Creek Lodge and Bakery.

I would submit that the applications from the Teslin community were much more directly relevant to the tourism industry. I mean, the extinguisher service, what does that relate to? Is that for John Munro and his services in the aboriginal rights question, or are the tourists expected to bring their vehicles to the gas station while their windshield and electric parts are being repaired?

In all seriousness, the question of certain communities in Yukon not receiving any benefits, with respect to the tourism dollars that are spent for the promotion of tourism, is a very serious one. It is serious in the riding that I represent and I have been asked to make the representation, in terms of this question, in this House as to why it was not done; therefore, I fully support and thank the member for Faro for bringing forward such a motion.

I hope that this question of all communities in Yukon receiving a fair shake, in terms of tourism dollars, will be addressed by this government. I hope that it would mean that the potential in the Teslin area, in terms of tourism development, will be realized by governments spending tourism dollars to promote tourism activities.

Motion No. 6 agreed to as amended

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

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

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: We shall recess until 7:30. When we return, we will go on with Bill No. 13, *Fifth Appropriation Act, 1983-84*.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee to order.

Bill No. 13: Fifth Appropriation Act, 1983-84 — continued

Mr. Chairman: We will depart from the format and proceed with Community and Corporate Affairs. Is that agreeable?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

On Municipal and Community Affairs

Hon. Mr. Lang: The costs that are outlined for that particular area are basically four items. One is an advance of \$60,000 to Teslin for the purposes of operating between January and February in view of the fact that they did not have a reserve fund, and the institution of our new dollars. What this means is that we will vote this money and less will be voted for Teslin in the main estimates. It is just a financial exercise. It is an advance on the money that they have coming to them.

Further to that, there was overtime for ambulance services that amounted to approximately \$25,000. We are also in the process of looking at forestry regulations for the Government of the Yukon Territory. We have been getting a lot of pressure, as all members know, within the small amount of land that we have responsibility for, to look at forestry and at what we should be doing. We have contracted somebody to look at the various options we have. Once we have that, we will be promulgating regulations.

¹⁰² This will be in concert, of course, with the Department of Renewable Resources. Also there is a contingency fund built in to the supplementaries as explained by government leader of approx-

imately \$70,000.

Mr. Penikett: Before I pursue any questions that may or may not arise from the dissertation of the minister, I wonder, since I was not expecting these for a few minutes and I am, perhaps, not perfectly well prepared, if he could just take me back to a couple of numbers first that I am not clear about. When I look at my information here, after the first supplementary O&M, we have, it seems to me, \$6,834,000 in the revised vote. The second supplementary cites as voted to date, \$6,860,000, and there is a difference there that, at first glance, is about \$26,000, which I am not quite sure I can account for. I wonder if the minister could just explain that to me.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not have that information off the top of my head. As far as the figure that I have here is \$6,860,000. The revised vote is \$7,028,000, according to the figures I have before me. On the capital, \$9,805,000, and we go to less \$602,000, so therefore we go to \$9,203,000. I am not too sure what figure the member is referring to, I am sorry.

¹⁰³ **Mr. Penikett:** I, in no way, want to hold things up for this. This could be my error and I am perfectly willing to admit it. I am a person, as everybody knows, of monumental modesty.

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is why we have so much in common.

Mr. Penikett: Well, the minister obviously has a great deal about which to be modest.

I do not want to hold anything up, but I wonder if I could just check and see if there is a problem with those figures because, when I look at the first supplementary, it does talk about, at the end of that process, a total vote of \$6,834,000. The figure noted in the book here voted today is \$6,860,000 in the O&M: there is a difference there and I am not sure I understand it. I am sure that may be my problem, but if there is something wrong with the numbers. If the minister will take notice, that is fine.

Hon. Mr. Lang: There is a problem.

Mr. Penikett: There is a problem? Okay.

The minister talked about the slight increase in connection with ambulance services. Could he elaborate a little bit? Was that increased usage or was there something about the nature of the service that changed to cause it?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, it is not increased personnel, or anything of that kind. It is just a normal procedure that we have done in the government. As you will recall, at the end of the year, in this particular area, we generally have a supplementary to take care of overtime and various other things that happen in that particular program. It is not as if we have expanded it, by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. Penikett: What is the situation, at this point, with respect to the unexpended funds for the Jim Light Arena?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Where?

Mr. Penikett: The money that is not required, under the CAP program, for funding of the Jim Light project. What is the current state of negotiations and this territory's position, with regard to that project?

¹⁰⁴ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** Basically, it will go back into general revenue as the member knows. If monies are not expended then, of course, we have to revoke them. What we have done in the capital estimates, as you know, is voted \$2.25 million for the purposes of a new arena, cost-shared with the City of Whitehorse, 75-25. I think the member is as well-acquainted with the project as I am since I know he does read the newspapers. It would seem that it is going to proceed this year.

Mr. Kimmerly: Two points about ambulances. One is a statement I would like to make and the minister may or may not wish to comment. I do not mean to imply a criticism of the minister, but I do wish to raise a point that was raised with me that a Yukon family considered very, very serious.

