



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 33

4th Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, May 16, 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 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 16, 1984 - 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed with the Order Paper.
 Are there any returns or documents for tabling?
 Reports of committees?
 Petitions?
 Introduction of bills?
 Notices of motion for the production of papers?
 Notices of motion?
 Are there any statements by ministers?
 Oral questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Opposition challenge to touch football game

Mr. Penikett: Since this is National Physical Activity Week and today, Wednesday, May 16th, is Participation Day, I would like to ask the government leader if his side of the House is willing to accept a challenge, from this side of the House, to a touch football game, tomorrow noon, in Rotary Park?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: As I reported this morning, I jogged my 20 minutes this morning and reported it. I hope all members opposite have reported their participation today, as well.

I must say that the Minister of Education objects to any suggestion that she is going to play touch football or anything else, with the members opposite.

Mr. Penikett: Of course, in challenges of this kind, it is customary for the challenged to choose the weapons. I take it that the government leader is appointing the Minister of Education as captain of his team for this purpose. Can I just ask him if he would accept this advice, or if it is agreeable to him, if we name the former linebacker from the Queen's Golden Gales, the member for Mayo, as our captain for the purposes of working out this challenge.

Question re: Highschool streaming program

Mr. Byblow: I have a question of a more academic nature. This is to the Minister of Education. I previously raised with the minister the question of whether or not the Department of Education here in Yukon is going to be following the lead of BC and institute a high school streaming program with revised graduation requirements.

Has the Department of Education yet decided whether it will be following the BC curriculum changes intended in that jurisdiction for the next academic year?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No, we will not. We just received the white paper a week or two ago. The department is still reviewing that paper.

Mr. Byblow: Does the minister know at this time whether our current credit requirements for graduation will meet the university entrance requirements in BC, if BC goes ahead with its program this fall?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not know, personally. However, I am sure the officials who are reviewing the white paper are going to be, or have been, in consultation with the BC educational officials to see where we may have any shortfalls.

Mr. Byblow: Further to the general subject, can the minister advise whether or not there is any legislative authority in place that requires us to follow a BC curriculum and BC credit requirement for graduation?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No, I do not believe there is.

Question re: Old Crow Co-op fuel delivery

Mr. Porter: I have a question for the government leader.
 The government leader has committed his government to assist the

Old Crow Co-op in its efforts to solve the fuel delivery issue; however, it has not made any commitments to the large question of a freight subsidy program. Has the government leader initiated any discussions with the federal Government of Canada toward the establishment of a trade subsidy program for the community of Old Crow?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, as a matter of fact, I am experiencing great difficulty contacting the minister in respect to the immediate problem of the gas supply in Old Crow. We have been successful in arranging, with the departmental people in Indian Affairs and Northern Development, for the moving of the tanks and the creation of a tank farm; that work is now underway. We anticipate that the tanks will be in place and be prepared for gasoline by the time the Hercules flights start.

The major problem, now, is to identify the approximate \$100,000 of funding that is going to be required in order to purchase the fuel. I have, this morning, sent a letter to the minister, by means of telex because I have not been able to contact him, personally, on the phone, advising him of the situation and asking that the department immediately consider setting up a revolving fund so that Old Crow would be able to buy this gas.

Mr. Porter: The House appreciates the attention the government leader has paid to the issue. We are afraid that it is going to be short term and not long term. The issue of freight subsidies for rural remote communities was an issue identified during the food prices inquiry. Has the Yukon government taken any action on the recommendations with respect to rural and remote communities that were initiated at the food prices inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, we have been involved, primarily, with the issues as they have arisen. They normally are crisis issues. The last one that I can recall was with Old Crow, once again, in respect to the changing of the postal service and the possibility of the elimination of airline flights in and out of Old Crow. We were successful — along with the help of the federal government, I must say — in having Canada Post change their mind about what they were going to do at that time.

We have not addressed directly, though, the recommendations of the study in respect to subsidies to outlying communities.

Mr. Porter: Is it the position of this government that a freight subsidy program for rural and remote communities is desirable in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know. At the present time, I would have to say — the member has asked; is it the position of this government — it may be desirable, but I do not know if it is practical, nor do I know what kind of costs we would be talking about. We have determined that it would be desirable to try and equalize the cost of energy, electricity for instance, throughout the territory. We are working on that.

Some years ago, it was decided that the costs of liquor should be equalized throughout the territory. That was done, not by this government but by a previous one. Slowly, I think these things are, no doubt about it, desirable. Whether they are practical or not is another question.

Mr. Porter:

Question re: Local manufacture of licence plate decals

Mr. Byblow: I have a question that was brought to my attention from the highways debate last night, and I direct it to the minister responsible.

It is my understanding that, currently, this government uses a Saskatchewan firm to provide the license plates used by vehicles in the territory and a Vancouver firm to supply the renewal decals for those plates. Since the government has announced its intention to provide new plates for next year, has any consideration been given to manufacturing these plates locally, as an economic and job incentive?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, because, if we were to consider manufacturing plates locally, the cost of providing those plates would be prohibitive to us. We can buy those plates for a fairly small sum by purchasing them from an organization that manufactures them by the 1,000's. If we were to get into that business in the Yukon Territory, we would not be able to produce them or we would have to raise the license fee to \$10, probably, just to cover

the cost of producing the plates.

Mr. Byblow: I trust that the minister has done some cost analysis of this.

It is also my understanding, in recollection, that, several years ago, the rehab centre, in fact, manufactured license plates that were used in the territory. I would like to ask the minister why that was discontinued and why, as a result, we have to go outside of the territory for what appears could be produced here?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, we have never had our license plates manufactured in the territory.

Mr. Byblow: That comes as news to me and I will certainly have to check it.

On the subject, can the minister provide any information as to the increased cost that was borne by this government, as a result of the personalized license plate policy that was put in place this past year?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It does not cost us any more to have that plate produced. The additional cost to us is the bookkeeping, because it all has to be done manually, where the other licence plates are computerized. If you are asking me what the price of a plate is going to be to the public, that decision has not been made yet. I have to take the paper to Cabinet and we have to set a price on it.

MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 2

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Member for Whitehorse South Centre prepared to proceed with this?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Whitehorse South Centre that an order of the Assembly do issue for a copy of each travel claim submitted by each Cabinet minister during the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Mr. Kimmerly: I can be fairly brief in simply explaining the background to this motion and the reason for it. Members will be aware that I asked the same question, or I asked for the same information, in a written question last month in this very session and a legislative return was supplied by the government leader that simply said it is not the policy of the government to release this information. It was that answer that prompted me to put this motion for production of papers on the Order Paper. It seems to me that it is a fairly clear and simple issue and I will just explain briefly why it is a good idea to provide the claims.

Travel claims by politicians of all kinds and all levels and pay and indemnities to politicians are clearly matters of public interest. They attract media attention and the media and the population in general are interested in the information. It is clearly a matter of some importance to the people who are our bosses, so to speak — the people who elect us and the people whom it is our duty to serve. It is clear in my mind that the overwhelming public opinion would be that this information should be made public and would be of interest to the population in general.

Secondly, there is an argument that most people accept almost instinctively, i.e. basically, as follows: that if something is hidden or if something is kept from them, people are suspicious as to what it is. They wonder about the possibility of wrongdoing — or not even necessarily wrongdoing — but in things that were done that they or the majority of the population would not agree with. If it is open and if it is inspected by the public in general, or representatives of the public who can be the opposition members in the Assembly or the media, then there is an almost instinctive reaction that nobody has anything to hide and the public is not generally suspicious of it.

That, in itself, is a fairly compelling argument to make these documents available to the public.

I have not studied carefully whether or not these documents are available through the *Freedom of Information Act*, although surely they should be available in this form regardless of the provisions of that act. This is an easier method to achieve their disclosure.

Another argument of some merit is that people universally accept that if somebody — regardless of who it is, regardless of his status in life, or his power or influence — everybody should be accountable for the monies that are entrusted to him by the public and are spent by him for the public good. It is a clear policy in all businesses that ultimately the travel claims of employees are supervised and audited. Ultimately, the directors of the corporation are responsible to see that everything is not only proper, but that the owners of the business, being individual owners or public shareholders, are satisfied that the accounts are dealt with in accordance with policies that they agree with.

In this case, ministers of the Crown are clearly accountable. Ultimately, the government leader is accountable in this area as it is clearly in the regulations under the *Financial Administration Act* that travel by ministers must be authorized by the government leader. Clearly the ministers are responsible for travel claims and travel accounts in their departments and ultimately the government leader is politically responsible to the territory to show that nothing is suspicious or hidden, or below board as opposed to above board.

Perhaps even more importantly, the taxpayers and citizens of the Yukon should agree with the way money is being spent, because it is their money that is dealt with by us here in a trust capacity. It will therefore, I am sure, be an easy matter for politically accountable ministers and the government to vote for this motion and to ensure that suspicions are not aroused in the public and that suspicions are not justified; and that the public has access to this information that is has a right to know.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We, on this side of the House, will be voting against this motion for the production of papers, mainly because there are a number of precedents for doing so. I have said, in this House, before, and I will continue to say it, that it is the policy of this government and every other government that travel expense claims are not tabled in the legislature; they are not public documents, nor will they ever be public documents.

I should point out that these travel expense claims for ministers, like all other travel expense claims, are audited by the Auditor-General of Canada, along with everybody else's. We are not trying to hide anything; it is simply a matter of policy and one that is very, very rigid in its control, and has been for years and years and years.

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

Mr. Kimmerly: That is unfortunate. The only argument put up in defense, it appears, is that it is policy and it is precedent. That certainly does not hold any water with me and it will not with the Yukon public, I am absolutely sure.

The next step, I suppose, is to file an application under the freedom of information legislation. In looking at the exceptions there, these documents do not appear to be covered and the information should be available, under the freedom of information legislation.

It is unfortunate that it is necessary to chase down this kind of information in this way. It would be very simple to disclose the information, unless, of course, there is something to hide or something intensely, politically embarrassing. Frankly, I see no other reason to deny the information, except that it might be politically embarrassing.

A responsible government and an open government discloses information to the public or the representatives of the public. I am sure that Yukoners will agree with me and I am sure that suspicions, in fact, will be aroused by the decision of the government to deny this simple request on such a flimsy reason, merely that it is precedent.

I am absolutely sure that the general feeling in the territory is that the way to ensure political accountability, in ministers of the Yukon government, is to expose what they do to the public, so the public can make up its own mind whether it agrees or disagrees with any actions of the government.

The government leader is now denying that possibility. It is anti-democratic and it is most unfortunate and it will not, in any way, end this particular quest or this debate.

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 2 defeated

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

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 21

Ms Clerk Assistant: Item No. 1, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item No. 1?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that this House urges the government to designate those areas in which the public is directly served by the Government of Yukon as being non-smoking areas.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is, again, a simple motion. It can be easily understood. It will be supported by all members; at least those members who do not smoke.

The intent is not to deny people who do smoke the opportunity to smoke. The intention is not to make the lives of the public servants who smoke uncomfortable. The intention is to allow citizens who, of necessity, have dealings with the government from time to time, to go to information desks or the license bureau and registration desks at the Yukon government and to do their business in an atmosphere that is not polluted by secondhand smoke.

The smoking of other people does annoy and, in some cases, interfere with the health of other people. It should be recognized that when citizens do business with the government, as we require them to do, concerning such things as purchasing licenses, paying medicare, and the like, that they be entitled to do their business at a government desk free of a polluted atmosphere from secondhand smoke.

It is a modest measure. It would promote health; it would promote the comfort of especially non-smokers; and it would be an excellent expression of political will, and political policy that we are not about to make the lives of smokers very difficult. We are not going to allow them to annoy and interfere with the clean air of those who are doing business with the government. This is a simple motion. It is a modest measure. I would urge all members to support it.

11

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Why me?

All these simple motions that we have to deal with really are not simple motions. We only have non-smokers in the House, at the present time, too.

First, I would like to thank the member for Whitehorse South Centre for raising this issue. Actually, I am a little more than surprised that it has been brought forward as a motion to this House.

As the member opposite knows, the government sets policy and this is a policy measure that we are discussing. I believe this is one issue that would be very difficult to deal with as a blanket policy. I believe that this issue is better addressed by departmental policy. For example, in the Department of Health and Human Resources, receptionists dealing with the public do not smoke while carrying out their respective responsibilities.

Further to this, there are times when dealing with the public that it could be advantageous to permit smoking in direct service areas, such as when providing counselling to an alcohol abuser. It would seem more than a little cruel to me to insist that, while being counselled on alcoholism, that he should butt his cigarette, at the same time; it would be sort of like removing both crutches at once and I am not totally in favour of that.

It would also seem that this proposed motion would affect more than just government personnel and that a great deal more thought would need to go into any policy that potentially affected so many people. For that reason, I am sorry, but this side will not be supporting this motion, although I would like to pass around my ministerial commendation for quitting.

Mr. Penikett: I was very pleased to hear the Minister of Health

and Human Resources thank my colleague for presenting this motion. I had a moment or two, in the last couple of days, when I would have thanked him even more for not presenting it.

This, I should emphasize, is not a party issue and I want the government leader and the members opposite to understand that. For that reason, I would urge upon the government leader the wisdom of allowing for a free vote on this issue. I, of course, have a personal interest in "smoking" out the polluters on this question. My opposition is clear, there are "butts" about it and I definitely do not want to leave anybody "fuming", in this place, after this debate is over.

However, I think the usefulness of a free vote on this measure would be a good precedent. I think it is obviously recommended and I think it is atmospherically sound. I think, also, if the government leader would join me in supporting this idea for a free vote, it would establish a useful precedent for both our sakes, in encouraging private members to bring motions to the House that they might want to discuss, but which all members, on either side of the House, whatever their party persuasion, might not feel obliged as an act of solidarity to join.

It would allow them to vote their consciences and vote their wishes and vote their hearts and minds on these issues and the House could express itself, if you like, democratically and freely but without partisan blinkers, without partisan blinders. If there is a smoker's majority on one side or the other, they would not necessarily reign but nor would the wishes of the sort of clean living, non-smoking fraction impose itself either; we would simply have the members vote as they wish. Therefore, I am encouraging members on my side to hold a free vote on this side and I would hope the government leader would encourage his troops to do the same.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think the suggestion is a valid one, but we do have one major problem. We are responsible for the administration of the government on this side and we are talking about the effect this might have upon an awful lot of employees who work for this government. As the Minister of Health has said, we do appreciate the issue being raised. We appreciate it being raised here. I am sure that, if we had a free vote, in fact the motion would pass and then I am also confident it would be misinterpreted by an awful lot of employees in this government, because it would not be recognized that this simply is an urging of the House to the government but, rather, it probably would be interpreted as being a decree from this House to the employees, and I think that would be bad. I would like to have the Minister of Health have the opportunity to deal with the employee associations on this matter so that we can in fact set realistic policies along these lines.

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

Mr. Kimmerly: The debate has taken a very, very interesting turn, I think. We have an invitation to a free vote and a statement by the government leader, which I believe to be accurate — or my judgment is the same as his — that if there were a free vote it would pass: seven to one on that side, four to two on this side, probably. I am sorry that a free vote will not occur. It is incumbent upon me, I think, as the mover of the motion to address the arguments raised against it, and I will do that, but before I do so I would like to say that I am very encouraged by the open attitude of the Minister of Health and the government leader towards the question and I am encouraged by the information that it will be discussed with the government employees; and, further — perhaps by the time of the next motion — there might be a development in this area.

The Minister of Health talked about the undesirability of not allowing smoking in a counselling session and I would respond to that argument by saying this: it is not the intent of the motion to stop that. It is my opinion that counselling that occurs in a private setting, probably in a counselling room or certainly in a confidential setting, is not in a public area.

It is "a private encounter with a public official" and it is not the intent of the motion at all to restrict smoking in a counselling office or in a counselling session. It is my opinion that the wording of the

motion does not call for that.

The minister stated that it would be difficult to establish an overall government policy and it would be better to establish a departmental policy. I do not wholly accept that, but there is merit in considering the individual situations. For example, a government liquor store may be an area where the law should be the same as the law in other stores in the community in order to avoid confusion with the public. That is an argument with some merit. I do not accept it personally, but I can see it is certainly arguable. In a garage, the situation should be governed by safety factors, as it is in airports. That is a particular situational consideration.

It may be an area where more thought is required. I have absolutely no problem with working on the wording of a new motion to make it absolutely clear what is meant. The intent of my motion is that in areas generally thought of as public areas — that is, the counter where you buy your license or pay health insurance in a government office or a government occupied office — should be non-smoking. The non-smoking rule should apply to everybody there including the receptionist or cashier and the other citizens on the other side of the counter. There should be no smoke in that area. That policy, it appears, is supported by the majority of members here. It is only a matter of finding a way to put it into proper directional policy so it becomes part of the government policy in the future. I will look forward to that development over the next month or so.

11 *Motion No. 21 defeated*

MOTIONS RESPECTING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to motions respecting committee reports.

Motion No. 20

Ms Clerk Assistant: Item No. 1, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

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

Mr. Penikett: Yes, I am.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition THAT the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented to the House on May 3rd, 1984, be concurred in.

Mr. Penikett: It is a pleasure for me to lead off on this debate of the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. I will briefly summarize our activities in the past year and our recommendations and listen with interest to the contributions of other members of the committee and the ministers who will respond.

As the preface to our report indicates, the committee had 11 meetings in this past year. We held formal hearings from February 7th to 16th, during which time we heard from officials of the Public Service Commission, the Workers' Compensation Board and the Department of Economic Development, to account for their administration during the year under review. As well, witnesses were called from the Departments of Municipal and Community Affairs, Finance, Justice, Government Services and Health and Human Resources, as well as the Yukon Housing Corporation, to discuss the implementation of recommendations that had been made in previous years, as well as to discuss the Auditor-General's letter, or his report on "any other matter".

We spent, in committee, this year, considerable time on the outstanding issue of capital project management. During that time, the committee became concerned with the question of the authorship of the government's response in the report to the Auditor-General, with regard to the 1983 recommendations of the committee. That is something about which other members of the committee will, no doubt, have something to say, but which I hope the committee does not have reason to express itself, again, in years in the future.

Another issue for us was the question of developing some elementary measures of productivity for some of the departments, so that the spending requests that are brought to the House in the estimates can be justified.

The committee, in a complimentary note, is pleased to comment on the improvement in the estimates' material, the material that is now in the estimates' book, which we think, on the whole, makes it a much more relevant and informative document.

In passing, I think the committee would want me to publicly thank Raymond Dubois, the Auditor-General for Canada; Harold Hayes, principal of the Office of the Auditor-General; as well as the clerk of our committee, Missy Follwell, who performed such Trojan service.

12 We had a precedent this year in that Mr. Dubois, for the first time, appeared with a committee not only as an expert advisor, but also made a presentation to us as a witness in respect to capital project management criteria.

As all members will know, we have established or evolved a tradition in this Committee of consensual decision-making. It is not our habit to come to a conclusion on difficult questions by the means of votes. It has been our tendency to talk out delicate issues until some kind of agreement has been reached. I think we have all found that the most useful and productive process for us. I should mention that in this year's hearings, the member for Mayo substituted for the member for Faro and even though he was new to the Committee, I think all members felt he did an admirable job.

As I mentioned before, we did a major review of the Public Service Commission, Workers' Compensation Board, and the Department of Economic Development Branch. We did extensive follow-up on six other departments.

As I also mentioned, in commenting on the quality and accuracy of information in some documents, we were a little concerned with an apparent lack of communication between the central agency, in this case finance, which is responsible for many of the documents we see and the Auditor-General receives. It at least has the last word in this respect, and other departments, line departments, who are preparing the first draft of information which appears in public documents that are to be examined by the Committee.

As I believe all members know, the major issue this year evolved from recommendations in the 1983 report. They concern management procedures and accountability. We are pleased to note that since our hearings, procedures have now been prepared or are in the process of being approved. The Committee looks forward to following up next year on the implementation and effectiveness of these measures.

If I could, I would very briefly — not read, but — touch upon the subject matter of the recommendations that we make this year. These recommendations are 13 in number and they include four recommendations that are directed to the Public Service Commission. These deal with the questions of delegated authority procedures, casual appointments, activity performance indicators, and training and development program costs.

13 We also have four recommendations for the Workers' Compensation Board, and these deal with the classes and assessment rates, transfer of the Occupational Health and Safety Officer, performance measurement system, and doubtful accounts and write-offs. For the Department of Economic Development, we have three recommendations and these involve the management of human resources, activity performance indicators and a matter of accuracy of information. For Government Services, we have a recommendation that arises from the 1983 recommendation, which is that the department should submit its project management policies and procedures to the Auditor-General for review and comment once they have been approved by management board. That is the issue I had mentioned earlier on in my remarks.

The last of our recommendations concerns Municipal and Community Affairs. It, too, arises from a 1983 recommendation and is, if you like, a companion recommendation to the one made for Government Services about project management processes. Our recommendation here is that the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs should determine the applicability of the project management processes developed by the Department of Government Services to projects undertaken by the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs, and follow them as far as possible.

I will conclude on that note. One could talk at great length about

some of the issues we deal with and some of the evidence we heard this year, but I think that is not necessary.

As usual, our report contains a transcript of all the hearings; a number of important relevant documents are appended into the report and they are there for anybody to see who wishes to look. As well, since there is in a sense — we discovered this in committee — nothing new under the sun — many of these issues recur in time and we deal with them year after year — I think it is still important for me to conclude on a positive note. I believe we have seen significant improvement in the management systems and the administration of this government in the years the committee has existed. The committee, of course, does not claim any special measure of credit for these improved administrative practices but all members of the committee do like to feel that they have a positive role to play in these improvement.

Mr. Brewster: The Public Accounts Committee has once again tabled a report that makes recommendations to improve the accountability and efficiency of the Yukon government. These recommendations have been presented for the betterment of the Yukon government and the people of the Yukon. I would like to comment on the Public Accounts Committee's observation of the Public Service Commission. The policies and procedures of this department have a profound effect on the destiny of many Yukoners, young and old alike. This is especially true in our small communities where seasonal employment with the government is a major source of income to local residents.

It is encouraging to hear that the Public Service Commission is looking more seriously at the practice of local hire. It has been argued that a local hire policy is unconstitutional. Those arguments are not well-founded. The Government of the Northwest Territories has gone as far as presenting a discussion paper on affirmative action plans for native hiring. They propose that hiring preference be given to native candidates in all public service competitions. They also state that the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and the *Human Rights Act* allow for this type of program.

When I refer to native Yukoners, I mean someone who is born or raised in the Yukon. The color of a person's skin has little to do with it. Webster's Dictionary defines "native" as a person belonging to a locality by birth or origin. I feel very strongly that the government must support a local hire policy in every way possible. We must look at the practice and give it more attention. It was a policy that was good for the Yukon 20 years ago, it is good for the Yukon today. Although we all realize that the Public Service Commission operates with the merit principles that predominate criteria for candidate selection, is it not more accountable to the people of Yukon when local preference is practised where possible. It does not make sense to bring a person into a community for a job when there are qualified people within that community who are ready, willing and able to do the job.

Another area that was of interest to the Public Accounts Committee was the way in which the Public Service Commission delegates the hiring responsibilities for casual employees to the various departments. The initiative in itself has merit. The Public Service Commission cannot divorce itself of all responsibility for casual employees. By looking at the number of casual employees who remain on the payroll past the maximum six month period, it is obvious that a better system of monitoring casual employees is in order. The Public Service Commission is accountable for this function.

