



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 25

4th Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, May 2, 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, Recreation and Culture
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

Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, May 2, 1984 - 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time to the Order Paper.
 Are there any returns or documents for tabling?
 Reports of committees?
 Petitions?
 Introduction of bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 24: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 24, entitled *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that a bill, entitled *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.
Motion agreed to

Bill No. 26: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 26, entitled *Electoral District Boundaries Commission Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that a bill entitled, *Electoral District Boundaries Commission 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?
 Oral questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Gambling in Dawson City

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Justice. On Monday, the minister stated in the House that the gambling operation such as the one in Dawson City, Diamond Tooth Gerties, was in fact legal. What is the minister's basis for making this statement; has he got an opinion to that effect from the Attorney General of Canada?

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: I would caution the minister that if he has a legal opinion it cannot be expressed in the Question Period.

Mr. Penikett: Our rules clearly state I can ask the minister if he has obtained an opinion. The minister may even provide the House with the essence of it. I cannot ask the minister, however, his legal opinion or to give a legal opinion.

Mr. Speaker: The way the question was stated, it would appear the hon. member is looking for an opinion which may be legal in nature and in that case I cannot permit the minister to give a legal opinion. However, I will permit the minister to answer the question.

Mr. Penikett: With respect, your ruling is wrong, sir. Our rules clearly state that I may ask if a minister has a legal opinion. I may not ask him for a legal opinion. I may not ask him what his opinion on a legal question is. Our rules are clearly framed — as one of the authors of them, I know this — to ask the minister if he has obtained a legal opinion, and also, since it is pertinent and germane to our discussions, what that opinion may be. What I cannot ask him is if he would give us an opinion himself, for whatever value it may or may not have.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member was listening to what the Chair had to say on the matter, I still say the same thing. I must rule that if the minister has a legal opinion, he is not to give it in question period.

We will now proceed with the question period.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I challenge that ruling.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member wishes to challenge the ruling of the Chair, he will have to do so by substantive motion.

Mr. Penikett: Please accept my notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I take it, then, there are no further questions, this afternoon?

Mr. Penikett: I just want an answer to my question: whether the minister has attained a legal opinion.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have obtained a number of legal opinions, not necessarily just from the one source that was asked about. The other day, on Monday, I am not sure if I said it was my opinion that it was legal or not, but it certainly is my opinion. I am not a lawyer, as the House realizes.

Mr. Penikett: For the record, the minister said, "Yes, it is legal"; a statement of fact.

Given the apparent proliferation of gambling concerns in this country, such as the one in Calgary and the one proposed for Whitehorse, could I ask either the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs if the territorial government is at all concerned that the legal status of existing gambling operations will come under review by the Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, it is a concern of ours, naturally, because Diamond Tooth Gertie's, being the only legal gambling operation of its type in Canada, is of concern to us. If there is too much proliferation of gambling in the territory, or in Canada, it is all going to come under review and we, perhaps, may be facing the situation in the future where it will all be disallowed.

Mr. Penikett: Could I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, as a question of fact, by what statutory authority does the government presently regulate the operation at Gertie's?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We regulate the KVA under section 190 of the *Criminal Code*.

Question re: French language

Mr. Byblow: My question is to the Minister of Education on the French language question. In previous questioning, the minister said that she accepted as accurate the estimated number of 67 students who would attend a program of French language instruction in Whitehorse. Has the minister sought a legal opinion on whether the numbers meet the constitutional obligation to provide French language education?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The *Constitution* states "where numbers warrant", and it is up to the provincial or territorial government to decide what the numbers that warrant it will be.

Mr. Byblow: I ask the minister again: has the minister sought a legal opinion as to whether the numbers warrant it?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We have sought a legal opinion as to our constitutional obligation; we have sought two of them. However, it is not the legal opinion that decides where the numbers warrant it.

Mr. Byblow: Could the minister advise what the substance was of the legal opinion?

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. members, for some strange reason, seem to be testing the Chair. It would seem to me that, in the interests of parliamentary procedures exercised in the conduct of this House, it would be more appropriate for members, if they have difficulty phrasing questions that come within the rules, or do not understand the rules, the Chair would most certainly bend over backwards to assist all hon. members from doing this, rather than to have confrontations with the Chair provoked today, for some reason. Perhaps it is just by coincidence that these things are appearing. The Chair wishes to be as lenient as possible, within the bounds of the Question Period, but there are rules for the asking of questions about legal opinions. They are

certainly clear and I would ask all hon. members to take this in mind in phrasing their questions.

Mr. Penikett: On the point of order. I have no wish to be provocative to the Chair, but it is our respectful submission that the Chair is misinterpreting the rules that this House has adopted for itself. It is not a question of us wishing to break the rules, it is a matter of us wishing to observe the rules that we made for ourselves — that we made for ourselves on a recent occasion — as a result of frustration with interruptions during Question Period or the normal flow between ministers and members opposite.

If I may quote from the rule: "The question may not seek an opinion, legal or otherwise." The clear meaning of that statement is that I cannot, nor can any member, ask a minister to give a legal opinion on his own. It is perfectly in order, here and in every other legislature, and the House of Commons, to ask the government if the government or the ministers of the day has obtained, either from law offices of the Crown, or from private lawyers, an opinion as to the legality or the constitutionality of any matter of policy before it.

It is also possible, as a question of information or as a question of fact, to ask what that opinion was. The minister may or may not give the opinion. The minister may in fact from time to time say we have two opinions and they are different: they were this and this. It is then perfectly in order and as has been done in the House many times before for the minister to say we have obtained such an opinion and the legal opinion, the legal advice that we have is "x, y, and z".

It is perfectly proper to do that. What we may not do, and what the rule clearly is intended to do, is to get into legal disputes on the floor of this House, which only one member in this House is equipped to do, and even in other legislatures, where there is a preponderance of lawyers, to prevent them becoming lawyers' circuses with lawyers trading legal opinions on the floor of the House.

It is perfectly proper, though, perfectly germane, in respect to the government business, to find out if the Crown or the ministers of the day have obtained information as to the legality, constitutionality or otherwise of a measure or measures that they propose.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I was around at the same time as the leader of the opposition, when these rules were written and, under specific rule no. 2, it is very, very clear: "A question ought to seek information and cannot be based on hypothesis or seek an opinion, legal or otherwise"; any opinion, legal or otherwise, with respect.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

In this matter, it has always been the position of the Chair, in this parliament, that questions asking for legal opinion are out of order. That has always been the stance of this House. Questions that ask a solution to a legal questions, such as the interpretation of a statute, are also held to be questions that would be out of order.

It would be so much simpler if members who have chosen that they do not like the rules, or if the rules do not work in their favour, try to change the rules. Well, it is up to the House to do that: if you do not wish to go by the rules that are established, then perhaps the House should change those rules to fit their needs, rather than those of the House. However, that is something that only the House can decide and all the Chair can do is interpret the rule and enforce the rule.

I must rule, as I have before, that questions relating to opinions or answers in terms of legal opinions do not fit any place, and just take up the time of Question Period, as we are now, discussing the matter. I would ask that if you wish to deal with this further, you can either do so by coming to my office, which is always open, or by substantive motion in this House.

May we proceed with the Question Period.

Mr. Byblow: I believe you have been given notice of a challenge to your ruling, so, to make the Question Period more productive, I would like to phrase my final supp to the minister this way. Is the minister prepared to transmit the findings of her legal opinions to Association Franco Yukonais?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: In due time.

Question re: RCMP contract

Mr. Kimmerly: To the Minister of Justice and not about legal opinions in any way, shape, or form, but about the police contract. Has the minister consulted with the RCMP concerning the issue of the degree or the priority of enforcement of possible impaired driving infractions. If so, what was the policy or the position of the government at those consultations?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: We discuss a number of things in relation to the police services agreement, all the time, at all of our meetings. Certainly that issue comes up. We have laws that certainly state what they are supposed to do: how they are supposed to enforce them.

Mr. Kimmerly: When the issue of enforcement of impaired driving laws comes up, what is the policy position of the government concerning the priority given to enforcement of our impaired driving laws?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: It is seated in legislation, and the priority is high.

Mr. Kimmerly: In considering the government position concerning the police priority in enforcement of impaired driving, by what method does the government ascertain public opinion?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: My office is always open for anyone who wants to call: my phone is there, I am there, the whole government is here and available and wide open to receive anything from the public.

Question re: Subsidies for rural electrical power

Mr. Porter: On April 5th of this year, I raised a question with the government leader on an issue of rural electrification. Upon review of those questions, there seems to be some misunderstanding so I will put the question again to the government leader. Is it the policy of this government to provide financial subsidies to rural residents so that they can afford to purchase electrical power?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry if there was a misinterpretation. At the present time we have an agreement with the Government of Canada that provides some assistance to rural residents in respect to the costs of buying electricity, or energy.

That program has been in place for a number of years and is continued on a year by year basis.

Mr. Porter: I understand that the government has chosen a policy of equalization of electrical rates to the consumers in Yukon. Does the government leader not understand that this policy initiative would be a disadvantage to those rural residents who do not reside adjacent to established communities?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There is a definite misunderstanding now. We certainly, as a government, have exhibited a tremendous amount of interest in electrical equalization. We have not yet adopted a policy, and there is quite a big difference. Certainly, what we have to be able to know is exactly what the impact is going to be on every resident of the territory, and that is what we are trying to find out. We are trying to determine exactly whether or not it would be beneficial to have equalization. Certainly, I have personally always been of the opinion that if we can equalize the cost of alcoholic beverages throughout the territory, I somehow feel that we should be able to equalize the cost of energy.

Mr. Porter: Milk would be a good addition to that as well.

The government leader stated that there is a four million dollar surplus as per the budget introduced to this House. Is the government leader prepared to appropriate a portion of that budget to support a reasonably priced rural electrification program for Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I must say that we have been actively engaged in trying to find some sort of a formula or method of providing reasonably priced energy to everybody in the territory for a long, long time. We are not going to be able to solve it with some sort of a surplus in this budget; not at all.

Question re: Women's Bureau

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau. The advisory council to the Women's Bureau was established in 1982 and has been inactive since that time due to lack of funds according to the minister. Since the Women's Bureau budget has only increased by \$1,000 for this fiscal year, can I ask

the minister if it is the intention of his government to continue to operate that department for another year without that committee?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: That is probably more a question that should be addressed in the budget debate. We will be discussing it there. I am sure.

Mrs. Joe: It was just a matter of yes or no; that is easy.

On April 9th, the minister said he would undertake to provide this House with the amount of money it would cost to reactivate the study on women in the labour force. Does the minister now have that information?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I believe I have answered the question, in the following days, but if I have not, I will check *Hansard* and then get back to the member opposite.

Mrs. Joe: Since the Women's Bureau has been on a low priority level since its establishment, is it the intention of the minister's government to continue to operate that department for another year on the same level?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The Women's Bureau is not a low priority item for this government, nor for the Department of Justice, for that matter. The funding is restricted, as it is throughout government, and so it has to be operated within those restraints.

The Women's Bureau is a very active area and I can certainly get into a very long-winded description of what the Women's Bureau actually does; it will take a lot of time, though. I will deliver it to the member, if she would like.

Question re: Agricultural development

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the minister responsible for municipal and community affairs.

The minister will remember his introductory letter, regarding agricultural development, to Eugene Whelan, the federal minister responsible for agriculture, which, up to a few weeks ago, had received no reply. Has the federal minister responded, to date, and, if not, have tracer letters been sent to the federal government to discover on whose desk the request now sits?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not believe I stated that, specifically, with respect to the correspondence that I have received, because I am not too sure which letter the member opposite is referring to. I think it is safe to say that, if I did, I would have to table it, in any event, and I would have to re-evaluate that and decide whether or not I was prepared to do that.

Mr. McDonald: There is no need to table the letter: it is the one in my hand, which is dated January 9th, 1984, to the hon. Eugene F. Whelan, signed by the minister. It is the first letter the minister has apparently sent to the federal minister.

The letter draws the attention of the federal minister to the desire of Yukon to have access to the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration Services to provide assistance in developing irrigation and water supply projects. Could the minister explain what is meant by assistance and whether there are any specific projects the government has in mind that are worth noting?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We want to see if the program would apply to Yukon. I should just inform the member opposite that, in the very near future, I hope to have a meeting with Mr. Whelan to discuss issues of this kind, if he can fit it in his busy schedule, between trying to run that particular department and run for the Liberal leadership.

Perhaps, at that time, once I have had that meeting, I will be in a better position to answer the questions of the member opposite.

Mr. McDonald: For my final question, perhaps the minister will take part of it on notice, in that case, given his preceding remarks, and perhaps he could answer the second portion.

What specific help is the Yukon government looking for from the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration Services to develop community pastures and what efforts has this government made, itself, to develop community pastures?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We are very much at a disadvantage as far as the creation of community pastures is concerned. I am going on memory. I believe there was a report tabled in the House approximately seven years ago pertaining to the question of community pastures and the pros and cons of such a system being put into effect. I should point out that if that particular program was

available, then it would have to be assessed. I think the principle we are looking at is whether or not the program applies to Yukon.

If the programs do apply to Yukon, then, could they be implemented here in Yukon, is the question we are putting to the Government of Canada. We have not got down to specifics because we have not got a definite answer to the fundamental principle: does the program apply to Yukon? Once that is established and if it is in the positive, then it puts us in a position to be able to discuss at length — officials to officials — what programs could be made available in concert with those people in the association as well as individuals who would benefit from those Canadian programs.

Question re: Kwanlin Dun Band, relocation

Mr. Penikett: For the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. Could the minister report to the House on the status of the planned relocation of the the Kwanlin Dun band to the new Hillcrest subdivision?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the minister to be brief in this because that would seem to require quite a lengthy reply.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will assure you, I try to be brief at all times, depending on the question.

I am not in a position to update the House at the present time. I just organized a meeting with the City of Whitehorse, Monday morning, to discuss specifically the question of relocation of the village to the future site in Hillcrest. Once I have attended that meeting, perhaps I would be in a better position to answer the question that has just been put.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the minister for his answer, but fail to understand why there was any doubt about needing anything more than a brief answer.

The band is apparently building more permanent dwellings in the Takhini area. I wonder if the minister could tell the House if this means that the negotiations perviously referred to by himself, on behalf of the band to purchase land in Hillcrest, are currently in abeyance?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to assure the member opposite that we have done everything as a government to assist where possible the relocation of the present village. I should further point out that in his preface to his remark, he said "apparently are building", and I do not know if that is true or not. I do know that, if that is the case, it is going to cause the City a great deal of problems because they are very concerned that when they gave their approbation to the first number of homes that were to be built there that it would not become a permanent subdivision of the City of Whitehorse with all ancilliary problems that would occur. It was to be a transition type of construction so that the relocation could proceed. These are the questions that I am sure will be raised Monday morning.

Mr. Penikett: In the event of the band relocating to Hillcrest, has the minister decided, as a matter of policy, what form of local government will be effect in the area? Will it be the band council village or is a ward within the city being contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Once again, these are questions that I am sure will arise with our meeting with the City of Whitehorse. As you know, this side of the House — I am not too sure of the other side — has always taken the position that, in the best interests of all people in the territory, the principle of the one government system should, and has, to be preserved. Therefore, any move contemplated would have to be done within those parameters. If there is a ward to be put into place, of course, that is decision that would have to be made between ourselves and the City of Whitehorse, if such a request were to come.

Question re: Student employment program

Mr. Byblow: I direct this to the Minister of Education. I am receiving a number of enquiries surrounding the student assistance employment program and, for the record, I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions about it.

Because the application forms for the program, as well as the details about the program, are not publicly released yet, can the minister tell the House whether the program, in general, will follow the guidelines of last year's program?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, it will.

Mr. Byblow: Is, or will, the student eligibility for the program be the same as those in the current *Student Financial Assistance Act* for post-secondary grants?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I am not quite sure if they will or not. I will have to get the answer and bring it back for the member tomorrow.

Mr. Byblow: What advice does the minister recommend I give to people seeking application forms and details about the program?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: He can advise them to contact the Department of Education. There is an individual there who is available to help people who have enquiries about the student employment assistance program.

Question re: Police Services Agreement

Mr. Kimmerly: Again, about the Police Services Agreement, but about a different issue under it: has the minister consulted with the RCMP concerning the policy and priority of the enforcement of the pornography laws currently?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: As it is a *Criminal Code* offence, it is regulated, and therefore paid for, by the federal government's side of the RCMP agreement and police services to Yukon. It is not really my jurisdiction. I do intend to speak about it at our next meeting, but it is really not my jurisdiction.

Mr. Kimmerly: Has the Minister of Justice consulted with the federal Crown Attorney's office concerning prosecution for pornography in Yukon recently?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I repeat, again, that is not my jurisdiction, so they are acting under the federal Attorney General on anything they are doing on that matter.

Mr. Kimmerly: I understand the jurisdiction very well.

Has the minister considered specifically asking for public input on the definition of community standards, concerning pornography, which is presently the federal law?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have not asked for it, no, but if the member has something he would like to bring forward to give to me, I would certainly consider it.

Question re: Women's Bureau

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau.

Since the minister has not indicated to this House that the advisory council to the Women's Bureau will be reactivated this year, will he provide this House the amount of money it will cost to reactivate it for a year?

Mr. Speaker: I would assume the hon. member is not asking for money, but information relating to money: is that correct?

Mrs. Joe: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is in order.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: That will be done during the budget debates, I guess. We will be discussing the Women's Bureau, in that discussion, so if the member wants to ask that then, I will have the information with me.

Mrs. Joe: Other than the Women's Bureau to the advisory committee, are there any other advisory committees in this government that are presently inactive due to lack of funds?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have no idea; it is not a question properly asked of me.