I was told that the ambulance attendants removed a corpse and the corpse was found in embarrassing circumstances, although not in any criminal way or anything like that; it was not a suicide or a potential suicide. The family was extremely upset at the gossip that they believed originated from the ambulance attendants. It could have originated from other sources, and I promised to raise it. I simply make a comment that medical personnel are clearly

instructed in confidentiality in these kinds of things and ambulance attendants should be as well.

¹⁵ I will leave that as a suggestion to the managers in the department to pay attention to confidentiality. The managers in the department will understand what case I am talking about.

The second point is about ambulance fees for senior citizens. I have corresponded some time ago with the government about this, and I was to led to believe at an earlier time that the government was looking at doing away with ambulance fees for senior citizens. I would ask if there has been any progress issue?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I understand that my colleague from Health and Human Resources is working in that particular area, and I am sure he will have something further to add during questions on the mains.

We basically deliver the service and we are instructed to charge the individual corporation or company or government, depending upon who is getting the service. Our job is just to run the ambulance service.

¹⁶ **Mr. Penikett:** I have no wish to hold up the estimate, but since it may cause problems in terms of the totals and everything, could someone just get back to me on the question I previously raised.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We will certainly get back to him because I would like to have an explanation as well. It will not cause problems, mainly because what we are dealing with is only the column in dark figures in the supplementary estimates; those numbers are the numbers we are dealing with in this particular exercise.

Mr. Penikett: I do appreciate that. The only thing is I just do not want to have some screw-up about what the total of the revised vote ends up being, versus the previous number, and if there is some explanation or if it is typo, I would like to know, that is all.

Operation and Maintenance in the amount of \$168,000 agreed to Capital in the amount of a refund of \$602,000 agreed to Department of Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of a reduction of \$434,000 agreed to

On Economic Development

Mr. Chairman: We will now go on to Economic Development in the amount of \$64,000, on page 8.

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is very straightforward. There is a requirement for additional O&M funding of \$64,000 to accommodate the increased cost of power that is supplied to domestic consumers outside of Whitehorse. These funds are 100 percent recoverable from the Department of Indian Affairs cost-sharing agreement that I spoke of in my ministerial statement here yesterday. Also there is a Special ARDA program of \$109,000 largely due to the fact that fewer projects requiring YTG funding this financial year have been submitted for funding approval.

Mr. Byblow: Considering the condition of the Yukon economy over the past year, I would be curious from the minister why, in light of the funds that he has available, he would not have undertaken some initiative to examine further means of diversification or encouragement of recovery.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is not just strictly isolated to the Department of Economic Development. Most of the initiative this past year primarily went to the various programs and departments for the purposes of winter works projects over this past year. We have been doing a lot of work as the member knows in the Beaufort Sea. I think you have spoken to quite a number of people in the companies that we worked closely with. As far as the prospects for employment for people in the Yukon, we are working almost full time. We have one individual working with the CTC to follow through on the outcome with respect to the White Pass & Yukon railway question of Cyprus Anvil, which has been taking a lot of our time. The other area that we have been doing a lot of work on between administrations is the economic development agreement, which I indicated at the opening of the session in the Speech from the Throne. We hope to be able to announce the culmination of many hours of work in the economic development agreement.

¹⁷ I have to stress to the member opposite, this is not a program department. A lot of these originate from this department, but perhaps are implemented by the Department of Highways or other

departments of government, depending upon their responsibility.

Mr. Byblow: During the course of the year, Intergovernmental Affairs moved to the Executive Council Office. Did the budgetted amount for Intergovernmental Affairs clearly move with the branch to Executive Council?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps this may be a final question. I raised with the minister in Question Period, the reasoning behind the reduced amount of money anticipated under the EDA. Did the minister care to elaborate at this point about it?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We made it known here that we were negotiating what we thought was a five-year, \$50,000,000 economic development agreement. I believe those are the numbers that were stated, in ballpark figures.

We were then informed that, over the past year, we went down to \$35,000,000, then we went down to \$25,000,000, and now we are down to \$18,000,000. I think the fact is that the Government of Canada does not have the financing that they thought they would have with respect to these particular agreements. I am not about to stand up here and castigate the federal government. I recognize their financial situation, too. I am not totally happy with the \$18,000,000 Economic Development Agreement but, on the other hand, if that is what is available, that is what we have to go with. Those are the facts of life facing us as a government in this particular area.

Mr. Byblow: The minister almost said, "You should not bite the hand that feeds you".

Have there been any indications from the federal government in the negotiations currently taking place that they are considering \$25,000,000 to Cyprus Anvil as part of the reduction?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, not to my knowledge. Perhaps this is one of the reasons I had not thought of. Maybe this is one of the reasons we are down to \$18,000,000. They have all kinds of projects like this all across the country, not just Cyprus Anvil, in isolation.

The key thing, from where I sit, is that we have to do everything we can to encourage Cyprus Anvil to get back into business. I think, in part, that is going to solve a lot of our immediate economic problems in the territory. If it gets back into production, I am sure it will solve a lot of the member opposite's problems too.