The Committee has reviewed the recommendations of the 1982 Public Accounts Committee report and are encouraged to see how the government has responded to these recommendations. It is very gratifying to have eight of the 13 recommendations already implemented. Four of the recommendations that are not yet implemented will be acted on soon. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has indicated it will be implementing activity performance indicators as suggested in recommendation number five, during the 1985-86 operating year.

This department has also indicated that it is developing health and safety performance indicators as was suggested in recommendation number six. The department informs us that their workload studies

are proceeding and performance standards as suggested in recommendation number 11 of the 1982 Public Accounts report should be ready for inclusion in the 1985-86 estimates. Social work performance indicators will be very useful tools for the department.

The Department of Highways and Transportation is studying recommendation number 13 in regard to long-term planning. The department will be able to fully implement the recommendation during the 1984-85 operating year.

It is very clear from the preceding comments that the departments of this government are listening to the Public Accounts Committee and acting on the recommendations. For this, they should be commended. It is my sincere hope that the recommendations of the 1983 Public Accounts report will be considered with the same seriousness as the previous years.

Mr. McDonald: Let me begin by extending thanks to the member for Faro and the indulgence of the other members of the Public Accounts Committee for allowing me the opportunity to participate in the committee hearings this spring. It was a pleasure to meet in a truly cooperative manner with the other members of the House, with a view to promoting a single purpose, that of promoting the cause of a more efficient and accountable civil service.

As you will know from the chairman's report, I was given the pleasure of leading an investigation into the Workers' Compensation Board. I would like to thank the witnesses before the committee for their good-natured cooperation.

I would like to briefly review recommendations five to eight, of the Public Accounts Committee report, which emanate from the testimony given at the hearings. The first is a recommendation to improve the kind of information provided in public documents. It was felt, by the committee, that the board could provide more detailed and comparative information in its annual report to make the statistical information more meaningful. If the public had an opportunity to understand the statistical tables, at a glance, and to see and understand the trends over previous years, they might be encouraged to take corrective action when poor trends become apparent.

The second recommendation is one that loosely mirrors one that was made previously for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This recommendation called on the government to transfer the Occupational Health and Safety Officer from consumer and corporate affairs to the Workers' Compensation Board. It was felt that the separation of the safety inspection function from the board, which is, in part, paying the cost of the safety inspectors, was inefficient use of the board's funds. The board, in essence, was not getting full value for the expenditure of its funds.

The incorporation of the safety inspection function with the board is further seen as a method of incorporating a collective insurance system with accident prevention. In short, the board has a vested interest in reducing the social costs associated with poor safety practices and, therefore, could conceivably provide more effective safety inspections and educational services.

The committee then turned its sights on one of its favourite hobby horses, that of performance indicators. It is always seen as essential that a government department or agency should be in a position where it might evaluate itself effectively. This is not always easily done; however, the committee felt that the board should include in its self-evaluation the comparative analysis, overtime of both the time taken to process claims and the changes in accident rates. These two factors would be helpful in determining how effectively and efficiently the board is performing its duties.

Finally, the committee recommended that the board should always disclose the accounts, held with the board, which are held doubtful or are written off every year. The committee felt, perhaps, that the board went to a reasonable length to collect outstanding debts. However, should the amounts written off climb unreasonably, thereby putting increased pressure on other employers to carry the cost of the collective insurance system, then it would be made obvious to all that the new debt collection measures or measures to ensure payment should be considered.

18 Making this information public would satisfy the board's clients that all was being done that could be done or, on the other hand, signal to them the need for corrective action.

I close by saying that it was a pleasure to work with the other members of the committee. A lot of good solid work was done and I would be happy to have the opportunity, should it ever arise in the future, to do it again.

Mr. Falle: I, too, echo my colleague's sentiments. I have had a lot of pleasure working on the board and it is one of the few boards this government has where party politics do not play a part. Everybody on the committee worked toward serving the public to the best of his ability.

I had the pleasure of leading an investigation on economic development. For lack of a better word, it was interesting. I think, through careful study of the department, we found we hit the department at a time when they were reorganizing. There was quite a bit of confusion, I thought, that was not justified. I think the committee's recommendation was made fairly clear. The department should immediately take proper measures to develop and implement necessary management procedures. I, as a member of the committee, felt that maybe there was not enough control in the department but, again, I have to stress that was being reorganized at the time.

There were some areas in the department where we found information that was very confusing. As a matter of fact, it was contradictory. From the explanation given to us, we could see where the confusion came from. It is very clear in the report. But I think they will get together next time, and the next time we follow up this department, if I am on this committee I am going to be looking forward to quite an improvement.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I want to, on behalf of all of the departments of the government, thank the Public Accounts Committee for their work again this year. It is getting to be a system that the departments are learning to deal with and I think, as we go along and get more and more into it, it will in fact get better.

I want to deal for a couple of minutes with a bit of the report in respect of the Department of Finance, because I want to register that concern with the Public Accounts Committee.

19 In general, there seems to be a trend in the views of the Public Accounts Committee, towards having the Department of Finance assume a supervisory relationship with the program departments, which, in my view, is neither appropriate nor desirable. For example, on page 42, there is a statement that "The Department of Finance, in consultation with the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs, should formally establish a work schedule and timetable for completion of the work, so that progress can be effectively monitored."

The deputy minister, when appearing before the committee, said that he expected there would be an informal relationship between finance and municipal and community affairs and that we would expect to receive a copy of the completed report. Obviously, this will be necessary for the kind of financial disclosure we will need for the public accounts — when I say "we", I mean the Department of Finance.

A similar and more serious illustration of the Public Accounts' tendency to regard finance as having some kind of special overseer role is the statement on page 32, of the report: "The Department of Finance has the major responsibility for government systems and procedures". Clearly, finance does have a responsibility to ensure that the public accounts are prepared in the proper way, that matters going to the management board are coordinated and submitted to the board, in a proper manner, and that, in the provision of accounting, payroll and financial information services, there is a compliance with the requirements of the *Financial Administration Act*.

In my view, however, the committee is saying that, in managing such projects as the Faro school and the Dawson sewer and water system, the Department of Finance has a responsibility for the internal management systems of government services and municipal and community affairs. This, certainly, is not in accord with our

view. I do not think it would be in accord with the view of the deputy ministers of those departments, either. I just want to make the point with the Public Accounts Committee that finance is not the overseer of all of these departments.

I hope that the foregoing does not give the impression that finance is, somehow, trying to avoid responsibility, with respect to the Faro school and the Dawson sewer and water projects. Our responsibility was to provide accounting services to the departments concerned and, as far as I am aware, these services were discharged properly.

Accordingly, I think that the role being assigned to finance by the Public Accounts Committee is incorrect and undesirable and, if acted upon, would only serve to create interdepartmental frictions and distort lines of responsibility and accountability throughout the government.

I would also like to say a few things about the recommendations from the committee, with respect to the Public Service Commission, because that is one of the areas where I have a direct responsibility.

20 I want to assure the member for Kluane that we are very much involved, and want to continue to be involved, in a local hire policy. We have strengthened that policy just in the last two months to make sure that local hires are getting the dominant chance. We have done that by issuing a policy directive that says that all positions must be advertised locally within the territory for at least two weeks before they can be advertised outside. We are making a real effort to hire locally.

In respect to the recommendations, I would like to take just a moment to run through the four recommendations that were made in respect to the Public Service Commission. The first one was in respect to the delegation of hiring authority. The recommendation was that the Commission should establish procedures as soon as possible to monitor the practices and procedure exercised by departments through delegated authority to hire casual employees. If I might, I suspect that if I give this information now and the member for Mayo listens very carefully, it will probably answer some of the questions he intends to ask me when we are in another place within the hour, in respect to budget items.

The following departments that currently have delegated authority to hire casual employees in certain job categories: Highways and Transportation, in respect to labours, equipment operators, and survey crew personnel; Renewable Resources, in respect to campground personnel, heritage restoration personnel; Tourism, Recreation and Culture, in respect to information centre supervisors, and receptionists; Department of Education, in respect to custodial workers and substitute instructors at Yukon College; Yukon Housing Corporation, in respect to managers of Yukon Housing Association and labourers; Yukon Liquor Corporation, in respect to warehouse personnel, liquor store cashiers, and liquor store clerks; Health and Human Resources, in respect to youth service workers, recovery unit attendants, senior citizen homes staff; and Municipal and Community Affairs, in respect to survey crew personnel.

All hiring is conducted in accordance with the *Public Service Commission Act* under Public Service Commission policies and directives, which have been circulated to, and discussed with, the hiring departments. All personnel files of casual employees are kept in the Public Service Commission and the required break in service after six months consecutive and continuous employment as a casual is processed and monitored by the Public Service Commission.

Formal delegated hiring authority contracts are signed between the hiring departments and the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission recruitment staff will review all hiring department's files concerning the employment of casual staff semi-annually, commencing this fall.

21 Another recommendation was that the commission should disclose in public documents the total number of casual hires, the number of casual appointments made by departments through delegated authority, and the number of appointments terminated after six months and then re-engaged. The total number of casual hires are already disclosed in public documents, namely, in this government's annual report and in the operation and maintenance

estimates. As a result of the committee's request, the last two items contained in the recommendation will also be disclosed in public documents in the future. Since these categories have not been separately tabulated in the past, the required data collection will commence retroactive to April 1st 1984.

The third recommendation was that the commission should include in its estimates information, wherever possible, planned activities supported by performance indicators justifying its request for funds in order to create a base for future accountability. The estimates information supplied has increased considerably in type and detail from 1982-83 to 1984-85. The data supplied in the estimates currently before the House has been expanded as a result of the concerns raised by the committee.

The fourth recommendation was: the commission should disclose in public documents the full cost of its training and development programs, including the cost of educational leave and the number of employees taking that leave.

The full cost of operating the training and development branch is shown in the O&M estimates. The 1984-85 estimates also note the number of employees who have completed educational leave during the last fiscal year. Future estimates will be more specific in delineating costs of educational leave and the number of employees taking such leave.

The Minister of Economic Development is not present today so he cannot report on behalf of his department, but I would like to report for him that the Department of Economic Development has just undergone an organizational review by a consultant hired by the Public Service Commission to do that organizational review. It was done primarily as a result of the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee and I am quite confident that the member from Hootalinqua and all members will see next year a marked change in the submissions of that department to the Public Accounts Committee.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I would like to thank first the committee for its work, the diligent work it has put in, and the time put in doing this. I would like to deal with the recommendations dealing with the Workers' Compensation Board on pages 44 and 45, as it applies to classes and assessment rates. The comment I would like to give is that I am pleased to report that the board has included in the annual report for 1983 a description of the various classes and the industries within the classes and the assessment rates, the assessable payrolls and the previous figures for comparison. On recommendation no. 6, which is transfer occupational health and safety officer, the comment here is that the government is presently reviewing all aspects of occupational health and safety and drafting new legislation on the subject to replace the accidents prevention regulations pursuant to *The Workers' Compensation Act*.

On Recommendation Number 7, performance measurement system, the comment here is that the establishment of performance indicators and standards for claims is, indeed, a complex subject. It is obvious, from discussions with other jurisdictions that it is nearly impossible. It is in the area of quantitative measurement that numerous external variables begin to impinge upon the settling of meaningful performance standards. Variables include caseload size, availability of medical services, assessment and training facilities, medical specialists and geographical distribution of caseload. The only method available is "regular case", for example, claim file inspections, reviews, annual performance reviews. Regular meetings with staff and claimants are consistently and most effectively the most effective means of assessing the quality of work performed by the Workers' Compensation Board staff. The board feels it is, therefore, not possible to develop a performance measurement for the time taken to process claims and comparisons.

Then, the comment on the eighth recommendation, which is doubtful accounts and write-offs is that the board will disclose the financial statements for 1983, the allowance for doubtful accounts and the actual write-offs for the year.

So, as you can see, the board is working towards the committee's recommendations; except for number seven, they will be carried out.

Mr. Porter: I have some very brief comments, with respect to comments raised by the other side in response to the Public Accounts Committee report that was tabled.

This deals specifically with the issue of local hire, if you will. There was a comment made, on the government side, that local hire for Yukoners was an issue that this government was seriously looking at. They spoke about directives being issued to the various departments of government, particularly the Public Service Commission.

There was also mention of the fact that they were aware of the initiatives undertaken by the NWT government, with respect to the discussion paper on affirmative action, in regard to, specifically, native hire. I am also aware that those have been monitored and we will continue to monitor the efforts of that particular government.

I think that, to be honest, this government, in the time I have been here, has not improved on the issue of native hire. I think the government must look at that issue. It is not good enough to simply raise eyebrows and say, "Well, gee, there is nothing we can do about it", because this government, in the particular economic times we have, is one of the single most important actors in the economy. This government employs people. This government purportedly represents the people of Yukon.

I think that it is a realism that has to be faced by the government. The government has to sit down, look at itself and say, "Yes, we are not employing enough native aboriginal people within government and we should begin programs aimed at recruiting them; to bring them in and to employ them". I think that would only work to the advantage of government.

This is a serious issue. It has been an issue that bothers people; they get uneasy about it, they get uncomfortable, they do not know how to deal with it. However, it is an issue that is clearly an issue right across this country.

People talk about this country being made up of a various collage of minorities. As a matter of fact, we had a parliamentary committee established specifically to look at this very important issue. A report has come forward on the visible minorities in Canada. Clearly they have said employment of aboriginal and other minorities is an important consideration in the decision-making process of governments and private institutions in Canada. They have urged that the private sector look at a policy of encouraging people to come forward, to become employed by themselves. They put that same message to government, although they stop short of demanding government make it mandatory.

Principally, what has been discussed is that there be some time for government to consider the report and recommendations specifically on the issues raised and government come forward to initiate policies. When the Minister of Health went to the communities, I was in a couple of communities with him. The issue was raised, and he was very sincere about it with his deputy minister. He recognizes the problem. He recognized that a lot of the clients that his department deal with are native people.

He has stated clearly that he has intentions of putting forward programs that encourage native people to become involved in the area of social work and is looking at the criteria for hiring social workers to be changed to a degree to accommodate more native people. I think that is a positive step in the direction of hiring more native people. I generally urge that when government advances the position internally and looks at the issue of native hire, that they pay particular attention to try to find some way to encourage more native aboriginal people of Yukon ancestry to become involved in this government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the opposition now speaking will close debate.

Mr. Penikett: It is a very important issue, the one raised today by the member for Kluane and joined by my colleague the member for Campbell; an issue that was raised in Committee by the member for Hootalinqua. I would suggest that it would not be proper for me to join in that policy issue now, because that is not within the competence of the Committee. I believe there will be an opportunity in the Public Service Commission estimates for those people who want to deal with those policy issues later today. I look

forward to that debate.

I do want to respond to the comments from the government leader, particularly those he made in his capacity as the Minister of Finance. I think it is very appropriate that the Committee should take note of the observations that he and the finance department have made. If we have communicated to the government a belief that the Department of Finance should have some kind of special supervisory role, then clearly we have erred and that is a useful caution from the government leader.

Let me try and explain, though, if I can, more exactly, what the tone and the feeling of the committee is. I think on one hand we have the historic statutory responsibility of the treasurer, which is a peculiar situation under our constitutional set-up. There is also, I think, and I hope this will not be misunderstood by other departments, a fairly high regard by members of the committee for the Department of Finance and its officials and maybe an almost accidental inclination to show special preference in that direction.

However, there is a much more serious point, I think, that has to be made and I hope it will not be misunderstood by the Department of Finance. That point comes in respect to the information in documents we are dealing with. There was a particular matter this year in some information that was contained in the response to the Auditor-General's recommendation in the report on "any other matters" that was tabled before this House. The difficulty there is that, while we understand that the inaccurate information, which found its way to the document, originated with a line department or two, and we could understand the disinclination of the Department of Finance to want to take any kind of blame for that, we believe it is very important to have some kind of understanding about who is responsible in the final analysis for certain things. We have come — perhaps wrongly, but this is an open question — to conclude that the Department of Finance was, in the final analysis, responsible for communicating certain kinds of information to the Auditor-General and the House. If it did not have, if you like, absolute responsibility, it certainly had a special responsibility, given that we were dealing with financial information. It is, I think, that that we were wanting to address.

The problem, the government leader will understand, is that if there are several people responsible for something at some time, it makes it especially difficult to nail down who is responsible and who is accountable, and I hope the committee will have an opportunity to think about that problem in the future and perhaps talk to the appropriate officials in the coming years.

Let me illustrate the difficulty for the committee for the government leader in this respect. We did hear, in respect of the capital project management this year, the five recommended criteria from the Auditor-General, which were as follows: responsibility and accountability should be clearly defined and communicated at the beginning; requests for funds should be supported by accurate and complete documentation; final approval should be based on full information; project implementation should be properly controlled; and completed projects should be reviewed. We understand, in dealing with capital projects, that that is not the job of the Department of Finance, if you like, to manage those jobs. We would also expect, if I may say this, that the Department of Finance, because of its mandate, would have an interest in these matters that touch not only financial management but the whole administration also. It is perhaps those relationships that we have not fully understood yet or perhaps have not fully evolved in this government.

Let me say this as a purely personal — and I do not say this in any critical way, — I have had an opportunity since we got into these issues to talk to a couple of consultants. I understand that the problems we have tried to talk about in respect to capital projects, are not at all unique to this government, nor are they unique to the public sector.

One of the frustrations that apparently consultants have in dealing with large projects, and it is their experience, that it is very difficult for the consultants to find out exactly what it is the owners or developers want. They have a great deal of trouble in defining whether they are talking about somebody who wants a house built or some oil company that wants an office tower built. It is a real

problem for a client sometimes to be able to describe what it is they want.

When you are dealing with a client, whether it is the government or not, you may be dealing with several people. You may deal with a contracting department. You may also deal with a client department and there may be confusing messages there that can produce difficulties. You may have one dealing with budgets and contractual requirements and, in another, people are talking to you about what they are going to be doing in the building and, then, a third group of people might be managing a construction phase.

People who are in the business have emphasized to me that it is for this reason that — and I think there is some evidence of it being a problem here — that is why the pre-design phase in some people's field becomes absolutely the most important stage in major capital projects. It also gets to be, in a small community like ours, a great difficulty in finding the appropriate professionals for the appropriate services.

All I want to say in making those points in response to the government leader is, if we have misunderstood the responsibilities of the Department of Finance, we would admit our error. I would hope that he would understand, too, our difficulty in wanting to have one person or one agency that is responsible for any particular matter. That issue of having one agency, one department, or one officer responsible in respect to capital projects also follows. I would emphasize that while we understand that the problems we are identifying here are not unique to this government or to governments elsewhere or to the public sector. They are things where there is room for improvement. We submit that what the government is doing and what we recommended is going to take us on the right path.

Motion No. 20 agreed to

Ms Clerk Assistant: Item No. 2, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

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

Mr. Brewster: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill Number 3: Third Reading

Ms Clerk Assistant: Third Reading, Bill Number 3, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move Bill No. 3, *Employment Standards Act*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill, No. 3 be now read a third time.

Mr. McDonald: I am rising to speak to the bill at third reading for a couple of reasons. The first reason is that I thought the debate at Committee stage was rather unproductive and somewhat disappointing. The reason for its being disappointing was that the efforts made by me and my colleagues to improve, or to fine-tune, the bill were for naught.

We wanted to take the improvements that the minister tabled, the improvements to the old *Labour Standards Act* and the *Wages Recovery Act*, and make the improved bill better. We wanted to also change the direction of the legislation where we felt it had gone seriously wrong. It should not be surprising to anyone that we were unsuccessful in our efforts.

The first area of concern, as was mentioned in committee debate, was the area pertaining to the minimum wage. The opposition side stated quite unequivocally how we felt the legislature should approach the issue of the minimum wage. We felt that a new relevant base rate must be established by the legislature; we felt that it should reflect northern reality, a Yukon reality; and we felt that it should represent a living wage.

In the past, to refresh your memory, two committees of the legislature have studied the problem and investigated the issue of minimum wage, amongst other things. There have been numerous submissions regarding the minimum wage, amongst other things, and there has been plenty of time for the government to establish

ramifications of any increase in the minimum wage.

We, on this side, said that the legislature should, initially, set the rate, and that an appointed board should not be setting the rate. We felt that it was wrong to pass the buck to an appointed board, because political decisions were ours to make, and we should make them.

We called on the minister to tell us what the government's position was regarding the minimum wage. The minister repeatedly stated that the minimum wage was to be determined by the board and ratified by the minister. We did not get any indication, any inkling at all, as to the government's political philosophy behind the minimum wage. We did not get any understanding of whether or not the government even felt that the minimum wage should represent a living wage in Yukon.

The minister stated that the issue will be given to the board to decide, initially, at least. The minister will then accept the board's recommendation, if he silently agrees with it, pleading that the board has the expertise to handle the complexities of the issue.

He may just say, to any public opposition, that the decision was made by the board and he is captive to the expertise of the board. Of course, if he disagrees with the board's recommendations pertaining to the minimum wage, he may just claim that the board was not politically sensitive to reality and charge them, again, with the duty of raising or lowering the rate.

²⁷ The creates an unreal situation with regard to decision-making in the territory. We disagree with that. We want the legislature to establish a base rate and we want a formula, established by the legislature, which the board could review to provide for any changes in the rate, over time.

We believe, strongly, that the government's position on the minimum wage is a shameful one. As I said, the minister has never once stated the government's political position regarding minimum wage. The government was absolutely silent on that issue and, in our opinion, that is irresponsible.

Another major issue that we dealt with, at some length, during committee stage, was the issue of equal pay for men and women. This elicited some rather interesting remarks from the minister. The minister said, "Equal pay for work of equal value has nothing to do with men and women". He said that it is "...the biggest socialist idea that has ever hit this country..." and he said that it is "...going to get rid of unions and equalize the masses". In our opinion, that is unadulterated nonsense. There is nothing, in my opinion, perceptible about the minister's understanding of the issue.

The provision of equal pay for work of equal value has everything to do with men and women. It is geared to ensuring that men and women, who work for a particular employer, should get the same pay for work that has the same skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions. It is not the same as equal pay for similar work in the same establishment: it is far from it.

Also, it is not the biggest socialist idea to hit the country. I would argue that other big socialist ideas, such as medicare, universal education and universal pensions certainly rival this idea as one of the biggest socialist ideas to hit the country.

Certainly, it will not get rid of unions, not that the minister really cares about that, I am sure. The unions, obviously, have other things to do besides negotiate wages. In any case, unions in the country, unions in the north, unions in Yukon have gone some distance to try to ensure that, in the operations in which they work, there will be equal pay for men and women and that men and women will have equal opportunity for advancement.

My last point, I believe, is obvious. The proposal of equal pay for work of equal value will not equalize the masses. Its goal is a much more modest one. Its goal is to ensure that men and women receive equal pay for work of equal value in a particular operation, for a particular employer.

²⁸ It is not the national incomes policy. It is not calling for all miners in the country to be paid the same rate. It is not calling for all lawyers in the country to be paid the same rate. It is not calling for all the secretaries in the country to be paid the same rate. It is a policy that tries to ensure that men and women who work in the same operation, perhaps at different jobs, but with jobs that have the same skill, effort and responsibility, and where the working

conditions are the same, that those men and women will receive the same rate of pay. I think that is a fair proposition. We should at least agree to the proposition in principle and then work toward its implementation.

Our position is that the government's position on the issue is not defensible. The minister's remarks attacking the concept of equal pay for work of equal value are not defensible and, from my perspective, they are not even capable of being understood.