Question re: Land use

Mr. McDonald: I have a question to direct to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Some weeks ago, the minister said that he would check into the procedure used to discover land use conflicts, when application is made for agricultural lands: he had been asked whether the government was pursuing a one-window approach in sorting out any perceived conflicts. Can he now say with any certainty whether the one-window approach is used and whether the Agricultural Development Council is, in fact, that one window?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The council is the one-window. Any applications that are put forward, I understand, proceed through the council, initially, to see whether the land is arable and meets the criteria, with respect to the actual disposition that would be required for the purposes of agriculture. If there is any question of conflict,

it is then sent to the various departments responsible and reviewed: their comments are taken into consideration when a decision is made.

Mr. McDonald: One brief question for clarification: are the various departments of which the minister speaks territorial or federal or both?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Territorial, because we do not have responsibility for federal land.

Question re: Land use conflicts

Mr. McDonald: There is, obviously, a problem amongst many farmers in the territory that they will be applying for lands that are currently federal Crown lands. There are, obviously, cases where there could conceivably be land use conflicts, whether it be forestry, whether it be water resources, or any number of land use conflicts that the Government of Canada may dream up. I am wondering whether the minister would consider extending or expanding his one-window approach to include federal government departments, to allow the prospective farmer to forego having to visit innumerable federal departments to ensure that applications okayed by this government would be the last word?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I guess I take that as representation, is that correct?

Question re: Mining Task Force

Mr. Byblow: I have a question on House business I would like to direct to the government House leader. I received a request from the government House leader to stand over a motion intended for debate today on the subject of the mining task force. Because I am unclear as to the reason for standing it over, which I am quite prepared to do if it will expedite the intent of the motion, I would like to ask the government House leader if he can provide a reason for the request.

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think these are matters best left dealt with between the House leaders themselves. I do not think these types of matters have any place in the Question Period and I certainly will not permit any discussion along that line. I would suggest that the hon. members get together and resolve questions such as this outside of the House.

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a point of order, as government House leader, I would like to say that, from my perspective, if the member wishes to pursue the motion on the Order Paper he is quite within his rights to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Once again, the chair will hear no more discussion on such matters.

There being no further questions, we will now proceed from the Question Period to orders of the day.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 12

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

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

Mr. Brewster: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Kluane that this House is of the opinion that every Yukon community must have proper medical services available within or near to the community and that this House is of the opinion that the community of Beaver Creek does not have proper medical services available, and that this House is of the opinion that the federal minister responsible for Health and Welfare should take decisive action to ensure that the residents and visitors to Beaver Creek are provided with adequate medical services by stationing a resident nurse in the community, and that the Speaker forward a copy of this resolution to the federal Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. Brewster: I have been relentlessly working to have the medical services in Beaver Creek brought to an adequate standard for well over one year now. During that time it has become crystal clear that what is needed is a resident nurse within the community. I have been working hard towards that end but with little movement

on the part of the federal Medical Services Branch. I must commend the efforts of the Yukon minister for health and human resources and his officials for their work on my behalf. Unfortunately, all our efforts have not yet paid off.

All the people of Beaver Creek ask is that they be treated fairly. Is it fair for the federal government to deny the service of a resident nurse to the people of Beaver Creek when every other community in the Yukon has access to a nurse within their community or within 75 miles. Beaver Creek is the only exception.

As we all know, everything is relative. We are not asking the federal government to construct a major hospital in Beaver Creek. That would be unreasonable. But is it unreasonable for the people of Beaver Creek to have the same medical services that are available to other Yukoners? Every Canadian is entitled to proper health care. Most Canadians have come now to believe that this is one of the privileges of being a Canadian citizen. The debate about the cost of health care rages on throughout Canada. Health care is by far the most expensive service offered to the Canadian public and yet no one is willing to cut health care costs.

Simply put, health care is one of the most important services to the taxpayers of Canada. Proper health care is just as important to the people of Beaver Creek. Some critics say the costs of a nurse in Beaver Creek are not justified. I beg to differ. What price do we put on human life? If a nurse could save the life of just one individual, that cost would be justified.

I recognized this need long before I was elected to represent the Kluane riding in this Assembly. Once elected, I set about to correct this inadequacy. To date, my efforts have shed light on how the system works, but have had little impact on the bureaucratic mandarins who make the decision. It appears these civil servants have developed quaint little formulas to help them make their decisions. The formula might say a community must have this many people, or that many facilities before a nurse could be stationed there. No matter how they try to refine these formulas, they will never come up with an equation that deals fairly with all situations.

Were the civil servants in Ottawa thinking about the people of Beaver Creek when they developed their criteria? The answer is clear: they were not. Other considerations besides population must be taken into account.

Please let me elaborate on a number of events that have clearly demonstrated the inadequacy of the medical service in Beaver Creek. I was informed that a resident of Beaver Creek was contracted by the medical service branch to administer first aid and dispense drugs. I was told the person contracted was a qualified paramedic. After inquiring with this individual I determined he was an emergency technical technician, a medical status that is not even recognized in Canada. Medical service officials later admitted this person was not on contract but he did have access to the clinic. He was allowed to dispense drugs in emergency situations. The irony of this situation was that RCMP had to store the small supply of drugs on its premises. If the RCMP were on patrol or away, pain-killing drugs were not available. This arrangement is totally unacceptable.

During the summer of 1982, this emergency technician made 40 night calls; another 12 calls were made by a former nurse who lived in the community. The medical branch responded to these callouts by saying that most of them were for American tourists and implied they were not interested in providing services to the American tourist travelling through Yukon.

I would like to provide this House with a copy of correspondence given to me by the manager of Alas/Kon Border Lodge. It clearly indicates the attitude of the medical service bureaucrats.

It seems they have no consideration about the health of Yukon economy or the impact tourism has on our economic wellbeing. I will table these correspondence for the information of my fellow members. For the benefit of other interested people, I would like to quote from the letters.

The first letter is sent from the office of the regional director, medical services branch in Whitehorse, to Mr. Wilson, the vice president of Alas/Kon Border Lodge.

"The perennial problem of health services to the community of Beaver Creek has once again been raised. The current stable

population is serviced by two visits per month of approximately one week duration of each visit. There is increased pressure for this department to provide full time nursing services, particularly during the summer months; due to the large number of guests at your lodge. It is my feeling Alas/Kon Border Lodge Limited has direct responsibility for the care and well being of its guests. Your company elected to situate your lodge in a community with very limited health resources, and a very small population, and logically, to operate on a seasonal basis. This department gladly provides any required health services in communities where those services are already in place.

"I am sure you will agree it has never been nor is it currently feasible to extend the already limited health resources within Yukon to accommodate your decision to locate in a remote limited resource area.

"I respectfully request your company give serious consideration to placing adequate health service in your lodge at Beaver Creek to accommodate your guests. This is not an uncommon practice in a large hotel facility.

"If you feel there is insufficient need, or that community and traveller pressure would compromise your service to your guests, perhaps it may be possible to cost-share with this department or with the Government of the Yukon. I would appreciate hearing your thoughts on this long-outstanding matter."

This letter is from Steve Lennard, Vice President, Alas/Kon Border Lodge, to Mr. D. W. Shellenberg:

"Your letter of March 8th 1983 to Don Wilson of Alas/Kon Border Lodge Limited has been forwarded to my attention. While Alas/Kon Border Lodge did indeed elect to locate a lodge in Beaver Creek, we are not the only beneficiaries of this decision. Provisions and equipment are purchased in or through Whitehorse and we, of course, hire Canadian citizens to work at the lodge. Further, the existence of this lodge enables us to bring thousands of tourists through the Yukon and they leave behind them thousands of dollars. The alternative would have been Tok, Alaska, and not only would we be hiring US citizens, ... rather than Canada. With our purchase of the Klondike Inn, we are committing ourselves further to the development of tourism in the Yukon.

"You mention in your letter the fact that it is not feasible to extend coverage to an area with such a small population. I believe that the summer population of Beaver Creek approaches 150 Canadian citizens, consequently more than Destruction Bay where a fulltime nurse is located. Perhaps it would be possible to have the nurse fulltime in Beaver Creek in the summer months, and Destruction Bay the remainder of the year.

"You suggest that our company provide health facilities at the lodge, and I honestly believe that this responsibility should lie with Health and Welfare Canada and/or the Government of the Yukon. Private industry can provide the capital investment and employment to bring economic growth to the Yukon. I do not believe private industry should also be required to directly foot the bill for health services.

"I hope you do not find these opinions to be too dogmatic and will give further consideration to placing a fulltime nurse in Beaver Creek during the summer."

The Alas/Kon Border Lodge is now building at Tok, Alaska. What factor was the nurse and cooperation of federal bureaucrats on this decision? It is bureaucratic attitudes like this that are stifling the potential of our tourism industry. Recognizing the total inadequacy of their service in Beaver Creek, northern health bought a house and converted it into a clinic with a living area; they now heat this building year-round. It was indicated to me that the next year's budget would provide for a resident nurse. I now believe they never had any intention of providing a resident nurse.

They also gave the doctor in the north highway area the freedom to do what he wanted as long as he kept the people quiet. On May 1st 1983, the senior medical consultant with medical services in Ottawa and the director of medical services in Yukon attended a public meeting in Beaver Creek. In the short time they spent there, the people of Beaver Creek made their needs known very clearly. It now appears they were only showing the flag. They said a population of 500 was needed to justify a resident nurse.

¹⁶ The people of the meeting quickly challenged them, saying this criteria would disqualify almost every community in Yukon.

Trying to squirm out of that blunder, Medical Services officials next said the population regulations were made for the Northwest Territories, not the Yukon. A person in the audience, who was from the Northwest Territories, challenged them again, saying this was not the case. The medical officials then admitted that the policy did not apply in the Northwest Territories, either.

After this meeting, the people of Beaver Creek were disgusted by the attitude of federal civil servants. As it now stands, the nurse from Destruction Bay/Burwash area, visits Beaver Creek for two weeks of every month. This system makes the problem along the north highway even worse. The nurse now must have two homes: one in Beaver Creek and one in Destruction Bay. Medical Services complained that it is hard to get nurses to work the north highway. With a schedule like this, it is no wonder.

Instead of having one dissatisfied community, we now have three. No one can predict when an emergency is going to happen. The new system will leave three communities without emergency care during periods of each month.

The people of Medical Services branch are aware of the peculiar situation in Beaver Creek. The weather conditions are the most severe of any community, with a Canadian low of minus 62.8 degrees Celsius. This increases the chances of accidents and makes travel to and from Beaver Creek impossible, at times.

The people at Burwash Landing would like to see a nurse at Beaver Creek, so that their community would be better served. Beaver Creek is 188 miles from a health centre; the only community with this dubious honour in Yukon.

Another irony: Medical Services emergency cases can be evacuated by air, but who has the authority in Beaver Creek to do this? If the RCMP are on patrol, only the nurse at Destruction Bay can authorize a medical air evacuation. The ministers of this House can testify that their plans to fly into Beaver Creek were scuttled on two separate occasions because of poor conditions. Air evacuations are not always the answer.

The residents of the Beaver Creek area number 115, according to the Yukon Annual Report: northern health says only 80 people live there. Northern health also says there are only 30 summer employees at the Alas/Kon Border Lodge: the lodge manager says they hire 68 people. Northern health says many of these employees are American: this is false.

In 1983, there were over 100,000 people who made the border crossing at Beaver Creek. How can we sit back and say we have no responsibility for the travelling public?

Need I say more? The facts challenge the arguments of the Medical Services bureaucrats and bring the entire operation into question. We need some action before a life is lost because of the poor set-up for medical care in Beaver Creek. I ask for the unanimous support of this motion and I thank everyone for their support. To demonstrate our resolve of this matter, I will be calling for a division.

Mr. McDonald: I would like to respond briefly to the member for Kluane's motion and to express this sides absolute support for, not only the intent, but the explicit wording of, the motion. I would like to keep any arguments that I might make as pure and pristine as possible, so that the message to the federal government is absolutely clear.

I would like to reiterate, as a fellow rural MLA, the problems that the member for Kluane mentioned regarding the uncertainty that many in rural areas feel, regarding medical treatment.

¹⁷ I know, from my own experience, that when the mine in Elsa was shut down for a short time and the doctor services were cancelled for a short time, people had to travel a mere 30 miles to get to the nearest nursing station. They felt that they had to bear considerable hardship as a result.

Certainly, being hundreds of miles away from the nearest fully equipped hospital is inadequate to provide peace of mind to many rural residents in any case. The travel costs to travel from home to a nurse or doctor to receive even an ordinary checkup, in some cases, are horrendous and people save in order to be able to afford such a

visit. I suppose one of the most objectionable things quoted by the member, from federal health officials, regarding their opinions of the proposed nursing station is essentially that because people make a decision to locate in rural areas they have, more or less, feathered their own nests; they have taken it upon themselves to locate in rural areas and, therefore, they should have only themselves to blame.

This, of course, is a horrendous statement. It is something that, obviously, rural MLAs do face from time to time from various levels of government. I think that must be something that must be combatted by everybody in this House; urban and rural MLAs alike.

Another point that the member mentioned was the fact that cold weather makes travel difficult; either for travelling medical services or for allowing in rural districts to get to a rural medical centre. This factor cannot be understated; it is a significant factor, and must be faced by federal officials. I would like to reiterate our support for the member for Kluane's motion and to assure him that he will be absolutely, from this side of the House, getting unanimous consent.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I rise in support of Motion No. 12, requesting that Mr. Speaker communicate the resolution of this House: that National Health and Welfare provide resident nursing services in Beaver Creek. Since taking office, both I and my officials have urged Medical Services Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare to provide a better level of service to people living on the north highway. Residents of Destruction Bay and Burwash Landing, like those of Beaver Creek, do not have the security of resident health professionals, as the current federal practice requires one nurse to service the people of the north highway from south of Destruction Bay to the Alaska border to the north.

While basic public health functions, such as well baby clinics and immunization, can be handled in that way, urgent health problems, home nursing and proper follow-up on chronic and geriatric patients cannot.

¹⁸ With concern having been expressed by residents of Burwash Landing and Beaver Creek, and in spite of the formal requests of my department, National Health and Welfare has indicated no intention to provide a resident nursing service in Beaver Creek. The provision of that service, in my view, is long overdue.

I urge members to support the motion, requesting the placement of a nurse in Beaver Creek.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: As Minister of Tourism, I also wish to express support for the member for Kluane in his endeavours over the past years to have a nurse placed in Beaver Creek. When the member for Kluane first approached me as Minister of Tourism, I was very eager to support his endeavours and made representation on his behalf to the Minister of Health and Human Resources with the Government of Canada, to encourage him to consider sending a nurse to Beaver Creek. I expressed to him that we were making many efforts to increase the numbers of visitors through Beaver Creek and the numbers are increasing rapidly. Many of our visitors to Yukon, particularly in the bus tours, which do come through Beaver Creek, are elderly visitors. We feel, in the Department of Tourism, that the extra support systems should be in place if we are going to adequately take care of the visitors whom we get to Yukon.

I wish to express support to the member for Kluane and encourage him to keep up his endeavours to fulfill his commitment to the people in the area that he represents.

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

Mr. Brewster: In closing off this debate I would like to thank everyone for the apparent support. I would also like to leave the following numbers with the House: Yukon border crossing 1983, Beaver Creek: autos 79,433; bus, 21,326.

That is very close to five times the population of Whitehorse. Whitehorse has large numbers of doctors and nurses. Beaver Creek has nothing.

In closing, I might add that in 1983 the estimated expenditure of tourism was \$77,000,000. The community of Beaver Creek, during tourist season, averages 250 to 300 people per night staying in Yukon. Is this not worth protecting and looking after? The cost of a nurse, compared to this is very small. The federal medical branch is now putting two nurses in other communities but still refuses one for Beaver Creek. The residents of Beaver Creek pay taxes and they are loyal Yukoners, but are unfairly treated by the bureaucrats from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Agreed.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Agreed.

Mr. Falle: Agreed.

Mrs. Nukon: Agreed.

Mr. Brewster: Agreed.

Mr. Penikett: Agreed.

Mr. Byblow: Agreed.

Mr. Kimmerly: Agreed.

Mr. Porter: Agreed.

Mrs. Joe: Agreed.

Mr. McDonald: Agreed.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are: 15 yea, nil nay.

Motion No. 12 agreed to

19 Motion No. 13

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

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

Mr. Penikett: Yes, I am.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. leader of the official opposition THAT Standing Order 27 regarding notice be referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges for review and recommendation; and

THAT the Committee make recommendation to the House as to the advisability of requiring notice on amendments to motions.

Mr. Penikett: This is not a matter with the same kind of human urgency as the matter raised, a moment ago, by the member for Kluane, nor is it something that I would want the House to spend a lot of time on. However, it is a small procedural problem — or a problem, in my view — that has been bothering me for some time.

Recently, during one of these Wednesday afternoon debates, I was struck again by the ridiculous situation that we were put in, in the middle of a debate, when a very substantive amendment came forward to a resolution, which, in some ways, changed the proposal considerably. Because of the timing of the amendment, there was no opportunity for, at least members on this side, to consider it carefully or to caucus about it or discuss the advisability of supporting it or opposing it.

In reviewing the motions that we have considered in the last few years, it struck me that there has been an increasing tendency to amend motions presented by private members, on the floor, in the middle of debate. Now, occasionally, I think those amendments have been improvements to the original proposal. On other occasions, I think they have been of questionable procedural legitimacy and, in fact, in one or two cases that I reviewed, I think had I had a chance to study the motion before it came on the floor, I would have challenged the motion on the grounds that it appeared to change the principle of the motion before us.

The difficulty is that there may be good reasons for the majority in this House, or any number of members, to want to improve a motion or to change a resolution to make it more acceptable to the whole House, and that is fine. The problem is for the mover of the motion, who may have a very particular kind of cause to promote. It is somewhat frustrating to be sometimes confronted with a very complicated and involved amendment to the motion and then have no chance to study it: to be forced, in fact, to draw a conclusion

about it almost immediately, and then to make a decision about whether it is worth supporting or not.