Mr. Porter: One of the reasons the minister stated for there being a surplus of \$109,000 in the revised vote was that the territorial government had fewer projects to fund with respect to the ARDA agreement. I would also ask the minister if the federal government's portion under the agreement had not been expended was the reason why \$109,000 was left over; the federal government and the Yukon government cost-shared programs under the ARDA agreement.

¹⁸ The federal government, as I understand it, has run out of funds under that agreement. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not to my knowledge. We cost-share 75-25, depending on the program that is being undertaken. I could check, for the purpose of discussing it in the mains, whether or not they have run out of financing, but they have not, to my knowledge. My understanding is that they are looking for us to, I believe, to sign another agreement.

Also, I should hasten to add that there is a review of the guidelines, under the Special ARDA, which is underway — I am not too sure of the time, but it should be completed fairly soon — to see if there should be any revisions to the general guidelines that have been in place for a number of years now.

Mr. Porter: The minister further states that the federal government wants the Yukon government to sign another agreement. I would suppose that the current agreement must run out at the end of this fiscal year. Is there any negotiation ongoing, at the present time, toward the conclusion of a new agreement and what is the likelihood of that occurring early in the new year?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not believe that is correct. I am not sure of when that agreement expires, but I do not believe that it was signed for the purposes of April 1st to March 31st of any given year. I would have to check the dates of that agreement.

I do know that there is a review underway of the guidelines of the program. Once that has been completed, I am sure it will be

submitted to the Special ARDA committee and the various governments to review and see whether or not there is anything that should be altered to make a better utilization of the dollars.

I should point out that the other reason that there are dollars available is there were fewer projects actually submitted over the course of this past year. I just want to add to this discussion that I think that an area that we should be looking at with Special ARDA, if the Council for Yukon Indians and the Government of Canada agree, is, perhaps, channelling more dollars towards the inception of cottage industries. I think it would be very much of a positive step, as far as Yukon is concerned, and I think it would benefit more people from the point of view of employment and also from the point of view of the tourism industry. Those are the comments that I presented to the people who interviewed me. I felt that, perhaps, as opposed to buying existing businesses and this type of thing, that perhaps there should be a real look at the general concept of how those dollars are being spent. From my observation, it would seem that there are just a very few people getting the benefits, as opposed to a project, such as the Yukon Parka Factory, which employs quite a number of people and also brings forward a Yukon product for the purpose of not only us, locally, but the tourist trade. Maybe it is an area that should be looked at from that point of view, because there is only a finite amount of dollars and if we could spread it as far as we can, then I think it is to the benefit of everyone.

Mr. Porter: What happens to the surplus \$109,000 in this area? Is it carried over in the next budget to further our funding, or does it go back to general revenue.

Hon. Mr. Lang: You have to wait for the budget, but, as you will recall — and I believe it was in our capital budget — we voted dollars for the Special ARDA program, so, there is a continuation of dollars. This is just a year-end, to wrap-up all the various departments and programs. Everything goes back into general revenue, but we have already voted our capital and made our commitments, in that particular area.

Mr. Byblow: I am very pleased to hear the minister supporting the projects like the Parka Factory and proposing the further development of cottage and secondary industry. I think the minister has come around, to some extent, from opinions of a couple of years ago. I would be curious if, at this time, economic development is conducting any studies in this area; the secondary cottage industry, the manufacturing-type of economic activity potentially suitable to the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The review of the Special ARDA program just took place here recently. It is an area that I have spoken of and if there is a request, through this particular vehicle, for us to further examine the possibilities of further cottage industries, there is no question that we are prepared to do it. I should point out that, over the course of the past six months, our people within the department have had specific projects that they have had to undertake. In fact, in some cases, we have been shortstaffed. It is an area that we should be looking at and I am prepared to have asked of the department just exactly what we could do to encourage this and further examine it as a possibility as far as diversification is concerned.

*Operation and Maintenance in the amount of \$64,000 agreed to
Capital in the amount of a refund of \$109,000 agreed to*

Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of \$168,000 agreed to

On Health and Human Resources

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go on to Health and Human Resources on page 18 and 19.

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: What we have before us this day is the operation and maintenance fund, Supplementary No. 2; \$745,000 for operation and maintenance and \$714,000 capital.

The funds required primarily result from a higher than anticipated volume for child welfare; hospital outpatient services and medicare, on the operation and maintenance. The \$714,000 are increases of higher than anticipated billings from the federal government for north health service construction projects.

On the O&M, some of the areas that we have found a increase in,

above anticipated, are in the areas of child welfare services, rehabilitation services, the general hospital services, hospital insurance services, Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan, disease control, subsidized medical travel and contingency fund. Those amounts are approximately, in thousands of dollars, in the order of 110, 173, 28, 217, 439, 9, 5 and 100 respectively. If you wish to discuss those further, I will be quite prepared to.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am especially interested in two areas: child welfare and alcohol and drug services. I am interested in rehab services, as well, but I will do them one-by-one.

Perhaps that is the most efficient. First of all, under alcohol and drug services, I am aware that a person-year has effectively been lost under that program. I asked about it in Question Period. I am told that it is temporary secondment or something like that. I am particularly concerned, and I am going to be addressing it probably at some length in the mains in a couple of weeks, but I also address it here because it relates to the year just coming to a close. I would ask the minister first of all if the estimated caseloads identified in the mains have held up over the year. What is the shortfall in the increased expenditure in that particular program thus far?