We applauded the government's initiative to implement a maternity leave provision in the act. We felt this was a large step forward for this government and we recognized that they were faced with some opposition as to the institution of the provision at all. However, we felt there was some justification for fine-tuning the provision. We felt the provision was too rigid and was not flexible enough. We recognized the problems for small business and we cannot be insensitive to those concerns, but we must accept that both men and women in the country, in Yukon, will work and that they, in some cases, must work, and that they all have the right to work. To put it bluntly or crudely, the species must procreate and they must work and procreate at the same time. Accommodation to permit all this must be made.

The minister's remarks about adoptive leave, we felt, were unjustified. We feel that society encourages people to give children who would otherwise be wards of government a home life and financial security that every child should enjoy. We should not permit those people to face a penalty of the loss of their jobs when they accept the emotional and financial burden of adopting children. Parents who have children of their own or who adopt children should have the opportunity to take time off work without pay and without penalty.

The next issue was the issue regarding forfeiture of pay. The government, as I have stated a number of times, has penetrated the area of the employment relationship in a rather misguided manner. The minister has assumed that because there is a formal or informal contract between the employer and the employee, therefore the two parties to the contract are equally able to afford the same penalty when either party fails to give notice of termination.

²⁹ This, clearly, is not the case. The employee can no more afford to lose a week of his entire revenue than the employer can. The legislation calls for penalties that would hurt one party much more than it would hurt the other. The employee must forfeit a week of his entire revenue, while the employer must forfeit a fraction of his payroll.

This is clearly unfair. It is not widely accepted in the country, for very good reasons. The provisions in the act calling for this should have been removed at committee stage. We should have reaffirmed the principle that wages earned should be wages paid.

Once the bill hit the committee stage, you may be aware that there were amendments to the bill regarding, amongst other things, the removal of the provision calling for double-time after 12 hours of work. This disincentive provision to work employees longer than 12 hours, against their will, was the last protection left in the act. You will recall that, in the old act, there was provision preventing work beyond 60 hours a week. The alternative, in the new act, was meant to be the disincentive of the double-time after 12 hours: that was removed.

In an attempt to ensure that various industries, for example, the exploration industry, might be able to work in remote areas without having to search for employment standards exemptions, we now have a situation where all industries and all services will operate in a wide open environment. There will be less incentives to encourage employers not to work their employees long hours, 16 in a day, and will further permit them to work their employees up to 35 days in a row without a break.

So, the minimum standard the government now provides in Yukon is one where an employee may not be worked longer than 16 hours a day for 35 days at a stretch. That is some minimum. There is no need for an individual employer to approach the board to justify the need to work employees for such long periods of time. There is even no procedure in the act to ensure that, when exemptions are necessary — and it appears that, with such broad standards, it may be seldom be necessary to apply for exemptions

— to ensure that the board must canvass the employees for their opinions. Their opinions about being worked long hours for a long period of time do not seem too terribly important.

So, in an attempt to deal with industries that operate under certain conditions, the act has been altered to permit all employers to have the same latitude or wide discretion as to how they will treat their employees.

“ There should have been another restriction in the hours of work provision in the act, perhaps double time. Those industries who legitimately require exemptions should be given the opportunity to come before the board to justify the exemption and then receive it. That would be the civilized way of dealing with the matter.

In any case, I do not feel the minister took the time and trouble to effectively defend the government's position in a number of areas. I feel very unsatisfied with the debate that took place at the Committee stage. We felt that there was some further positive fine-tuning of the act that could have taken place. It did not take place. That we regret.

On balance, let me just reiterate that it is a better bill than its predecessors, but it is not as good a bill as it could have been.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I agree with the member across the floor, that the debate in Committee was disappointing. It was disappointing for a very good reason. I believe the members across the floor, especially the member who just finished speaking, was trying to make political points and yet never came forward with one amendment. He never proposed one amendment to the legislature. If he was serious about the points that he was trying to make, why did he not propose amendments?

He talks about the board setting the minimum wage and suggests that the politicians should set the minimum wage. I agree that politicians should set a minimum wage, but only after someone who has some expertise has made that recommendation. I certainly do not see the expertise in this House, nor will it be generated in this House because it is a very complicated area. We are hopeful that the board will develop the expertise in order to make recommendations to the government.

He talks about equal pay for men and women. Equal pay for work of equal value, in his opinion is equal pay for men and women. It is not only equal pay for men and women, it is equal pay for everyone. It deals with a lot more than men and women. He says that I said it was a socialist idea and I am glad that further on in his remarks he did agree that it was a socialist idea, a very big one. He said that there were a couple of others that were perhaps bigger, medicare and universal education. I am glad to see that he admitted it was a socialist idea.

Regardless of whether he agrees that it could destroy unions, it could destroy unions. It has great potential for destroying unions. There is nothing stopping the growth of the point system in equal pay for work of equal value of dispensing with unions altogether. At least, I am glad that he recognizes it was a socialist idea.

This *Employment Standards Act*, perhaps is not the greatest bill in the world, but it was the best that we could come up with at the present time. There are no radical moves in this bill. Taking the labour situation into consideration in Canada today and the rapidity with which various legislation is changing — and even changing in regard to union agreements — there are a great many union agreements that are being renegotiated at the present time.

A lot of situations are changing. One that I raised in the House, during our debate, and one of the reasons why we took the double time for overtime out, was the fact that a union — a very powerful union in this country, in fact, one of the most powerful unions in this country — had just completed an agreement with a local company that dispensed with double time, altogether.

It is not very often that a union does that, so you can recognize that there is a great change in the labour atmosphere in Canada today. For us to make radical moves in any direction would be very pretentious of us and not very beneficial to the people of this territory.

We tried to bring in an act that was as fair as we could make it for employees and employers. Perhaps we did recognize that the philosophy of the party across the floor was somewhat different.

They have a totally different philosophy when it comes to labour and management and we recognized that we were not going to get agreement on every subject.

However, I would also like to state that one of the reasons why the debate in the House was somewhat lacking was because the member across the floor, the member for Mayo, has a very bad tendency to always want to have the last word. He never wants to accept someone else's argument. He always has to stand up and have the last word. So, this is my opportunity to have the last word, and I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. Penikett: Why do you not use it to say something?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The leader of the opposition asks why I do not use it to say something. I am using it to say something. I am using it to say that, perhaps, if the member for Mayo, during debate, would accept what someone says from the other side of the floor, without getting up and putting forward the same argument over and over again, that debate would go much smoother in the House.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I move that Bill No. 3, *Employment Standards Act*, do now pass and that the title be as on the Order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources, that Bill No. 3 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: I will declare that the motion has carried and that Bill No. 3 has passed this House.

May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: 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 Education that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

We shall take a short break, until 3:35, and, when we return, we will go on to Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, followed by Bill No. 9, *Financial Agreement Act, 1984*.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole to order. We will go on with Bill No. 12, under Public Service Commission.

Bill No. 12: *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85* — continued

On Public Service Commission

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Commission's budget and staff complement have both been increased as the result of the implementation of new and enhanced programs in the line departments. During the 1983-84 fiscal year, the person-year for the manager of training and development was restored. This person-year had been eliminated during the overall 10 percent budget reduction in 1982-83 but the individual had continued to be employed on contract. As well, the casual half person-year in employee records and pensions was converted to a permanent person-year for a clerical position.

The Commission obtained contract consulting funds during 1983-84 in order to finance organization studies in five departments as well as an overall government-wide organizational review. Lapsing funds in the amount of \$134,000 are being carried forward to complete these studies during 1984-85. In addition, a further \$200,000 has been provided in order to obtain consultants to (1) develop and implement a new bargaining unit classification plan; (2) conduct an organizational review of the Commission; and, (3)

review the Commission's policies, examine its paperflow processes and develop operational manuals.

Three additional person-years are being provided for as follows: clerk typist and recruitment labour relations officer — that is two positions — in the recruitment and labour relations branch; and a clerk typist in training and development.

These person-years are essential in order to cope with the significantly higher volumes of work that are being generated due to expansion of programs in line departments, a variety of job creation programs, continuing emphasis on local hiring, and training of employees and efforts to streamline personnel systems. By way of further explanation, I can advise committee of the following:

(1) Currently, recruitment staff handle an average of 15 competitions each, whereas in the provinces the average is six. This situation results in delays in recruitment and filling of vacancies. It also requires staff to work long hours on a continuing basis and leads, on occasion, to hasty decisions, which can result in further expense and staffing problems.

(2) One clerk typist is required to support in the general office area presently 14 staff and the Public Service Commissioner. By two permanent typists and the Public Service Commissioner's secretary, the volume of typing is extremely high in the personnel function. Position descriptions, classification reports and recruitment actions all generate a high demand for typing. As an example, every job application requires a minimum of two or three letters and often more when references or other information are required. Failure to provide this position will lead to increasing delays in both the recruitment and classification functions. One clerk typist is required to support the staff training function; presently, this one-man operation is developing, coordinating and putting on over 30 training programs. The clerical support position is essential to allow the smooth continuation of this volume of staff training activity. Continuation of the present staffing level will prevent the development of future programs, which will lead to reduction in the training available and an increased dependence on the more expensive purchase of training courses and services.

(3) Contract and consulting funding is required to carry out projects such as organizational analysis, class series reviews, revision and development of personnel policies, and development of new training courses, labour relations research, et cetera, which currently do not get done or are done at the expense of other personnel services. The effect of not providing for these activities is that the government ends up reacting to crises rather than anticipating them.

The Commission's departmental objectives have been restated to reflect its relationship to management board and line departments. However, this is not effected with the actual operations of the Commission. Program changes may be changed in next year's estimates, depending on the results of the Commission's organization review that is scheduled to be completed by the end of July. The actual review will not commence until the government-wide review has been completed.

In the office of the Public Service Commissioner, there is essentially no change since the 1983-84 forecast. In the recruitment and labour relations branch, I have referred to the addition of the two person-years primarily because recruitment volume has increased significantly since the 1982-83 actuals, as is shown. The same is true for the labour relations area.

The Commission is currently engaged in a negotiation process with the Public Service Alliance of Canada and issues still in contention are to be referred to binding arbitration. The arbitration hearing is expected to take place some time in June, although the selection of an arbitrator has yet to be finalized.

Negotiations with the Yukon Teachers' Association are to commence shortly and a meeting has already been held between the employer and the union to exchange proposals.

The volume in recruitment has already been referred to. As of Friday, May 4th, the Commission has 35 advertised competitions on the go requiring some 50 hires. This includes seasonal hires for information centres. The majority of the competitions are for vacancies in the managerial, technical, and professional areas for which qualified candidates are difficult to secure.

In addition to the advertised competitions, a considerable number of recruitment action requests are being forwarded to the Employment Centre, Student Manpower, and Outreach Workers on an ongoing basis. Statistics noted in the estimates indicate an increase in this volume.

In employee records and pensions, the transactions and adjustments are estimated to remain relatively unchanged from the 1983-84 forecast. The Commissions' branch heads have just commenced a personnel assistance feasibility study in concert with Systems and Computing Services, and an outside systems expert. This will hopefully result in the establishment of systems that can provide more detailed information for subsequent estimates.

In training and development, the addition of the proposed person-year has already been referred to. This branch provides a heavy volume of training courses and other avenues of career development such as reimbursement of tuition on correspondence for evening courses. The Branch also administers the Employee Assistance Program, which is established to try to remedy on-the-job performance problems that may result from personnel and/or family problems.

The underfill program continues to be used where possible. It is a fact that the availability of underfill hiring slots is strictly subject to the hiring department's ability to absorb such trainees. Due to the specialized nature of a number of jobs and the department's current workloads, underfill appointments are frequently not feasible. As well, if a fully qualified candidate applies on a competition an underfill candidate cannot be selected as appointments are based on merit.

In the Compensation Branch the work volume has continued to increase quite dramatically as the accompanying statistics show. Branch personnel act as liaison officers between consultants and line departments concerning the organization studies referred to earlier. The Branch director is the key contact person on the system study, which has just commenced. She also acts as secretary to the steering committee on the government-wide organization study and she is endeavouring to select the consulting firm to develop the bargaining unit classification plan. This plan is intended to enhance local hiring, on the job training, and affirmative action components, as well as sharply reducing the number of single position classes currently in existence.

We have received proposals from six Canadian firms, all of which have been rejected for being inadequate. A further 15 invitations have been sent to other Canadian firms and some US firms. While we fully intend to have the study done by a Canadian firm, if at all possible, the required expertise does not appear to be available in Canada. This view is supported by our contacts with other Canadian Public Service jurisdictions. In essence, Canadian jurisdictions are considerably behind the US in the development and implementation of state of the art classification and compensation plans.

Generally, then, the commission is already taking action on the recommendations enunciated by the Public Accounts Committee, as I reported in the House, today. As a result, the 1984-85 estimates contain more detailed information than in the past and future annual estimates will contain yet more detail.

I should report, as well, that the commission is working with the occupational health and safety group, in consumer and corporate affairs, to implement a comprehensive safety program for government employees. The policy governing this has been developed and will be put into effect within the next few months.

As well, a policy governing the use of visual display terminals and units has been developed and will be reviewed by the Deputy Ministers Review Committee, management board and Cabinet, over the next three or four weeks. Information concerning the use of this equipment is being developed and will be printed and distributed in tandem with the implementation of the new policy.

Mr. McDonald: I thank the government leader for a rather detailed report and I also thank him for the remarks he made, during the motion debate this afternoon, regarding the Public Accounts Committee Report.

The government leader will appreciate that there was so much information flooded in, in such a short time, that it is very difficult

to assimilate a great deal of it. Only a small portion of it is included in the estimates, even though there is increasing information in the estimates, which I recognize. Having said that, perhaps the government leader will be patient, should I not have assimilated any amount of the information that he imparted, this afternoon.

The government leader alluded to the possibility that the department's objectives, in the future, may be altered, as a part of the new program to review the internal workings of various departments in the government. It does not, however, go without notice that the departmental objectives, listed on page 209, are, in fact, different from those objectives that have been listed in the past.

Last year, of course, the objectives spoke of the duty of the department to recruit employees, conduct job evaluations, to house the pay and benefit administration, to enter into contract negotiations, prepare for contract negotiations, to deal with employee training and development and, also, employee documentation and records.

« This year, of course, the departmental objectives speak of the duty to provide information and services to management board and other departments, in accordance with personnel legislation. There seems, on the face of it, a move away from direct action to an advisory capacity.

If that, of course, is the case, we see it as a problem. We have stated a number of times in the past that there have been problems, for example, with the delegation of the Public Service Commission's authority to hire. We feel that the hiring standards should be uniform across government and the Public Service Commission is a department that can ensure that that does take place.

The Public Service Commission can also ensure that the public may be certain that the letter of the law is obeyed, in that the public would focus its attention on the one department, rather than the many departments. Can the government leader tell us, now, if there is a perceptible shift in the duties and responsibilities of this department, over the past year or years?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. I found it quite interesting — I guess it is the first opportunity I have had to comment on it — we are on page 200 of the estimates now and have gone through a number of departments.

In fact, the departmental objectives for every department, without exception, have, in fact, changed over the course of this past year and are being shown, publicly, for the first time, in this budget. The reason for the changes was because, when we did the much-talked about capital plan — I am sure members opposite will recall me talking about the capital plan as much as three years ago — and we finally got it completed this winter, one of the things that we had to do and be very, very careful about was that we had to develop departmental objectives for every department. Not only did we have to develop departmental objectives, but we also had to develop program objectives for every program.

Now, as the member for Mayo has pointed out correctly, in past years the departmental objective of the Public Service Commission has been a composite. It has been this general statement that we now have here and a composite of the program objectives. We had those all as departmental objectives.

In fact, I am confident that if he goes on through and looks at the program objectives, he will find that we still have all of those objectives in mind and very much in the forefront. It is just that it is put together in a little different manner this time, and it is the same in every department of the government. We have had to move away from the concept of strictly departmental objectives and actually develop program objectives; that is what caused the change.

» There has not been a change in the actual objectives of the department at this point in time. I do suggest, though, that as a result of the reorganization there may well be programming and departmental objectives changes. We will not know that until that time and it would, of course, be something that would be reflected in next year's budget.

While I am on my feet, I think I should assure the member from Mayo that the criticisms that he and the Public Accounts Committee raised, the problem that they identified with our practice of delegating the hiring authority for casuals, was one that we were

appreciative of, that we recognized as being a problem, and that we have acted upon. I want to assure him that, although we do delegate hiring authority in respect of casuals to the departments — and I gave that list in the House — it is very much controlled with respect to the files, with respect to the layoffs, and so on. That is very much controlled by the Public Service Commission, because there is little doubt about it in the legislation; it is a responsibility of the Public Service Commission. They were quite prepared to have the Public Service Commission take on that responsibility and, hopefully, we will not get into the situation ever again that we found ourselves in two years ago.

Mr. McDonald: I appreciate the government leader's remarks. He quite correctly stated that this was a recommendation by the Public Accounts Committee to encourage the Public Service Commission to take greater control over its responsibilities and to ensure that any delegative authority it may decide to pass over to other departments would be kept in line with legislation.

The minister mentioned this afternoon, I believe in the motion debate, that various jobs and job classes in various line departments were listed as those departments for which the line department would have the authority to hire within the guidelines the government leader mentioned. On a point of clarification, are we talking about the hiring of casuals for those particular jobs or job classes, or are we talking about the hiring of permanent person-years into those jobs and job classes?

« **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We are talking about both. The delegation of the hiring authority is done by the Public Service Commission. In a lot of instances, it is actually handled at the Employment Centre by the Government of Canada. It is a direct relationship between the Employment Centre and the hiring department. If he wished, I could run down the list quickly again, for the member. It is not necessary? I hope I have answered his question.

Mr. McDonald: I appreciate what the government leader is saying. I think I understand the extent to which Public Service Commission is trying to grapple with the problem of delegating its authority and yet at the same time ensuring that good hiring practices take place in accordance with the legislation.

The government leader mentioned that the hiring practices would involve a monitoring by the Public Service Commission and a processing of documents by the Public Service Commission to ensure that, at least after the fact, the system would be followed closely and effectively.

Can the government leader state what review the Public Service Commission does to ensure that hiring practices are not conducted on the basis of favouritism? What I mean by that is that, there have been claims in the past, erroneous or not, that certain departments - highways, for example - delegates its own authority to hire to camp foremen, et cetera. The suggestion has been in the past that that latitude of hire has meant that the camp foreman has taken on a special privilege in the community, a certain stature that perhaps is not his due. I wonder if the government leader would be able to comment or elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I suspect that it has been an issue or a problem in the past and I suspect it will be an issue or a problem in the future, in some instances. I do not believe that it has ever been widespread, certainly not in this government. Then we have another problem, I guess, that just makes it a little bit tougher for us in that we are such a small constituency. When you take in the whole territory, literally everybody knows everybody. Especially everybody knows the territorial foreman in any one community in the territory. Usually the territorial foreman has been there for such a long time that he knows everyone in the community, as well. It is virtually impossible. They do have, because they have to have, that local hiring authority. They are in a difficult position. I would expect, with respect, that they are susceptible to that criticism all the time.

» I also believe, though, that most all of them would, in fact, be cognizant of the fact that they are being watched and that people will criticize them if they are blatant. Once in awhile, I am sure that one of them or two of them may be blatant but, on the whole, in the majority, I would guess that they are just as fair and trying to be just as fair as anyone else when they are put in this difficult

position.

Mr. McDonald: I am sure that that is the case. I would hate to think that questionable hiring practices are the rule and not the exception. Can the government leader, on this one point, state whether or not it is specifically the case that camp foremen or regional superintendents are not permitted to hire members of their family?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have some pretty strict rules. We have policies with respect to family working together in departments. It is not allowed that one member of the family be in direct supervision of another member of the family. That is just not allowed.

In other cases, there are cases where there are two people of the same family working in the same department, but our policies demand that they be physically separated so that there can be no question of any wrong-doing, at all.

Mr. McDonald: The claim by the Public Service Commission that they will be bringing this hiring practice under control or they will control the delegation of authority to hire by various departments will, of course, be reviewed by the Public Accounts Committee, I assume, next year, as a follow-up. Perhaps we can leave an investigation of that follow-up to that time, when I conceive it will be rather detailed and also give the Public Service Commission the amount of time it requires to perform the performance reorganization effectively.

I have some questions, of course, about the hiring of casuals, which I have asked in the past and which have nothing to do with the reorganization. Last year, I believe even previous to that, I asked the government leader whether or not the Public Service Commission had provided a manual to new casual hires, casuals who had not, obviously, been in a union, to delineate their rights, duties and responsibilities, their obligations, and to ensure that they knew exactly what the score was regarding the employment relationship between the government and themselves.

I wonder if the government leader could tell me whether or not the practice of informing the casuals of their rights and their duties and their obligations, in a clear and succinct manner, is actually taking place now?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am quite confident that it does take place, but I would suggest, in most all cases, because they are casuals, it takes place in a verbal manner.

⁴¹ Permanent employees, of course, when they are hired, have job descriptions that they are given, where every detail of their duties, at least, is, hopefully, enunciated.

You must understand that we hire quite a number of casuals during the course of the year, some of them in very, very remote circumstances. I notice our estimate, for this year, for casuals and contracts, is 1,250 employees. I cannot say that we, as a matter of policy, give them any kind of documentation; not every one of them.

Mr. McDonald: I may not have expressed myself very clearly in the past. I do not believe I have ever suggested that the casuals should undergo a rigorous orientation program but, rather, that they be given something that would establish duties and obligations, rights, responsibilities.

The government leader will remember a situation at Moose Creek campground, where some employees felt that they had the right to protest a supervisor's decision by staying off the job for a morning; that resulted in their dismissal. It was interpreted by, at least, one government minister that they had walked off the job. They interpreted the situation as a dismissal.

If they were given some sort of documentation, something more than just a verbal presentation, which does not always tend to be rigorous or complete, in order to ensure that these employees are fully cognizant of what their duties and responsibilities are, in the future we may not see situations, such as the situation at the Moose Creek campground, where the employee may labour under the misapprehension that he has rights that he may not have.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not want to seem flippant about this, because I recognize that the member for Mayo is very sincere in what he is saying. However, I want him to consider that that was very much an isolated instance. I cannot recall, in all of my years of

experience with this government, that we have had casuals who have been terminated because of what I guess could properly be called a job action.

I can well understand the foreman being caught unaware. I am sure he was but, surely, the employees cannot claim or did not claim that they would not have done it had they known that they were going to be fired for it. I have a hard time accepting that as an argument. I have raised this issue with the Public Service Commissioner. Of course, he is quite cognizant of the concern that was raised by the member, at the time, but we do have some administrative problems with it.

I would be prepared to make an undertaking to the member that I will have the Public Service Commissioner and his recruitment people look at the feasibility and the advisability of trying to put something together.

⁴¹ I guess one of the problems is: how comprehensive does this become? Does this end up being some sort of an iron-clad contractual arrangement that no one can get out of? I have some misgivings about the whole thing, because casuals, as I say, a lot of times are hired exactly as that — casuals. We have to be able to move with the flow of whatever is happening.