²⁰ I suppose in the life of the territory this is not a matter of earth-shattering importance, but it bothers me a little bit because we are a small house: it is often the case that one may be required to vote on an amendment within minutes, even seconds, of having seen it for the first time. I do not think this is fair to members. In large jurisdictions, obviously, when an amendment to a motion, even on opposition day or even on any private members day, is presented, it is probable that a speaker or two will hold the floor for a sufficient time for some people, the interested members, to at least consult and discuss and draw some conclusions as to whether they like the proposal or not. There may also be, in other jurisdictions, some informal discussions that go on about the nature of amendments and about the content of amendments. I do not know of any other place that requires notice of amendments and I am not sure they may be necessary anywhere else; but it seems to me that it is potentially a real need here. Let me explain why.

Most of the time when motions have been amended it has been when a private member on this side, in fact, but not always the case, has made a proposal. The government for some reason, or the majority members, may have found in their caucus there was something wrong with the proposal. It has not been the custom for the majority in that case to come to the mover of the motion and say, look, we have problems with this part or this part of the motion: we are going to propose this amendment and just thought you ought to know. It is usually left to the mover of the motion to discover this amendment in the middle of the debate. This puts the mover, or the private member, at a considerable disadvantage, because the discussions that led to the creation or the drafting of the amendment went on in caucus and that person is often not privy to them.

Most of the time, as I said, these amendments have been moved in response to opposition private members and they have come from the government side and they have often been moved by members of the Cabinet. That is understandable enough. But, if this practice were to become one that were so predictable that members wanted to get into gamesmanship about this, I think we can have a potentially messy situation. If I believed that if I were going to present a motion of a serious subject — let me think of something off the top of my head, something that might be appropriate for Wednesday afternoon: corporal punishment in the schools, the black-topping of a certain highway, the use or expansion of a certain kind of government service or the reduction of another, or some such motion — it would be, if I believed that the government was in fact going to pull a surprise and in fact amend the motion without letting me know in some way that vaguely distorted its meaning but gave them an opportunity not to oppose it, there might be, if we were interested in playing games, a very strong inclination, on my part, to present a much more bland motion.

²¹ Take the proposal I have before me, today. I have moved that the Standing Order 27 be proposed to be moved to the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges. If I were into a game playing, I could begin the debate on this motion and then, before I sat down, move an amendment — or one of my colleagues could move an amendment — adding rules to amend the motion to propose that Rule 42, 53, 127 and bunch of others could be added to it, too, which would defeat the purpose, even if it passed. It would defeat the purpose of giving notice.

All I am saying here is that it seems to me a simple question of fairness. If, as a result of an amendment, we are not going to be discussing "a, b and c", but simply "a and b", or if, as a result of an amendment, we are going to be discussing not "a and b", but "a, b, c, d, e, and f", there should be notice given of those changes.

As a purely practical matter, I do not know how much notice would work. I do not know whether we are now required to give notice on Monday for motions on Wednesday. I do not know whether you could give notices of amendments on Tuesday, or whether that would be reasonable. I do not know, if it was a very important resolution that some members wanted to amend in a major way, if as a purely practical matter, the best thing might not

be to simply table the amendments or introduce the amendments on one Wednesday, adjourn the debate and then continue debate on the following Wednesday: that might be a practical arrangement in certain cases.

Having said that, I want to raise the concern before members of the House. I do not particularly care whether we vote on this proposal today; I am not wedded to the notion that it should go to the committee or that the committee should be convened specifically for this purpose.

If I had my druthers — and I do not know whether members are inclined to respect my wishes on this matter or not, it does not concern me very greatly — I think I would just simply like to, if I could, today, adjourn the debate, after other members may have contributed whatever they have to contribute, and leave it for a while to allow for some informal discussions and any private views the members may have to make on this thing, to see if any other member considers it a concern worthy of some discussions, formal or informal, and to see if they recognize the problem and then, if they recognize the problem, see if there is something they might want to do to deal with it.

Motion No. 13 agreed to

Motion No. 14

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: Yes, I am.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Mayo: THAT this House urges the government to introduce legislation covering occupational health and safety as soon as possible; and THAT this House is of the opinion that such legislation should have as its purpose:

(1) the amalgamation of responsibility for occupational health and safety within one department; and

(2) the modernization of occupational health and safety legislation to include the enshrinement of such rights as the right to refuse unsafe work.

Mr. McDonald: I trust that all members of the legislature are truly seized with the need for introducing new comprehensive occupational health and safety legislation to Yukon. It is long overdue. Working people for whom such legislation would ultimately benefit say it is overdue. Employers who must deal with a confusion of legislative and enforcement jurisdictions say it is overdue. The consultants report commissioned by this government three years ago said it was overdue three years ago.

The fact that the government has announced that it will be developing an accident reduction program for public employees — I think it was announced in the Throne Speech, if I am not mistaken — suggests that it, too, is concerned to a certain extent about the health and safety of public sector workers. Of course, a unanimous vote for this motion would go much further in convincing the public that the government is interested in the wellbeing of all Yukoners on the job. It is important too, that not only do we develop legislation and enforcement procedures that lack ambiguity and are efficiently administered, but we must also view occupational health and safety from the workers point of view.

It is the worker, after all, who must remain healthy and safe. His or her livelihood, or his or her life, at times, is certainly on the line. Occupational health and safety programs that reject the participation of the workers themselves are generally doomed to failure; at the least, these programs are of no consequence. Workers must participate fully, and the rights to ensure their own safety must be enshrined in legislation.

Generally, working people in our society find themselves as small cogs in a large machine, with little room for individual initiative or job satisfaction. The work place is found to be one of the most authoritarian settings in society and can be quite impersonal. In the midst of this, the workers themselves try to scrounge a measure of independence and try to assert their identity. It is sometimes a struggle for many people to maintain a measure of human dignity in the work place. What is truly devastating is the fact that some

workers who try to live their lives as proud independants find themselves injured and crippled, or, after a life's work, find themselves bowed down by years of minor disabilities, unable to care properly for themselves and living in a society that is generally insensitive to the effects of industrial disease.

Coming from the mining industry, myself, I see more than anyone, probably, the affects of debilitating accidents and disease. You often see old miners at the age of 55, arthritic, slightly stooped, breathing deeply from silicotic lungs, and wearing the hearing aid badge of office. These are the survivors who have, for the most part, been able to make a living at mining, and who are the experienced old hands. They recognized belatedly the value of working safely in a safe environment and the value of not taking unnecessary chances to spur on production. Some are even beginning to recognize that the old ways of working can be made better.

I have personally worked in an underground mining environment where there are temporarily unsupported roofs, where the working place is small, dark, cold and damp, where ventilation or access to fresh air is always a concern and always a problem, where you are physically removed from other workers and from supervisors and where essentially your own safety depends on your own best judgment. In this environment, accidents happen. They often happen. One's best personal judgment as to safe working practices is sometimes mistaken, even for the most experienced miner. It is the environment that is potentially unsafe. The irony is that often the worker is blamed for his own accidents. Often, working in an atmosphere that places a high value on increased production, and an atmosphere where the employee is given indirect incentives to cut corners and to work in an unsafe manner, we hear today increasing emphasis is given to the promotion of greater productivity. Unemployment is rising. The workers are sometimes being told not to bitch about problems, that they should accept their lot in life, that they should be happy about having work and they should always remember that there are many others who could always take their place and be willing to work without any complaint.

In this working climate, in this atmosphere, there is obviously a need for government to ensure that the workplace environment is kept safe. Legislation should be developed to ensure that workers are accorded secure inalienable rights on known potential hazards, to participate in the development of health and safety standards and to refuse to do work they reasonably believe is unsafe.

The report that I mentioned earlier on, the report commissioned by this government — a consultant's report, written by a man by the name of Roy Elfstrom — said that there is reliable evidence that the present governmental inspections — referring to Yukon jurisdiction — safety program systems and legislation provide only partial and often sporadic periods of legislative control over occupational safety hazards. He suggests that control or inspection of placer mining and contract mining and exploration is an absolute minimum. He says that, despite the general understandings held by government and industry officials, placer exploration development ventures and contract mining have been exposing employees to high risks of personal injury. Neither the federal nor territorial accident prevention agencies have provided any significant inspection or investigation coverage. Conscientious attempts have been made to conduct safety inspections without much effectiveness. The logistical problems have been so great that, for instance, two of the three placer fatalities in the period 1970 to 1980 were never investigated. Demands on safety inspection resources for placer exploration, et cetera, are highly seasonal, being very great in the summer and virtually nil in the winter. The work crews are transient and scattered in a shotgun pattern across most of the territory. The problems are understandable but nevertheless it results in an unacceptable token coverage of the substantial portion of the mining population.

He concludes with a rather chilling commentary that there are many reliable indicators that point to an increase in problems related to the protection of the mining industry employees and particularly those respecting their health.

The report catalogues a whole series of anomalies and inadequacies in the present legislation: I am sure that the minister is

aware of such inadequacies. I certainly know that industry and unions and workers are certainly aware of these.

One of the major inadequacies, of course, is that there are too few inspections: this is universally felt. The fact that for mines, the accident prevention regulations pursuant to the *Workers Compensation Act* prescribe different standards than does the *Mining Safety Act*. They suggest that jurisdictional ambiguities have led to gaps in inspection services and, at the same time, overlapping jurisdictions have led to ambiguities.

One of the most serious deficiencies, in my opinion, is that old Yukon legislation is silent on the rights of the employees in matters of their own health and safety. To this end, the report that I mentioned does make some recommendations. It suggests that employees, the working people themselves, need full disclosure of safety and health information that is available to them and to their employers; they need to accompany inspectors on regular surveys; they must have the right to refuse work that the workers believe, reasonably, to be unsafe; and they must have the right to take part in decision-making regarding safety rules, which is, incidentally, a prerogative that is accorded only mine managers in the territory, when it comes to the mining industry.

He suggests, and it is almost universally felt, that union protection is not sufficient protection. First of all, not everyone is unionized and, in any case, things like time off for safety inspection is a bargainable item at the bargaining table and that a monetary encouragement for people to take industrial first aid courses, for example, is also a bargainable item. The message, of course, is that measures to account for sound occupational health and safety practices should not, in any way, be bargainable, at all, and should have nothing to do with a cost benefit analysis of any one particular operation.

Workers in the territory and workers in the country have to work. They have to enter the mines early on dark, cold winter mornings, they have to perform backbreaking work; some have to sit for hours in front of video display screens. Some workers in the territory have to drive heavy equipment; many perform repetitive mind-numbing tasks; they have to work in a climate of economic uncertainty; but, they do not have to work in an unsafe and unhealthy environment. The government clearly has a role to play in civilized society to provide sound legislative backing and sound inspection services. It should play that role.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: On March 29 of this year, I announced that we were drafting new occupational health and safety legislation. On subsequent questions from the member across the floor, I also said that we were addressing all areas of occupational health and safety. I stated that we were also including the government in the occupational health and safety. We also proposed that the new act and regulations replace the prevention regulations on our *Workers' Compensation Act*, the *Blasting Act* and Regulations, the present *Mine Safety Act* and regulations, the Camp Medical Regulations of the *Public Health Act*, and we will also be dealing with first aid, accident reporting, explosive actuated tools: all will be amalgamated into the Occupational Health and Safety. We are also going to consider under that act, commercial diving, occupational health, radiation, and coal mining.

All of these will totally modernize our occupational health and safety. While I am on my feet, I question the member wasting the time of the House when I have already announced that we are updating a totally new occupational health and safety act. I question the reason why he is wasting the time of the House to put a motion forward when he already knows what the answer is: that we already agree.

Mr. Penikett: I liked the minister's speech until he got to the last part. Sometimes the work here, I suppose, would be dangerous, but I had an awful moment a while back when my colleague for Mayo was speaking when he was referring to mindnumbing work: I thought he might be talking about us.

I am pleased to hear the minister responsible reiterate once again that legislation in this area is in the pipe. I am also pleased to hear that he will be dealing with the question of the confusion of

jurisdictions and the split responsibilities we now have in this field. I am somewhat offended with his notion that we are wasting the time of the House by discussing this bill. If that is true, then clearly he was wasting the time of some members of this House when we had a committee on this subject just before the last election, because there is no doubt that we could have had legislation. We had a green paper on occupational health and safety, which was referred to a select committee right before the last election. We also had, when we are speaking of select committees, ones that have dealt with issues concerning the working people; you will recall that we twice had committees dealing with employment standards. The minister will well know that notwithstanding the promises of legislation forthcoming, it took quite good seven years before we ever saw a debate on the subject. I will be not at all apologetic for joining in a discussion of this important question today.

28 If it helps hurry up the legislation, I think it will be a good thing.

I recently had the pleasure of re-reading an article about one of those people in this world who is probably not famous in conventional terms, and who may not even get in the history books as they are read in our schools, but who I believe is one of the genuinely great men, if there are such things, in this country. That was an article about a guy by the name of Dr. Robert Sass, who is in this country the author and the major thinker behind much of the good work that has been done in the occupational health and safety field in the last few years. I unfortunately record that while he was, until the spring of 1982, the director of the occupational health and safety branch in the Government of Saskatchewan, he was unfortunately one of the first people let go by the new government when it came to power in that province.

Political questions aside, Sass has written extensively and very thoughtfully about the problems of occupational health and safety. He has been fond of coining a phrase that goes something like this: "What you don't know about your work can really hurt you." He has been a real pioneer in talking about the nature of work and the injuries that people can suffer at work. Not all those injuries are physical or obvious. He, for example, tells the story of the postal worker who broke down in tears at his daughter's wedding; and most people would judge that to be a normal response of a proud father on the bittersweet occasion of his daughter's passing from, if you like, childhood into womanhood. But in reality this man's emotional response was brought on by the heartbreaking realization he had at that moment that he did not know this person who was his daughter, and the reason he did not know this person who was his daughter was that he had spent his life working on the nightshift. He had come to the realization that this person had grown to maturity without him having been able to develop a kind of normal, loving relationship with this member of his family because of his working schedule.

Now, work is an extremely important thing for us. The second question most people ask after they ask your name is: what do you do? It is an important part of our identity. Most of us, I guess, in a sense are, if you like, captives of our work.

29 Many people in the working situation are caught between what they know is right and safe and prudent and what is healthy and proper and sane, and between their strong desire to provide for the families and protect their economic position and their jobs. There is an unfortunate tendency, especially in current economic times, for people to want to sacrifice what may be in their best interests in order to protect their job and their family's interest.

To state the obvious, a working person's health is really his most important asset. There is, I think, occasionally, an unfortunate attitude to the problem of occupational health and accidents on the job, which Sass has called the "workers of Swiss cheese mentality". This is an approach that blames the worker and says it is the workers who are full of holes and every hole represents a particular deficiency or some problem in their character and, if the workers only had strong characters, were intelligent and rational, they would sort of be like, if you like, Canadian cheddar; they would not have any problems with safety on the job.

This is akin to the notion that occupational diseases and occupational accidents and occupational health problems come because of a worker's accident proneness, because the workers are,

in some way, too stupid and not bright enough to do the right thing. Obviously, it is not true that most accidents on the job are the result of carelessness, even in the cases, as my colleague has described, where people are doing very repetitious or mind-numbing or unchallenging work.

It is not surprising to get workers who care less and less about their jobs and, therefore, end up becoming labelled careless because they really are not happy in their work or not very interested in their work. Unfortunately, there are still a lot of jobs that are not very engaging, from that point of view.

It is a tough thing to talk about occupational health, sometimes. There is a very strong tendency amongst all of us to see, for example, silicosis as a problem that your lung has, rather than a problem of hardrock mining. There is a very strong inclination for all of us to see the problem of hearing impairment as a problem of aging, rather than the result of working for many, many years in a noisy work environment.

Unfortunately, as well, there has been a tendency in our country — some of the best information on this subject, I think, has come out of Ontario and BC — to approach this issue from a body count perspective, to see a problem as becoming serious when there are a certain number of widows and orphans or to say, as they have done in Ontario. And that is an unfortunate procedure there because their *Workers' Compensation Act* is different to ours. They have a schedule of permissible injuries and diseases and it is only when a certain number of people have in fact suffered from them that they get added to the schedule. That leads to a sort of curative rather than a preventative approach, and the curative approach is the one that we have with our workers' compensation system, as admired as it is.

The problem with workers' compensation figures, if you look at them across the country, is that a very, very tiny percent of the workers' compensation awards are made to workers with work-related illnesses and diseases. Better than 98 percent of the awards go to workers who have been disabled as a result of accidents. That is an important statistic to remember. A very tiny percentage of awards are based on work-related diseases. However, Canada Pension Plan figures show almost exactly the reverse. Seventy-five percent of Canadians die from disease; only about 25 percent die from accidents. What this suggests is, of course, that there are an awful lot of people acquiring in their working lives — the minister from Tatchun objects to my using statistics; he objects to the way I use them, because I use them intelligently and I understand that is alien to the minister; I understand it is a problem. I am sorry — problems from the workplace that are serious, debilitating and subtle. The problem with many of the health problems that people get in the workplace is that they creep up on you; they do not happen all of a sudden one day. You acquire them over many years and it is in fact quite hard to identify the point at which a person became ill.

For this reason it is extremely important as a general principle to establish the right of working people to know as much as possible about the potential dangers, threats from materials they work with, or whatever, in the workplace. It is also important to establish as much as possible the right to participate, for those working people, in the considerations about the safety of the working conditions. Finally, as my colleague from Mayo has said, there is the very important right to establish the right of working people to refuse work that is dangerous.

Now, as I said before, when the economy is down or when the economy itself is sick, the worker I think is in some ways in a kind of double jeopardy because those people who have jobs are, I think, inclined to see their job as a first priority rather than their health.