I am particularly interested in the juggling of the person-years and my aim is to again ask the advocacy of service in the direct counselling area because I have some experience in the court system currently of getting appointments and getting people proper service in that area. It appears to me that the service is now grossly overworked and I am particularly interested in why a service, which is grossly overworked, loses a person-year in the middle of the year.

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: I think that it can be said for anything to do with social services with any government that all areas are always overworked and in need of extra people. We recognize this and I realize the onerous task and the onerous duty that the people who work in my department are doing and I am very thankful that the members of the opposition are aware that they are working to their fullest extent. I should like to thank him for all of these. If he has been in here on the weekends and seen the log book he would have seen that they have been in here on weekends as well. They do an extraordinarily fine job.

The reason the person has been moved from the alcohol and drug services for the time being is to do a job that he is qualified for in the human resources department under the director of human resources who is in direct control of alcohol and drug services. He is working in a related field on, I believe, some book work and service that needed to be done. In the area of drug and alcohol services, I hope that the member opposite asking for those figures is in the mains and not at the present time. If it is at the present time I would have to take it under advisement and bring those figures back.

Mr. Kimmerly: I will perhaps identify the question, and I realize that the minister may not be expected to answer immediately, but the question follows the general questions I asked about the expenditures in the individual programs. In the mains, I recognize that we get a last year's actual forecast, and that information is probably all I need, but in this area, I would ask if the original budgeted figure for the program is \$167,000.

Does the minister now know if the present forecast is an over-expenditure or an under-expenditure in that program?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: We have an under-expenditure in that program of \$16,000, and that under-expenditure is due to the reorganization of the department. We had reduced office expenses from what we thought we would have, so we are under-expended.

Mr. Kimmerly: We had voted \$14,000 for education and prevention. Has that actually been expended or is it expected to be by the end of the year, or is that part of the reorganization that has already occurred?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: Some of the expenditure of the \$14,000 is in the re-education field, that the person has moved over to do the work in this area rather than over in the other building. His person-year is still in the same department, under the same program.

Mr. Kimmerly: I will make an additional comment, then perhaps I will leave it, because my purpose is to set up and identify

a problem that I will be dealing with at much greater length in the mains.

I was somewhat amazed to learn that there were essentially two supervisors, and really, practically, two counsellors in the program, although there are other activities carried out. It appeared to me immediately that the supervision was top-heavy in that department and, frankly, when the supervisor was moved, I was not upset in any way at all. I thought that was appropriate, in fact.

¹² I was disappointed that a councillor was not added. It would have been wiser, in my view, instead of putting in the new supervisors approximately a year ago — not quite a year ago — to have expanded the number of councillors or used the person whose job it is, primarily, to do out-patient treatment. It is that area that appears to me, because I am a person who refers people to that service, I know that area is grossly over-worked in Whitehorse.

I will leave that, for the time being, and identify to the minister that, during the mains, I will be examining the program in some substantial detail.

I will go on to child welfare. I am extremely interested in this. *The Children's Act*, of course has increased interest, territory-wide. It appears to me that substantial changes are going on and they have not been identified, in any real sense, in any prior budgets; certainly not in the last two debates on the mains.

It appears to me that the department is increasingly active. Now, that is a purposely vague statement and I wish to explain it, coming at it from several perceptions or several points of view. The minister and officials have said that there has been, in the recent past, an increase in the number of suspected child abuse cases or an increase in reports of suspected child abuse.

I am not arguing with that; I am trying to understand it. The argument has been made to me that child abuse is on the increase, and that it is on the increase, nationally and in the Yukon, for various, unexplained reasons.

¹³ It has been explained to me that child abuse may be on the increase because of the economic depression; that there are increased pressures on families due to poverty and unemployment. That may be part of the answer but I do not believe that it is the whole answer.

It is also being said that the increased attention, specifically around *The Children's Act* and child welfare issues, had led more people to report suspected cases, and there is a change in the reporting, although the numbers of actual child abuse cases are relatively stable. It has also been said to me that the standard, or the test, or the definition of child abuse has been substantially changed in the last little while. The definition is a broader one than the one used in the previous years. Because of that, more cases fall into the category.

All of those different reasons or explanations may be partially right, or only some of them. It is certainly apparent to me that, at the public meetings that the minister held and that I attended or received reports of, there were substantial complaints from citizens about the activity, or the perceived increased activity, of the child welfare officials.

¹⁴ Relating to the last year and to the supp that he is asking for funds for, could the minister comment on those reasons. I would ask for an update of the information on page 79 of the original estimates, giving estimates of the number of children in care, because that would rationalize the addition of increased funding for this particular program.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I think I can help my learned friend across the aisle here. The increased funds are a direct result of the judiciary placing children in outside facilities, at a greater amount. That is reflected by an increased per diem cost in the number of children who are requiring those services in outside facilities. Those facilities are court order placements; they are not placements from the department.

Another small portion is the utilization of a homemaker, rather than admitting children into care, for about \$4,000. \$106,000 was for the outside placements.