Mr. McDonald: I readily admit that the Wolf Creek campground situation was an exception; at least, it is an exception as far as I am aware. It is not often that people take that kind of job action and it is probably even rarer that they are fired for it or their employment is terminated for doing so. What I particularly had in mind was not so much an all-encompassing collective agreement that would take care of every instance but would be in essence a disciplinary guide. I am sure the government leader will be aware that in arbitration jurisprudence it is suggested that discipline cannot reasonably take place unless the employee has been informed or efforts have been made to inform the employee in some way or other of his duties and of the rules of the game. Obviously, this is not a union situation but nevertheless the rules of fair play have been established in arbitration jurisprudence and there is no reason why fair play cannot take place in a situation such as this.

The government leader may be aware that disciplinary guides, even when posted, are not considered to be iron-clad even for arbitrators. It very much depends on the individual circumstances of a case. Quite often, in fact, there is a guideline that stipulates that discipline shall not take place without just cause and therefore not always is it the case that the disciplinary guide is considered iron-clad. In any case, I think it would be advantageous for the government, in the name of fair play with its employees, to ensure that they understand what their duties and obligations are. If the government feels it is advantageous for it to include other things in such an orientation, then so much the better for the casual employee. I appreciate the government leader's undertaking to perhaps do something about it.

The next area I would like to explore — only very briefly — regards the filling of permanent positions that have been filled temporarily by casuals.

⁴² The Minister of Justice said, I believe yesterday afternoon, that permanent positions in that department were being filled with casuals while the position was waiting to be filled. How long, generally speaking, does the government permit a position to remain vacant in the sense that a permanent employee is not put in the position and allow a succession of casual employees to fill the position?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know that there is any rule. I do not know that there is any policy. I do not believe that there is. Once again, it is one of those things where you have to have some latitude. The practicality of the matter is that any deputy minister would rather have, if he has a permanent position, a permanent employee in that position than a casual, at any time. The administrator of the department, or the deputy minister, has to feel much more comfortable and much more secure with a person who has a permanent appointment in that position.

Sometimes it is necessary to fill a permanent position with a casual. We try not to do that. We try and encourage the departments to leave the position vacant rather than fill it with a casual. In some positions you absolutely must have a person because they are

serving the public. If you leave the position vacant, then your service is falling down. If it is at all possible, permanent positions are filled with another permanent employee at the earliest possible date.

Mr. McDonald: That is very reassuring. The government leader may recognize too that the departmental administrator may not feel so badly about a casual employee in a particular position rather than a permanent employee because the casual employee obviously can be manipulated more than a permanent employee can. The constraints of the contractual arrangement by a union agreement may provide some protection for the permanent employee that is not there for a casual employee. There is some concern that there may be some incentive as a result of that arrangement for the deputy minister not to fill the position absolutely immediately. I am reassured that the policy is that the position will be filled by a permanent employee.

Perhaps the government leader can tell us whether or not job advertisements are issued immediately upon the resignation of an employee in a permanent position?

« Is it the case that, when the employee resigns or gives notice of termination, that that type of advertisement is issued?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, the employee gives notice and it is sometimes some considerable time. It is a function of the department. They advise the Public Service Commission when they wish to have the jobs advertised but, normally, no advertisement starts until after the position has in fact been vacated.

Mr. McDonald: So the position is, in fact, advertised as soon as the position is vacated if there is the intent to keep the position filled?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes. If it is intended to fill the position, that is true.

Mr. McDonald: Last year, I believe, the government said that, in all cases, casual employees will be given preference where they are slotted into a job. To what extent are they given preference in the weighting of the various factors when determining when and how the job is to be filled?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There are an awful lot of job applications that go out that, in fact, are restricted to employees of the government, including casuals. That is a very definite preference that they do have. Casuals are considered to be employees of the government, as long they are working for this government. Always, employees have a preference. It is our policy to promote from within whenever we can. We exercise that policy at every possible opportunity.

Mr. McDonald: Does the government have any indication of the frequency of the practice where casuals are laid off for a day and then rehired? Is there any monitoring that the Public Service Commission feels confident of that will ensure that this practice does not take place on any sort of regular basis, and does not even take place in exceptions?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is one of the reasons for the change in procedures, the basic reason for the change in procedures. We discovered, much to our embarrassment, that we had some-35 people who were working for this government as casuals who were regularly being laid off for one day every six months. It had been going on for years. We have made an assessment and any of those positions that were deemed by the departments to need a person there longer than six months, had to make them permanent positions. Hopefully, we will be able to avoid this. One of the reasons that the Public Service Commission now retains the casual files is to police that very issue. It becomes very difficult for the department to convince the Public Service Commissioner that they should contravene the legislation.

« The legislation is very clear: a casual should not be in a position for any more than six months. If someone is needed in a position for more than six months, then some consideration must be given, immediately, to it becoming a permanent position or vacating it entirely.

Mr. McDonald: It is encouraging to hear that the Public Service Commission is, in fact, confident of the procedures in place now to ensure that the practice that the minister mentioned does not continue.

The one question that I asked, I believe, in general debate of the budget and, again, in highways, regarded the listing the numbers of casuals in the budget. I may have received an answer and maybe it did not sink in or maybe it was not satisfactory. In any case, I still feel the need to ask the question, again.

Does the Public Service Commission no longer budget or encourage the budgeting of casual people in the line departments? Can there not be some indication, somewhere, about the casual person-year establishment, from the previous year, and the anticipated casual person-year establishment for the current budget year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, we do not allow the departments, as a matter of policy, to budget casual person-years. We do that on the basis that they have enough vacancies, during the course of the year, to look after those casuals and they must pay for the casuals from within their own budget. It is a management tool that we use; it is one of the controls that we exercise.

It is very difficult for a department to be able to foresee, at the beginning of the year, how many casuals it might be using during the course of the year. Also, sometimes the department does not have very much control over this, because they may well receive orders, from Cabinet or from management board, that they should embark upon a specific program during the course of the year, in mid-year, and it requires the hiring of casuals in order to do that work.

The 1,250 that is estimated in the recruitment labour relations branch of the Public Service Commission is, simply, an estimate. It is our best guess, given our track record and given what has happened in the past years, of the number of casuals and contract people who will be employed during the course of the year.

Mr. McDonald: I think I understand the minister's answer. However, the minister mentioned previously that certain departments, such as highways, use a great deal of casual labour, as a matter of course, to conduct their business over the summertime. It can almost predict the sort of casual labour it will need because so much of its work is seasonal. In that department, of course, it might be valid to list the number of casual employees that it would have in its department, as it is valid to list the number of permanent person-years in a particular department.

« It is not sufficient to use the constraints that the minister was talking about to ensure that the proper management takes place in the person-year establishment. In that case you have to anticipate that there will be a great increase in the number of person-years or the number of casual employees that you may have. Can we not have that kind of information in the budget?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It may well be that the member has raised a valid point. When I speak of controlling casuals, by controlling person-years, and by controlling the budgets, that flies in the case of every department except Highways. The reason for that is that the funds for the maintenance of highways are allocated on a per mile basis, not on the number of person-years that they have in the department.

Person-years are the major expenditure in every other department of the government, except Highways, who have this requirement for a very large number of casuals. They actually can budget for their casuals in their costs of maintenance of the roads on a per mile basis. The budget for Highways is actually built on a little different basis than the other departments. The predication for their money is quite a bit different.

Certainly, I think it is a legitimate request and one that we will undertake to see if we can identify how many casuals are being used each year in Highways. I believe that the other department that uses the second largest number of casuals would be renewable resources. It would be much more difficult to estimate how many might be used there simply because you do not have the same kind of a formula base. You do not have a number of miles of road that you could use.

I will ask the Public Service Commission and the Department of Highways if they can come up with a number, and they should be able to do that given the number of miles of road and given the number of casuals we have in any specific year. They should be able to come up with a formula. We will make sure that that is reflected in the budget.

Mr. McDonald: There are a couple of other areas I would like to deal with before we get into the line items. I am sure that there may be something else my colleagues would like to delve into as well.

The government leader will remember that the Public Accounts Committee report mentioned the hiring qualifications for employees; the need for local hire. It became clear over the course of the spring that in some instances while the government wanted to hire locally as much as possible, the hiring qualifications requested by the various line departments seemed to be somewhat excessive. " They almost froze out, as a matter of course, local Yukoners who could not, except in very rare and exceptional circumstances, meet the qualifications. Have there been any attempts made to ensure that the qualifications requested are in fact the qualifications required? Obviously, nowadays it is quite common, because the nature of the unemployment situation in the country, where there are a lot of very qualified people in the country out of work, there is a temptation amongst employers to get the most qualified person possible, when the qualifications may not be necessary to fulfill the job. Have there been any attempts to control that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, we have made some attempts and, in fact, we have been successful in some cases. One department that comes to mind, of course, is Health and Human Resources, which has dramatically changed the qualifications required for social workers; those changes allow us to hire social workers on a local basis much more often now.

It is a requirement and a duty of the Public Service Commission to make sure that the qualifications that the departments are looking for are in fact legitimate. They cannot request overqualified people. The Public Service Commission has the legislative authority to go back to that department and tell it that it is requesting overqualified people, that this should be the maximum or the minimum qualifications you should be looking for. But the department does have the right to request certain qualifications. We are dealing with that on a department-by-department basis, as I say. We have done a lot of work with Health and Human Resources, particularly as regards social workers, not because we feel that social workers should not be qualified, but there was a definite opinion in this territory that they did not have to be quite as qualified as what we were looking for over past years.

Mr. McDonald: The issue of local hire, to a certain extent, can be associated with the issue of affirmative action programs in the sense that you try to do your best to hire a certain class of people who may not be your first choice for one reason or another. It became clear in Public Accounts Committee testimony that the government is involved in northern careers program — I believe it is sponsored by the Department of Indian Affairs — and the northern development on-the-job training program as well as what is called an underfill program and an on-the-job training for the disabled. Can the government leader explain as elaborately as time permits the nature of the underfill program?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The underfill program is one where the department sends a vacancy notice to the Public Service Commission indicating that they require a person in a specific position. The Public Service Commission, if they think that there is a possibility for underfill, will go to the department and ask whether they will consider underfill. That is a responsibility of the department because, after all, it is not the Public Service Commission that has the responsibility for the management of the department but, rather, the deputy minister of the department. If the department says, "yes, we think we can use an underfill, we are prepared to go with an underfill in this position", then the position is advertised. It is advertised on the basis of these are the qualifications but underfills will be considered.

Those underfills are looked at and, depending upon the qualifications, depending upon the degree of underfill, they may get paid at a percentage lower — it could be 10 percent or 15 percent — than what the going rate, if you will, for that job happens to be until such time as they qualify for the job. During the time that they are in the position, the object of the exercise is that they are hired as an underfill, then one criteria is that they are prepared to do the necessary study and learn the necessary things to become qualified in that job. If they do, of course, then their salaries are increased to

the full amount and they have the job permanently; that is their reward for becoming qualified in the job. In essence, that is the underfill program.

Mr. McDonald: Can the government leader briefly tell us if there is any indication as to how much the underfill program is, in fact, used? Also, when an underfill employee engages in training, is there any time limit to the extent that the training should continue? Does that time limit depend on the job?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We do have a number of employees who are hired on the underfill program. I am not sure, but I believe that they can take up to as much as a year in order to get qualified. The Public Service Commissioner is in the Gallery and is advising me three years to get qualified.

" So, we try to be as flexible as we can, but there are a number of people who are hired on underfill. Particularly in the local situation, there have been more, of course, with the emphasis on local hire. The deputy ministers are quite cognizant of our desire to hire locally and, a lot of times, that is one way that we can meet that objective.

Mr. McDonald: I would appreciate, sometime in the future, if the government leader does not have the figures before him, some indication as to the effectiveness of the underfill program, this year and over the past years, to see how many people are actually being admitted to the program.

The other question I would have is the issue regarding on-the-job training for the disabled. Does this program bear any relation to the underfill program? Perhaps the government leader can explain.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, it does not bear any relation to it, but we do have a program where we hire disabled persons for specific jobs, jobs that are identified that they can do. It would be very nice if we had more jobs that we could put them into, but we are attempting to do as much as we possibly can in this area.

Mr. McDonald: As an addendum to that, it would be equally as interesting to see how effective that program has been, over the years, and, if the government leader could provide those figures, it would be very helpful.

The next area that I would like to discuss very briefly is the issue of the contracting out of government services and the future of those persons laid off or, I guess, terminated — fired — if you consider that, technically, the job will continue. Can the government leader explain, in some more depth, what efforts are going to be made to ensure that these people are taken care of by government? The government leader has suggested, in the past, that every effort will be made to find these people new work, over a 12-month period. What indications does the government leader have that the Public Service Commission will be successful in finding people work in that particular job class, in an environment where, I believe, there is very little turnover? I would appreciate a sort of candid answer as to what the government leader anticipates will be the outcome of that job search for the people who will be laid off.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am aware that there has been one job offer made, I understand, to most of those people who are going to be affected by that layoff. I am confident there will be other job offers, between now and the time that the layoff comes into effect.

We will make every effort to not have to break their employment but, if we do, they still, by dint of being laid off from their positions, will have a preference in hire for 12 months after the date that they are laid off.

" **Mr. McDonald:** I would like to ask the minister whether or not he knows if any of the persons who are scheduled to be laid off or who we may anticipate will be laid off in the near future, by September 1st, are in fact persons who were hired under the underfill program or hired as part of the on-the-job training for handicapped persons? Would any of those people be affected?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: One person was hired under the underfill program.

Mr. McDonald: Obviously, that is too bad for that particular person.

The government often is attempting to lay people off in a particular building, no matter what their term of service is with the government; they are laying them off from this particular job at

once. Obviously there are people who had less service and who may offer less merit, to put it in rather an awkward way, than do the people who are scheduled to be laid off. Why is the government considering laying off just the people in the one section rather than laying off the people either according to merit or according to seniority?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think what the member obliquely is asking me is: what about the seniority system? It is not going to apply. This is an identifiable job that we are doing away with. I guess, probably, if we are going to be candid, I think what the member is saying is the janitor in this building should be treated the same as the janitor in the school or in another building somewhere else that we might have janitors in. We do not think that way. This is the job that is being made redundant and therefore the people who are working on this job are the unfortunate ones in this particular instance. If it had been a school that it was happening in, then of course these people here would not have been affected. That is the straight matter of it all.

Mr. McDonald: The government leader said that the job here is to be made redundant and that is the extent of it. I would suggest that it is not in fact the job that is being made redundant; it is the job and the place of work, because we are identifying a specific place of work. The employer happens to be the Government of Yukon, whether it is a particular department or not. For the employees, it may not be a significant issue, but the job is a janitorial job or a custodial job. It is a class of work in the government that applies not only in the main administration building but also in schools down the street. There are some people who have been hired many years ago, ten years ago, and who have considerable merit as janitors, as custodial workers who are working in the government building, in the main administration building, here.

⁵⁰ There are people who have been hired with government only a year or two years ago, who are working as employees of the Government of Yukon in buildings down the street, perhaps in a different department, but in buildings down the street with, conceivably, less merit and less term of service or seniority.

It seems that not only is a seniority principle not applied, and I understand that it is not generally applied in government anyway, but even the merit principle is, to a certain extent, bastardized by this policy of identifying this particular job and this place of work for layoff. It seems conceivable that to be true to the merit system — and it might even be true to the seniority system if you are wishing to apply that system as well — to transfer around and layoff those persons who have less merit or less seniority elsewhere and maintain the people with greater merit in government; transfer them to a different building or transfer them to a different job, and allowing the government still to follow — what I consider to be a misguided policy — the policy of contracting out the service in the main administration building. Why has the government not even been true to the merit principle in determining the layoffs for the custodial workers?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I believe that to the best of my knowledge we have been true to the merit system. I do not think the member for Mayo, nor anyone else, can indicate that we have not been true to the merit system. It just simply is not a factor in this case. I have to say again, as far as this government is concerned, maybe it is this government that has become redundant as an employer in respect to those people. There is no doubt about it, the job is redundant. It is not going to be there any longer. There will be people doing the work, but they will be working for a different employer.

Mr. McDonald: I am not quite prepared to say yet that the government is redundant. Come next election, perhaps, I might change my tune.

I still fail to understand the government leader's argument that they are being true to the merit system here. What he is suggesting by saying that is that the people being laid off have less merit. They may still be meritorious enough to work for the government, but under the circumstances they have less merit than other custodial workers working for government.

I am not sure whether the government leader would be prepared to say that. My information is that such an analysis has not even

been carried out to determine whether or not the people in this building have more merit than other custodial workers in other buildings in the city.

⁵¹ The government leader said that the merit system is not a factor in this case. Well, perhaps it ought to be a factor in this case, perhaps we ought to be true to that principle or be true to whatever general hiring principles that we apply for the government.

It seems unfair to take the easily administered route in order to carry out this policy. I am not convinced that the government has taken the best route. I am convinced that they have taken the route that is easiest to administer. I think that that may be unfortunate. The fact that the job affects a job, specifically, in the administration building is, in effect, in my opinion, an irrelevant factor when it comes to determining whether or not you are going to keep long-time, trusted, meritorious employees of the government and whether or not you are going to be true to the principles that you establish — the merit principle and the seniority principle — if that has any effect, at all. Obviously, the decision has been made and it is unfortunate, in my opinion, that it has been made in the manner that it has.

I have no more questions, in general debate. Perhaps, if others would like to discuss issues, this may be their time.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate? If not, then we will go on to programs: Office of the Public Service Commissioner, page 212.

On Public Service Commission

On Office of the Public Service Commissioner

Mr. McDonald: I have one brief question. Can the government leader state why we can maintain the permanent person-years and still see a drop in the personnel costs? There is a six percent drop: are we anticipating a six percent drop in pay, or meritorious conduct or what, exactly, is the reason for the six percent decrease?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I believe the member for Mayo will recall, in my rather lengthy opening remarks, I mentioned the work being done jointly, throughout the department, by the Office of the Public Service Commissioner, with respect to clerical staff and so on. There has been some slight reorganization and we anticipate that there is a shift in money from one branch to another. It is just because of the number of people who we are going to be having in each of the branches. Overall, there is, of course, a fairly substantial increase in the amount of dollars within the department as a whole.

⁵² *On Operation*

Operation in the amount of \$107,000 agreed to Office of the Public Service Commissioner in the amount of \$107,000 agreed to

On Recruitment and Labour Relations

Mr. McDonald: Perhaps the government leader can refresh my memory as to who the two increased person-years are? I notice that in the statistics page, facing page 214, we anticipate lesser everything, either in recruitment or labour relations; we anticipate less activity, and yet an increase in person-years. Can the government leader just explain why that could be?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There is in fact a clerk typist being hired and a recruitment labour relations officer. As I stated, one of our major problems, one of the real problems, we have in this department, is keeping up to the demands of the other departments of government. This department is expected to provide a service. We sometimes face long delays and those delays can, in some instances, be put on the doorstep of the Public Service Commission simply because we are understaffed. I do not think there is any doubt about it. I gave this statistic with respect to caseloads and our people handle something in excess of double what is the norm in most constituencies.

Mr. McDonald: While we are in statistics, the forecast for 1983-84 shows a forecasted increase of 350 more casual and contract employees than was previously estimated. Can the government leader give any sort of simple explanation as to why that is?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have to ask the member whether he is talking about page 215 in the casuals, because it seems to me, what

it says is that in 1982-83 we had 1,213; in 1983-84 we anticipate that we will have 1,553 or some 300 more than the year before; in 1984-85 we anticipate that we will have 1,250, or some 300 less than we had last year.

Mr. McDonald: The only point I was making was that last year in the estimates for the estimated number of casuals that we thought we would need for 1983-84 which is not in this particular page was about 350 less. I wonder if the government leader can give us a simple answer as to the increase.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes. I am sure all members will remember the joyous news last fall when we informed the House of our \$10,000,000 make work project. That necessitated the hiring of a tremendous number, very close to 300 casual employees, over the course of the winter.

Mr. McDonald: The joyous news about the \$10,000,000 did not come to the House first, it came to the communities first. In the case of a particular \$75,000, it came to the press first. There are all kinds of interesting situations that arose at that point in time.

Can the government leader give us an indication as to - on the statistics page again, under labour relations, number of employee grievances - adjudication and or court actions, the success rates for the 34 and the eight actions that are listed here in the 1983-84 forecast?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I guess probably, in respect to grievances, you would have to ask the member, "what is success?" Is it who won the grievance procedure? I am sorry, I do not have those statistics at all. I am sure I could get them for the member. I understand that what he anticipates as a success is if the employee has beat the government, then it is a success, is that correct?

Mr. McDonald: I take my responsibilities as an MLA quite seriously. I would hate to see either side throwing out frivolous grievances or sending cases to adjudication without any sort of proper rationale. As a member of the legislature I would like to see a government be successful where it is justified. I think that goes without saying.

I would just like to point out that on page 214, I believe that there has been a name change. The YTPSA is no longer an entity that I am familiar with. I think we are referring to YGEU now.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no more general debate we will go on to line items.

On Operations

Operations in the amount of \$706,000 agreed to

On Long Service Awards

Long Service Awards in the amount of \$15,000 agreed to

On YTPSA

YTPSA in the amount of \$23,000 agreed to

On YTA

YTA in the amount of \$4,000 agreed to

Recruitment and Labour Relations total in the amount of \$748,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go to Employee Records and Pensions on page 216.

On Employee Records and Pensions

Mr. McDonald: I have a brief question regarding the statistics on page 217. Last year there was a statistic that recorded the interview telephone rate. It is not included this year. I believe in the 1983-84 estimates it was 55,000. I wonder if the government leader could give us an indication as to what it is this year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The reason that the statistic is not there this year is because there is not an actual count done. It is an estimated figure and we did not think that we should continue with that kind of a statistic. They have the same number of telephones; probably even more.

⁵³ I am convinced that they still get a very, very large number of calls in that particular department.

Mr. McDonald: So, the estimates for 1983-84 was 55,000 and this year it is very large.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is very large.

Operations in the amount of \$183,000 agreed to

Employee Records and Pensions in the amount of \$183,000 agreed to

On Training and Development

On Administration

Mr. McDonald: Can the government leader refresh our memories as to what the 63 percent increase in this particular department is?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is the addition of one clerk typist to this particular branch.

Administration in the amount of \$83,000 agreed to

On Training Public Servants

Mr. McDonald: Why is the training allotment down by approximately half? Do we anticipate fewer transfers in the next year, which require less training? What would the reasons be for that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, if the member looks at the statistics, we anticipate that we are going to be training more employees, this coming year, than we did last year, probably because there are more employee-sponsored courses. Also, with having our training and development people on staff, once again, as employees, it may well be that we can do much more of this in-house, than we have been able to do in the past. I would anticipate that is the reason.

Mr. McDonald: I notice, on the statistics page, the term "employees trained". I think it used to be called, last year in the estimates, "course participants". Obviously, we are assuming that the training courses have been successful. Can the government leader give us any indication of how the Public Service Commission determines the success rate for the training courses?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Of course, the Public Service Commission does do assessments. I think the best assessment, though, is from the employees, themselves. I have never ever heard anything but very positive feedback, with respect to the courses that are put on by this particular branch. Also, we get positive feedback, just generally, on employee training throughout the government.

I guess there is the odd person who thinks it is a waste of time, but, certainly, once again, that is not the norm. It is definitely a very, very small minority who feel that it has not been very well worthwhile.

⁵⁴ **Mr. McDonald:** Is there any specific formula to determine specifically how particular training courses are doing?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There is no formula. One of the assessments is the demand, and we have a tremendous demand. We never have any trouble filling training courses in this government.