I think working people are inclined to make trade-offs between their jobs and their health, which, I think, in the long-run are not prudent. A lot of what needs to be done in this area is not necessarily in the area of legislation, but I think it is in the area of education. A lot could be achieved in this area, I think, with public information or public awareness programs, and I think we have made some tentative steps in that direction. However, I reject the notion proposed by the responsible minister that, somehow, the department has been working with appropriate haste on this

question. I think, if this motion today helps expedite the process, at all, I think it is useful. In any case, I think it is an important enough question, as important as any other question that we have been dealing with to warrant some discussion of it in this House.

Mr. McDonald: I thought this was going to be a rather routine motion. I thought that the statements expressed in the motion were in the category of motherhood statements. What I find, in fact, is that the minister responsible for consumer and corporate affairs and the minister responsible for the occupational health and safety of working people in this territory, has accused this side and has accused me of wasting the time of the House in discussing this issue.

This is the first time in the 25th Legislature we have ever discussed occupational health and safety issues. This is the first time, ever in my political life in this legislature, that we have discussed this issue, and we are accused of wasting the time of the House when we bring it up in such a manner.

The proposal by the government to modernize legislation was an election promise, some years ago. We have heard nothing but promises from the minister and from previous ministers that the legislation is coming. The minister has mentioned many times that he is prepared to reorganize his department. He says that he has promised that he will hire a second occupational health and safety officer; this is a promise of some considerable standing and we are still waiting for that position to be filled.

I, in my speech, referred to a consultant's report that was tabled three years ago, but was studied prior to that. It was a report that canvassed people of the territory who reported that the inadequacies in the legislated body of occupational health and safety law had been inadequate for some considerable period of time.

To discuss, and to ask the government to table, this legislation, as soon as possible, does not seem to me to be at all an unreasonable request. It is not, in my opinion, a waste of the time of this legislature.

This is a personal opinion; we have had the opportunity to debate various pieces of legislation including the *Business Corporations Act*, which was a monumental effort on somebody's part. Obviously it took a considerable period of time and public resources. Yet, the abominable state and condition of occupational health and safety legislation and enforcement services to protect the safety and health of the working people of the territory is put on the back burner. We have the Minister of Corporate Affairs — and I say that pointedly, corporate affairs — suggesting that we are wasting the time of the House in dealing with this. I will take his most recent promises to bring in modernized legislation and modernized inspection services to heart and we will, if he agrees, start from time zero, today.

I can tell you that I am not going to be prepared to allow such an extended wait in the future. I have waited two years in the legislature. I have waited many more years as a working man in this territory. I have waited for two years; I will not wait for another two years. If the legislation does not come forward as the minister has promised, then we will be spending a great deal of time in this House discussing this issue over and over again and investigating every permutation of every issue that has to do with occupational health and safety.

Motion No. 14 agreed to

Motion No. 15

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

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre THAT it is the opinion of this House that drinking alcoholic beverages while driving on Yukon roads causes a public danger; and THAT it is the opinion of this House that prohibiting consumption of alcoholic beverages by persons driving on Yukon roads reduces that public danger; and THAT this house urges the Government to introduce legislation which would prohibit persons from drinking alcoholic beverages while driving on Yukon roads.

Mr. Kimmerly: Although the specific wording of this motion is new, the principle is not. I believe it is the fourth time I have raised it. The last two being April 27th, 1983, and November 17th, 1982.

I have raised this motion in various forms in the past. I have asked for select committees, I have urged the House to do things and I have asked the House to state opinions. This particular motion is worded intentionally in a fairly narrow way. It has three parts. It calls for us to express an opinion that drinking alcohol while driving on the road causes a public danger.

I would be very interested if anybody here disagrees with that. It is a statement that I believe is relatively uncontroversial and members should have no trouble accepting it.

The second statement expresses a second related opinion and it is that if it were illegal to drink while driving on Yukon roads, probably most people would obey the law, as most people do, and that that would reduce public danger. I believe that is a very simple expression of opinion and, in fact, those opinions can be backed up with sociological, empirical, scientific data.

The third statement is, perhaps, the most controversial, because the government side has voted against it in the past. However, it follows logically from the other two parts of the motion. If drinking while driving causes a danger and if making it illegal to drink while driving would reduce drinking while driving and, therefore, reduce the danger, well, then, why do we not do it? It seems to be very simple.

The motion calls for introduction of legislation that would make it illegal, as it is absolutely everywhere else in the country. If it is, everywhere else in the country, then, we should do it.

It may be that there might be a technical argument, from the other side, that instead of producing a motion, I should produce a bill. If that is raised, I promise you, by Wednesday next, there will be a bill. If you accept this principle, I would be most pleased to do the drafting of that particular bill: we may get the bill at some point in the future, in any event.

I am going to speak, for a moment, in support of the principle, as I have in the past. I am going to try and do it in as objective a way as I can. I will simply refer to the arguments I have made in the past years, but I will not repeat them.

I will substantially make one additional argument which I believe is perhaps the most important one.

On November 17th, 1982, I raised arguments that especially for the group of young people who are learning to deal with alcohol, the permissiveness of the Yukon law is particularly dangerous, and I raised that argument before. It is interesting that that kind of argument has been commented on in national magazines and Newsweek recently stated that the drinking laws in American states, indeed 27 American states, at the time of printing, had changed and the drinking age was increased to a higher age, usually 20 or 21. It was largely because of the carnage of our young people on the road and other illegal activities that caused that.

Last year, the bordering State of Alaska increased their drinking age and recognized that it is that group of people who are potentially at the greatest risk.

Another argument I raised is that drinking while driving is particularly dangerous because there is a delayed effect of the alcohol on the driver's brain and body, and it is not predictable, and it is especially not predictable to a person whose brain is impaired by alcohol; it is a consequently substantial danger in that their feeling of wellbeing gradually changes and they would find themselves in an impaired state and only just be realizing that, possibly, as they went into an accident.

I received correspondence after that motion. There was a letter addressed to the government leader and it stated this:

"The Whitehorse branch of the Consumers Association of Canada was extremely disappointed that the government defeated the motion to ban drinking while driving. We are aware that a great many automobile accidents are alcohol-related.

"Mr. Philipsen stated that this motion was 'a control and interference over the rights and privileges of all individuals'. Does our government consider it a right and privilege of drinking drivers to kill or maim innocent people?

"Public drinking in Whitehorse is already under control. Surely,

we have more to fear from a drinking driver than a drinking pedestrian. We hope your government will reconsider its position and support a ban on drinking while driving." That is from the Consumers Association of Canada, Whitehorse branch.

I received another communication from a Whitehorse resident, who says, "Operating a vehicle with any alcohol intake should be illegal, with no exceptions". That is just an example of some correspondence.

I received a very lengthy letter from an informed professional person, who stated this: "The point at which I am driving is that the law accepts the principle that drinking and driving is permissible. That is, it is quite legal to have blood alcohol level above .01, but below .08, but does not provide the means whereby the individual is able to determine the alcohol level above which driving is not permitted: "The very arbitrariness of the law sets .07 as a legal level, but .09 as illegal. Neither you nor anyone else can give anyone any accurate way of distinguishing between the two levels."

"That is a very important point, because it means that citizens are allowed to drink — indeed it is legal, indeed it is condoned in large measure in our society — and allowed to drive after drinking, and in Yukon, even allowed to drink while actually driving. At an arbitrary point the federal law fixes, it becomes illegal. The writer of the letter states that that is unfair.

It has been expressed very eloquently in larger works on the subject, in academic books, and I would refer to some of them generally, and a conclusion is made that North Americans will continue to drink and drive unless they are convinced it is too dangerous to themselves to go on doing it. It requires a substantial change in our social attitudes about drinking and driving and a substantial public opinion change in order to achieve real safety.

There are many ways to do that. The social action groups or political action groups particularly interested in the issue refer primarily to emotional arguments. If you see pictures of children being mauled or maimed, or killed by drunks, it is an extremely emotional reaction that most people have. Other ways are with scientific and statistical information. It is interesting that more Americans in the United States alone have died at the hands of drunk drivers in 1981 and 1982 than were killed in Vietnam. That is a very startling figure. On average, about three Americans are killed and 80 are injured every hour of every day, by drunk driving.

Now, those figures are forceful and the emotional arguments are perhaps even more forceful, and may go some way to change public attitudes. It is generally accepted that most people who drive while drunk are not caught. Indeed, the chances against being caught are about one in two thousand, in fact. It is generally accepted that it requires a significant political will and a political and social change in order to meet the public ambivalence about drinking and driving and really protect our innocent citizens on the roads.

Recent statistical information obtained from the Yukon RCMP appears to indicate very simply and clearly that the change in the law, which came into effect December 15th, 1982, did not change the situation, i.e. the impaired driving rate has remained virtually the same. The information I have is the Yukon figures concerning 1982, and partial figures for 1983, and I will quote some figures.

In the Yukon, in total, considering the offences of impaired driving under section 234 of the Criminal Code and impaired driving under the breathalyzer section, section 236, and refusing to blow into the breathalyzer under section 235, the total in calendar year 1982 was 552 convictions. That is made up of section 234, 219; section 235, 34; section 236, 299.

In the first six months of 1983, we should expect a figure of less than half. The figure, in fact, is slightly more. It is 281, consisting of 72 convictions of 234, 19 under 235, and 190 under section 236.

If we consider Whitehorse alone: in 1982 there were 410 convictions, and in the first six months of 1983, 205, or exactly half of the previous year's rate.

The statistics in other communities are similar, considering the small numbers. I will go through them for the sake of informational purposes. In Beaver Creek, 3 in 1982, and 4 in the first six months of 1983. Carcross: 5 in 1982, and 9 in 1983 up until June. Carmacks: 12 in 1982, and 7 in part of 1983. Dawson: 11 in 1982,

and 3 in 1983 up until June. Faro: 2 in 1982, and 1 in 1983. Haines Junction: 9 and 8. Mayo: 9 and 1. Old Crow: 3 and 4. Ross River: 19 and 4. Teslin: 16 and 8. Watson Lake: 49 and 26.

It is clear that impaired driving is not declining in the territory. It is remaining at its rate, which is somewhere between 3 and 4 times the national average. It is my opinion that part of the reason for that is the anomaly in our public opinion concerning drinking and driving. Part of the reason is the very difficult position that we place citizens in, in giving them a mixed message according to the law: it is legal to drink and drive, it is legal to drink while driving, but they are caught and severely punished if they go over an arbitrary limit.

It would be fairer and it would be safer to everyone in Yukon if we changed our law and recognized that it is dangerous for people to be drinking and driving.

It would reduce the danger if we changed the law, so I say why do we not do it?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As the member across the floor said, this is the fourth time he has raised this issue. I would just like to comment on a couple of things that he said.

I would like to go first to the statistics that he just used, the 552 that were convicted of impaired driving in 1982 and the 281 in 1983 in first six months. In most of the communities where that happened, especially Whitehorse — 410 in 1982 — it is now illegal to drink while driving. So, his use of those statistics is useless to the argument; it is already illegal to drink and drive in the City of Whitehorse.

He says that the drinking age is being affected by allowing people to drink and drive. I do not know what the drinking age has got to do with it; the member has never come and asked to raise the drinking age in the territory. According to most statistics, the people who are involved in alcohol-related accidents are not drinking at the time of driving, they have been drinking previous to driving.

We have opposed this motion on the four previous occasions and we will be opposing it, as well, this time.

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

Mr. Kimmerly: In rebuttal, I raised the statistics to show that the incidents of impaired driving are not reduced substantially, or reduced at all, because of the change in the law, which occurred in 1982. It is important that we express a political principle and lead the way in changing public opinion and changing the ambivalence of public opinion concerning drinking and driving.

The ministers have, in previous debates, expressed that it is an individual right or freedom to drink and drive. It appears that they are no longer saying it or are not emphasizing it; they are simply saying we are opposed and we are not going to change our mind.

It is clear to me that nobody disagrees that drinking alcohol while driving is dangerous. People accept that. It is dangerous and it is obvious. Nobody disagrees that most people obey the law and that a change in the law would reduce the danger; nobody disagrees with those things in any serious way.

Yet, the government has pigheadedly stuck to an archaic policy that they believe that people should be able to drink and drive on Yukon roads. Nowhere in Canada is that the case but here, and our impaired driving rate is the highest in the country. More than that, our deaths and accidents, related to alcohol, show a similar statistic. It is not only that people are getting caught, it is obviously that more people are drinking while driving and driving immediately after drinking here, than elsewhere in Canada.

The statistics are absolutely blatant. There is an extremely strong case for saying the problem here is greater than anywhere else in the country and our political response here appears to be, "Well, we have defeated the motion, in the past, and we are going to do it again", and no other explanation is offered. That substantially saddens me.

Motion No. 15 defeated

Motion No. 16

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 5, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 5?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre: THAT it is the opinion of this House that public access to the law is assisted by the indexing of legislation; and

THAT it is the opinion of this House that an index, such as that provided with the office consolidation of the *Elections Act*, should be prepared for each commonly used act of Yukon.

Mr. Kimmerly: The concept or the idea of an index to the law is in no way a new one. Indeed, as I read history, it was attributed as one of the reasons for the French revolution, 200-odd years ago; that the public did not have sufficient access to the law and it was a principle in their new constitution that the law be available to the public.

It is of course an extremely important general notion. It is presumed that everybody knows the law and ignorance of the law is no excuse if a person is found afoul of the law.

Access to the law is a difficult thing for most lay people. We passed a motion some years ago expressing the principle that a law be written in a simple, commonly-understood language, and that goes a long way in increasing the public's access to the law. An index to legislation would similarly go a long way. If you put a book in front of people and say, there is the law, read it, very few of them read it. Most people are interested in the law when they have a specific question to ask or a specific problem to solve and they want to know where the law is about their problem or about their question, and that is perfectly reasonable. As reasonable people know, if you have a book about the law and if you are interested in a specific part, you look in the index under the identification of your question and you get a page number or a couple of page references, and if you read those pages you have probably got the law about your question or your problem. It is very much simpler. Indeed, the case can be put more strongly; it is impossible. It is absolutely impossible for lay people to wade through all of the laws in order to find what specifically interests them.

An index to the law would be of assistance to lawyers, but more importantly, it would be of greater assistance to the general public and would serve eventually to make it possible for the general public to be more knowledgeable and more aware of the law that affects them.

The Canadian Law Information Council is extremely interested in this question of indexing. Some years ago it sponsored a pilot project in Newfoundland. It indexed the revised statutes of Newfoundland. That experiment has proven to be most successful in establishing a better method of indexing, or furthering the library science of indexing, especially in the legal area. It has served as a substantial service to the people of Newfoundland. Very few Yukoners look up the law of Newfoundland. More Yukoners look up the law of Yukon. It would be most appropriate for Yukon to do a similar thing.

It would have a budgetary implication, or a monetary implication. I would urge the minister of finance and the minister of justice that expenditure in this area would be most appreciated by Yukoners. I would urge them that there is assistance available from the Canadian Law Information Council and possibly from federal sources. It will be common in the future to index major statutes and I am sure it is a beginning area. It would certainly be welcomed by Yukoners if, instead of thumbing through the lengthy *Wildlife Act*, or the *Companies Act*, or *The Children's Act*, as examples, they could look at an index and directly go to the section that affects them. The compliance with the law would increase, and the ability of citizens to realistically know the law would increase, and ultimately everybody would benefit.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: We, on this side of the House, support this motion as introduced. There is no question the public access to the law is important and we look favourably towards any suggestion that will improve it. Indexing the legislation, as is proposed in the

motion, for commonly used statutes, would no doubt be helpful. Alternative systems and mechanisms for indexing are to be considered in connection with the consolidation project of all Yukon legislation and undertaken in this fiscal year. The extent to which an indexing system can immediately be developed will depend on the decided format of the consolidated statutes, the ease of updating indexes, once in place, and naturally the costs of alternative systems.

It must be recognized that indexing of statutes, to be truly efficient, is not comparable to indexing other less technical publications. Proper indexing is a complex and technical process and requires specific knowledge. While we support the principle of indexing for commonly used legislation, we must first decide on an efficient and practical system so that indexing will be consistent for all statutes; and then we must obtain the resources to carry out the necessary work.

Therefore, as I already stated, we clearly support the principle and intent of this motion. The reservations I have expressed are simply to make all members aware that the process is not without significant complication and expense. Notwithstanding this, we will review indexing systems in place in other jurisdictions and to the extent practical develop a system suitable for our use in Yukon.

Motion No. 16 agreed to

Motion No. 17

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

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

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that it is the opinion of this House that an up-to-date "Revised Statutes of Yukon" should be prepared as soon as is practicable.

Mr. Kimmerly: I will be very brief, as I expect this is probably an uncontroversial motion as well. There are a few issues that deserve some comment. I asked in Question Period the other day about the Revised Statutes and also about the issue of translation into French. The government leader mentioned the Revised Statutes of 1973. I would be extremely interested if I have missed a significant factor here, but I am aware of a revised statute law of 1971 and a consolidation as of 1978. A consolidation, of course, is different from a revised statute law.

It is, undoubtedly, a service to the public and a service to the legal profession, specifically, to provide as many up-to-date revised statutes as are possible. It is impractical, financially, to do it every year and every five years or so appears to be an accepted balance in publishing revised statutes.

In Yukon, it is my opinion that it is time to do it again and I am pleased to note that work is underway. I would be very interested in learning of a target date for completion of this important work.

I mentioned the issue of translation into French and that is a related topic. I have received conflicting information about the state of the translation. The government leader, I believe, stated 10 to 15 percent of the statutes were now translated. It may be that about half of the 1978 consolidation is translated, but not yet approved by the federal justice department, and the annual volumes are pretty well up-to-date.

I have received other information from the Secretary of State, federally, that the revised statutes were done, but the annual volumes were not translated. In any event, it is a matter of fact and debating it here is of absolutely no use.