In the area of child abuse, if the member opposite had good, factual evidence of why the increase in child abuse was happening, the department would be extremely delighted in hearing about it,

because, from all their studies and everything they go through to find out what causes these types of things, they are not able to come up with a firm idea of exactly what it is. However, they do know that child abuse is definitely on the increase.

I would try and quote some figures that I hope would be relatively close to being accurate. In 1982, I believe there were 16 children taken into care; in 1983, I believe there were 43, and 22 of them were in the last three months and even those were of a sexual nature — one was of both a physical and sexual abuse. In the first 14 days of 1984, there were 28 cases of child abuse that were brought before the department.

¹⁵ In none of those instances did I ever hear a member of the department say that these cases were not reflecting a large number of cases but a small amount of abuse. I have never heard that. It is not that I am bound by confidentiality, but the department is not allowed to tell me anything that goes on in that area. I do not know of specific cases. I do not know the specifics of those cases. I just know the numbers and the amount of the increase and the amount of work that is being done now by that department in that area.

I have asked the same questions as the member opposite and one fact that seems to be fairly evident is that it follows a flow pattern and it is generally around the holiday areas. You can usually look over a holiday, and just shortly after a major holiday, for an increase in child abuse and it will then subside until the next holiday.

The unemployment and increased tension are both areas that the department has looked at to see of these were areas that may have raised the figures. The discussion of *The Children's Act* in the communities I think has been an extremely healthy discussion. The community feeling that we have been able to give, both myself and my deputy minister on our travels, has been extremely enlightening. It has helped us greatly in the redrafting of this legislation that is tabled in this House. The meetings that we have had with the Council for Yukon Indians, to cite one individual group, have been very fruitful and productive. They are now publicly on record as being totally in agreement and happy with the structure of *The Children's Act*. There is only one small area of contention, which I am sure we can address and work out.

The criticism of *The Children's Act* seems to come, although strongly, from a relatively small minority. I would suggest. And it seems to address only specific areas. Those areas are not areas that I believe would have anything to do with reducing the amount of child abuse. I think the areas that are being addressed are being addressed because people have a feeling that their rights are being abused while we are trying to protect the rights of the children.

¹⁶ I do not mind the criticism. I welcome it. I think the debate on it would be healthy. I do not mind criticism from any group of individuals or any interest group. If they wish to come and discuss it with me in my office, my doors are still open. That goes for members of the opposition as well, if they have a problem with it. I believe the debate on it is healthy. I believe that that is all that can be said at the present time about the child welfare.

Mr. Kimmerly: It appeared as though we were debating *The Children's Act* at the moment, and that is not my intention at all. My intention was child abuse, or the child welfare line in the last fiscal year coming to an end this weekend.

The minister quoted cases. In 1982, there were 16 in care, and in 1983 there were 43. In the first days of 1984, there were 28. Are those cases of children actually in care, or actually brought in care or are those complaints that are investigated?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am sorry if I sounded like I was debating *The Children's Act*. The question was asked and that was the most concise answer that I could give at the time. The number of cases that I quoted in 1982 and 1983 were children that were taken into care, and, naturally, the first 14 days of 1984 were cases that were before the court; children who had been abused who were either before the court, going before the court or were before the court for a decision at that time.

I cannot give you an accurate answer of how many of those 28 were placed into care, but I am sure I could come back with a more up-to-date figure if you wish.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister also said the fascinating thing

about confidentiality. He said that he was not aware of the individual circumstances of these particular cases. I would like to say, because it adds to an understanding of my perspective of this problem, I am aware of a number, probably in excess of 10 percent, of those particular cases.

¹⁷ In my activities as a lawyer, in my law practice, I am under the same type of confidentiality restraint, although of a different kind. It is a privileged restraint, a privilege belonging to the client. Also, the cases are in a closed court and that implies an additional confidentiality.

However, I do wish to raise two general situations. This is about an actual case, but I am going to be very purposefully vague, so it would be impossible to identify. Some time ago, a boy was experiencing problems and the problems were largely around truancy at school. He was interviewed at the school by a child care worker and he complained about being struck by one of his parents. He was taken into care as a case of a suspected child abuse and it went to court.

In the court, interesting things occurred. It was actually a very unusual case, but I will get directly to the most important point. The child returned home, because the child ran away from the receiving home and returned home. It went to court and the court scheduled a hearing for three court days, about five months and three weeks later, at a time when the school year would have been over.

¹⁸ I raise this point because it is a part of a very real problem and it is my belief that one of the reasons why the minister is forced to come to the legislature and ask for a supplemental is this kind of a problem. There was a problem and the parents and the child and the social worker or the director disagreed as to what kind of problem it was. That was absolutely clear and it was necessary to get a judicial determination as to the authority or the power of the director to carry out a certain corrective course of action. The court adjourned it to a time five months away when the situation would have been totally different.

That is not an isolated case. I can mention two cases, in fact, which are before the courts this week and next week that I was involved in, and would have been if I were not here, where children were apprehended and the court hearing is at a substantial time after that. I raise it because it has budgetary implications here, but even more important it has a tremendous emotional implications. I know for a fact that everybody is frustrated. The courts are frustrated but you cannot criticize the court staff or the judges.