Training Public Servants in the amount of \$77,000 agreed to

On On-the-Job Training

On-the-Job Training in the amount of \$22,000 agreed to

Training and Development in the amount of \$182,000 agreed to

On Compensation

Mr. McDonald: My questions relate to the statistics page, 221. Under the line development of bargaining objectives, we seem to have an increase from one to two. Can the government leader tell us one what to what?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am advised that last year we were only dealing with the public service bargaining unit. In the coming year, the Public Service Commission will in fact be dealing with both the public service and the teachers.

Mr. McDonald: That clarifies things considerably.

Can the government leader tell us where the major compensation studies are going to take place and which departments will be given organizational analysis?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I know I have advised the House of that. They were listed, I believe, in the budget speech. I will try and list them off the top of my head: economic development, justice, renewable resources, tourism, the Public Service Commission, and education; and then the whole government-wide survey. So there are six plus one.

On Operations

Operations in the amount of \$267,000 agreed to

On Projects

Projects in the amount of \$340,000 agreed to

Compensation in the amount of \$607,000 agreed to

⁵⁵ **Public Service Commission in the amount \$1,827,000, agreed**

to

On Department of Renewable Resources

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am pleased to present to the House the 1984-85 operation and maintenance budget for the Department of Renewable Resources. Our capital program over the past year, and the coming year, was most ambitious indeed. At the same time, these programs provided a much-needed economic stimulus in a number of regions of the territory.

In campground development and rehabilitation, the department will be employing numerous people for an estimated 2,900 person-days of work. In addition, we will contract heavy equipment and operators for 960 person-days. As a result of our program, the O&M expenditures reflect the additional maintenance costs such as campground maintenance. While our 1984-85 estimates are approximately \$650,000 less than the 1983-84 forecasts, much of the decrease can be attributed to the fact that many of our cost-shared programs have expired or are winding down. These include the renewable resources sub-agreement, the resource corps program and the Yukon River Basin Study. It might be noted, that the wildlife management program indicates a \$300,000 decrease from last year's actual expenditures. In actual fact, it is an increase of \$205,000 over last year's base. Last year, under the economic stimulus program, we were able, throughout the year, to devote an extra \$500,000 towards wildlife management programs. Overall, I believe the budget before you, for the Department of Renewable Resources, is a responsible one.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Porter: I know that you are all anxiously and excitedly awaiting this particular juncture in the budget talks. I will not disappoint you and conduct myself in my normal, usual fashion in a non-aggressive, diplomatic approach, of course, unless provoked to do otherwise. I know how much the minister likes his naps in the legislature, so I will try not to be too long.

One of the repeated comments that you have heard about the department, in terms of management of its affairs, is that when given some difficult issues to respond to, such as the predator control program and the need for studies that speak to baseline data in terms of the numbers of species, the department has, in the past, stated that they have not been able to do the job because they are a young agency.

I would like to set their record straight on that particular statement. I think that what is in order is a brief review of the historical relationship of the government and the department. The first legislative initiative, with regard to game management in Yukon, was made in 1894 by the passage of the *Northwest Game Act* in the federal House of Commons. 1898 saw the creation of the *Yukon Act* and the establishment, of course, of this particular institution known as the Yukon government.

The *Northwest Game Act* of 1894 applied in Yukon until the territory was granted the right to legislate for its game resources in July of 1900. The new territorial council approved its own game ordinance and, on January 19, 1901, assent was given to an ordinance respecting the preservation of game in the Yukon Territory.

Some salient features of that legislation was a change in seasons on big game and no closed seasons on fur-bearing animals. The game legislation of 1901 introduced bag limits for the first time and required the reporting of game killed to the Royal North West Mounted Police. The ordinance also created game guardians, as opposed to wardens, who were granted power to search any bag or other receptacle, vehicle or other means of transportation.

Another major feature of that ordinance was the penalty levied on those who failed to use game meat for food. The penalty, in those days, of the section that called for penalties, called for a fine of up to \$500 and a three-month jail term; a very stiff penalty, in those days. Looking at some present day cases, that particular penalty would be viewed as stiff, as well. Unfortunately, many of our laws, today, with respect to penalties for game offenses, in my opinion, are not stiff enough, particularly when it comes to the issue of wastage of animals.

The Commissioner-in-Council was granted power to alter sea-

sons, but not bag limits or any other provision. In the ensuing years, the game ordinance was changed many times, but it was not until 1920 that it was revised in a major fashion.

The amendments of 1908 are interesting, in light of the recent regulatory changes announced by this government. In 1908, the game ordinance was changed to state that only males of big game species could be taken. It is interesting to note that, 76 years later, we have come full circle to that question and now are adopting similar measures. Of course, I refer to the Cabinet decision of this government to change the wildlife regulations, on March 30th, 1984, to ban the hunting of cow moose on a Yukon-wide basis.

The Yukon game ordinance of 1920 contained 44 sections on 16 pages, as compared to 25 sections on five pages of the earlier law. The ordinance created new classes of licenses for market hunting, big game guiding and the fur trade. This new ordinance, coupled with the *Fox Protection Ordinance* of 1914 and the *Fur Export Tax Ordinance* of 1919, granted the Yukon government unprecedented authority over game management in Yukon.

I will not continue that particular line of debate. I simply want to illustrate, for the record and for the public at large, that we have had a long history of game management in Yukon and, for anyone who is interested in reading up on the historical, relevant points of game management in Yukon, there is a book, entitled *Trophies or Meats*, that was written by Robert McCandless in 1976 and was unpublished. It looks at game management in Yukon from 1896 to 1976. It is an excellent book for anyone who is interested and can be obtained at the local library.

In case members opposite do not understand the intent of my opening remarks, I would like to produce evidence, in terms of why that is critical to understanding the situation.

The minister wrote a letter to Mr. D.M. Lavenier, President of the Wildlife Society of Canada. That particular letter, which was referred to earlier in the legislature in terms of Question Period, is dated March 27, 1984. In that letter the minister writes: "We have not yet developed species specific management plans or area management plans since we are a relatively young agency." For the record, I would like to show that game management in Yukon is not a new undertaking, it is one area of legal jurisdiction that this government can competently say is within its mandate. It has been with governments of Yukon since 1901. We have had 83 years of responsibility for game management for Yukon.

I believe that in terms of the constitutionality of whether or not Ottawa still retains some jurisdictional competence in this area is by and large an issue that has been set aside. I do not think anyone is worried about it. I think that Ottawa has conceded that Yukon government does have legal constitutional authority to effect jurisdictional laws with respect to management of game.

As a further point of interest, the *Game Ordinance* has been revised in some way at virtually every session of the territorial legislature for the past 83 years, a record that surpasses any other Yukon law. It is with this historical background as evidence that I once again call for the government to begin to look very clearly at its responsibilities and to begin to put in place some long term management policies. As I stated in the legislature on Wednesday, March 28th, the time for Yukon to adopt a comprehensive wildlife policy is now.

On March 28th, I tabled in the House a motion calling for the creation of a select committee of this legislature to study and to make recommendations to the House on the proper management of Yukon wildlife resources. In his response, the minister attempted, in my opinion, to duck the issue and to revert to a political counterattack. The minister charged that it was, in one instance, attempting to undermine the credibility of the wildlife advisory committee and as well accuse me of sabotaging the land claims negotiations.

I think that the records of *Hansard* will clearly show that those charges were absolutely ridiculous and, when viewed in the context of a motion, would be deemed to be totally irrelevant to the discussion in respect to the creation of a select committee.

There is no question that the department has had a tough go of it over the last couple of years. To its credit, in many instances, it has been showing signs of attempting to reorganize, and re-priorize

some of the mandates that it has. I understand that the budget talks about the reorganization of the department along with other departments of government. I am most interested to hear the minister very clearly spell out what kind of reorganization has taken place in the government, particularly in the Department of Renewable Resources. I would like to hear his opinions as to whether or not that reorganization will allow the department to manage game and game resources on a more efficient basis.

⁵⁹ I think many of the problems we have experienced with the department could maybe not have been eliminated but probably could have been contained and given specific guidelines in which a decision could have been rendered, had we had a comprehensive wildlife policy which covered most of the issues instead of the situation where we would have issues pop up out of the bush, as it were, then we would have to, on a crisis management basis, respond to those issues. I think that, for the record, it should be clear that we, the official opposition, clearly see that one of the priorities of the department has to be the creation of that particular comprehensive wildlife policy. I think it would be in order, at this particular point, to ask the minister what his current thoughts are on developing a comprehensive wildlife policy and has there been any recent discussion within the department about that issue and can we see, in the next couple of years, over the life of this legislature, some concrete initiative by the minister and his department toward that end? I am speaking of a planned process within the department internally. I understand they have embarked on a whole series of community meetings, one of which I was in Teslin, which, as I stated earlier, was a good meeting.

Are the game managers — the biologists, the enforcement people, the people working parks, the ministers themselves and the deputy minister — sitting down and are they talking about a comprehensive wildlife policy for Yukon? If they are, can they give us some idea as to how it can be effected and what kind of role the public would have in it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It was nice for the member across the floor to give us the history of game laws. It was fairly obvious what he was leading up to. However, I would like to state for the record that the Department of Renewable Resources was formed seven years ago and since that time it has been greatly involved in developing game management.

The member across the floor also raised the issue of 1908 when they only allowed shooting of the male of the species and he says we are only now coming back around to only allowing hunting of the male of the species. Regardless of what year or whenever it is, you allow shooting of the female of the species when your populations are very high. So there is justification for shooting the male or the female of the species at various times. While I am thinking about that, I wonder if the member across the floor would be interested in talking to the people whom he represents and speaks about quite often in this House — the native people of the territory — about not shooting the female of the species. Because that is one of the very intense problem areas that we have. The native people of the territory indiscriminately shoot cows and calves and it is a very intense problem for a department of the government that is trying to manage game when they do not have the full jurisdiction over that game; people who form a large minority of the people in this territory and they are not controlled. So there is a problem there as well.

He is talking about putting in place long-term management policies and yet, when we tried to gather information such as we have been trying to do with our predator prey study that we are doing in game management areas 7 and 9, both he and his party have not supported it.

⁶⁰ In fact, we have spent a great deal of money in trying to gather the information that is needed, in order to form a wise predator-prey management policy in the territory.

He talks about management policies and yet, when the government is busy gathering information in order to put a policy in place, it is objected to by members across the floor. I would be interested in knowing what he thinks a policy is, what a management policy is and if he thinks you can just sit down and write one.

There is a great deal of work that goes into a management policy

and, in order to form a policy that has some benefit to the government and the people of the territory, it requires information and it requires a great deal of work; it requires expenditure of a lot of money. It is easy to sit down and say the government should draft up a management policy, but that is not exactly the way it happens. We are working on it. We are working very hard on it and, hopefully, within the next couple of years, we will have it in place.

Mr. Porter: I said I would not get provoked, but the minister is trying awfully hard to have me give up on that commitment.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Let us be civilized about it.

Mr. Porter: The Minister of Education is talking about civilization. I wonder if she can indicate a degree of that and be quiet while I am speaking?

In terms of the issue of native hunting, the member makes the statement clearly that it will show up in *Hansard* that native people are indiscriminately shooting the female moose and other female species of game. I have to take issue with that statement because, clearly, that is not the case. The usage of the word "indiscriminately" would mean to imply that the majority, the vast numbers of native people, are going out there with intent and doing as such.

It is not an issue we are going to solve here, right now. He cannot think that he can sit here and raise the issue and expect, through the course of the debates between now and 11:30 — if we finish by then — to solve that particular issue. It is an issue of paramount importance, in terms of the negotiations of land claims. It is an issue that strikes at the heart of constitutional rights for aboriginal people in Yukon.

It is an issue, a right that is guaranteed to the aboriginal people of Yukon, through 17(3) of the *Yukon Act*. We are not going to be able to amend the *Yukon Act*, here; it is a piece of legislation that can be amended only by the House of Commons. For him to raise that particular spectre of debate, at this time, is not productive. I think that it is irresponsible and he very well knows that this has been debated and debated, in the past, many times, throughout the public and the legislature — the member for Hootalinqua raised the issue, in an unrelated fashion, a few days ago.

The issue is clear, it is a land claims issue. It has been negotiated, agreements have been struck, his government has been party to an agreement that says aboriginal people will forego that right, as a result of settlement, in exchange for other rights.

⁶¹ I do not think it does anyone any good for him to raise that issue here. In terms of the question of management policies, he says you just cannot simply sit down and decide management policies. He is right. You cannot do that. I think that is what is being done. That is very much my point. This government, by and large, has been engaged in the policy process of simply sitting down and deciding on the spot how management policies will be affected. I think that we have seen that over the last couple of years. Particularly this department. Most recently on the issue of the bear removal program.

In that respect, that is why I raise the issue with the minister and remind him of the debate that went on earlier in this Session with respect to the motion for a select committee.

Policy formulation by government involves many factors. It involves the technical aspect of the minister's department, the technicians who are charged with the responsibility of being hired as biologists; it involves the enforcement part of the department; it involves the political aspect of the department to which the minister is responsible for, collectively, internally getting together and deciding issues that have to be looked at. It has to be taken to the people. It has to involve all of the people of Yukon, particularly those groups that have a vested interest in wildlife management. There have to be discussions with those people. Government has to propose something to them, and say here is what we are looking at, what do you think of it.

My idea was excellent. You do that by creating a select committee of this legislature, mandate that committee with that responsibility, allow the committee to go to the communities and meet with the people. Talk about wildlife policies and make some decisions collectively as to how we should see it in the future. I think that it was very clear as to the intention and I completely

understand the policy process and I think that the minister would be well advised to read those debates over again. If he sleeps on it he may have a change of heart.

Mr. Speaker: The time being 5:30 we shall recess until 7:30.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Committee will come to order.

We will go back into general debate on the Department of Renewable Resources.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to make a point or two, just at this stage in the debate, before our critic goes on to another point. I would really like to make a statement, rather than ask a question and can be fairly brief in doing it.

The major issue is that we are calling for a comprehensive wildlife policy. The minister is speaking about more specific kinds of issues, for example, specific predator control measures and the departmental statements have been around that.

I would like to make two points. Firstly, it is obvious that there are competing general interests, for example, the conservation interests, expressed most eloquently by conservationists. There is the interest of the outfitters and the tourism industry.

• Tourism makes a living from the wildlife in the territory and also the tourists, of course. They use the wildlife as a tourism resource. That is a very important interest. There is the trapper's interest for furbearing animals, which is slightly different. There is an interest that is exercised primarily by native people in subsistence living, or in food supply through the wildlife in the territory. Then there is the interest of the resident sportsman, best exemplified by the Fish and Game Association. They are primarily city dwellers who enjoy hunting and who use the wildlife resource to hunt and who also get meat in the form most often of moose and ducks, I suppose as well. There are also the fisherman. There are other interests.

It is my perception that the interests of the sports hunters and the outfitters have been weighted very heavily or have been given very high priority by this government.

• Politically, that makes a lot of sense, because there are a lot of votes in that corner.

What the member for Campbell is calling for is, obviously, a serious, sober balancing of those interests and the other interests, in order to achieve a long-term wildlife management plan for the Yukon. That is something that the departmental statements, in the past few years, have been deficient in, in our opinions, I think.

I would like to make a point that I have made before, but I would like to extend it a little bit and say that it is my personal opinion that very great attention should be paid to the Porcupine caribou herd, from the point of view of exploiting that herd. I say that in those words, very carefully, and I need to explain what I mean by the word "exploit".

Certainly, the conservation interest is to maintain the herd in as wild and as natural a state as possible and, therefore, to maintain the habitat. The interest of the people of Old Crow is primarily for meat; for hunting. There are tourism implications and other implications, as well.

• It is obvious that the major caribou population that used to be found at Caribou Crossing, now Carcross, at certain times of the year is either decimated or virtually decimated. That is a tragedy. It is decimated because of hunting pressure and population pressure.

With developments in the northern part of the territory, the caribou herd is threatened; maybe not today, but the direction is clear that there will be a development on the North Slope of some sort or other, that is obvious. The Dempster Highway is already built. Various proposals exist and will exist in the future that may interfere with the habitat of the herd. The population of Old Crow is not a small stable population as it was for generations. There is something like a population explosion because of modern medical attention and other resources; for example, winter fuel and flown-in food that makes the existence of the Indians there much more secure.

• In the long-term future, the population is going to grow and be a greater burden on the herd, if the traditional ways continue into the future, which all of us hope they will, at least, in some form.

It is my opinion that if the worth of that herd — and it is tremendously, tremendously valuable — is demonstrated and is known in other terms than subsistence hunting, then the value of that wildlife resource is more of a force that must be considered in the competing developmental interests that will occur in the north Yukon, in the long-term future.

It is my opinion that scientific resources should be made available to the people of Old Crow to, essentially, farm the Porcupine caribou herd. That is, the herd should be studied at the speed and at the direction and supervision of the people of Old Crow. The policies of the government concerning the herd should change and there should be a policy allowing the commercial exploitation of the herd for meat and, especially, for the tanning of the hides, which is essentially a wasted resource now. If it is scientifically managed in cooperation with the people of Old Crow, it is my opinion that that resource would be a tremendous economic resource, primarily for the benefit of the people of Old Crow but, ultimately, for the benefit of the territory.

• It is my opinion that the present beef farming operations in southern Alberta are less efficient than farming of the natural buffalo would have been if we had managed that resource well one hundred years ago, or even less in terms of time: 70 or 80 years ago. The opportunity to maintain that extremely valuable resource and enhance it and increase the economic base of the territory is not properly studied now. The policy of the government is to simply look at the traditional use of the village of Old Crow as it existed in the past. The projections as to the increased need are not adequately made in my view.

I would emphasize that the potential for a tannery in Old Crow to utilize caribou hide is an extremely important and valuable potential. The Department of Economic Development, in conjunction with renewable resources, should be assisting the people of Old Crow in developing that herd. That process would clearly establish the economic importance of the herd. The wildlife interest and the renewable resource interest would be properly valued when the competing interests of non-renewable resources and renewable resources are balanced against each other on the North Slope.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member started out by talking about competing interests in wildlife in the territory. There are a great many competing interests in the territory.

He mentions tourism, subsistence hunting, the wildlife interests and wilderness interests. This is exactly the situation that the Department of Renewable Resources is in, trying to balance all these interests and come up with a policy that is suitable to everyone.

I suggest to the members across the floor that on wildlife interests it is very hard to make value judgments and come up with a policy. We have the Indian land claims in process right now. In order to meet our commitments under that Indian land claims settlement we have to guarantee that there are going to be so many animals. If there are not, the native people may not even get their share. Certainly the white people of the territory who also rely on subsistence will not be getting anything. There are a great number of different competing interests that we have to deal with.

• One of the reasons I spoke earlier about our predator-prey relationship study and the project we are doing in game management seven and nine is to find out what we will have to do regarding predators in the territory in order to guarantee the moose and caribou population of the territory for the commitment that we have under the Indian land claims settlement.

The member makes the statement that departmental statements have been deficient, regarding wildlife policies. Perhaps so, but all I can say to the members across the floor and to the member for Whitehorse South Centre is that I am sure, in my own mind, that he could not come up with any better policies than the people I have working in my Department of Renewable Resources. I am very sure.

It is easy to sit there, across the floor, when you are not involved and criticize what is going on. It is very easy to do that. We recognize that we are not always right and that there are mistakes made. People learn from their mistakes and, in seven years of having a renewable resource department, I think we have come a

long way in the management of game in the territory.

I would also like to state that I think something that is vastly overlooked by critics of government and their renewable resources and wildlife branches is that man is also a part of nature. As the years go by and as cultures change, we have to change, as well. I think that is one thing that is greatly overlooked in this territory.

We often talk about native hunting and native hunting rights and native aboriginal rights, regarding game in the territory. Native ways of life are changing, as well, and native populations, compared to 50, 100 years ago, are vastly changed from the lifestyle that they had during those days. What we have to recognize and what the native people have to recognize, as well, is that we all have to change.

We have to change our mode of living and we have to change our mode of hunting in the territory. If we are going to protect those wildlife populations out there, we are all going to have to make adjustments in the way that we want to live and the way that we have lived.

It is all right to say that for thousands of years these people lived off of these caribou. We have the capability and the native people have the capability, today, to destroy those caribou in a few short years. They have that capability because we have come up with modern weapons and we have come up with modern ways of hunting. So, everyone has to make some changes.

The member talks about commercial exploitation of the Porcupine caribou herd. I suggest to you that commercial exploitation would probably be the worst thing that we could possibly do with the Porcupine caribou herd. If we want that caribou herd to stay in our northern area of the Yukon Territory, and if we want it to remain as it has been throughout history — at least as long as man can remember — then we are not going to be able to commercially exploit it.

Once we start commercially exploiting that herd, then we start to become managers of that herd. We are going to manage it for exploitation. As soon as we start managing it for exploitation, nature is out the window. We are going to manage it just as the Inuit people in the Northwest Territories managed the reindeer herds there. They manage them for exploitation. They are wild animals, too, although they have been domesticated. If we talk about managing for exploitation, we are talking about domesticating.

He talks about a tannery for caribou hides. I guess if we are going to have a tannery for caribou hides, then we have to get back to commercial exploitation. That is exactly what we are going to have, especially if it is in the area of Old Crow. I agree, I would like to see a tannery for wildlife hides in this territory. I do not think Old Crow is the place for it. I think probably Whitehorse or somewhere in southern Yukon where we can not only tan caribou hides, but we can tan moose hides or any other hide. I believe that that would be great. It would be a great commercial benefit to the territory. Unfortunately, no one has seen fit to put a proposal forward yet. No one has seen fit to come up with the money to start such an industry. I will be happy the day it happens. But, I would be very sad to ever see us getting into the commercial exploitation of the Porcupine caribou herd.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have just a very short comment about commercial exploitation. The very worst thing that could occur is if commercial exploitation is made possible legally and some entrepreneur goes in and kills all the animals and makes a fast buck. I am not talking about that at all. I am talking about farming a herd of wild animals, and managing the herd to the benefit of the herd, and to maintain it forever. That is possible. With increased scientific information and wise management there can be a continual commercial benefit, as well as a continuation and adaptation of the cultural benefit to the people of Old Crow. That, in my opinion, would protect that herd economically in the long term future and ultimately to the best long term interest of the people of Old Crow and the entire Yukon.

Mr. Porter: I am glad to get back into the debate here.

The minister, when he was talking about a tannery, talked about the various species of game that we could tan: moose, caribou, and so on. He forgot to mention we could possibly tan his hide as well

while we were at it.

In terms of the tannery itself, the idea was looked into. I believe it was 1980 that the Old Crow band, in conjunction with the CYI and Special ARDA, did do an economic evaluation on the possibility of a tannery in Old Crow. Yes, at that time, the idea was a feasible idea and Old Crow was probably the most suitable location in Yukon for the establishment of a tannery, simply because of the fact that, when you talk about a business, you talk about the laws of supply and demand and there is no question that the supply is there. The question that had to be looked at, of course, like most everything associated with that community, would be transportation costs.

As well, they also conducted a study on the ability of the establishment of a fishery plant, in conjunction with the Hahn Fishery Plant, established in Dawson City. Again, there were indicators of economic viability for that project.

So, the whole area of commercial exploitation of renewable resources is an area, I think, that is presently beyond the ability of this government to look at. I think it is a very complex area and it is an area that has to be given really good, sound, scientific research before you make a move in that direction. It has been proven, in the past, that it can be done on a small scale basis and I suspect that, in the future, as we become more sophisticated in our management practices, that we will one day be able to utilize country foods, as it were, as a real alternative to the imported beef and other products that we bring up from the south.