I would express the opinion that whatever is now translated should be mailed to us and put in our libraries, as it would assist some people, especially unilingual French people. It is, of course, an issue as to which version is authoritative, the French or English or both and, in our next revised statutes, I am sure that that issue will be dealt with, especially if federal Bill C-26 progresses at all in the House of Commons.

I will simply express that this motion was placed on the Order Paper in order to emphasize to all members and the government that we support a new addition of the Revised Statutes of Yukon. We support the distribution of the French translations, which are now available, whatever that is, and look forward to a speedy resolution

of the constitutional and practical problem of the translation of the Yukon statutes.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: This motion is stating exactly what we are doing. I have stated it earlier this week as well. I do not want to waste any more of the House's time dealing with that. Three questions I think the member opposite mentioned in his debate I will address.

We intend to have the statutes revised this year. The completion date should be this year. That is what we are shooting for; the end of this fiscal year.

As to the French translation being made available, if we ever find out the exact truth as to what is available in Ottawa and what is not, we will be requesting it be sent here; there is no problem with that.

We are in agreement with the motion, because we are doing it; it is in process.

Motion No. 17 agreed to

Motion No. 18

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 7, standing in the name of Mr. Byblow.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item No. 7?

Mr. Byblow: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Faro: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the proposed Government of Yukon task force on mining be directed to hold public hearings to solicit submissions from all persons or groups, who have an interest in mining development and to make recommendations within one year on the proper role of the Government of Yukon in reference to mining development;

THAT it is the opinion of this House that the membership of the task force should include from the Yukon Legislative Assembly the Minister of Economic Development, one private member from the government caucus and one member from the official opposition caucus whose electoral district includes a mining community.

Mr. Byblow: I want to tell the House that the basic intention of the motion is to suggest some parameters for the proposed mining task force. I believe fundamental to the motion is our position of support in principle to the creation of that task force.

I think that the need to establish the position of this legislature towards mining development in the territory is clearly long overdue, however, that assessment has to be made with one qualification. The absence of non-renewable resource ownership and control in Yukon is probably considered the stumbling block towards any clear position on the subject. However, I do not believe that, in and of itself — that is, the lack of ownership control — should be a deterrent to the discussion and articulation of what role government should play in mining development.

I represent a mining community and I am acutely aware of the debate surrounding government's role in mining development. In such a debate, there is a very broad set of viewpoints. These viewpoints range from government non-involvement to government joint venturing. I think it is fair to say that there is a multitude of varying degrees of government responsibility and involvement between these two extremes.

The issue is complicated by the various agencies who have an interest in development, whether they be fisheries, the environment or others. At the same time, there is considerable professional advice and expertise already documented. Some of it, of course, is quite debatable, but, from many branches within the department, Indian and Northern Affairs, from this very government, from the Northern Minerals Advisory Committee, from the Yukon Indian Development Corporation, and a host of other representative groups, we have a multitude of points of view. I think that the proposed subsurface ownership of lands, through the land claims process by the CYI, adds another important dimension to the issues.

The point I wish to make relates to the purpose of the motion. We believe that a public input process would be most beneficial to the task force. It would be most beneficial in fairly representing the broad Yukon interest on such an important issue. Our mineral resources belong exclusively to no one, neither the bureaucrats in Ottawa, nor to any minister of the government, nor to any corporate

interest. However, the responsibility for directing the policies of resource management rests with government.

I believe that for these policies to be in the best public interest and in the broadest public interest there must be a fair representation in what the government role will be.

45 To me, this motion simply identifies a scenario for determining that role and I would encourage its support. The motion simply proposes a guideline in time. It proposes a style of that mandate; in fact, it even suggests a mandate. It suggests also, in part, a composition of the task force, but I believe it allows enough latitude in all of these aspects for some discretionary changes as may be deemed necessary.

I believe very strongly that on such an important issue, and such an important initiative, and such an important and major economic subject, it goes without saying that any dealings or recommendations or advice from the task force ought to represent this House. That representation is expressed by the inclusion of an opposition member and two government members. That was the ratio used in committees when opposition was smaller and when we did have committees. Having that kind of representation, I would submit that this would strengthen the credibility and it would enhance the clout of the task force.

I think there is no doubt the task force is going to be dealing with some monumental issues. We have the placer mining development regulations staring us in the face. We have, as I mentioned earlier, subsurface rights approved in principle by the federal cabinet in the land claims process, and we have the anticipation of land transfers. We do not underestimate the importance of these issues for Yukon. The issues are extremely important as they will affect mining development in the territory. A consensual approach, as suggested by this motion, is most important if this territory and this government is to have any lobbying strength for its constitutional growth toward control of resources.

We are prepared to cooperate most effectively to advance this cause. As stated by the leader of the opposition in a previous motion, I would submit that we are quite prepared to adjourn debate if the motion requires further thought or further scrutiny or if some useful purpose may be served by temporary delay. Should that not be the case, I would seek support and encourage its passage.

46 **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have just a couple of comments on the motion before you. You will that recall during the course of the Question Period the member opposite asked me a number of questions and in his preamble he indicated a conversation we had had in respect to the possibility of deferring the motion, which was a request from this side of the House, as with another motion that we have already dealt with.

I am somewhat disappointed from the point of view that this has broken to some degree, the tradition that I and the House leader on the other side had more or less, as gentleman to gentleman, agreed upon; if there was a requirement from one side or the other that an issue not be dealt with, that time could be called for. I obviously see to some degree that the rules have changed noticeably in the past number of hours. I find that unfortunate.

I just speak as a member now, because I think that is a reflection to the present situation that we find ourselves in in the House, as the various political parties that are involved in discussions of this nature.

I want to point out that if the member opposite felt it was so important, he would have taken into consideration my request, as the minister responsible, that debate on the motion be deferred. I had a number of reasons for them. I do not particularly want to go into them. I do not think that the member opposite really is that interested, to start with.

In view of the obvious position that he has taken in proceeding with the motion, I would like to conclude by saying that I will not be supporting the motion. I appreciate the support for the principle of what we are doing and we will proceed accordingly. Once decisions are made as far as the terms of reference, the member opposite will be notified.

Mr. McDonald: I am deeply disappointed that the minister has

felt that the motion did not require any sort of substantive reply at all. The minister talked about the procedure for submitting this resolution to the House and that he had requested that the resolution be held over for a period of time. I am sure that the member for Faro can verify it. I know that the member for Faro took great pains after our meeting this morning to search out the minister and talk the matter over with him. I feel that we have certainly carried our share of the burden in determining whether or not this motion should go through today. The minister's comments, I do not feel, are at all fair; I do not feel that they are justified.

The reason for the motion is obvious. The fact that the government had proposed a mining task force with terms of reference that were unclear and that had priorities that were unclear, we felt, as a result, that it might be the better part of responsibility to offer some suggestions as to priorities as to terms of reference. We felt that it would be wise to give the task force, which is paid for at public expense, an all-party character. We felt we could give the task force a measure of credibility, especially considering that the two major mining communities in the territory are represented by opposition MLAs.

47 I have nothing more to respond to. Obviously, the minister, like his answers in Question Period, has decided not to respond substantively to the issues at hand; that is unfortunate. It is also unfortunate that he has decided not to support the motion, in any case. It is truly too bad.

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

Mr. Byblow: I, too, was very disappointed to hear the Minister of Economic Development say that they will not be supporting the motion, in spite of our best efforts to encourage the principle of the task force and to encourage the principle that the task force ought to, and should, represent, in some measure, the House.

The minister went to some great lengths to explain that he would not have preferred to debate the issue today. He did not provide any reason to explain why; he did not provide any reason for his desire to defer debate. I provided the minister with that opportunity; I provided the minister, also, with the opportunity to leave the motion on the Order Paper and adjourn debate.

I consider the motion of some major importance to the territory. I would submit that the minister considers it trivial, just as he considered the whole question of economic development in this territory, over the past several years, as trivial. The minister's sense of economic development is hobnobbing with highrollers in Calgary and Alaska, but his perception of what it takes to do economic development is a meaningless term.

I truly am disappointed that the minister opted for this course of action. I sought consensus from the minister. I hope that he will have the dignity to reconsider.

We are still quite prepared to provide the most effective cooperation that may be necessary to pursue the question of House representation on the task force and set some parameters for that task force, something, quite obviously, to date, we have not heard from the minister.

Motion No. 7 defeated

Motion No. 19

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 8, standing in the name of Mr. Byblow.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 8?

Mr. Byblow: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Faro: THAT this House urges all interested parties, including, specifically, representatives of Cyprus Anvil, White Pass, employee organizations and affected governments, to meet for the purpose of resolving the urgent question concerning the transportation of ore concentrates from Faro to tidewater.

48 **Mr. Byblow:** This motion, like the one previous, is presented with some measure of urgency. It is my contention that unless this House encourages some talking between the affected parties over the question of ore transportation to tidewater, pretty soon there is not going to be very much to talk about.

The people in my riding are fed up with the uncertainty surrounding the future of Cyprus Anvil and that community. I believe the people of Yukon are becoming increasingly annoyed at the developing gamesmanship by Dome Petroleum in its effort to force a road option. White Pass appears to be sending confusing signals about its position in the road/rail debate. In the meantime, what we have is a cornerstone of Yukon's economy, the Cyprus Anvil mine, crumbling, and as it crumbles further so with it goes the ever-increasing risk of it never re-opening.

It might be suggested that we have to wait for the CTC report: that we have to wait for that final report of theirs before we can say or do anything. I submit that we have had a preliminary report from the Canadian Transport Commission and it provoked such controversy and challenge that its very findings became suspect. I do not say that to condemn its efforts because I think they were very useful, and its current efforts are no doubt going to be helpful. And I am not in any way trying to preclude or prejudge what its final report is going to be. But what is clear, in this entire exercise, is that all parties are going to have to get together sometime and work out a solution.

The CTC will not order Cyprus to use the rail; it cannot. The CTC will not order the Yukon government to open up or upgrade the Skagway Road; it really cannot do that either. Nor will the CTC dictate that the Alaskans should amend their transportation policy to conform to Canadian preferences. The fact is that the final resolution is going to boil down to a political decision; probably on an economic basis, but with a tremendous requirement for consensus in whatever final action is proceeded with. I submit that a signal from this House, to get the parties together, is most in order at this time.

What I see happening are some very alarming developments. We have Dome Petroleum corporately committed to selling Cyprus Anvil. We have hardening positions developing on the Alaskan side against the road option.

"We have Cyprus Anvil calling for road tenders, based on assumptions about load weights and road standards and licencing authorities and a whole host of transportation factors that do not exist. We have the Canadian and American governments essentially pussyfooting around in the face of this major dilemma.

What we also have developing is a situation where Cyprus Anvil cannot sell the mine because the transportation question is not resolved. It will not open the mine because, in the first instance, it is committed to selling, not operating, the mine; and, secondly, the transportation question is going to be awaiting a political decision. If Dome does not like the political decision, the delay could be indefinite and, I submit, potentially devastating to the economic viability of that mine ever going back into operation.

I do not think it really matters what the CTC says, in the final analysis, whether it recommends road or rail: the fact is that we have the major issue of ensuring that all parties are in agreement to make whatever recommendations come forth, work. That means they have to get together to do it.

The kingpins in the agreement to make it work, the American and Canadian governments and, of course, the labour unions involved and, of course, the principle players in both the mining and the transportation sectors, have to, at some point and very soon, get together. I think a strong message from this House would heighten the need for that to happen.

I think, collectively, on behalf of Yukoners, that we want to see that all parties are committed to serious discussion and, of course, hopefully, resolution. I believe the issue facing the Yukon economy on the subject is too serious for us to remain silent much longer.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am a bit at a loss about the message that the mover of this motion was trying to get across.

I think I will start out by saying that I believe that his perception is wrong. I think what he said to us was that he thought that we should somehow be seeking a consensus between Dome, who is playing games, the White Pass, who is confused, Cyprus Anvil, who are crumbling, and the CTC, who are suspect.

³⁰ I am sure, I am positive, that when the hon. member looks at *Hansard* tomorrow those are the exact words that he attributed to

each of those very important players in this little game, as he called it.

There is going to be consensus in the final analysis. I think that there will be a solution. The key always to that solution has been the recommendations that this government is going to get from the CTC. One of the keys for Cyprus Anvil, they have said right from the very beginning, was transportation costs. They came to us looking for help in respect to their transportation costs. We do not have, and we said right off the bat, the expertise to be able to offer that help to them. We knew where we could get it. We have gone after it. Everybody is quite prepared to wait until we get those recommendations. They are going to be here in a couple of weeks.

It is most interesting that this is all of a sudden becoming a crisis issue with the member for Faro; most interesting. This is all of a sudden; it has to happen today.

I also find it interesting that he seems to know what is going to be in that CTC report. I have to tell him that I do not. He may well be right in his guesses. If he is, I am also going to tell you that I will be very, very disappointed. We have waited a long time for this report.

It is critical to everybody in this territory. It is critical to Dome. It is critical to White Pass. It is critical to Cyprus Anvil. Surely, those people know how critical it is to everyone in the territory. They are not going to try and duck the issue. They do not have to. In respect to Alaska, I believe that the positions may harden, but they also have a tendency in Alaska to be very, very cognizant of what is happening here.

I must tell you, and I do not know whether the member opposite is aware of the fact, that there was agreement reached between White Pass and the Alaska government and the city of Skagway in respect to docking facilities; an agreement that has been something like two and a half years in the making. It has been on and off I do not know how many times. The bottom line now is that that agreement has been reached. Everybody is happy and everybody is satisfied and it is going to be for the benefit of everyone in this territory when the work that is being done there can finally be completed. I do not think anyone should believe for one moment that we should be stampeded at this point in time.

Mr. Penikett: I must commend the government leader on the rhetorically extremely effective opening line in his address, and I commend him on that, without regard to its substance. I want to deal seriously with the points he makes. He predicts that there will be a consensus between the players; he predicts that there will be a decision and he predicts that decision will come in the form of recommendations to YTG in a matter of very little time. I cannot quote him exactly but I think he indicated that it would be shortly.

Be that as it may, I think he will have to understand that as a matter of some seriousness from this side the timing with each passing day becomes more critical. The timing of not only CTC decisions, but the conclusions about resolving what Dome calls a transportation problem is very critical. With respect, I must say to the government leader that it is not just a crisis for the member from Faro. I think it is a crisis for many people in this community and I think it is a crisis also for many of the players in this situation.

We have had, I think, under the auspices of CTC, a great debate going on for a while. The public has presumably followed each particular debate in great detail. We have had the positions of some of the major interests stated quite clearly. YTG is supporting the rail. I think also the YVA has, for its own reasons, had an interest that way. We had Dome quite clearly stating that it wants trucks. We have had, in perhaps the clearest statement so far, a letter from the speaker of the Alaskan state legislature opposing the use of the Skagway Road. We have had the Yukon Labour Federations supporting trucking, and I believe their major arguments for doing that, if I remember, were that they perceived there would a lot of jobs or more jobs in the trucking option for Yukoners than in the rail option. Interesting enough, in conversations with people who are in that business, quite the opposite could be the effect; it is possible you could have owner-operators from Alaska getting all the work if in fact we went to the trucking option. And we might have, in fact, less jobs for this community as a result.

We also have White Pass, which has a railroad, that I presume it would like to put to work. Even though as some people pointed out a few years ago White Pass itself was interested in shutting down the railroad. But I think it is also, when we talk about White Pass' position, probably true that they are in a better position than anybody else around here to pick up the trucking contracts, if in fact that comes open.

« What I think has to concern us — and I hope that the government leader will understand that this is not an unreasonable concern — is that the CTC study, the preliminary report, the interim report, the final reports and the final recommendations and so forth, while very useful in terms of the whole problem in terms of transportation planning for Yukon, may not point or may not give us the decision that has to be taken here; the decision that has to be made by the shipper of the ore about how they will transport it. They are not going to make that decision by themselves. But, there has to be — if you like — a contract between a carrier and a shipper. I think, also, because of what is happening at Cyprus Anvil, because of what is happening at Faro and their current state, we have to be extremely concerned about the timing.

The situation is complicated by Dome Petroleum's position of basically wanting to sell the mine before they open it even though they recognize that opening it would obviously improve the prospects of selling it. Now, I think whatever the CTC report says, there are decisions that have to be taken beyond that; some agreement have to be made. I think decisions have to be taken very soon. I think the CTC, while playing a useful role in terms of gathering, sifting and analyzing information, is not a mediator, they are not a conciliator, they are not an arbitrator; they are not going to produce the final solution. I think it is appropriate that this House send a simple message to the parties; especially to White Pass and especially to Dome, but also to the other players. It is important, and it is fast approaching the time where we absolutely must get together, sit down and work out a deal for moving the ore from Faro to tidewater, because Yukon's economic health depends on it.

The government leader has been in communication with a lot of the people who are interested in this question and he will know and will understand that a lot of those people who are interested in the situation have also been in communication with us. One of the people, who is in fact quite close to the situation, has suggested to me recently the kind of framework for a deal or for a plan of how to resolve the situation. That person has characterized the proposal or the thinking as a made-in-Yukon solution as opposed to a made-in-Ottawa solution. I presume by that, that a made-in-Ottawa solution would refer to the CTC.

It is true that I think the CTC is not examining all the areas and all the implications of these questions. There are some questions about employment in this community as opposed to Alaska. There are questions that are not being dealt with by the CTC.

« It has been suggested by this party that if the railroad is to be shut down, rather than have it shut down as an economic accident, or economic fatality of world metal prices or some other convergence of events in Faro, that this should be a planned demise of the railroad over an 8-year or 10-year time frame, that there be a planned approach to close the railroad, if necessary, which allows time and this is critically important, to upgrade the road if that is going to be the option, so that this territory would have an opportunity to adjust itself to the changes that would happen in the employment patterns and so forth.