¹⁹ The social workers and the director are frustrated because they need a decision from the court and they need it quickly — within a week or two weeks — they need it very quickly. The parents are extremely frustrated because they are not living with their children and are under extreme pressure, psychologically and also financially, and other pressures. Most important of all, the children, who have a different sense of timing than mature adults, are left in a very uncertain situation.

Now, in that situation, most families get worse. I have been in this business for some time and I used to be a lawyer for the director of the Northwest Territories. I used to be a judge and I have seen it as a judge and I see it as a lawyer in these kinds of cases now, and most families get worse, in that situation.

I raise it now because it is extremely important, because of the increased caseload right now, that the minister has already identified. There is a lock in the courts and it is something that we can address, if we pay serious attention to it. It is not my purpose to criticize, because I am sure that if the Minister of Justice and the minister responsible for child welfare, the judges, the parents and myself and whomever sat down together and thrashed it all out, at the end of the day we would be in fundamental agreement as to what the problems are.

²⁰ There should not be a fight about it, but it is a very serious problem. When the families get worse, one of the effects is longer court cases; the children initially in care stay in care longer. It all has a price tag attached to it. It is my opinion — and it is more than an opinion — I know that a substantial part of this supp is because of that kind of problem. I have gone on a little too long, perhaps, on that one.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I will let Mr. Philipsen answer and then we will recess for 15 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: After being admonished for my lengthy dissertation on *The Children's Act* before, I will attempt not to do it now.

I will say that one of the areas in *The Children's Act* where we will try to address this problem, is a relatively long second attempt to improve the situation by having the child being able to be kept in care and being brought before the courts. I hope that will be one area that may help alleviate the problem the member from the other side is mentioning.

Mr. Chairman: We shall now recess until ten to nine.

Recess

²¹ **Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue with the Department of Health and Human Resources.

Mr. Kimmerly: I did not really understand the last comment made by the minister. He appeared to say that *The Children's Act* was going to solve this problem, or something like that. I have difficulty believing that, but anyway, I would like to talk about the additional \$110,000 we are voting for. It is my opinion that in the past, that would have been a substantial saving on last year's cases, that to get an additional judge or additional court staff temporarily in order to hear the emergency cases would have gone a long way to correcting some of these cases. I make that comment very seriously, and I hope that it is taken as a constructive suggestion, because it is more humane and, indeed, it would save money in the long run.

²² Going on to the specifics, there is \$4,000 for a homemaker service and \$106,000 per diems and outside placements for children in care. Presumably it is clear, pursuant to court orders. It is perhaps slightly misleading to say this is because of court orders because in all of those cases the department was pursuing a court order or asking for long term care for particular individuals, except possibly one. The philosophy of the department has been that they advocate taking a child into care and, especially on difficult cases, sending the child outside and paying an expensive per diem.

²³ It is clear to see that in the dollar amounts asked for: \$4,000, as opposed to \$106,000.

Would it not be a saving, in human terms, of emotional trauma, as well as a saving of money, if those figures could be reversed; that the expenditure for family supports could be much, much more and the out-of-territory expenditure much less? Why does the department not follow that direction or that philosophy in its court applications for children alleged to be in the need of care?

²⁴ **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I hate to keep coming back to *The Children's Act*, the one that is presently before this House, but I would ask the member opposite to read Sections 107 and 108 and the old Section 123, all relating to the family unit and keeping the child in the family unit, and keeping a child at home before bringing it to court. Other than that I would have to agree that, naturally, we would like the expense to go down by keeping the children here rather than having to send them outside. It is a court order that places them there and I cannot answer for that and I am very sorry, it is not my department to decide whether we would have another judge or not. I am sorry I cannot answer those questions.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. May I suggest that we are on the *Fifth Appropriation Act* and the *Child Welfare Act*, which we seem to keep getting to, will be coming up later. So rather than possibly discussing that now and later, could we not more or less stay on what the *Fifth Appropriation Act* is for.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am very interested in staying on the act and specifically talking about the amount asked for, \$110,000 for child welfare, which of course is mostly for per diems for children in outside facilities. It is misleading for the minister to say that "these are court orders, they are not my responsibility".

²⁵ **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have never stood on a point of order in this House before. It is my understanding that the word "misleading" is tantamount to calling

another member a liar, and I will not accept that. I am not trying to do that here. I am not trying to mislead anyone in this House.

Mr. Kimmerly: The director is clearly under the minister's control as far as policy and expenditure go. The director is making application for those orders in the court. That is the only way to get an order for care in an outside placement and the director is clearly making application for those orders and it has very important budgetary implications. The budgetary implication, this year, of course, is an additional \$110,000.

²⁶ It is my political duty to question that expenditure because that expenditure is, I believe, largely a waste of money, it could be avoided and it should be the policy of the department that the director is more prone to supply family supports, as for homemakers, and less inclined to ask for residential care, especially residential care outside where the children are clearly away from their communities, their family, their parents and friends.