Just a further comment about that particular issue that people were talking about, with respect to the viability of the caribou herd, I would just like to say that, given the current availability of caribou in Old Crow, you can be guaranteed that no one in Old Crow is walking around asking "where is the beef"?

Much of this Fourth Session of the 25th Legislature was preoccupied with the very issues we are talking about now, in terms of debates, and that is the wolf and bear control programs. I think that we have made it very clear, on this side of the House, that we have done everything possible to alert the government to the negative ramifications of the decisions that they have taken on this issue, to date. There has been a massive backlash to the government's predator control program, not only from Yukon, but from outside of Yukon, from the United States. We have received inquiries and letters of protest from all parts of the globe and I believe, at one time, the minister was receiving as many as 20 letters a day. As evidenced in the paper, the other night, those letters are still coming in from the tour operators.

There is no question that there is speculation that that backlash could very well result in a shortfall of tourism revenues, destined for the needy coffers of this territory's economy.

It seems, we have made the point time and time again, that this government is willing to take that huge risk of a declining tourist market and is stubbornly entrenched in its position to proceed with the predator programs, as announced, even though it has been pointed out, time and time again, that these programs are deficient of a solid, scientific data base.

There is no question that every tourist-oriented business in Yukon will be watching its revenue picture very closely this season. By that same token, we, the official opposition, will be monitoring next year's tourism statistics with particular attention paid to the revenue that is brought into the territory as a result of that economic activity.

This issue has tremendous ramifications because we only have to look at what is going on with the anti-seal lobby. It is still going on. It was initiated 10 years ago. That issue is still being felt today. Fortunately the people who are involved in that issue are beginning to develop a well organized counterattack to that particular issue. The Inuit of the eastern Arctic, particularly, and the people in the Maritime provinces are joining forces and formulating a national body to articulate their concerns and counterattack what is happening with them in that particular area of the resource economy.

I think that in the Yukon it is a different situation right now. We are just beginning to feel the brunt of the backlash. I think there is no question in anybody's mind that, because of the announced

programs and because of the way in which they are announced, the damage to Yukon has already been done. In today's media, it is not difficult to receive negative press, but it is an entirely different story to regain a positive image. I think there is no question that the Yukon's reputation as a wilderness retreat area has taken a serious image beating on this question.

Over the long haul, the only way around it in my mind is good sound management policies. They have to be put before the public. They have to be argued, advanced, displayed and in place to show that they could work. I suggest to this government that it is not too late to undo bad decisions. They can begin to undo the damage that has been done. If they refuse to, I guess we will just have to pick up that task when we take over the reins of government here in Yukon.

Before I leave this particular area of concern, I would like to ask the minister what exactly his department has been doing to salvage the image of Yukon in this particular area. It is my information that, as an example, a small travel agency operator located in the state of Massachusetts has received a bulletin from the Minister of Renewable Resources on this issue. I would like to ask the minister how many such letters or bulletins has his department sent out to date and to whom was this information directed?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would like to address the comments that the member across the floor made. Number one, he talks about a massive backlash. I can assure him that there has not been a massive backlash. It has been a very small backlash. It has been by a very specific group of people, specifically that type of people who think that whatever is walking around should never be touched. It should all be allowed to walk around. These are the kind of people who say that we should not be exploiting our resources. Yet they want to jump in jet planes and fly all over the world. They live off the backs of people who have certain ideas about protecting our resources. They make a living, actually, out of being protesters. We have quite a few of those in Canada, today. Hopefully, sometime in the near future, Canadians and Americans, and North Americans generally, are going to wake up to the fact that what they are doing is destroying themselves by supporting this type of people.

He pointed out that the program that we are doing in predator-prey management is deficient in information. I can assure the members across the floor that in the program we are doing we have more scientific information than any other program that has ever been instituted in North America regarding predator-prey relationships. I can also assure you that the same kind of programs are going on in other parts of Canada. In fact, I just had one across my desk today. There is one going on in Saskatchewan where they have removed black bears. In fact, it is going on to such an extent that they are now even starting to poison bears because of the problem that they are creating with the ungulate population.

I can assure you that we have ample scientific information to back our program. In fact, other than a few radical biologists who disagree with our program — and they do not disagree with it on biological grounds, they disagree with it on philosophical grounds — we have not heard a complaint from anyone who has any biological expertise. Regardless of the message that you continually hear from across the floor, we do have the support of a great many people in this territory and a great many people in North America. In fact, we are leading the way. In a few years from now, I think they will look back on it and say that the Yukon Territory was the forerunner in predator-prey management, because it is happening all over North America.

I would also like to state that the member across the floor mentioned negative press that we have received. I suggest to you that most of the negative press that we have received has been received in the territory and it has been the reporting of statements that are made by the people across the floor.

Mr. Porter: Maybe the minister does not think that 750,000 people are going to have an impact but, to date, those are the numbers that have been indicated are involved in an active organizational fashion around this particular government's predator-prey program and decisions to undertake them.

I was not going to get into the debate right now on predator-prey programs that the government has undertaken but, seeing as how

the minister has advanced and taken debate in that direction, I will follow suit. The minister makes the announcement that everyone is virtually in agreement with this program, except those radical biologists. Obviously, if they do not agree with his program, they are radical biologists.

I would like to quote some of the biologists who have commented on the particular program. We have a man by the name of Roland Mah, a biologist at the Lethbridge Community College in Alberta. He talks about the government's program, and says "I am not really that confident in the Government of Yukon's ability to census their moose population. They admit some pretty wild fluctuations in numbers exist and how can we manage bears if we do not know how many there are?"

It goes on to state that Mah, who has trained some Yukon conservation officers and has been a big game guide in Alaska, says he has serious doubts about the conclusions reached when moose-hair is found on bear scats. All the scats tell us is what the bear has eaten. It does not tell us what he has killed, or if the bear fed off the moose after the animal died, because of poor habitat.

He points out the fact that, in the late 70's, Yukon had some pretty severe winters and the moose and caribou have been declining because of habitat problems. He said that a lot of the dead moose that could have been seen could have been as a result of the habitat problem.

He also continues to say, "I have very serious reservations that bears, with a density of one per 50 square miles, have the ability to hunt and find those moose calves; the energy is not there". That is one particular biologist's opinion.

Another important area he talks about is what this government should be doing is research and they should especially concentrate in the recent and long-term relationship between the moose and the moose's food supply.

Dick Russell, a Canadian wildlife service biologist in Edmonton, warns that if you kill too many bears, actually, what could possibly happen is that you increase the bear populations. His theory is based on personal activity that he undertook in the Fort McMurray area, where an experiment done six years ago, according to him, shows that removing male black bears triggered a population explosion because more cubs survived. What he states is that, as a biologist, he has observed that a lot of the male bears do, in fact, take bear cubs.

We also have Dr. Charles Jonkel, who teaches at the University of Montana and has studied grizzlies for 24 years and is recognized as an authority on a world-wide basis. He says people in Yukon, who do not know enough about bears and wolves to not launch such a massive impact on the populations. These are direct quotes, and I quote, "If you screw up generations of hierarchy of the bear population, all hell can break use. The best thing for Yukon is what is there, naturally, or it would not have been put there". He says his advice is to "work with what you have got".

These are some of the biologists who have commented on the particular program that has been announced by the government. Of course, the minister will simply slough them off and say that they are radical and, therefore, their opinions do not count, even though they have had 24 years studying the bears.

I think that one of the critical issues of this question, with respect to the bears, has always been how many bears are there? To date, the government has not indicated that they know it all, in terms of what the density figures for Yukon are. As a matter of fact, the biologist employed in the department, to give us evidence in this area, stated that what they have are guesstimates and how they have arrived at those guesstimates is by simply taking density figures from other jurisdictions, such as Alaska and the Northwest Territories, and extrapolating those figures and using them to give an indication as to what the bear population in Yukon is.

We had the Pearson report that a lot of people are familiar with. Dr. Pearson worked with the Canadian Wildlife Service and spent a number of years examining and studying bears in Yukon. He came up with a figure in excess of 13,000 bears for Yukon. A few years later, Mr. Grant Lortie, a bear biologist employed by the Government of Yukon, conducted a survey of his own and he came up with a figure of just slightly more than 5,000 grizzlies for

Yukon. I would like to ask the minister if he can tell us now how many grizzly bears we have at the present time in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: First of all, I would like to deal with the statements made and the quotations from the biologists. The first letter he quoted makes exactly the point that I was trying to make earlier. The biologists did not know what was going on. He showed his ignorance by talking about moosehair in scats. That is not where we got our information. We got our information right on the spot, right where the moose calf was killed. We have that information by knowing exactly how a bear kills a calf and what it does with the remains. It buries the remains and the grizzly hair was on the bushes all around where the calf was killed. We have ample evidence to show that the grizzly bears killed the calves. To me, that just points out the ignorance of some of these biologists who have not even taken the time to read the information that is available to them. I am glad that the member across the floor raised that, it just shows exactly the problem with some of these people.

As for the number of grizzly bears in the territory, we do not have an exact count of the grizzly bears in the territory. Let us take it at the minimum and suppose there are 5,000 bears - never mind the 14,000 that Dr. Pearson, who is a bear expert, quoted - let us take the 5,000 bears. We are talking about removing 60 bears, which is less than one-tenth of one percent of the bears in the territory. We are doing it for a special project in order to give us research information. They kill hundreds of chimpanzees every year for research.

As I told you earlier, they are poisoning bears in some places because of the problems. We are using them for a special research project and we are not just going out and indiscriminately killing the bears. We are trying to generate revenue from them as well. I suggest that the people across the floor start to think about what we are doing and the value of the information that we will be gathering for the Yukon government and for the people of the territory.

Mr. Porter: I do not know what killing chimpanzees has to do with the issue at hand, which is the discussion surrounding the grizzly bear population. Maybe he alludes to it because he is trying to find his roots and try to make a connection with the missing link. I think the question that I put to him is a very legitimate question. If they do not know how many bears we have in the Yukon, then I suggest that it is their job to sit down and figure out how many there are. Is his government undertaking a study to obtain information as to the amount of bear populations in Yukon?

Mr. Chairman: Any more general debate?

Mr. Porter: I would like the record to clearly show that the minister refuses to answer the question. Obviously, the refusal of the minister would indicate that his government is doing nothing about finding out how many bears there are in Yukon. I would further state that that is the problem with respect to management in Yukon. We do not have a species-by-species database. We do not know, in Yukon, how many animals we have. That is critical to management, in anybody's book. It has been pointed out to the government, time and time again, that the first thing that you have to do is sit down and figure out your resource base. Figure out how many animals you have in Yukon and then you can move to a better system of management.

In the bear control area, the minister announced certain measures, this spring, in terms of changes to the wildlife regulations. In the regulatory changes, he has made changes to allow for the taking of grizzly bears by residents. He has taken off the one-in-every-four-years quota and allowed residents to go into the bear control area and take a grizzly bear on a yearly basis. As well, he has stated that his department will be issuing one hundred permits to residents to guide non-residents in the particular control area to take grizzly bears. Furthermore, as he has just stated a couple of minutes ago, his department is also allowing big game outfitters to take additional bears in that area. To date, how many permits has his department issued under those three areas?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not know if the department has issued any permits under that provision. It is very unlikely that we will ever reach one hundred.

While I am on my feet, I would also like to state that the reason I did not stand up the last time is because it is obvious, with the

debate that is going on in this House, it would not matter what I said; the members across the floor — especially the member for Campbell — would be standing up and arguing something different. So, it is not productive to stand up and say something here. I have said, more than once in this House, what we are trying to do and about the information that we are trying to gather, as well as the money that it costs to do it and how long it takes to do it. Obviously, it does not matter what you tell the members across the floor, it does not seem to sink in.

Mr. Porter: I have never liked quitters and I think that is what we have got going here. I think that the minister has been given a responsibility by the people who elected him. He has been given a responsibility by the government leader to look after game management. I think that he should just realize the basics of his responsibility and at least address himself to responsible questions that are put to him.

I think the fact that he does not know how many permits have been issued, to date, by his department in this particular area, is totally irresponsible. I think, because this program has caused such a great deal of controversy, that you would think that the minister would see it in his best interest to keep close touch on what is happening. I think that it is totally relevant information and I cannot, for the life of me, understand why he does not answer the questions.

If he refuses to move any further on the grizzly program, then I would hope that he would have some basic answers with respect to the wolf program that was undertaken by his government.

One thing, before we move into the debates in this area, is that I would like to correct the record. Earlier, I had made the statement, in Question Period, that the department was spending \$1,200 per wolf in the wolf program. I quoted inaccurately from a *Yukon News* article; the \$1,200, upon rechecking the article, really addressed the collared wolves. That was the expense that was incurred by this government, with respect to that particular program; it was not the predator removal program, which was done by choppers.

My general question to the minister, which should not cause any great deal of controversy, is: in the past, we have received an unclear indication as to the exact numbers of wolves that have been taken. I would like the minister to indicate to me if he could give a number, to date, as to the total number of wolves taken by his government officials, under the predator removal program? Can he further break that down as to the numbers taken in the Finlayson area and numbers taken in the study area? Could he also give a number, to date, that his department knows about, in terms of the wolves taken by choppers? Could he tell me if his department plans on further removal of wolves for the next season?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think I have given the members across the floor the information on wolves in the Finlayson area. There were 105 wolves taken, this year. I do not have the breakdown before me, right now, of how many the government caught and how many the residents got.

As far as game management zones seven and nine are concerned, I think it is about 25 wolves that we have taken, so far. We have quite a few on the radio collar. Unfortunately, during the winter that we had this year, there was not very much snow and it made it almost impossible for us to remove the wolves. However, we did remove approximately 50 percent of the wolves in one area of the study area, the critical area that we were studying, so that it will afford us at least enough information to show how it will be affecting the moose calf survival rate. That is an update on the wolf situation.

Mr. Porter: Going back to the debate on the programs undertaken by this government to combat the negative lobbying that has been done by outside the interests, I earlier asked the minister as to how many letters and bulletins his department has sent out to date and to whom was the information directed. How much has his department appropriated, in dollar terms, for a public relations campaign aimed at clarifying this government's position, vis-a-vis the predator control program?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: First of all, we never sent any statements to any travel agents. If that was done, it was not done by my department. We have responded to some of the letters. We have

responded on an individual basis to a lot of them and to people who we felt were knowledgeable enough. For organizations, we sent them the paper that I tabled in this House, the Ungulate Predator-Prey study that the members have all seen. It is not my department that would be replying to travel agents unless those travel agents specifically wrote to my department. As far as how much money we have allocated for public relations, we have not allocated any money to public relations; it is all part of our wildlife management. We reply to people who write to us. There has not been any public relations project put in place to try to justify what we are doing, because we feel that we are totally justified and we are not getting any flak from people in the know. The only people who are complaining are people who do not know what is going on or they have been fed false information by various groups.

While I am on my feet, I would like to say that the Conservation Society of the Yukon Territory is one of the groups that has been very detrimental to the people of the Yukon Territory in this regard. Regardless of the statement by the president of the Yukon Conservation Society that they did not support the tourism boycott of this territory, I can tell you that any day of the month I can table before you the telex, from Paul Watson to me, saying that the Yukon Conservation Society was their representative in the territory. A big part of the damage done to the territory has been done by Yukoners.

Mr. Porter: The minister seems to operate on the philosophy of "be reasonable and do it my way and everything will be okay". It all seems to be very black and white to him: either you are for him or against him. Fortunately, that is not the way most people conduct their affairs and how they see life.

This is a very important area. I am disappointed that this particular department is not undertaking a campaign of its own, because I think it is going to catch up to us. I think that if we ignore it and think that it is going to go away, we are going to be mistaken. With satellite communications, what we say here can, conceivably, be heard the world throughout very instantaneously. If the government is not putting together a program of its own, is the government at least monitoring what is being said?

¹⁷ Do they look to the southern media outlets to provide them with newspaper clippings of stories and letters that relate to their program? Have they obtained copies of the radio and television ads that we hear are being produced in the United States and aired? Is the government at least doing that; monitoring what is being said to the wider population of tourists that are looking to come to the Yukon, hopefully, one day?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. We reply to some of them.

Mr. Porter: It seems that we are not gaining much ground in this area as well. I will shift the debate once again. I would like to enter into the area of parks, which is a large responsibility of this particular department. I speak of the territorial parks as opposed to the national parks. Has his government developed a policy for territorial parks?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. Our policy is laid out in legislation.

Mr. Porter: Unfortunately that was not the issue I was getting at. Everyone knows there is a territorial parks act.

I will get back into the policy discussion area. I focus now on the issue of the northern Yukon. We have heard recent reports that the Governments of Canada and Yukon are looking at a park. I might say that the whole area of northern Yukon in recent time has become the subject of a great deal of controversy in respect to overall land use planning decisions. One of the important decisions that has been debated is the issue of the establishment of a national park in northern Yukon. The Berger Report recommended the establishment of such a park. The COPE agreement-in-principle in 1978 called for such a park to be set up as well. In addition, both the CYI and the community of Old Crow have been favourably disposed to the idea of a park, as well as the federal government. How does the minister's government support such a proposal of the establishment of a national park in northern Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. The national park in northern Yukon has been supported by this government long before a national park was ever proposed. We proposed a territorial park in northern Yukon in the Firth watershed.

I do not know really why the questions are coming across the floor. It has been public knowledge. We have put our position forward in a Northern Yukon Resource Management Model. I am sure the member has seen this, as has every other person in the territory.

Mr. Porter: I raise this question because I am under the understanding that the federal government parks people are coming to the Yukon very shortly to begin negotiations with the Yukon government with respect to this particular park. As well, they were recently in the community of Old Crow speaking about the whole issue of setting up a park. At what stage are the negotiations between his government and the federal government and the representatives of the aboriginal people at in terms of the establishment of a northern Yukon national park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We negotiated with the federal government and with the native people, and the COPE claim that laid out that there would be a national park in the northern Yukon and that the eastern boundary would be set by the land planning process.

¹⁸ It was negotiated and signed and sealed and sent to Ottawa. Unfortunately, some members of the federal civil service do not agree with that claim and they are trying to renegotiate it. We have taken a very strong position that we signed our agreement and that was our position and it was agreed to by all parties and it is not our intention, at this time, to deviate from the agreement that we signed with COPE and with the federal government.

Mr. Porter: On the park boundaries that have been looked at, with respect to the national park, I understand the controversy is in respect to the boundary, as to where it will fit, relevant to the geographic location of, I believe, the Babbage River. Does the minister's government support the boundary to include the headwaters of the Babbage River?

Motion to extend sitting hours

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move that the Committee of the Whole and the Assembly be empowered to continue beyond 9:30 p.m. until such time it is agreed to adjourn for the purpose of continuing consideration of the bills before the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Tracey: With regard to the eastern boundary of the park, it is signed in the COPE claim, and is a position that we support, that the eastern boundary shall be set by the land planning process. There has been no land planning process take place, to date.

We have not taken a position on the eastern boundary of the park, although our position has always been that it has to be west of the Babbage River.

Mr. Porter: As of 1982, the department had proposed two areas within the Dempster Highway as territorial park reserves. They are Tombstone Mountain and the Arctic Circle Crossing.

In January, 1974, YTG submitted an application for 32,775 hectare territorial park reserve in the Tombstone Mountain area. It would cover an area on the west side of the highway, running back from the YTG campground on the highway, at kilometre 73, to encompass Tombstone Mountain to the west, the Tombstone River to the north, the headwaters of several streams draining into the north Klondike River, on the south. I have passed through this area many times and there is no question in my mind that some of this area is some of the most beautiful I have seen. I think the potential for tourism in these areas is tremendous.

I might say, while I am talking of the relative beauty of the place, that those areas around Tombstone and the campground that is there and the one that is farther up, I believe on the Ogilvie River, are some of the best campgrounds in the territory, for their setting and also for what is there. Of course, the third one is located near Ross River, at Houle Canyon.

¹⁹ In November 1972, the YTG submitted an application for another park reserve. This proposed site was a 174,528 hectare site located at the Arctic Circle Crossing Park, which would include portions of the highway corridor, Eagle Plain and the Richardson Mountains. The plan for this site included historic and geographical road markers of the Arctic Circle, viewing areas for scenery and wildlife

and a commemorative exhibit to the astronomer, Simon Newcombe. In 1982, an information sign was placed at the pull-off at Arctic Circle. Can the minister give this House an update as to the status of these two specific sites that were proposed for territorial park reserves?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. I am glad to hear the member across the floor support us in our request for these territorial parks. I would hope that he and his party would make that position known very clearly to the federal government, because the federal government seems to think that it does not matter what the Yukon territorial government wants, they are not going to get it anyway. I would hope that they would support us and I would hope that, in the future, that land is turned over to us for those purposes.

Mr. Penikett: The minister has asked our help in the matter. If he would like it, I am sure we can arrange it because there are enough of us who seem to be able to communicate reasonably effectively with other politicians in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Porter: In the last opportunity I had to stand, I committed a very grave error, particularly in light of the fact that the Chairman is a member representing another beautiful area of the Yukon: that is Kluane. There is no argument. In fact, Kluane has been designated as a great spot to visit and I go there, as well.

On November 29, 1982, page 299 of *Hansard*, the minister stated "another one we would like for a territorial park is Herschel Island". Is that a position that is still held by this government? Assuming that the minister's answer is in the affirmative, could he give us a progress report as to where this government is at with respect to establishing Herschel Island as a territorial park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, it is our position. In fact, it is the position that we have also signed in the COPE agreement-in-principle. It is our firm position. Unfortunately, we seem to be having the same problem with Herschel Island as we do with the eastern boundary of the national park in northern Yukon. The federal government is now fairly reluctant to give up jurisdiction. That is all up in the wind, as well, and has to be negotiated. We are also taking a very strong position in that. It was negotiated; it was agreed to; it was signed and sealed and it has gone to Ottawa. We are not prepared to now back off and give the federal government some jurisdiction over this or that or the other thing. We have negotiated that it become a territorial park, and that is exactly what we want it to be; a territorial park.

Mr. Porter: On November 29th, 1982, page 299 of *Hansard* the minister stated that "a couple that I mentioned were Kusawa and Ethel Lake. There are others, such as Fort Selkirk". The minister, of course, was referring to additional sites identified as locations for possible territorial parks. Is the minister still pursuing territorial parks status for the areas of Kusawa, Ethel Lake and Fort Selkirk?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, we are pursuing territorial park status for quite a few of those areas. In fact, Kusawa Lake was agreed to by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in excess of approximately a year and a half ago, when we originally talked about a land planning agreement. He agreed and he has stated it in writing to us that they would turn Kusawa over to us. That has never happened, either.

Mr. Porter: On another related issue, the minister stated, on page 299 of *Hansard*, dated the 29th of November, 1982: "One concern has been the corridor concept through the territory, to have the Yukon River declared as part of this International Gold Rush Park. I think we will probably be progressing with this International Gold Rush Park aspect".

Can the minister give us a progress report on the efforts of his government towards the establishment of this International Gold Rush Park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The Gold Rush Park concept has not been concluded, although we are still in agreement with the concept, as long as we go with the noble aspect of certain areas as Hootalinqua or the Thirtymile. In fact, we now have in place, as well, the agreement on Heritage Rivers and we have proposed that the Thirtymile section of the Yukon River become the first part of the river, the first river in the territory proposed for Heritage Rivers. That has been proposed to the federal government — well, it is not

proposed to the federal government, there is a committee that decides on that. However, we have already made that proposal and that fits in with the concept of the Gold Rush Park.