In the meantime, to state the obvious, I think that most people would see that there has to be some transportation if that mine is to survive. There has to be a transportation system in place and functioning. If necessary, and I have no hesitation in saying this to the government leader, while the railroad may be the preferred option, it is quite possible that we could be talking about federal subsidies here.

I am not afraid to be saying that if that is necessary then so be it, and let us do it, because it is appropriate. What we do not need, and what I think would be a very unfortunate thing to happen, is to have some kind of ad hoc solution; which is not made by CTC, or by White Pass, but is made inadvertently because Dome makes the decision in its own private interests, which are not in the public

interests of the people of the territory.

I do not think I am exaggerating to say that time is running out on the question. If the mine does not open soon, we face the prospect that it will not open at all. I think Cyprus Anvil or Dome wants to sell the company. It wants to sell the company before the mine opens, even though I think they would agree that they would have far better prospects of selling it if it were open. We have all these areas of uncertainty and areas of dispute, some of which the CTC will play a role in resolving.

Beyond their recommendations, we need some very important and very immediate decisions by some of the players in the game. I think those decisions can best be achieved by those players meeting face to face, negotiating and making a deal. The simple message I would like to see this House send to those actors is to urge them to do exactly that. Not in contradiction to what the CTC was doing, but in concert with what the CTC is doing. I think that would be in the best interests of all the people of the territory.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The motion that we have before us is clearly a message and I appreciate what the leader of the opposition has had to say in respect to the issue that confronts Yukon. I think, at least from my perspective, I view the present ownership in a context of a situation that could be defined as the reluctant bridesmaid. I find it difficult, as a taxpayer, and as an individual who has the taxpayers' purse for part of his responsibility, dealing with an organization that bought a mine, which, within months, was closed down. Now the reason it is not opening appears to be various governments' responsibilities; not those, necessarily, of the mine, of the mine owners.

« I think that we are dealing with a very major decision forthcoming as far as Yukon is concerned. I heard the member opposite talk about subsidies. It has been made very clear from the Alaskan side that if subsidies are required they would not be prepared — and there is some question whether or not they would have the legal authority in any event — to put subsidies forward for rail. That puts the Canadian government and this legislature in a very difficult situation if the majority of the jobs are going to continue to be on the American side yet the subsidies are going to be coming from the Canadian taxpayer. That is one variable that I think is going to have to be seriously considered in respect of any decision being made in respect to our transportation corridor to the coast.

I think it is important, for the record, to indicate to the members opposite that the government leader and a number of us have met with the president of Cyprus Anvil and the president of Dome for the purposes of discussing the question of the rail option versus the road option, and they are very clear in their position and I have to give them some credit. They do not want to run the mine. They have made that very clear, and I would submit that it is to the point that they will not run the mine unless something happens that is unforeseen.

I think one of the keys, as far as Cyprus Anvil is concerned, is to have an owner who is interested in running the mine and investing in the mine for the purposes of that particular ore body and also for the purposes of further mining activity in the Yukon.

I think, as far as the motion is concerned, I do not know if it will be possible to get all the parties together. We have been doing everything we believe we can do from our side as far as examining the road versus the rail option. I think that assessing the road option is going to be a very expensive venture if the various levels of government — federal, territorial, Alaskan and the American governments — are going to proceed with opening that road; there are some major technical problems, I gather, for the long term. There is major capitalization and the major question of costs of O&M, which, of course, from the point of view of Cyprus Anvil, are very beneficial, because they no longer have to pay the costs of operation and maintenance as well as, to some degree, the capitalization of the rail transportation link. That, of course, would be picked up by the general taxpayer at large.

« That is another question that is outstanding and I have to ask myself, when you take a look at the mine, about the prospects of the mine, where the taxpayers of Canada have put forward \$50

million, the taxpayers of the territory have put \$2 million directly into the present stripping project, the Government of Canada has brought forward the decision that the NCPC will lower the rates to the community of Faro and, in particular, Cyprus Anvil, significantly; when you start adding all these things up, you have to ask yourself how far is the taxpayer going to offset and offbalance these costs that are being accrued by Cyprus Anvil, at the present time. Those are very much outstanding questions that are going to have to be confronted, especially by government, on how far they are prepared to go.

I think, between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Yukon Territory, that we have gone at least half that country mile, to date, at least half, with respect to recognizing the cost burdens to that particular mine. One of the basic questions it is going to come down to, when it all is finished and done, is how far are we, collectively in this legislature, when it comes down to the bottom line, prepared to go, with respect to the long-term obligations that will be assumed.

I want to point out that we recognize the impact on the territory of the workforce. I think that was one of the prime purposes of bringing the \$10 million winter works project to bear over the course of this past winter, which was very successful, in view of the unemployment in many areas, such as Carcross. If you take a look at the projects we put forward, it put a lot of people to work, over the course of the winter, who would not have been working had that not proceeded.

At any rate, just to conclude on the social side of things, we recognize that the decisions are going to have to be made. As the government leader has said, they are going to have to be made fairly soon. But I want to make a point here and I do not think this point should be lost in the debate today. Even when you say to Dome and Cyprus Anvil, if we were to say it today, that we were going to open that road, there is no commitment that, on the converse, it will go into production.

So, it seems kind of funny that all these things have to be put into place, on one side, but there seems to be no commitment on the other side. That is another very major variable, with respect to what is facing the various levels of government and industry. I find it very disconcerting, that if we make a decision and we, hypothetically, said, "Yes, we are prepared to go with the highway" and the Alaskan government said it is prepared to go with the highway to meet the full demand, as far as the Skagway-Klondike road is concerned, that the mining company does not feel that it has to make a commitment. I really do not believe that that could be called a two-way street.

So, in conclusion, I want to say and echo the government leader's position that we are very concerned with respect to the question of the White Pass rail and a decision is in the offing. I think it is safe to say that we are prepared to support the motion.

Motion No. 19 agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

We have had a very long day. Would it be the pleasure of the House if we recessed until 7:30?

Before we go, may I point out one thing: our recesses have been going from 15 minutes to 20 and now to 25, and if this continues we will cut them back to 10 minutes; if that does not work, we will cut them back to five; if that does not work, there will be no more recesses.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call committee to order.

We are now on the *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, dealing with the Department of Education — Advanced Education and Manpower, general debate.

Bill No. 19: *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85* — continued

Mr. Byblow: I would like to make what I hope will be some closing remarks on a couple of issues we have debated over the past couple of days, albeit at short stretches at a time.

In the first instance, I do not propose to attempt to change the minister's mind about the value or the wisdom of the education task force. It is, and it will be, a matter of public record that the task force contributed and will contribute substantially to the serious kind of debate about education, in the territory, that is desirable.

I think it is a fact and a matter of record that the task force helped identify a number of problems that I know the minister wants to alleviate. It is also a fact that the minister sent a monitor with the task force and, in a sense, was part of it. Certainly, there is no objection to that. That the minister chose to send a high profile Conservative Party person is also a fact and it is a matter that, in the minds of some, raises some question.

I only resent the suggestion that in some way the task force is creating issues. I have been too long in Yukon classrooms, and have too long been associated in the field of education, to want to use education as any kind of a political football, or for any kind of crass political purposes. That is clearly not the overwhelming response that my colleague for Mayo and I have received. I do resent the suggestion.

Extending from that, again in what I hope to be closing comments, I did find the minister's attitude somewhat cavalierish about the wisdom of placing a psychologist into the school system. To me that was not the kind of concern I had hoped the minister represented. At the same time, it does raise a little question about the minister's perceived relationship with the school committees and her purported communication with them.

I would appeal to the minister to recognize that there is concern about the high dropout rate. There is concern about the increasing stress of students that is not adequately being dealt with.

There are aspects about the system that need attention within the system, and I appeal to the minister to address the call for things like increased counselling services, support staff and program review. I say that there is a call for greater parental involvement. There is a desire for greater decision-making and authority about the delivery of our education. I submit that the initiatives detailed by the minister in the past couple of days, in and of themselves, are good and must be viewed in the total delivery system of education in the territory. In no way should it be considered as if throwing money at a problem will make it go away. I sincerely say to the minister that I believe we all have a deep respect for the formal education process and we all sincerely want to address its concerns and improve on it. I have a couple of minor points that I would like to clear up in general debate, and the first one deals with busing.

In questioning the minister during Question Period, there was indication that the minister was looking at the prospect of splitting up rural bus contracts — or the ability to contract bus service — into smaller ones.

Without getting into any detail of background on the subject, because we have debated that at some length in the House, I would ask the minister what her intentions are in respect to breaking up busing contracts and the department's ability to do that, under the current Diversified contract?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: As always, the member for Faro makes my heart palpitate, sometimes, when I listen to him discuss educational matters and it brings tears to my eyes, too; I really find it quite remarkable.

I said yesterday that I was through discussing the task force and I will stick by that, even though the member has put out some very interesting bait, which, I reassure my colleagues, I will not take.

The busing situation, we have also discussed very thoroughly. I believe I have indicated to the member opposite that the Diversified contract does not expire until 1986; we will not be breaking the busing contract until that contract is up for renewal. The main

concern and objective of this government, in providing busing service for children, is to provide a safe service and a reliable service.

“ I do appreciate the concern that the people from the Mayo-Stewart-Elsa area have regarding busing. I would submit to the member for Faro, that what they want is a bus and they are not entitled to a bus because of numbers. They are provided with a busing subsidy, which we have increased two times in the last two years. We are providing their subsidy to them according to our legislative responsibility to those people. The Elsa community has been provided with a busing service this year, because the numbers of children qualified at 25 in the community of Elsa to be transported to Mayo for school. We put that bus on for this school year. The other children that the member is going to ask about, the ones from Stewart Crossing; there are not enough numbers there for a busing service to be provided.

Mr. McDonald: I am going to have to enter the debate now, obviously. We are discussing the future of busing in my riding, specifically. As I understand it, there are other complaints, and other busing anomalies in the territory that can be addressed at some other time. I do not think any is as serious as the immediate issue is at Stewart Crossing. That may be debatable, and I certainly would be willing to defer to any other organization or group of people who claims a greater need.

The minister began her remarks by saying that Stewart Crossing wanted a bus and extended her remarks to say that the subsidy had been increased twice in the last two years.

“ Before I expand on my remarks on the busing issue in general, I should just say that it might be somewhat misleading to suggest that Stewart Crossing wants a bus, in the strict sense. I believe it has been stated more than once and I know that they would like school transportation and if a van service could be provided to perform the same task they would be looking forward to a van service, recognizing that the service would be cheaper.

Some background for your benefit, Mr. Chairman: the issue in Stewart Crossing is not a recent issue. It has in fact been on peoples' minds for some time now. As I understand it, the 1981-82 school year had a bus provided by Diversified. It was cancelled. Sorry, in the 1980-81 year there was a bus provided by Diversified; in 1981-82, a bus was provided by Indian Affairs on the basis of emergency funding. Now, at the time this was decided, it was decided at a meeting at which the previous Minister of Education and the Minister of Indian Affairs were in attendance in Mayo. The meeting decided, apparently — and this has not been challenged by anybody whom I know — that a busing service would be provided by the Yukon government following the 1981-82 season on the proviso that Indian Affairs would provide emergency service for that year.

Following the election, of course, budget restraints were cited as the reason for not providing the busing service for the 1982-83 season and onwards. People in the Mayo district and Stewart Crossing were seized with the desire, obviously, for a busing service. They had a number of public meetings in Mayo, one of which I understand the minister attended and I was in attendance as well. At that particular meeting the minister encouraged the school committees to take their position through resolution to the annual school committee conference, which they subsequently did in the form of two resolutions: one to review the regulation stipulating that 25 students must be needed to warrant a bus, and the other resolution to consider breaking up the umbrella busing agreement that was currently held by Diversified Transport, on the understanding that the breaking up of such an agreement would result in lower costs for rural transportation routes, and thereby allowing more busing service in rural areas within the same busing budget.

“ These resolutions were submitted to the annual school committee conference last year, and were passed; both were successful. Since then, we have been waiting for some indication from the minister as to whether or not they are being treated seriously.

The school committee recently met, once again, to discuss the issue, because it feared, as I do, that nothing is going to be done for the next school season to improve the next school season. Subsequently, it submitted another resolution to the conference held

only very recently, that proposed more specifically that, persons living in rural communities and living on transportation corridors between the communities and the nearest school, have a reasonable expectation that school busing be provided. So, it suggested that the Government of Yukon reconsider its school busing policy to permit children, in established communities like Stewart Crossing, to be bused to school in secure and reliable manner.

This is much more specific, as you can appreciate; they were referring directly to Stewart Crossing. They are somewhat tired of suggesting solutions for the busing problem, which they do not feel has been adequately addressed by the department.

Now, I do not want to be too harsh on any one player in the equation. I would like to reiterate that the people in Stewart Crossing and along the Stewart-Mayo highway feel very seriously that this is one of the most significant items that they deal with, with government. They feel, as do I, that this busing policy has more serious ramifications than one might glean, at first sight.

It happens to be the case that, while the numbers for the bus are theoretically dwindling, the pattern of settlement along the Mayo-Stewart highway is being affected by the policy. People are not moving to farms or to properties along that highway because they feel that there is not any sort of secure method for busing their children to school. People are not moving to Stewart Crossing; in fact, people are leaving Stewart Crossing to move to other communities where they feel their children can get adequate busing to school.

“ As a result, Stewart Crossing is becoming a singles community. It is not a family community. They feel that the busing policy is the major reason why this pattern of settlement is taking place.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not the resolution calling for the breaking up of the umbrella agreement currently held by Diversified Transport would be a good thing. It is felt by some that perhaps the administrative ease that the government experiences when it deals with Diversified Transport is something that may be sacrificed in order to provide more service — more widespread service — to outlying districts.

I, personally, subscribe to that particular view. I feel that even though the busing agreement held with Diversified Transport does make it easy on government officials who administer the rural busing service and Whitehorse busing service, I feel that if economies can be found by breaking up the agreement to permit local contractors to provide the service reliably and efficiently, at lower cost, then that route should be pursued. Obviously, it would help the local economy in places like Mayo. Apart from that, I think that it would be a lot more effective in providing the busing service that people in the riding desire.

The minister did mention that they had increased the busing subsidy twice in the last two years, from \$9 to \$10, and \$10 to \$11. That has proven to be, and continues to be, quite inadequate. They would like the busing service. They feel that if the government gave the community a long term commitment for busing service, families would be moving into places like Stewart Crossing and would feel secure about moving into the areas along the Mayo-Stewart highway, which essentially is their right. It is essentially something that we as a legislature ought to be encouraging, considering that we want these areas to thrive.

I would like the minister to just expand upon the deliberations of the department regarding the resolutions that were passed last fall: the one being the breaking up of the umbrella agreement, and the other one the reconsideration of the 25 student minimum to warrant a bus.

“ I think that that is the least we can provide those people who took the trouble to thrash out the resolution and then took the trouble to have it presented and defended at the annual school committee conference.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It really does not seem logical to me, and I find it really quite unusual, that the member would ask and expect that this government would look at breaking up a busing contract, an umbrella contract, for one area that legislatively is not entitled to busing; they are not eligible for busing. If he is saying they do not want a bus, they want a van, that is fine, and I discussed that with the people and said to them, “you may use your subsidy and you

can hire someone to provide a van service". They indicated to me that that would not pay for the wages and it would not pay for the gasoline. Well, this is a busing subsidy that these people are entitled to and I do not buy the argument that they want the bus or the van put there in order to encourage the community to grow, because we have an example in Dawson, Yukon, where there were a number of children at Rock Creek and the parents were asking the government for a bus and the government responded that when they had eligible numbers they would get a bus. This year, they got a bus because they have over 25 children there.

So, it obviously did not impede or hamper the growth of that area. I just do not buy the argument that what you do is put the van there, or the bus, and people will move there; that is not how it works. When the people move there and there are 25 children, those children will be eligible under the legislation to be provided with a bus.

Our first concern, again, is the safety of the children. This is the only area in Yukon that is requesting a bus. We have had some concerns raised in the Carcross-Tagish area and, after we increased the subsidies, the people made arrangements and they seem to be working quite well in that area. We have no other areas asking to have private contracts within the communities. I indicated to the members a year ago that we were looking at the whole busing situation in Yukon; whether children who lived within the city limits could ride municipal buses and so on. It requires a lot of detailed work and we are going to utilize the time we have, until Diversified's contract is due to expire, to do a complete analysis of it. And that does not mean that we are going to make any changes. We may find that it is not cost-efficient or beneficial to make those changes. What we are concerned about is the present situation. We have an umbrella contract for busing that is providing an adequate busing service. We are providing subsidies to those who are not eligible for busing, and that seems to be working well. And we have one area that is asking for a bus or a van, and they are not eligible, legislatively.

"I have the resolution in front of me that was presented at the school committee conference, this past weekend. It reads: "Be it resolved that the Education Council urge the government to reconsider the school busing policy", which we are doing, in totality, "to permit children in established communities like Stewart Crossing" — I do not believe Stewart Crossing is an established community — "to be bused to school in a secure and reliable manner".

Well, we are doing that all over Yukon and we will do likewise for Stewart when the numbers of children reach 25.

Mr. McDonald: There were a number of remarks made by the minister, one of which I will take exceptional exception to, and that is the remark that Stewart Crossing is not an established community.

Stewart Crossing, as to whether it meets any legislative definition of this government is of little concern to the residents of Stewart Crossing: Stewart Crossing residents consider themselves residents of a community. This may be where we differ, once again, because we have also had this issue thrashed out with regard to Elsa, which is another community in my riding that is not a community.

It seems that, as far as this government is concerned, the only community in my riding is Mayo and everything else is a suburban area of that community. There are four communities, according to the people in those communities: one is Stewart Crossing, one is Mayo, one is Elsa and one is Keno.