²⁷ We started, in a very general way, about why this increased expenditure is asked for. I am standing here saying that, in my judgment, the money is not being spent wisely; that the philosophy of the department is wrong, in that they should be supporting the possible improvements available through homecare services and less inclined to ask for court orders for placement of children in outside facilities.

That completes the point I wish to make on child welfare. I will offer the minister an opportunity to respond, if he wishes, before I go on to something else. He indicates he does not wish to.

I am interested, also, in social assistance. I would ask the minister if the forecast expenditure is as it was forecast originally, or is it now different?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: In the area of social assistance, I am happy to report that we have a reduction in the number of individuals requiring assistance. The reduction is in the neighbourhood of \$105,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have been adding up the figures given, so far. We are asked to vote an expenditure for \$745,000. I am now told that there is a saving in social assistance of \$105,000. Would the minister rationalize that for me, so I understand where that excess has gone in the department or is going to go?

²⁸ **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The areas that I discussed earlier, which I am sure the member has written down, are all negative variances. I am sure, if he keeps his total going to the end, when we do get to the end he will find that there has been a negative variance of \$745,000. It is just that I was happy to report that one of the items that keeps the negative variance at only \$745,000 is that we had a saving of \$105,000 in the area of social assistance.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in this saving. I am interested for a very specific reason, which the minister is already aware of, and which I wish to speak about for a moment or two.

As the minister well knows, there have two requirements added, as well as the means test, on the social assistance program. One of them is a residency requirement and one of them is a work requirement.

It is my opinion that the work requirement is quite illegal and is certainly immoral, considering the goals of this department. There are individuals who are clearly residents, clearly Yukon residents, who have not worked for three months of the previous 12 months. Those people are denied social assistance and that is one of the reasons — perhaps not the major reason, but certainly one of the major reasons — why there is an under-expenditure in this program.

²⁹ Is it the policy of the government that this work requirement continue and is it the policy of the government that this work requirement has been identified to the federal auditors for this program and do they accept it?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The hon. member opposite knows full well because I am sure that he has been in consultation with the Canada Assistant Plan auditors in Ottawa. He knows full well that the plan that we have, which has a work requirement of three months, is satisfactory to them. Yes, we will be continuing that requirement of the 12 month period.

There are two types of social assistant recipients. There are Yukon residents and there are transients. The work requirement that we have for transients is an acceptable one, as I have said. We have

an appeal process. A person wishing social assistance can go to a person in the department of human resources and ask for assistance. If they are not satisfied with the result, they can go to the supervisor. If they are not happy with the result after seeing a supervisor, there are then two levels of appeal. Both levels are open to any individual. One level is the social assistance appeal committee, the other is the social assistance appeal board. Neither, I am happy to report, has a person working for the Yukon territorial government on it. I have heard the argument that the department always wins these cases. That is truly and absolutely untrue and I have numbers that are available to me. I think, in the last nine cases, six were appealed and three were lost to the department, or numbers to that effect. There is an avenue of appeal.

The Canada Assistance Plan auditors are quite happy with the situation the way it is. We are quite happy with the situation the way it is. We are charged with the responsibilities of looking after the taxpayers' dollar. There are approximately 30 to 40 individuals per month who apply for social assistance, who are transient to this territory. If we were to pick up all those people and pay them social assistance it would be asking the taxpayer to foot a bill somewhere between \$120,000 to \$180,000 per year in excess of what they are paying now. I am quite proud of the way the department is handling this situation. I think all Yukoners should be equally proud and happy with requirements for social assistance.

Mr. Kimmerly: I thank the minister for that complete and very frank answer. I received a letter from the federal minister. The minister I believe got a copy, or somebody did in the government. It was very clear that she has confused the residency requirement and the work requirement. The minister has previously identified that there is a work requirement.

³⁰ I put it to the minister that the auditors looked at the situation of different levels of assistance to transients and to permanent residents. It is clear that the federal government had accepted that as a policy, and other provinces do the same thing. Transient assistance is at a different level and given in a different way from residency social assistance.

The work requirement is clearly illegal, in my view, and it is my understanding that the federal auditors and certainly the federal minister does not understand that there are long time Yukoners who are defined somehow as transients because they have not worked for three months of the last 12, even though they are clearly residents.

I would ask the minister if he is able to break down the figures he gave into the category of those refusing assistance because of residency and those refused assistance because of the work requirement?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Possibly the easiest way to answer this question for the member opposite is to explain what a transient's characteristics are. It is a person who, generally, recently arrived from the south with no fixed address, no employment prospects; they are generally single individuals, male or female.

If a transient approaches the department for assistance, we first ensure that the person has explored every possibility of self-support. If the person has explored every possibility of self-support, and it is determined that the person is eligible for some assistance, we do provide minimal assistance, and minimal assistance only. We refuse assistance to those persons who have not explored all possibilities of work.

We provide assistance to transients in the following way: we may give transportation south in the winter months. We may provide emergency medical costs not covered by their jurisdictions. We usually provide short term accommodations, generally for a night, and emergency food.

³¹ I would like to stress, however, that each case is dealt with on an individual basis.