We still stand by the statement that I made, at that time, that we do not want to see a continuous corridor through the territory, which is a park, but we do not want to see the heritage of the gold rush down the Yukon River destroyed, either. So, we want to protect certain areas along the river and certain communities, such as Fort Selkirk, at which we have applied for a territorial park and which fits in with that concept, as well.

We are also spending a great deal of money on upgrading Fort Selkirk and Hootalinqua. All of this fits in with that concept of the territorial park. So, yes, we are proceeding with that concept.

Mr. Porter: On November 2nd, 1983, on page 571 of *Hansard*, the minister announced measures to spend \$295,000 on the Tatchun-Frenchman Lake Park. I would like to ask the minister, to date, how much of that \$295,000 has been spent on the Tatchun-Frenchman Lake park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: In fact, much in excess of \$295,000 has been expended. I believe that we advanced that, last fall, when we were working on these advanced capital projects, in order to generate work for the territory.

I do not remember now, but I think we have advanced another \$240,000 if I am not mistaken, for that project. Part of that money has also been expended. We have expended in excess of \$300,000 in that area already. People are still working on it. In fact, it was a very good project for the winter in the Carmacks area. A great number of the people who would otherwise have been unemployed were employed all winter long on that project. It has been very beneficial. I was out there last weekend and had a look at it. It is progressing very well.

Mr. Porter: While he was announcing the work in respect to the Tatchun-Frenchman Lake park, the minister also talked about the Coal River mineral springs. He identified that as another suitable area for a territorial park. How much work has been done in the Coal River mineral springs area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There has not been that much done. We would certainly like to do a great deal in that area. However, that is costly as well. We would certainly like to see it set aside as a park. We would very much like to develop it. There is a great potential recreational area in the neighbourhood of the Coal River springs. There is actually a very excellent area just to the southwest of the Coal River springs to develop a recreation area. We would very much like to see that go ahead in the very near future.

Mr. Porter: To wrap up in terms of the discussions with respect to territorial parks, I would like to remind the minister that last year in the budget debates he said that there were 26 sites identified for possible territorial park development. Is that number remaining constant, or has the government added to that number?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It has remained constant to this time. We have not identified any sites since then that we would prefer to have as territorial parks. It is a possibility that in the future, some of those may be dropped, because we cannot develop them all. We have them on our list. We are prepared at any time to accept any of them from the federal government if they would be so kind as to turn some of them over to us so that we could begin developing them.

It seems like we get constant promises. We never get any action out of the federal government. Specifically on Kusawa, as I stated earlier, we even have it in writing that it will be turned over to us. Nothing has happened to date.

Mr. Porter: Three areas in the Ogilvie Mountains have been recommended by the Canadian Committee of International Biological Program for reserve status, due to their unique floral communities and their geological interests. These are Sheep Mountain or North Fork Pass area, kilometre 71 to 111 on the highway, and the Chapman Lake region, kilometre 111 to 142 in the Tombstone Mountain area. What is the present status of these sites? Have they been designated reserve status or are they going to receive the designation shortly in the future?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, they have not received that status and I would hope that they are not going to receive it in the near future.

At least in my perception, I see these proposals from the federal government, with regard to some of these sites, as specifically a land grab in order to protect this land. We would see that all of these sites should be addressed in the land planning process. If it is felt that they need protection, it should be protected by the people who are most involved, the people who live in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Porter: I understood that there was a move to designate an archeological site near Old Crow as a world heritage site. Has that officially been done?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Not to the best of my knowledge. No it has not been done. I do not know if and when it will be done. I have not had any contact from the federal government in that regard.

Mr. Porter: The next area I would like to proceed on is with respect to the Dempster Highway reports that the government has done. I gave the minister notice of this, a couple of days ago about, particularly, the planning projects undertaken by his department.

I will begin the debates by giving a very brief history on the Dempster. The construction of the Dempster was initiated in the late 50s under the roads to resources program and was completed under northern roads currently under the wing of the Department of Northern Affairs. The initial purpose of constructing the highway was to encourage resource exploration and development, benefit tourism and reduce transportation costs for northern communities. Environmental and social issues arising from the construction of the highway became a concern in the 70s and resolved in the production of a federal draft management plan. In 1978, an interim management plan, prepared by this government, was implemented through the Dempster Highway Area Development Regulations. It provided a mechanism to control land use and short term development pressures while baseline data on resources and development potential was gathered.

In August of 1983, the Dempster Highway corridor background analysis and management recommendations and the Dempster Highway summary of background analysis and revised highway corridor management suggestions were distributed for public review. They included: identified planning issues and concerns; a synopsis and analysis of available data; evaluation of the planning area; and, with respect to constraints to development and the development pressures and specific recommendations related to the issues and the uses of the Dempster corridor. This report was borne out of a joint effort by the federal and territorial governments.

In the beginning, a Dempster planning committee, composed of federal and territorial government officials, was organized to supervise the interim plan with the renewable resources department of the YTG assuming the legal responsibility for the preparation of an integrated resource management plan for the corridor. Since the publication of the report, intergovernmental dialogue, I might add, has been abysmally piecemeal. I might also add that, prior to the construction of the Dempster, there was no comprehensive environmental assessment plan as we know it. I think that we have to take into consideration the mood of the government at the time of the initial stages of deciding, in the first place, to build the highway. It seems that the government of the day was convinced that there was vast mineral wealth and all that was needed was to build a highway to transport the ore south.

↳ The animals that populate the roadway, at that time, were not given any sense of priority.

However, I think, today, the world is entirely different than the heydays of the 50's. Issues such as environment and animal welfare issues occupy centre stage of the world community. Today, people are extremely concerned about the wellbeing of this planet and we have seen a lot of evidence, particularly with respect to issues that affect peace movements and issues that affect environmental wellbeing throughout the world.

I think that, in the particular development of this area, we have developed an extreme, on both ends of the spectrum. On one hand, we have what people have been referring to as the environmental guerrillas and those are people who would, basically, go to the extreme of taking violent action over the issue of wildlife issues and issues of concern in respect to development.

On the other hand, of course, we have the people who simply lower the blade and put the throttle in the forward position and give

her full steam. This group, I would say, subscribes to the wildlife management theme that we should simply kill them all and let God sort them out.

Those are the extreme elements that we are dealing with. Fortunately, in Yukon, we do not have that kind of polarizing happening. People, fortunately, in Yukon are still dialoguing on issues affecting wildlife, with respect to land management and the issue of the creation of parks. We still, I believe, have an opportunity to bring forward some very sensible planning mechanism so that we plan the future of territory, with respect to the renewable resource area, a basis that pleases most of the sectors of society.

The Dempster, itself, is a subject that poses all sorts of environmental related issues. As well, it raises serious questions about the stature of land use planning in Yukon, which, I might add, is non-existent, despite the fact that we have, in this very House, debated through three readings the *Land Planning Act*. *The federal government, it seems, still refuses to move on this particular issue, and we have yet to see a concluded agreement with respect to comprehensive land use planning between this government and the federal government.*

With respect to the Dempster, there are all kinds of concerns. We still have concerns regarding hunting, as evidenced by the last few days, in terms of public debate on the issue. It is still a major concern as to how we institute necessary measures to ensure that hunting does take place in the process that is beneficial to the wellbeing of the resource, primarily.

We have other concerns, such as big game outfitting, tourism, resource development, trapping, mines, hydro, pipelines, oil and gas. These are all issues that Yukon people think about when they think about the Dempster Highway.

This particular report does many things; it is a wealth of information for someone who knows nothing about the Dempster and it is an excellent overview of issues. If you look at, simply, the table of contents, without having to read the whole report, you would get some clear idea as to what it talks about. It talks about the drainage, geology, and vegetation of the area, the Yukon Plateau, the Ogilvie Mountains, the Richardson Mountains. It talks about resources; it talks about minerals, location and the occurrence of minerals and the mineral types.

↳ It also mentions the oil and gas area. That goes on to tell us about the known reserves of the area and the rating for future potential development. Aggregate materials, this is gravel we are talking about, that are used in highway construction that identifies their locations and their accessibility. Heritage, unfortunately I might add that the report only takes a cursory view of the general history of the area and much more work has to be done particularly with respect to the heritage area.

In renewable resources, the wildlife resources of established population levels, habitat requirements, identifies wintering sites, speaks about the sensitivity of the wildlife species - two disturbances. It lists the major wildlife species. Unfortunately, I am to understand the wildlife that is identified here is not conclusive. It does not look at all the species that are available there. It looks at the fisheries resources. The estimated reserves in commercial and domestic use. The potential for forestry resources. Also it talks about general constraints of physical constraints, seismic, and in this we are talking about earthquakes when we talk about seismic in respect to this report. I might add that I understand that the last rating they had on the Richter scale was when the minister was last seen to be using the biffy at the Tombstone Park.

We talked about terrain of the Dempster corridor. We talked about the drainage area. We talked about sloping questions, permafrost, the glaciation, icing, scarring, flooding. In summation, there is a lot of information with respect to the Dempster corridor as we know it.

The report is good in terms of evaluating what the available resources are. By no means does the report speak to the issue of comprehensive planning. That is the issue that we have to get at. I would like to read directly from the report to get a sense of that particular area.

↳ In June of 1979 under the authority of the *Yukon Area*

Development Ordinance regulations provided the mechanism to control existing use and short term development pressure, while baseline data: surface, geology, wildlife, forestry potential; mineral, oil, gas potential; tourism and existing use were collected." This information has now been collected and it is all contained in the report that I have referred to; in both reports as a matter of fact. This report provides the next step in the planning process. It states that: "it includes identified planning issues and concerns; a synopsis and analysis of available data; evaluation of a planning area with respect to constraints to development and development pressures; and specific recommendations related to the issues and use of the Dempster Highway corridor. This report will form the basis from which long term management policies and strategies for this corridor are developed. With this theme in mind, hopefully this report will be thoroughly reviewed by all interested individuals to ensure the integrity and validity of the analysis and evaluation of the data."

It goes on to talk about the planning process: "The major steps which are being followed in the Yukon planning process for the Dempster Highway have been described in detail and planning proposal for the Dempster Highway corridor and are briefly outlined below.

²⁵ Determination of major areas of concern in the study area are: determination of data needs; collection of background information; analysis of information to determine development potential, development constraints and potential conflicts and impacts; development of management recommendations; the production of study for review and comment; formulation of goals and objectives for the study areas, based on the resource analysis and management recommendations; development of management policies and strategies; production of management plan for review and comment; implementation; review and revisions are required, the last statement of that planning process.

In conclusion, it states "in order to look at all aspects of resource use within the Dempster corridor, a comprehensive management plan must be broad in scope. For this reason, it has been necessary to work on a cooperative interdepartmental, intergovernmental basis. A planning team, composed of members from the various departments and agencies, involved in the Dempster Highway corridor was formed to provide a forum to discuss data needs, goals and objectives. Team members provided data in their areas of expertise, necessary to the plan preparation. As the process proceeds, they will be involved in drafting policies and management strategies based on the area's resources and jointly agreed upon goals and objectives. Public involvement review and comment will be other important proponents for the planning process".

I have a potential list of about 50 specific questions related to this particular study, however, if the minister is his usual affable self-evasive or self-effacing, helpful self, I think that we can get away with simply touching on the general areas of concern and those questions only number about a dozen.

I would like to ask the first obvious question as to what is the status with these reports that I have just talked about?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It was very nice of the member across the floor to read off half of the recommendations in the report. The situation right now with the Dempster Highway management plan is that we are now in the process of preparing regulations to manage the Dempster corridor. Some of them will, no doubt, be under the *Wildlife Act*, to deal with the wildlife. The other regulations will probably have to come under the area of the *Development Act*, because the federal government, in its wisdom, has seen fit that we will not have the Dempster corridor either. We are busy negotiating with the federal government, somewhat, in this regard. We are also busy preparing regulations to manage the corridor so that we can proceed with the in-depth study that is needed to come up with the very detailed management plan sometime in the future.

Mr. Porter: One of the paramount issues that has been looked at and thought about is the role of the public. What role does the Yukon public have in deciding how the management plans are effected in the Dempster corridor area and, to a large extent, the larger Canadian community? Should they be given access? Does his department have plans to establish future forums designed to

accommodate public input? Should this government plan to proceed in this area? Can the minister briefly describe the structure of the public forums that he envisions that the department would set up to solicit public feedback?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We have already solicited public input. ²⁶ As the member across the floor may recall, we advertised in the paper, and we advertised over the radio for public input on the Dempster management plan so that we could put together that plan that the member is quoting from, that final paper.

Mr. Porter: I understood that occurred. I understood some of the organizations that are primarily set up to monitor, evaluate, analyze and respond to environmental concerns did make their concerns known. But I was wondering about the Yukon public, the general citizens of the territory — would they be given an opportunity to respond to this development plan? If the minister does not have any plans to involve the Yukon public other than the fact they should read the newspaper and see that he has advertised for their opinions and they should have the wherewithal to write in. If he does not have any plans designed specifically to set up a public forum for them to come and speak to them about the Dempster, does he have a public review process built into future development? As we move from these plans and recommendations, hopefully down the line we are going to end up with an agreed-upon management plan for the entire corridor. As we move through the overall planning process, has the minister thought about a public process that can have a continuous input from the general public?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, and I think if the members across the floor would realize that actually, when it really gets down to it, talking about public input is great and sometimes the public does participate, but as in most other areas when you ask for public input you end up receiving very little. All you receive is material from interested people and those interested people react to an ad in the newspaper or a radio request; the general public, when it really gets down to it, is not that interested. So we have to deal with the people who are really interested in it and those type of people who will react and will give us their views and are usually very knowledgeable of what is going on and, in fact, they were knowledgeable of what was going on in the Dempster Highway management plan. They did put their views forward to us. If and when we finalize any new plans for the Dempster Highway, the same process will take place.

Mr. Porter: Has the federal government formally responded to the report and, if so, can the minister make available to this side of the House the federal government's response?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am not aware of whether the federal government responded or not. We applied to the federal government to turn over the corridor. I do not believe they responded to the management plan in itself. I think the only response we got from them was the response to the request for the turnover of the corridor. But the federal government and people in the federal government were involved in the actual preparation of the plan.

²⁷ **Mr. Porter:** I think that the reports that we are talking about can be best characterized as a set of management guidelines or recommendations, but we really cannot call the management plans. When will the minister's government prepare comprehensive, long-range management plans? When will we see that day?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member says it is not a management plan, but it is a management plan; a comprehensive management plan is exactly what it is. It tells exactly what is proposed to be done there.

As I stated earlier, we probably will, in the future, develop more detailed plans, but you have to recognize that the amount of money that was expended just to develop that plan was in the many, many, many thousands of dollars. This government just does not have unlimited resources to go and prepare detailed management plans for every area of the territory.

It is all right to talk about it; it sounds great and we would all like to do it. However, we cannot. We can only do so much. We did as much as we could on the Dempster Highway management plan.

We think we did a good job and I do not think that we have got a lot of adverse reaction from very many people. Certainly, there are always people who disagree with whatever plan you come up with

but, on the whole, that plan was fairly well accepted, even, as the member across the floor said, it is a fairly good plan. For us to go into an in-depth plan, a very detailed plan, we just do not have the money to do it.

Mr. Porter: A correction, for the record: I never did state that it was a good management plan.

My point was that it was a very good cataloguing of resource. It is a good piece of work as to identification of the wildlife resources, the mineral, oil and gas and locate them, on maps, even, along the Dempster corridor. You did a good job in doing that, but it is a far cry from a comprehensive management plan that would act as a guideline.

This is an area that the minister, obviously, disagrees with me on. I will not take up the time of the legislature running back and forth on the point. I would simply state that what we have here are 86 recommendations. To illustrate my point, I would like to read recommendation 84. It simply states, "The wildlife resource of the corridor area should be managed for the maximum benefit of the Yukon".

To a large extent, that is simply a motherhood statement: I do not see that as a very integral part of a game management plan. However, as I stated, there is obvious disagreement here and it is not to the benefit of the House to go on *ad nauseum*.

Does the Yukon government and the federal government have an ongoing, intergovernmental process in place to facilitate discussions, with respect to the planning of the Dempster corridor?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, we have an ongoing process in place to discuss all related matters in this territory, including the Dempster Highway. I am not sure just when the last discussions took place between my department and the federal government, with regards to the Dempster, but I would suggest to you that it was probably not very long ago when we were discussing it.

Mr. Porter: We are still working on regulations to manage the Dempster corridor. We are working on regulations in the wildlife area. I would suggest to you that any time in the last month certainly there has been contact regarding the Dempster corridor.

Mr. Porter: I am sure that the minister would agree that there must be a commitment on the part of all governments involved in this area for cooperation and coordination of their efforts in terms of developing an eventual plan to affect this particular area. The report itself speaks about a need for such cooperation. It acknowledges the fact that intergovernmental coordination is critical and crucial for any eventual management plan that comes out to be workable.

Can the minister inform the House what process his department has set up in conjunction with his counterpart in the Northwest Territories? Have there been any meetings with the minister there responsible? If not, are there plans for any meetings in the future? Is there any negotiating process that I am sure he would look forward to actively engaging himself in with the minister responsible for Northwest Territories with renewable resources?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I have not met with the minister from the Northwest Territories. We are interested in the management plan for the Yukon portion of the Dempster Highway. It has very little to do with anyone in the Northwest Territories, except for some hunting privileges of the people from Ft. McPherson.

They are now allowed to hunt in the territory. They also have a group trapping area in the territory. As for the management of the Dempster Highway in the Yukon Territory, we do not involve the NWT in it. We are not involved in the Northwest Territories portion of the Dempster Highway.

Mr. Porter: Just for the record, I would like to state my position on the matter. I would like to state the fact that I am disappointed that this government does not see it necessary to involve the NWT in an overall Dempster management plan. I think that we are talking about a piece of highway that traverses both jurisdictions. We are talking about resource development, possibly, for the future that will involve resource developments. We are talking about a number of species of animals that do not simply walk to a tree and say, "well boys, this is the Northwest Territories, we had better head back because old Howie is not going to look after us if we cross over". Those are important considera-

tions. I think. We should encourage dialogue between the two governments and hopefully, that is something that will come to the minister in the future. Hopefully there will be a realization that there has to be more of the intergovernmental management agreements to effect proper management of resources, be they wildlife or other resources.

In 1978, this government designated an area 16 kilometres wide along the highway as a special protection zone under the *Area Development Ordinance*. Has the minister any plans to revoke the *Area Development Ordinance* and, if he has, can he tell us for what reasons?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Before I answer that question, I would like to comment on the comments made by the member regarding consultation with the NWT. He asked me if I had been in contact with my counterpart over there with regard to the Dempster Highway. I said "no". I did not say that my department has not talked with any members of the NWT government. In fact, they have talked with them on more than one occasion about traffic and that on the Dempster Highway. Other than the traffic that is flowing through to the NWT, there is very little interest that the NWT would have on that highway in the Yukon Territory. In fact, it is very seldom that the caribou go into the Northwest Territories and then come into Yukon. Even if they did, it is a function, as I told the member, that will be under the *Wildlife Act*, not under the management of the Dempster Highway.

I forgot the question, now. I was busy answering. It is not our intention to do away with the *Area Development Act*. That is the mechanism that we have to manage the Dempster Highway. Unless the federal government turns the land over to us for our jurisdiction, the only way that we can have any method of control over the highway is under the *Area Development Act*.

Mr. Porter: If I recall correctly, I think the budget address given by the government leader spoke about \$180,000 for research within the Department of Renewable Resources. What is the intent of expenditure for that money? What research are we talking about?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We are talking mostly about the predator-prey management study that we are doing. We also have, in our general budget, monies set aside for wildlife management, for example, under which we do research in the Dempster Highway, as in other areas of the territory. That is a function of wildlife management. You have to do research. As the member commented, we had a great deal of information in that management study. Most of that was done just out of our general budget of wildlife management in the territory. As for the sheep population and the bird population in the territory, that was all done through our general studies. A great deal of it is done every year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Porter, I think that we should recess until 9:30.

Some hon. member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Chairman: You do not want to recess?

Mr. Porter: No.

Mr. Chairman: I can sit here all night until you are all through. All right, proceed Mr. Porter.

Mr. Penikett: Some other member could volunteer to take the Chair for you for five or ten minutes if you wished a cup of coffee. I am quite willing to volunteer.

Mr. Chairman: I thought that you people were tired. I am not tired.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I understood that it was my evening for the goodies and I am going to be very disappointed if somebody does not —

Mr. Chairman: Did you have a point of order, Mr. Philipsen?

Mr. Porter: I am moving now into the general area of points I would like to discuss, so I should not be much longer with respect to general debate.

One area I would like to talk about is *The Migratory Birds Convention Act*. Of course, everyone would know that this act is an international tripartite treaty between the countries of Canada, United States and Mexico, and primarily is designed to look at the migratory birds that habitat those three countries.

The State of Alaska has taken a position of a desire to amend the treaty on this issue and the NWT in the past has expressed similar

sentiments. I should explain the reason for those two jurisdictions looking at taking a position of amendment. In many areas of the north, they do not get to hunt geese and ducks primarily. When the hunting season opens, many of the birds have already gone and winged their way south. In Yukon, the problem being most affected by the hunting laws as they relate to *The Migratory Birds Convention Act* is the community of Old Crow, simply because of its geographic location. Has the Yukon government considered amendments to *The Migratory Birds Convention Act*? If they have, have they been in discussion with the other jurisdictions who are of like mind at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am not fully aware or fully briefed on what is happening on *The Migratory Birds Convention Act*. I know that people in my department have been in discussions regarding it and I am only sorry that I do not know enough about it at this time to be able to converse on a knowledgeable basis with the member across the floor. I do know that we have been in discussion with them and I do know that we are interested in some amendments to the act, but I am not well enough versed or well enough briefed on it to be able to discuss it on a knowledgeable basis with the member across the floor.

Mr. Porter: In the past, there was a potential for Canada and United States to conclude a west coast salmon fishery agreement. Unfortunately, with the change of certain governments and with the procrastination of others, the treaty never really came off and we have, particularly I believe, the State of Alaska calling for renegotiation of certain items of that particular treaty. In the past I have represented concerns to the minister during the Question Period, and asked for involvement, asked about the participation of this government — as to what this government had been doing to protect the salmon interests in the Yukon.

Salmon right now is an untapped resource in terms of Yukon. Largely, the use of salmon is restricted to the sport fishery and to subsistence fishing in the communities that are established along the Yukon River. The only real commercial attempt to utilize the resource has been initiated by the Dawson Indian Band with respect to the establishment of the Hahn fishery processing plant in Dawson.

What occurs there is that the plant simply buys from the fishermen and cleans the fish — it is a great project for the employment of young people in that community — and blast freezes them and then locates markets for them. Largely, the markets have been identified as in the Seattle area for Yukon Kings.

There is a study being conducted, right now, I believe, as to the economics of setting up a smoker, attached to that particular operation, to look at smoking particularly what is referred to as the dog salmon, because it is not seen as a gourmet fish and there may be a market, should, of course, the rabbis think it kosher, for a whole network of gourmet outlets throughout the world. So, there is great potential with that particular area.

Overall, though, I think that there is no question in anyone's mind that Yukon is getting the short end of the stick, with respect to the utilization of that resource. Most of the spawning grounds of those salmon are located in Canada, in Yukon. They use many of our streams to spawn and return year after year to those spawning grounds.