The minister mentioned that the people in Stewart Crossing are not legislatively entitled to a busing service. That may be the case, but that, in itself, is no reason to suggest that they are not entitled to it. The legislative requirements are arbitrary requirements that are established by government to meet a perceived need. What the people of Stewart Crossing and the Stewart-Mayo road and people of Mayo are saying is that the perceived need exists in Stewart Crossing, even though it may not conform to the 25-student conveyance vehicle that the legislation requires.

Another point that the minister made is that — she has made this countless times and I still fail to see the significance of the argument — what the people in Stewart Crossing are provided is a

subsidy. Now, she suggests that a subsidy means that, for some reason, an arbitrary figure of so many percent is all that the government is going to be providing to the parents to provide their own transportation.

A subsidy can be anything from one percent of the cost to 100 percent of the cost. You can subsidize something 100 percent; there is nothing in the definition of subsidy that precludes that. I do not understand the minister's point and perhaps she could expand on that.

"The Minister of Economic Development has a furrowed brow. Perhaps if he has some concerns he would stand up and express them verbally and perhaps I will be able to respond to a verbal attack, rather than a furrowed brow. The minister says that she is not prepared to provide a bus to the community to encourage the community to grow. What we have been saying for such a very long time now is that she should provide a service to the community to prevent that community from dying. It is dying as a result of this policy. People are leaving Stewart Crossing. Families are not settling. Families who have made commitments to settle on the Stewart-Mayo road are not settling on the Mayo-Stewart road. They are cramming themselves into Mayo, because that is where the school facility is.

She further said that the safety of children is her prime concern. She is not stating why she is suggesting that safety is her prime concern. I assume that it is the concern of all of us. If she implying that the provision of busing service by a local contractor will necessarily mean that the safety of children will be jeopardized, I think that we could successfully challenge that claim. If she means that, she should say it so we can debate it.

She said that they would review the Diversified agreement. She offered no promises. I am perfectly prepared not to accept promises from the minister other than to review this situation quite seriously. The minister has been quite careful not to make any promises to the people of that area.

I think that the concerns of the people of Stewart Crossing, of that district in the riding, remain legitimate concerns. They certainly do. Considering the way the patterns of settlement has been going in the last year and a half or two years, I think this is a rather serious issue. It perhaps does go beyond the issue of busing.

What the people are asking for is a cost efficient system. They have suggested that the breaking up of the agreement, of providing local contractors to provide the service more cheaply, could allow services such as this to be provided to populations of even less than the legislative requirement of 25 would suggest. They are suggesting that if you break up the contract to allow small private contractors to provide the service; they say, in this case, it could be \$15,000 to \$20,000 less than the Diversified agreement. The Diversified agreement is rather a nice agreement. The Elsa run for example, is \$50,000 plus fuel. It is on a guaranteed basis, and it climbs every year. It has not been static; it climbs every year and it is over five years. That is a rather attractive arrangement. There are some established busing contractors in my riding who can provide such a service, and much more cheaply.

"So, even if they were going to be providing a service to Stewart Crossing, it still would not make sense to seriously consider this option for the purposes of saving money alone. What they are saying is that you can relax that 25 student regulation because it does not make a heck of a lot of sense in a rural riding. You can relax that 25 student regulation and still operate within the busing budget that exists today. It is not an unreasonable suggestion. They are asking basically for you to consider that, that is all; and they are asking that you basically consider it seriously. And they have been asking that you consider it seriously for a long time now.

If we do not get any indication that the situation will be in fact studied carefully in the near future, we can only expect that we are going to be living with another school year where children will not be bused to school and children will have to take home study; or little children may be living in dorms in Mayo or living in strangers' homes in Mayo. We will have to live with another year of that. We will have to live with another year where families leave Stewart Crossing, and another year where people do not settle on the Stewart-Mayo highway, because of the uncertainty.

I think it is reasonable. I think what the people are saying there is, in fact, reasonable. They have bent over backwards to try to figure ways in which they can incorporate a service, a basic service like this, within the busing budget. They are not asking for extra bucks. They are asking the government administrators to provide a service, which conceivably could mean more of an administrative job for them, that is certainly not debatable. Nevertheless, it provides a service that people in that area feel very strongly about. The minister herself, at a meeting in Mayo, must have received, unless she is completely heartless, some indication of the passion of these people.

I am sure she is not heartless at all. She must have received some sort of indication that these people feel very passionately about this issue. This is not an inconsequential issue. When my colleague from Faro and I were in Mayo during the education task force hearing, we discussed this issue once again. This is a subject of some concern. We discussed the issue once again. The issue has not died at all, even though people have moved out and have tried to find alternate homes in order to be close to the school. They still feel passionately about this issue; they still want to be able to be free to move into an established community like Stewart Crossing and the minister is just going to have to address this issue. It is not going to go away. Hiding behind an arbitrary regulation that stipulates 25 students is not going to do the trick. It is as simple as that.

I do not know whether the minister wants to expand on that any longer. I will certainly invite her to do so. If not, then I have some other subjects that I would like to get involved with. But I would be happy to debate this the rest of the evening.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I am not going to get into a long debate, emotional or otherwise. I simply want to state, for the record, that in the Stewart Crossing area there are two families who are presently receiving a travel subsidy; that travel subsidy is \$11.20 per family, per day. There are two students who are on correspondence in Stewart and one family lives in Mayo during the week and Stewart on the weekend. I understand that they would prefer to live in Stewart but, obviously, according to that family, their children's education comes first. We are studying the alternatives to providing buses for the rural areas at a reduced cost and we will continue to make some assessments of those costs.

With regard to the comments about the cost of the Diversified contract and the innuendoes made about what a healthy contract it was, and how it went up because of gasoline costs, the contracts that we have presently are for the bus services, excluding gasoline. That was done in order to control the annual contract increase; however, the gasoline in Whitehorse is provided through wholesale bulk purchases. In the rural areas, credit cards are issued to the buses and they allow their drivers to purchase from local retail outlets. The department monitors the consumption by monthly mileage reports and inspection of credit card purchases and we have been successful in controlling the costs, as well as monitoring the fuel that is consumed by the school buses.

Mr. McDonald: I am not sure of the significance of the last point the minister was making about the busing contract. I do not know of anybody who would suggest that. I am certainly not accusing the Diversified people in Mayo of padding their agreements by doing something other than busing children to school.

If the minister is suggesting that I am, or if she is worried about that, herself, I can probably put her mind to rest, because I believe that the bus driver in Mayo actually only uses the bus for school purposes. We are talking, of course, for your information, of the Keno-Mayo run and not any other service.

To reiterate, the busing agreement for the Mayo-Keno run, this year, is, in fact, \$55,900, plus gas, which I understand amounts to about \$8,000 a year, which is not an unreasonable estimate. Nevertheless, it is an extra \$8,000 added on to the agreement. The minister said she did not want to get into a protracted debate, but she did make a suggestion that I am going to have to respond to.

She quoted some statistics that her department has compiled regarding the number of families who are on the subsidy. I would not doubt for a second that there are only two families left in Stewart Crossing who are receiving that subsidy. Nor would I doubt

that there would be one family on correspondence and one family in Mayo. Only a year ago, the figures were quite different. The added people who were included in the figuring some time ago have not evaporated. They have simply moved into Mayo and out of sight. That argument in itself, is not terribly strong.

The point that is being made here is that the character of Stewart Crossing is changing. Families are leaving. Farm families are not moving into Stewart Crossing as a result of the busing policy. Families are not moving to locations along the Stewart-Mayo road. That is simply a fact. It is not mythology. It is something that is actually happening. Everyone in my riding, and I am sure everyone in the northern district, realizes that Stewart Crossing is more than just some sort of temporary highway camp. There are people living there who have lived there for many years. There are people who live there who have nothing to do with highway camps. This is an established community. This not a temporary subcamp of the highways department. In any case, there are permanent houses there, government employees, people who have lived there for a long time. They regard Stewart Crossing as a community.

I would like to expand the discussion to talk briefly about the expenditure of \$75,000 at the Elsa school. I did not wish to do a postmortem on that money. That would be counterproductive. All I would like to investigate is the extent to which this money that is being spent is considered special money and to what extent the projects on which the money was expended should be considered as regular operation and maintenance or yearly capital funding.

I am wondering if the minister can explain if the Elsa school is entitled to regular consideration when it comes to capital funding. Where things marked for upgrading, such as the \$75,000 is to be spent on: retrofitting washrooms, replacing floors, some interior painting, repairing of furnaces, et cetera, blackboards for classrooms, that sort of thing. I understand that what might be considered special money might be legitimately spent on things like the big toy, which the school is getting. Nevertheless, the lion's portion of this money is to be spent on what I would have thought are regular repairs.

I am wondering if the minister can just explain the nature of the special funding and whether the Elsa school is in fact entitled to this kind of maintenance money on a regular basis or whether we have to look for special funding at whatever times, depending on availability, in the future in order to get general maintenance and repairs done?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It was special money that was identified, special capital monies, as we do with other schools in the territory when they need some major capital expenditures for upgrading for new blackboards and so on. In the past few years, just before I was in office and just after I was Minister of Education, the government had been spending a lot of money and capital on new facilities and there are several schools in the territory where we are looking for fairly large amounts of money to do some general maintenance.

One that comes to mind is FH Collins. We are looking for a considerable amount of capital funding to do some general maintenance in that school, which needs new lockers and blackboards, which have not been done in some 20 years, and the amount of money is quite large and we are not sure when we will capital funding available for that. Whitehorse Elementary and Christ the King High School also needed large amounts of money identified for some major maintenance repairs, and that has been done in the last two years.

When we visited the Elsa school, we recognized that the school had been there for some time and that some general monies would have to be identified to bring that school back up to a reasonable standard; with some new blackboards and some work as the member has read from the memo that I gave to him. When we came back to Whitehorse, we decided that whenever we had an opportunity to get some extra capital funding we would consider getting some of that for Elsa. We did that, and we have fulfilled our commitment to Elsa with that special money for some repairs.

Mr. McDonald: The member from Porter Creek East had a comment and if he would like to put it on record I will certainly defer to the Chair to him for the moment.

No, he would not? All right then.

As I said, I will try to refrain from going through a postmortem on the \$35,000 because it would involve some rather messy business. I have in front of me, too, a copy of a letter from the Elsa school committee dated April 12th, 1984, in which they attempt to establish a proper sequence of events that led to the determination of what the money was to be spent on. I think it is quite an eloquent letter and I do not think I need to expand upon it. If any other member of the House would like to receive a copy, I would certainly be willing to table it. It certainly does say everything that needs to be said on the issue, in my opinion.

One question I have, though, is that the minister suggested that this funding is legitimately special funding.

¹⁶ Just for the record, I wonder if the minister could just state, clearly, that the Elsa school is entitled to regular capital funding, on a yearly basis, depending on need, for the purposes of maintenance and general upkeep?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The school at Elsa is treated just as all the other schools are in the territory. We have never treated it any differently.

Mr. McDonald: I did not get that impression going around the territory with the task force. I am sure the minister did not exactly mean what she said, but that is not worth pursuing, either. I would like to deal a bit with one other issue. It is sort of a general issue and has nothing to do with my riding, believe it or not; at least, I hope it does not.

It has to do with the implementation of what has been announced at the joint youth venture capital program. The program, I understand, provides interest-free capital to students for seasonal projects, so that they can learn the joys of free enterprise. The minister suggested that this program is being practiced in Ontario and in British Columbia. I wonder if she could just state briefly what the success or non-success of this sort of program has been in those two jurisdictions. Could she give us a sort of breakdown. Obviously, the department would have assessed the success rate of this program before it ventured into it so, perhaps, the minister could just give us a speech on how successful she anticipates this program will be?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not have any specific statistics; however, the program was extremely successful. I have talked to other ministers about the program and they encouraged us to start the program, if we had that inclination. We are anticipating that it is going to be very successful, also, here in Yukon.

Mr. McDonald: I was listening to a news report in my hotel room, one night, recently, about the sister program in British Columbia. There seemed to be some problems with the guidelines of the program in British Columbia. Apparently, as I understand it, the amount of venture capital that students are allowed to use is in the neighbourhood of \$2,000 in that province. The repayment time is rather short. I wonder if the minister could explain some of the details of the program because, apparently, the guidelines in British Columbia are not attracting students, or, at least, the students are not flocking to the program in the numbers that the government had apparently anticipated.

¹⁷ **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I gave quite a thorough outline of the program yesterday and I explained all the details and all the qualifications and criteria of the program, and I am not about to repeat it this evening.

Mr. McDonald: Alright then. If the minister wants to be that way about it, fine. I had a different tack I would like to take, but if the minister is not going to cooperate, fair enough.

The one last comment I have about this program then is that the program is obviously directed at encouraging students who understand the joys of free enterprise, of taking risks, but obviously not taking risks with their own money but taking risks with some money. At the same time, we have heard some complaints about the curriculum from task force hearings that certain other subjects are not taught to the extent that they possibly could be taught. Here we have a program that teaches the joys of capitalism yet there are people in the territory, believe it or not, who feel that the history of unionism, for example, is not taught to the extent that it ought to be taught, considering the fact that there are a large number of people in the country who are, in fact, unionized and who, in fact, need to

be unionized. There is not really much education as to what it really takes to be an employee, because after all not that many of us, as a matter of fact, are going to be entrepreneurs; most of us are going to end most of our lives as wage earners.

I wonder if the minister could explain or expand on any programs the government might be entering into that might teach the children how to be motivated when you have to earn your living as a wage earner in society?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I think the member for Mayo is getting absolutely sarcastic and a bit silly. I cannot for any reason see why he would want to stifle our young people, particularly their imaginations and their creativity. This is a program that will encourage that kind of development and that kind of motivation and I cannot think of anything healthier for young people.

In school today — well, not even in school — here in the House we get demands and we get concerns raised by the opposition that we should be teaching young people life skills, and in life skills are things like what it is like to live in the real world and to have to borrow money and to perhaps want to start a business. We teach a program in school called Consumer Fundamentals, where young people have an opportunity to learn about the pitfalls of having credit cards and charging things and charging to excess and how to have bank accounts and so on, so that they function when they get out of school, so they can function in everyday society, which has become very complicated and complex for many adults.

This kind of program just enhances that education that we are already providing for these young people. It encourages them to learn about borrowing money, about dealing with banks; it stimulates their creativity and their imagination, as I have said, and I really do not think that there is anything wrong with encouraging an entrepreneurial spirit and encouraging young people to have an employer attitude as opposed to an employee attitude.

¹⁸ I suppose that this is where the member for Mayo and I part philosophically. He obviously wants to encourage all young people to be employees and to always anticipate and to have as their goals and objectives to always want to work for other people. Philosophically, I would like to encourage young people to utilize their creativity, and to use their imagination, and to use their brains, and their skills; and to maybe have their own business some day, and they be the employer. I know, philosophically, the member for Mayo is going "oooh". We part on philosophical grounds. That is why we are on two sides of the House.

I have an example of a young lady who established an ice cream parlor in Whitehorse last year. She borrowed some money from her father. She took a risk. That is also a healthy attitude, when people are prepared to take a risk. She took a risk and she established a little business. It was a very successful business for her. She learned a lot of things. I went in and spoke to her and she found the whole experience extremely satisfying. She made enough money to pay back her father, and she made enough money to put herself through another year of university. I think that is an extremely healthy attitude to develop in our young people.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should recess for 15 minutes, so that we do not have a question and no answer.

Recess

¹⁹ **Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole back to order.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Now that I see I have all the hon. members in opposition awake, and motivated, and ready to participate in some debate, I want to indicate to them that I seem to feel that they are under some misapprehension or perhaps they have misinterpreted the youth venture capital program. When I think back to the comments that the leader of the opposition made about indoctrination and so on, I just want to remind the members that this is not a program that we are teaching in the schools. This is a summer program that is provided through the adult education department for Yukon adults, 16 to 24 years of age. I think that this program is much better than a handout, which so many people get used to very quickly with the way governments are operating these days. We have identified some \$9,000 for the program. It is not like we are

putting hundreds of thousands of dollars towards this program to encourage our young people to go into competition with the private sector.

I just want to indicate for the members that we do provide programs. The member for Whitehorse North Centre made the comment that not everybody can be an employer. We recognize that. We have never said otherwise. However, it does not hurt to encourage young people to perhaps have a goal to be an employer. We provide, within the Department of Education, money for the student employment assistance program, which is money for the private sector to hire students so students have an opportunity to work as employees.

²⁰ We also have the student employment program, with the territorial government, where students have an opportunity to work as employees. So, for the members opposite to be quite startled and almost horrified by this program, I just do not understand why they would react that way.

Mr. McDonald: I thought I may have missed my turn forever, there, for a minute.

Mr. Chairman: No, you just should move a little faster. Move it along.

Mr. McDonald: Well, I cannot claim tired legs for not bouncing up fast enough.

The minister made some comments just now about the fact that this is a program for people not necessarily in the school system — I think that is what she meant — but people from 16 to 24. Nevertheless, the Department of Education has taken this initiative, which is, as the minister said in her previous remarks, teaching people skills such as borrowing money and starting businesses. She cited the starting up of an ice cream parlour, not as being part of this program, but as being an example of where you can borrow some money from daddy and get started and take a risk and do great things.

The minister said some things that I will have to take issue with. One was that I, in my own previous comments, was being sarcastic by suggesting that this program was not quite fair enough to all sectors of society.

²¹ I was absolutely deadly serious in my comments. There should not be any doubt about that upon hearing my following remarks.

The minister said that these people who are going to show initiative by borrowing money from this youth venture capital program are the ones we should depend on for harbouring imagination and creativity. It may come as a surprise to the minister, but people who are employees like to exercise imagination and creativity in their lives as well. It is not a monopoly held by people who happen to have money they can risk or money, whether it is risk capital or not, that they can invest in a project where they can be their own boss.