For a Yukon resident's characteristics, it is an individual who has not been able to secure work on a full-time basis in the last year. It would be a person who has attempted to secure work and taken advantage of all income producing opportunities. I would like to stress that a person has to at least attempt to find work in that amount of time. It would also be a person who may have recently exhausted UIC benefits. Individuals who fall into this category generally end up being provided with assistance at regular rate

levels. Again, each case is dealt with on an individual basis.

I again stress that any person may appeal the decision of the department to either the social appeal committee or the social appeal board. I am very happy to recognize the fact in the statement the member opposite made that, although the federal minister has viewed this, it is *his* understanding that it is illegal, not *her* understanding it is illegal. The last time that we sent out our work requirements to the auditors of the Canada Assistance Plan, which was in September, they viewed it and said our requirements were quite fine and we were falling within all their guidelines and they had no problems with what we were doing.

Mr. Kimmerly: Those guidelines just identified, it appears to me, would pass the tests, but I know of individuals who have been Yukon residents, who have not worked for three months of the last 12 and are denied social assistance and have gone through the appeal procedures.

The way the program is applied is that there is a work requirement, in addition to the transient tests. Has that work requirement been identified to the federal auditors?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I do not wish to go on with this all night but, yes, our requirements have been given to the auditors. I said it at the beginning and I have said it twice since. I do not know how many times I have to say it. Our plan for social assistance, in total — we did not hide anything from anybody — has been looked at by the Capital Assistance auditors and they have found it satisfactory and meeting their requirements.

Mr. Kimmerly: There is a request for additional funding for \$173,000 for rehab services. I would ask the minister to explain why that extra funding is asked for.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: On the rehabilitation services, these funds are identified for people who have been placed outside, not by the courts, but by the department, in areas of vocational rehabilitation services in areas we cannot help people with here.

The costs that are placed on us are increased costs on a per diem rate that we have absolutely no control over. The rates that were identified last year have gone up so greatly this year that it is reflected in this amount.

There is also a slight increase in the vocational rehabilitation here that was identified earlier this year, and I believe it was \$12,000 that we brought forward for the whole rehab here at that time. There is also an increase in the subsidy paid to clients of the vocational rehabilitation centre. If employment cannot be found for them locally, we give them a slight subsidy.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask about the program under mental health. Originally there was an estimate of \$237,000. Was that on target?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am happy to report that under the item, mental health services, due to the fact that fewer patients have been sent out of the territory recently, we have a favourable amount of \$49,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am keeping the list as it was given to me, and I commented earlier that I was confused as to the way the \$745,000 was arrived at. I also identified to the government later that I was going to ask for the various lines to be identified in the supplementals. I wonder if it is possible that the minister could simply go through the programs, they are all listed on page 74 of the main estimates, and give the current estimated amount on each of the lines?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I will go through all the departments and all the services, with both the positive and negative variances. I will try and give you a reason for each as I go through so we can help the member opposite from having to get up and ask a me a question on each one of these individually. Possibly we could reduce the amount of debate on this variant.

Under administration, human resources there is a cost ceiling of \$37,000. That is due to a vacancy in positions.

Child welfare services we have already discussed for a negative variance of \$110,000.

Social assistance we have already discussed, a positive of \$105,000.

Rehabilitation services we have discussed already for a negative variance of \$173,000.

Under the grants we have a positive of \$23,000, and that is due primarily to grants provided by NADAP to Crossroads.

Alcohol and drug services we have discussed, which is a positive of 16.

Residential facilities: some vacancies we had filled we were fortunate at filling at lower salaries for a positive of \$40,000.

Administration in the health services; we had a positive of \$31,000. That is due to a reduction in salary requirements resulting from vacancies.

Under general health services, increased billings from National Health and Welfare — and those are unanticipated increased costs that you just do not know about until National Health and Welfare bills you for them — a negative variance of \$28,000.

The Yukon Hospital Insurance Services; the volume of outpatient services is higher than anticipated. We have a negative variance of \$217,000.

The Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan; we have higher costs than anticipated for in-territory doctors, and that is \$358,000.

We had higher than anticipated costs for the start up of the Pharmacare Program of \$81,000, and that is due to the fact that this is the first year of its coming into being: equipment, purchase of canes, chairs, wheelchairs, et cetera.

Mental health services; positive, \$49,000.

Subsidized medical travel; negative, \$9,000.

Cancer control; negative, \$5,000.

Speech pathology; an under-expenditure, due to a vacant position, of \$77,000. We have a contingency of \$100,000. We have approved salary adjustments for a negative of \$42,000. That gives us a total variance of \$745,000.

On the capital side, the negative variance of \$714,000 is due to a cost that was incurred upon us by the National Health and Welfare on construction and we have no control over it.

Due to the lateness of the hour, I think we should report progress on the bill.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the motion.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that Mr. Speaker resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Brewster: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 13, *Fifth Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled March 28, 1984:

84-4-9

Yukon Teachers' Staff Relations Board Ninth Annual Report 1982-83 (Firth)

84-4-10

Yukon Lottery Commission Report 1982/83 (Firth)

84-4-11

Correspondence between Chairman of CYI and Government Leader—May/June 1983 (Lang)

84-4-12

Current Management of Ungulates and their Predators in the Yukon Territory (Tracey)