The minister suggested that we differed philosophically in our positions. I will not proceed to defend that remark other than to say that I preached an employee attitude and she preached an employer attitude. For the sake of her own party, I do not think she expressed the philosophical difference adequately. To start with, I would like to say that, as my colleague for Faro said yesterday, we are not opposed to this sort of program. The point that I was making — and the minister just said "do not encourage it", that is not true either — was that there are other skills that most of the people in society are going to have to have in order to function.

²² Most of the people in society are going to be employees; most of the people in society are going to have to learn to motivate themselves, as employees. Not everyone can be his own boss; society does not function that way. It simply cannot function that way.

It would be ludicrous to suggest, for example, that 200 individuals, each owning his own company, would go to Elsa to mine ore. The way society works is that people get together, in a group, so that they can more efficiently, through a hierarchical structure, extract resources and manufacture resources and get greater wealth. We are not individuals to the extent that the minister suggests that we can be; it just cannot be done. We cannot all be businessmen; we cannot all be successful businessmen. It just cannot be done.

Now, we may want to encourage some people to try that route, and there is nothing wrong with that. What I am saying is that most of us are going to be employees, and most of us are going to have to learn to motivate ourselves as employees and we are going to have to do a job for somebody else, but do a valuable job, nevertheless. Those are the kinds of skills and that is the kind of thing that we should be teaching in the education system.

As I said before, there were people in the territory who felt that the social history taught by the schools was not adequate, when it came to teaching a proper accounting of events, in the past, or teaching a satisfactory account of the way society is presently working.

²³ So for that reason, I think it would be worthwhile to supplement a program such as the youth venture capital program, with other programs, perhaps in the school system, to allow people to understand that, in most cases, they might have to be employees. They may have to learn what it is like to bargain collectively. The majority of the workers in the territory are union people. What is taught about unions other than derogatory slang.

The Minister of Justice has something to say. I want him to put it on the record. The Minister of Justice suggests that I check my figures. The majority of working people in this territory, who have jobs, are unionized. The majority of the people who work for this government are unionized. Most of the people working in the mining industry, including the placer mining industry, are unionized. For the eloquent member for Hootalinqua, who suggested that —

Mr. Chairman: Are we talking on unions or on education? I think we are getting a little far off on unions. The unions and the school part is fine, but now we are getting into unions and placer mining, and that has nothing to do with education.

Mr. McDonald: On that point, I am trying to suggest a reason why it may be justified to teach about unions, and I am trying to suggest that perhaps, because unions form such a major part of our society and which are, in my opinion, an essential part of our society, might be worthwhile to teach people what the value of unions has been and how people can function responsibly in a union environment.

²⁴ That is the only point I was making. I do not think I have to justify it to the incredibly articulate members on the other side who are kibitzing. The last point I would like to make is that the minister suggested that these people are going to be taught to use their brains to use their skills, suggesting perhaps that anybody who is not an entrepreneur or a strong believer in free enterprise does not use brains and does not have skills. Well, that is a fallacy; that will not wash. Let us hope, for the minister's sake, that does not get into the Yukon society and does not get made public, because it may suggest that people who are not fortunate enough to own their own businesses and be their own bosses do not have brains or do not have skills. That is not the case. That is all I have to say.

There is one question I would like to put to the minister regarding the terms of this program. The minister said today, first of all, that they have identified \$9,000 and that they would be prepared to provide loans to a maximum of \$2,000, and these would be interest-free for an applicant for a specified time and the maximum was six months. What policy decision led to the decision that the repayment time would be a minimum of six months, because, as I said before, the report from British Columbia suggested that people were not entering this program because they felt that the repayment time was far too short.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: If there is a wrong way to interpret something and if there is a negative way to interpret it and if there is a defeatist way to interpret it, the guy from Mayo is going to do it, let me tell you.

Even in the streets of Peking, free enterprise is allowed and encouraged to flourish. Even in Peking, or farmers markets. The world is encouraging free enterprise. You guys had better get caught up with the times; get with it.

Good grief! I just do not understand. Some days, the members come in here and they talk to me about education and they get on this big emotional debate about how children are individuals and have to be treated as such; then they come in and we start talking

about something like encouraging an entrepreneurial spirit in young people, giving them an opportunity. There are plenty of opportunities for them to learn to be employees, and I have just cited two of them that government has contributed a tremendous amount of money to, in comparison to the \$9,000 that we have identified here.

They clump all the kids together and say that they are all going to be employees anyway, that there are very few who can be employers. Well, this government is going to encourage those few; we are going to encourage all those kids, all those young people, to have an opportunity to learn about the private sector and private enterprise and free enterprise. Hopefully, they will be able to develop an attitude in their minds of what they want to be: whether they want to be a boss or an employee.

25 The member for Mayo talks about learning skills. Business management techniques apply both to employees and employers and if one has been the other before, they are doubly advantaged with skills. The experience that people would receive as an employer would be of a tremendous advantage to them, in the event that they were an employee, and vice versa.

Part of education and part of educating young people is to expose them to different aspects and different ways of living. I would submit to the members opposite that they get plenty of exposure to the fact that they will one day be an employee; they get plenty of exposure to union mentalities and union attitudes.

This government is going to encourage that, and hopefully we will be able to stimulate and motivate some young people who want to take that chance to see if they have the ability to be an employer. I appreciate that not everyone is going to be one, but that does not mean that we do not encourage anybody to be one, or that we encourage everyone to be employees.

The member is absolutely wrong when he talks about the program. We are not lending \$2,000 interest-free to these young people; they have to go to the bank and they have to arrange for that loan at the bank. We are paying the interest, and only the interest.

From the investigation that we have done, the province that we compared our program to wrote off a very small percentage of the interest, a very small percentage, which would indicate to me that these young people are very successful. This government is going to encourage that and God forbid the day that these people in opposition would ever form a government and encourage all young people to be employees.

Mr. McDonald: My blood pressure is rising here, because I think the minister is being absolutely ridiculous. We have not said — pardon me for shouting — once that this program should be scrapped. That has never been said. What we have first been doing is challenging the minister's suggestion that the only value to teach in society is to teach people how to be bosses and employers, when we know, as a matter of fact, that everybody cannot be bosses and employers.

If we want to be dream merchants, strictly dream merchants, without providing any sort of other backup, then we should be encouraging people to be more than just employers and bosses, we should encourage them to MLAs or the prime minister of Canada. I mean, why burst that dream balloon?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Why not?

Mr. McDonald: We should direct money into that dream balloon, too. The minister likes the idea of a prime minister course.

The point we are making is that this is one avenue in society that people should consider following. They should consider looking at borrowing money. I mean, it does suggest that people are going to be living beyond their means and that is something, certainly, governments are not expected to do.

25 It is encouraging people to borrow money and to try to determine a project that will make enough money to allow them to pay the money back and maybe make some bucks to pay their way through school, or whatever. This is supposed to be a program, I assume, to teach people how to exercise a little bit of free enterprise, as individuals, and make a go of it. There is nothing wrong with that program. What I am talking about is supplementing a program such as that to make other people understand that they are going to have to be motivated within an employment relationship as employees.

Now, the diatribe by the minister about how we hate to promote

this kind of free enterprise and how we want to scrap this program is a figment of her own incredible imagination. She made some remarks about people having plenty of exposure to the union mentality and union attitudes and if she would mind expanding upon that, I would be interested in her remarks. I would like to hear exactly what she feels about teaching in the schools about the union mentality and union attitudes. That could certainly encourage an extension of the debate this evening.

I would like to go back to the one point I was making before, about the maximum time to repay these interest free loans. The minister said yesterday that it would be six months. The reports that I have received are that six months are not enough. I am asking, once again, what led to that decision to make it a six-month repayment time? My understanding is, to reiterate once again, that that is one reason why students, or people in British Columbia, for example, are not flocking to the program. They are not even using the money that they have in their program to the fullest extent possible because of that reason. That reason has been cited as one of the reasons why people are not flocking to the program. I am wondering why the minister has chosen six months?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I believe it is approximately seven months. One of the reasons why we identified a very small amount of money was because we are starting the program for the first time. We are starting it on an experimental basis. It is a brand new initiative. We are just hoping that the program will be successful and next year we will be having to ask for more money.

I have a message from my colleagues to pass on about the prime minister program. They seem to be quite interested in us having a course for prime ministers, however, they are indicating to me that NDPers would not be allowed to enter that program because it was an identifiable waste of time. However, if you change to the Liberal party, then your chances, of course, go up.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Firth, would you get back to the subject please.

25 **Mr. McDonald:** The minister's remarks about the prime ministers program and the eligibility of NDP members to join is obviously a frivolous suggestion and quite a fantastic one, as a matter of fact, because I would think that apparently the prime minister who has been in office for some considerable time most recently, and currently was in office, was, in fact, an NDP member. So there would be some who suggest that the NDP has had more than its share of prime ministers.

The minister said that the program now has a repayment time of seven months; I have in *Hansard*, here, six months, from yesterday. Perhaps she would like to correct *Hansard*, because there is obviously a discrepancy here. I do not think it is a significant one in any case. She said that this program is being conducted on a first-time experimental basis and yet we are told, at the same time, that we have experience from other provinces and that other provinces have initiated this program and think it is just great, yet at the same time we hear from their experience that the six month or seven month repayment time is not going to be sufficient. So there has to have been some policy decision or some reason why they chose the seven months, because there are indications the seven months is not enough time to repay \$2,000. I am wondering why the seven months?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will bring for the member tomorrow a copy of the guidelines, because it specifies exactly the time limits in it, and he seems to perform very well when he is sent a memo and he has it in writing. I will provide that tomorrow.

Mr. McDonald: That is going to provide for us whether it is six or seven months for the repayment time. I will accept the minister's word whether it is six or seven months. That is not significant. As I said, that is a trivial aspect of this. I am asking, though: why six or seven months? Why, when we hear that in BC some children are not going to the program or some people are not going to the program because they feel the repayment time is so short, did we choose six or seven months?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have already said that we have not heard that. We have heard that the program was responded to very favourably and we have not heard those negative comments about the program. We wish to provide that program for our young people

here in Yukon, and we made the decision as a government that we were going to provide that program. We have discussed it with the Chamber. They also think the program is very good. They feel the time is adequate, the banks feel the time is adequate, the member from Mayo does not. Well, he obviously has a different opinion than some other individuals, who may not be as qualified as he is to express opinions.

Mr. McDonald: I am perfectly willing to accept that; however, there are others in British Columbia who feel the six or seven month time limit is not enough.

It was not at all a negative suggestion; it is a positive suggestion to encourage people to use the program fully, because there are suggestions that it is not being used fully in BC.

The minister tells me that the Chamber of Commerce and the banks like it. She still has not told me why they like it or why they like the six-month period or why the government likes the six-month period. Obviously, I am not going to get that answer because, probably, the minister does not know.

Mr. Byblow: I have just a brief question or two on the program my colleague was debating the last few moments.

What statistics does the minister have about the success and use of the program in Ontario and BC? Is there any general success rate for the program in use there? Was it utilized and successfully utilized for 50 percent of its use? How many dollars may have been spent in either of those provinces? I realize that is rather technical, but if the minister has some background as to the success that she cites about the program in other jurisdictions, I would like to hear it.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not have those statistics here with me. You know, you talk about knee-jerk reactions and I always have to think of how the opposition always gives us a bad time, as government, about knee-jerk reactions.

It is quite incredible. Here we bring in a small \$9,000 program into adult education to encourage Yukon people to further expand their knowledge and develop their skills. We have programs in these departments for hundreds of thousands of dollars, on which there seems to be no concern; except for this \$9,000 program. For some reason, the opposition finds very much objection to it.

Mr. Byblow: The minister seems to be inviting further debate and I do not think that the minister is fair in saying that this side has found some objection to the program. This side has found reason to ask questions about the program and the minister does not seem to know anything about it. That is not our problem; it would appear to be the minister's problem.

My colleague has made the case quite clear that, in his opinion, supported by his colleagues, maybe the minister ought to be considering a parallel program for the opposite point of view. I suggest to the minister that what we are dealing with here is an attitudinal question, a question about a philosophy, a question about an approach to our young people, provided by the government.

That raises a number of questions. It is not a case of condemning it. It is not a case of calling for it to be scrapped. It is not a case of anyone on this side suggesting that it is a bad program. I submit it is a good one; I would like to see it encouraged. I might even suggest some programs or some projects that some students might be able to take part in.

I might even be able to contribute some business principles that they should observe, or could observe, in the successful management of the project. If the minister does not know anything more about the program, then we do not have any more questions. My colleague from Whitehorse South Centre does have a question, however. I will cede the floor to him.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yesterday in the House I listed the complete guidelines of this program. I had a whole page and they can refer to *Hansard*. Everything is indicated in there as to how the program is going to operate. They can read that and they will find out. I have already indicated I will provide them, as I have always done in the past, with copies of what the program guidelines are. I have always sent them personalized letters as MLAs so that they can inform their constituents as to what the program guidelines are for any new programs that we establish within this government.

The criticism from the member for Faro, that we establish a

parallel program to present the other point of view, is absolute rubbish. He is not listening to what I am saying. I have already indicated that we have two programs in which we have identified hundreds of thousands of dollars, as opposed to \$9,000 for the student employment program and the student employment assistance program, where students work as employees, not employers. I hardly think that that is fair criticism.

Mr. Kimmerly: I simply would like to put on record that I support the youth venture capital program. Other members have previously said that and I am glad the minister recognizes that.

Mr. McDonald: For the record I would like to again express our support for this program. We suggested that there should be alternatives in the school system to teach people about what the minister would like to call the union mentality, for one example. I think we conclusively proved that the minister does not. I may be able to read the guidelines from the public document that she was reading from yesterday; however, we are asking about more than just guidelines. We were asking about the parallel experience in other provinces. We were asking about policy reasons to explain why certain guidelines exist. If the minister does not know, that is fair enough.

To what extent is the provision of agricultural programs going to be implemented into Yukon College? There has been consideration given to such programs. There have been promises made by the Minister of Agriculture, for one, and by the Minister of Education herself, for another, to suggest that we should expect some sort of agricultural programs implemented by Yukon College.

I am wondering if the minister could give us any indication as to whether or not the programs will be instituted in the near future, and what kind of programs they will be and what the terms of reference of the programs will be?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We do not have any programs identified in this O&M budget. I have listed the new programs that are going to be provided in Yukon College this year and we do not have any agricultural ones. I am still discussing with my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, what kind of programs they may be considering from within the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs, now that they have an individual who is responsible for agriculture. The department has made some enquiries, I believe, in Alaska and we will continue to pursue those and we will keep the member from Mayo updated.

Mr. McDonald: I would urge the minister not in fact to consult with the Minister of Agriculture but perhaps to take these decisions unilaterally; we might get some greater action.

It is slightly unfortunate that the programs will not be implemented in the near future. I know that there is a need for such programs. We certainly see, from the attendance at agricultural seminars, which are only one-day think-tanks, that there is a demand for such courses. I would like to expand upon this but I think it would be more appropriate to expand upon it when I discuss at length the agricultural program in Yukon, when we get into municipal and community affairs estimates.

I have one other brief question that also has to do with Yukon College, and it has to do with the provision of an industrial first aid course for Yukon. There has been some desire to have such a course implemented. I am wondering if the minister could explain to what extent they offer industrial first aid and whether or not they are prepared to expand it. I do know there is a need for it. There is a crying need for it, certainly, in the mining communities; one that could be taught locally at little expense to employer and employee.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We do not teach industrial first aid at Yukon College. It is the responsibility of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs through occupational health and safety, so the question can be directed to that minister during those debates.

As for agricultural courses or programs, I am an active member of the Livestock and Agricultural Association and I will be approaching them about some programs. We would not be proceeding in Yukon College with any programs without consulting the Minister of Agriculture and finding out if that was the general direction that they were moving in in that area. We will be doing that consultation shortly and, hopefully, will be able to establish some programs, if that is the desire of Yukoners and they display an

interest in such a program.

Mr. McDonald: There is some good news in what the minister said and there is some bad news. The bad news is that she insists on consulting with the minister responsible for agriculture. The good news is that, if there is demonstrated need in Yukon, then we will be entertaining programs at Yukon College.

I would certainly hope that the minister does, in fact, consult with the Yukon Livestock and Agriculture Association, as they are quite enthusiastic about the proposal. I am sure they have ideas of their own, as does, I am sure, the agronomist on staff, as to what would be worthwhile courses for the agricultural community.

I have nothing much more to add. I was not aware, at all, that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs conducted industrial first aid courses; this is a revelation to me. Perhaps the minister would briefly like to enter discussions and inform me as to the status of those courses?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, we do not put on an industrial first aid course. The only first aid courses that are put on are put on by municipal and community affairs, as it is responsible for the ambulance services; it has St. John Ambulance courses.

We do not put on industrial first aid courses; however, if it is felt that that is necessary in the territory, we would be certainly prepared to talk to the Department of Education about putting one on.

Mr. McDonald: That is encouraging.

The industrial first aid course, of course, is a course that is some months long; it is rather an in-depth course and is meant to train people to be, essentially, paramedics in an industrial setting and to train them to respond to industrial emergencies and industrial accidents, which, in many cases, people with nursing degrees cannot respond to.

It is a specialized course, definitely, but there is a need for it in Yukon. I am sure the ministers can verify that fact by talking to the mining community. Perhaps Yukon College, if it has the resources and the facilities, could consider putting that on in the future.

Mr. Chairman: Does that end general debate, then?

Mr. Byblow: I was not intending to raise another subject, tonight, because the next subject that I have could take some lengthy debate: it is on the French language. By way of notice, if the minister wants to adjourn and report progress on the bill, I would be quite happy to introduce that subject tomorrow.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I would like to report progress on Bill No. 12.

Motion agreed to

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Mr. Brewster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move 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 9:27 p.m.