What we end up getting is only what the State of Alaska allows to escape. They have an escapement level and certain percentages of the species, in terms of numbers, is looked at and, on a yearly basis, they only allow those numbers to come up to Yukon. The Japanese and the Russian interests hit them hard in the ocean and then, of course, the Alaskans take their toll on the Yukon River system.

It is a critical area, because I think that what Hahn Fisheries is designed to do, even though it is simply a marginal industry, in terms of it is not going to be a large profit-making corporation. It has been designed for the purpose, largely, of employment, largely as being a development spearheading, hopefully, some concern and some initiative, by governments, to give Yukon a greater share of the resource, to ensure that we realize more of the economic potential from the utilization of that resource.

Hopefully, that will occur, because the potential is vast. I think

that one consultant estimated that the potential is in the 20's of millions of dollars, in terms of the future.

I would like to ask the minister to simply give us an update on the issue, at the present time, as to whether or not his government is still monitoring those talks or the lack of those talks? Can he give us some idea as to whether or not those talks will be started again and, if so, is he optimistic about an agreement being reached? Should such an agreement be reached, what advantage does he see for Yukon, in terms of the contents of the possible agreement?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Until I took office as the Minister of Renewable Resources, we had no involvement with fisheries, at all. One of the first things that I did since taking office, was to get an expert on contract for us to become involved in the salmon negotiations. I agree with the member across the floor. It is critical to us. If we allow the salmon agreement between the federal government and the United States government to go through without protecting Yukon, we are going to be a long time fighting our way back.

We have been involved from the day that I became the minister. We have a very knowledgeable person working for us. He has been involved a great deal. In fact, he has managed to sway a lot of people involved in the negotiations, especially our federal government people, in regard to the needs and aspirations of Yukoners.

It is unfortunate that so far very little has been accomplished that is actually beneficial to us, except perhaps the fact that the Alaskan government recognizes that we have a problem here and that they are a great source of our problem. Also, the Canadian government recognizes that and now we are trying to include our rivers and protect the Yukon Territory in the negotiations. It is unfortunate in one respect though, that they are trying to conclude an agreement and leave the Yukon River to be negotiated afterwards. Our position has been all along that we want the Yukon River and the Yukon Territory involved and negotiated in the agreement; not wait for negotiation afterwards.

I think the biggest benefit to us has been that we have been in constant contact with the Alaskans. It is my intention to go over to Alaska in the near future to sit down with their committee. They have a committee that runs the fisheries in Alaska, the same as they have for game. I want to sit down with their committee and discuss fisheries because, as the member says, escapement is the number one problem. They have subsistence fishing over in Alaska that is not just native; it is white, it is anyone who wants to fish for their own use. Between their commercial fishing and their subsistence fishing, they are fairly well wiping out the fish population and allowing very little escapement into the territory. We are stuck with protecting the habitat of the spawning grounds and yet not benefiting from the fish.

We have been making that point over and over with the federal government, with the Alaskan government and with the United States government. I think it is starting to sink in. We are starting to benefit from it. I do not know if and when the salmon treaty is ever going to be signed. It seems to be a stalemate process that is going on. They talk for a little while and then they split up and go their own separate ways. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to reach an agreement. From the reports that I get from the person that we have working for us, it seems like the Alaskans — not so much the Alaskans but the federal government of the United States — is willing to give up very little. It is a case of constantly putting demands on Canada to give up this, and give up that, and give up the other thing.

Finally Canada has reached the position where they are not prepared to give up anymore. That is a stalemate that we are in right now. I do not know when we are going to get out of it or when the next negotiations are going to be. As I said, I intend, with my consultant who I have on staff, to sit down with the Alaskans and at least try to negotiate with them to allow more escapement into the territory, so that we can have a better fishing industry in the territory. As the member says, we have a great deal of the spawning and, yet, we are reaping less than one percent of the salmon produced. We are actually reaping far less than one percent of the fish that we produce in the territory. We are recovering, for our benefit, less than one percent. It is critical to us.

It is not just the Yukon River. We also have the Alsek and other rivers. It is an ongoing process that I am not prepared to give up on. I am sure that my colleagues are not prepared to give up on it, because it is critical to us. It is critical to the native people of the territory. In the future, it can have a great deal of effect on all of us.

Mr. Porter: I thank the minister for his very informative answer on the issue. Another area of the fishery, is the freshwater fishery. There is no question that the knowledge on the freshwater fishery in Yukon is extremely negligible. The Department of Fisheries have that responsibility, as well, at the present time. They have no staff really to speak of, in terms of being able to go out there and gather the necessary data. They make what I would term, quite appropriately, a token effort to be seen to be managing the resource when they really are not. There are some real problems there. I know that this government commissioned a study a couple of years ago — I think it was done by Peche — which raised some alarming questions about the health of that particular resource and called for some immediate action. I understand that this is an area that this government has had an interest, in the past in acquiring responsibility over. Has there been any recent negotiations with the federal government toward this end?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. That is another area where we are not giving up on. Every once in a while, I write another letter to the minister and, every once in a while, I get another answer back and the answer is "no". The member is right; we probably have, in the territorial government, more information than the federal Department of Fisheries with regard to freshwater fisheries in the territory. It is another major concern of ours. We feel that it should be turned over to us. Unfortunately, we have not been able to convince the minister in Ottawa to turn it over to us. But, we will not give up. We will carry on and, every time we get a little more information, it gives us a little better weapon against the federal government. I hope, with the federal election, that there will be a change in government in Ottawa and a change in policy and the freshwater fishery will be turned over to us.

Mr. Porter: Should the election in Ottawa result in a minority government situation, our people, being the balance of power, I can assure you that there probably will be some changes with respect to Yukon.

In other areas, the issue of Yukon trapping, there is some real concern developing, over the last few years. There has been a real apprehensive feeling as people sit down, after, maybe, they come out of the bush for a couple of weeks. They come home and manage to have an idiot box in their house and flick it on, take off their workboots and sit back and watch TV and see people standing in the middle of Times Square in London, saying "down with trapping", "down with the seal hunt".

These people are really concerned, because a large number of these people do it out of choice. It is a lifestyle that appeals to them. It is a tough lifestyle, so there are not too many feeble-minded people who are attracted to the industry. It is an industry that offers people a lot of freedom: they are their own boss and they are out in the bush all the time. It is a healthy way of life and, to them, there cannot be anything better going.

These people, I think, in many instances reflect the real backbone of our culture here, in terms of the often talked about independent Yukoner. Sometimes, he is just dragged out of the bar: he has got a healthy beard and you put a hat on him and take his picture of him and put him on the tourist magazine and away it goes: we are big, robust Yukoners.

Usually, the ones who really gives us character and spirit are those people involved in trapping industry, the ones out there and not grumbling and not talking about a lot of these issues. However, their very livelihood is at stake.

The Northwest Territories recognizes this. The native associations over there, a couple of years ago, organized a delegation and went to the European Council and lobbied for the European governments to seriously look at their livelihood, prior to making any drastic decision that could see the end of it.

Now, we have seen Yukon emerge through that awareness. The Yukon Trappers Association, for the last couple of years, has taken this on as an area of concern. I know the minister's government is

aware and I know his government is sympathetic to it, but what is his government doing by assisting Yukon trappers to campaign against that particular lobby effort?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Actually, we are doing a great deal. We are one of the founding members of the Fur Institute of Canada and, in fact, a bit later this month, I will be going to the initial meeting, where the first board of directors of that institution will be set up.

It is set up specifically to counteract the anti-trapping lobby that is being generated by certain ill-informed groups of people around the world, aided and abetted by some organizations in Canada. It is very detrimental to us, but I think we all have to recognize what has happened with the sealing industry, on the east coast of Canada, and that is something that could happen to our fur industry in the rest of Canada, if we allow it to proceed.

So, the federal government and the provincial governments, have agreed to set up the Fur Institute of Canada. It is charged with counteracting this anti-trapping lobby as well as generating money; in fact, it already has well in excess of a couple of million dollars to develop new humane trapping methods. But mainly the reason for it is to counteract the anti-trapping lobby that is developing around the world. We are very concerned about it, and every other province in Canada is very concerned about it. We are very intent on not allowing the same thing to happen to the trapping industry as happened to the sealing industry.

Mr. Porter: While we are on the issue of trapping, has the minister's department taken any internal decision to reduce the trapping season for lynx and marten and, if so, are they intending to reduce the season by one month?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am afraid I cannot answer the member truthfully on that; I would have to get back to him, but I will get back to him if he wants that answer. I am not aware of whether we intend on reducing it next fall or not.

Mr. Porter: Yes. This is a letter from a trapper in Mayo and he writes to the Game Department official responsible for Mayo and talks about the reduction of the trapping season. Apparently he had been informed that there were plans by the department to reduce the season for those two species of animals. He is concerned about it and makes the very articulate argument as to why it should not be done. It is a recent letter — dated May 11th — so, quite conceivably, the minister has not been made aware of decisions that have been talked about. Maybe they have not been committed but have been talked about. If there is a decision, I am sure the minister would write and pass that information on to me, as he stated earlier.

I would like to talk about the area of reorganization. If I remember correctly again, I believe the government leader spoke about reorganization in the government as being one of the priorities that has been pursued by his government; tourism was one department that was being reorganized. I also believe he said renewable resources was undergoing some reorganization. I would ask the minister if that is the case and could he very briefly describe the more salient features of any efforts to reorganize, and as to whether or not the reorganizational efforts will improve services of the department to the public and how so?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Before I comment on that, I would like to comment on the letter the member talked about. If there was any consideration of reducing the marten or the lynx season, it would certainly be developed over the summer and would be put to the wildlife advisory committee. Certainly, long before it ever happened, I would know about it and so would a great many other people in the territory. I would doubt very much that such a thing would happen. Well, I know it would not happen, so I can alleviate the fears of this member somewhat in that certainly, if his letter is to my department, they will take his concerns into consideration when they are dealing with it.

As for departmental reorganization, yes, we are doing some reorganization. It is my intention to make a ministerial statement in regard to that reorganization tomorrow. Yes, it will do a great deal for the department. Because I am going to make that ministerial statement tomorrow, I do not feel that I want to discuss the details tonight, specifically. I will say that there is some reorganization going to take place. I will give the members the details in the ministerial statement tomorrow. I think, once I have made that

ministerial statement that all the members across the floor will recognize that there has been a fairly detailed reorganization in the department. It will be beneficial to everyone in the territory.

Mr. Porter: The problem with ministerial statements is that you do not have a long time to study them. They usually come within the hour prior to coming into the House. You are expected upon the statement being read to jump up and immediately respond and try to sound intelligent and think that you understand a lot of the issues when you have had no time to research them. It is a very unfair process of government, as I have come to understand it. I would like to suggest to the minister that I will refrain from asking questions in this area should he agree to give the contents of the ministerial statement to me at 9 o'clock in the morning.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I will try to give the member the ministerial statement as soon as I can in the morning. I recognize what he is saying, but he would not know any more right now than he would if I gave him the ministerial statement. All he could say is what is in the ministerial statement, he would have to deal it in the same manner. He would have the option of asking me a couple more questions about it. I think it is only right and proper than when I announce the change in the department that the public also have the ability to have it at the same time.

I do not suppose it is anything radical. It is just a realignment of the department, with some additions to the department that I am sure the member from across the floor will recognize as being beneficial.

Mr. Porter: I am going to have to settle for that I guess. One area that has been of major interest is the harvest data that hunters bring in. Right now it is voluntary. They give you a questionnaire, and if you want you tell them where you hunted. Most oldtimers, probably like yourself, do not tell even their wife where they hunt. There has been some success in the past with this program. There has been some data brought forward that has been of a lot of use to the department in terms of making management decisions. We heard earlier that the wildlife branch have not compiled the harvest data for the last few years, obtained by the hunter questionnaires. The problem seems to be one of a technical nature with respect to the computation by the computers of the data then the sifting through and analysis of that data. Has the minister's department made any headway with respect to this particular issue?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, there has been some headway made and I am hopeful that in the future, when we get a hunter questionnaire, we will be able to punch it into the computer and get some figures that will be beneficial to us. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to get that information. If we want any information from those hunter questionnaires now, we have to spend a great many hours going through them and doing it manually. I am hopeful we will be able to generate some useful information in the future.

Mr. Porter: Well, wouldn't you know it. I do not have any more questions in general debate, and would like to know if my colleagues have any. It seems that, after a couple of rough rounds, you sort of get a rhythm and can really move through it, as we have done.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no more general debate, we shall recess until ten o'clock and get on with programs.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call the Committee of the Whole to order. We shall now go on to programs in the Department of Renewable Resources.

On Administration

Mr. Porter: Can the minister just give us an explanation as to why this figure is down from last year's budget?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. During the 1984-85 fiscal year the department will host the International Wild Sheep conference; that is \$10,000 that has been identified. Salaries and benefits are \$420,000. We have only nine person-years this year in this department. That is reason why it is down somewhat from previous years. The only changes in it are the Sheep and Goat conference

and the decrease because of one less person-year.

Administration in the amount of \$585,000 agreed to

On Land Planning

Mr. Porter: We see a change in terms of how the line items stack up last year compared to what is reflected here this year. Last year, land planning was not identified as a specific line item, itself, for budgetary purposes. Is this part of the reorganization that the minister will be discussing in his ministerial statement tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, we have always had land planning in the department. However, we have identified it this year. I will be addressing it somewhat tomorrow but land planning has been a function in the department for quite a while now. It is just that we have highlighted it because of the fact that we are becoming more and more involved in it and we are also trying to get the agreement signed with the federal government to become involved on a territory-wide basis in land planning. That is the reason it has been identified. It was in wildlife and parks up until now.

Mr. Porter: Can he explain why we are seeing a 30 percent increase in expenditure with respect to land planning?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is partially due to accepting costs within the land planning session which, in prior years, were included in wildlife and research management, plus \$40,000 included for preparation of a master plan for the Herschel Island historic park, which is recoverable under the northern oil and gas assistance program.

While I am up, the branch will also be involved in the Heritage Riverboard Federal-Territorial Advisory Committee federal provincial parks conference, and reviews applications under the Federal Land Use Advisory Committee, the Federal-Territorial Land Use Committees and Regional Environmental Review Committee, and it also develops input into the Northern Land Use Planning Program. So, we are involved in quite a bit in this regard and that is why you will see a little bit of an increase in this area.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$356,000 agreed to

On Land Resources

Land Resources in the amount of \$84,000 agreed to

On Parks Planning

Parks Planning in the amount of \$256,000 agreed to

Land Planning in the amount of \$696,000 agreed to

On Wildlife Management

Mr. Porter: Can the minister explain what area of wildlife management was impacted as a result of the 19 percent decrease?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As you will know, in this division here we have a great deal of involvement with the moose study, with the sheep and goat management, the bear studies and bird management. Really the only reason for any decrease in this area is because of the advanced capital that we had last year and the fact that we had such projects going as the Wood Bison project, which is now running down, and other projects such as that that we are not carrying on this year. The Yukon River Basin Study was another one that is almost reduced this year. Because of the reduction in the subsidiary agreements and other federal-territorial agreements, this whole department is somewhat reduced in O&M from last year.

Mr. Porter: When we look at the specific areas, we see that the larger decrease was in administration, 42 percent. I can understand that, with the discontinuation of those subsidiary agreements, and the Yukon River Basin Study particularly, that a large decrease would show up in administration, but in terms of big game management, a 35 percent decrease, when actually in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, this area should be on the increase. We should be spending more money to do more work in terms of locating an acceptable baseline data with respect to the species. Can the minister expand as to why we are seeing such a percentage decrease with respect to big game management?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I think if you will check the 1982-83 actual, you will see it is an increase over the 1982-83 actual. You have to consider that we put, as I stated earlier, \$500,000 extra into this department for the wildlife management studies in game zones 7 and 9 and that is reflected in the \$1,130,000. If we had not have

added on to that money last fall, you would have seen a forecast that was down in the area of \$700,000. So, it is not a significant decrease really; we have actually increased our big game management.

Mr. Porter: Is the minister telling me that the studies that were conducted with respect to the predator control areas, primarily game zones 7 and 9, that there has been \$500,000 spent in that particular study area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, we also spent \$150,000 in the Watson Lake area on the moose study down there. What I am saying is that we put an extra \$500,000 into this department last fall in order for it to gather more information on big game. That is the reason why you see \$1,130,000 there under what would ordinarily be in the neighbourhood of \$650,000.

Mr. Porter: Does the minister have figures available of the breakdown of what the costs have been associated with those particular studies? For example, can he now give us something that he was not able to give us in the past, which is a specific cost associated with, say for example, the wolf control program?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I cannot give a specific cost because that program is all part of a much larger program dealing with wildlife inventories. I could probably have my department break some of it out, but it would not be a totally accurate figure. I could give you only rough estimates of what it is.

Mr. Porter: I would appreciate at least that information as to what the rough estimated figures of expenditure were with respect to this study, where the money went in terms of the wolf programs, how much was spent with respect to the grizzly program and how much was spent with respect to the surveillance of the moose populations that were conducted within that area. If the minister can provide a breakdown in the future that will be helpful.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I can give you figures, but I cannot give you specific figures. In big game, general, I can give you a figure of \$434,900. That was the money that we expended on the big game portion of wildlife management. I can give you a figure for caribou: \$73,000. I can give you a figure for moose: \$77,500. I can give you a figure for sheep and goats: \$50,000. That is the money that we have budgeted in here for these types of projects. I can probably give you approximately that for last year, but I cannot give a specific breakdown of what it costs for the wolf program. I agree that if I can give you rough estimates, I will make them available to you.

Administration in the amount of \$157,000 agreed to

On Small Game Management

Small Game Management in the amount of \$513,000 agreed to

On Big Game Management

Big Game Management in the amount of \$733,000 agreed to

On Special Species

Mr. Porter: One question that I have always wondered about is the North American Foundation for Wild Sheep has provided money to the government toward the enhancement of a sheep habitat. I think that they did some burning in the Big Arm area or Little Arm area of Kluane Lake. They also were intending, I believe, to spend some money to study the effect that wolves would have on the sheep population. How does that money show up with these budgets?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is added into our budget and they are shown as recoveries. That is what it is: it is a recovery that we receive. For example, I think it is \$25,000, that we are going to receive from them this year. Well, we have received part of it already. That is to do the wolf-sheep study that we are doing in game management area seven and nine.

Mr. Porter: Can he tell us what it means by special species. The budgets in the past have never identified this area.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The reason we broke it out like that is because the bison, for example is a special species.

Special Species in the amount of \$11,000 agreed to

Wildlife Management in the amount of \$1,414,000 agreed to

On Wildlife and Parks Services

Mr. McDonald: Last fall, in the capital estimates we discussed the Mayo campground. I mentioned at that time that the camp-

ground - six or seven sites - was being eroded by the Mayo River. It is the only campground east of Stewart Crossing. The minister, who is also minister for highways made mention this budget session that some efforts would be made to encourage tourists to the area through the upgrading of the Mayo Lake-Dutton Creek road to encourage tourists to use, what is commonly termed, a circle route. We would like to encourage tourists to the area. We would like to encourage tourists to use the circle route. We would also like to encourage the tourists to use the campground. The campground, as I have said, is only six or seven sites. It is on the river, at a bend, which causes the existing sites to be eroded. Has the government made any plans to either upgrade this campground or to relocate the campground with a view to providing more sites so that tourists can be more assured that they will be able to have proper accommodation when they come to the area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I checked with my department and as far as I am aware, they told me that they have asked the federal government to put a land hold on a piece of land for a territorial campground in the Mayo area. As soon as the demand is there, we will be building a new campground in the Mayo area. I have told the members this before. We have a reserve on land now. As soon as it is required, we will be building the campground.

Mr. McDonald: Briefly, can the minister say where the piece of land is located? Would he know off the top of his head or would he be able to get back to me to tell me where that piece of land is located? Beyond that, could he also say what he means by the phrase, "the campground would be built when demand warranted?" It is the feeling of the people in the area that the six slots are being filled currently over the summer. Of course, if there are no more slots, there is no effective method of determining whether or not there would be greater use. I wonder if the minister could elaborate a little bit.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I think the piece of land that we have a reserve on is just upstream from the present campground. To my knowledge, that is where it is. The existing campground is not being utilized to its full extent. We have monitored it somewhat and even in the busiest days during the summertime — the busiest part of the tourist season — it, to our knowledge, has never been full.

Mr. McDonald: Obviously nothing has happened in the campground and last fall the minister and I agreed to disagree on that particular point. We both strongly had differences about the use of the campground and I would hope we could resolve that this summer to determine once and for all whether or not the use is there, and also, whether or not we could encourage tourists to use the campground more fully, to encourage tourists to come into the district, thereby necessitating an expansion of that campground.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Regardless of whether the member across the floor disagrees with me, I think my department is well aware of how many people stay in that campground. We have people there on staff in Mayo and one of their obligations is to monitor and check that campground. The campground is not being utilized to its capacity. Building a campground costs an awful lot of money and to build one just so that we can say we have a campground there is not a wise use of the taxpayers' dollars. As I have stated on more than one occasion, when the tourist demand is there, we will build a campground, the same as we do any other place.

Mr. McDonald: The minister will realize this is not Question Period where he gets the last word. When we were debating the Tracey campground adjacent to Carmacks, the justification for a million and a half dollars to construct that campground was such that this was not to be viewed as just another campground for tourists but would be an attraction for everyone in the territory. There was no prior experience to justify that suggestion, and we took it as an article of faith, trusting the minister to know what he is talking about. On the other hand, when we suggest that perhaps an expansion of the existing campground in Mayo and the encouragement of tourists and the significant efforts by the Silver Trail Tourism Association to draw tourists into the area, we are faced with a prospect that we are going to have to prove every last tourist before we get any sort of expansion of the existing six-slot campground. I think that is an inequitable situation if that is the way the government actually views it.

We, in the Mayo district, would like to see a campground with more than six slots. We do not feel comfortable inviting tourists into the area when we have a campground of only six slots and which is currently being eroded by the river. I would like to mention that it does have actually seven slots because there is a rather wide open space in front of the public urinals.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The member can have the last word but I will still get this point across. One of the member's own caucus members has complained on a great number of occasions about Frenchman Lake, for example: that Frenchman Lake campground was full continuously and there was always a shortage of space there. Tatchun Creek was always the same way. The reason why we are putting the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake park in there is because we need new campgrounds and while we are building the new campgrounds we are also building a park that will be beneficial for everyone in the territory.

Mr. Porter: Just before we leave the area of campgrounds, the increase that is reflected in the 1984 estimates obviously has to deal with construction of new campground sites, primarily slated for 1983-84, which would lead one to believe that there is still construction to be undertaken in the year 1984 in Moose Creek, Pine Lake, Yukon River, Carcross, and, rehabilitation in Aishihik and Klondike Rivers. Then we have the listed areas that were closed. This cites the reason of policy and economics for those decisions. How does the government determine which areas are closed and which new areas are built? Is there a process by which the government tabulates visitation to those areas, the frequency and the numbers that occur there? If such a study has existed, to bring the government to the point of decision to close certain campgrounds or to open others, can the minister make that information available?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. The reason that we closed these campgrounds is because we have built a major campground in the vicinity. It is uneconomical for the government to maintain these small campgrounds. It is very costly to clean them up and gather up the garbage. When we build campsites such as Pine Lake at the Haines Junction, such as the large campground in Watson Lake, they are spaced at a distance for the benefit of tourists and it is not economical for the government to maintain these small campsites in between. That is the reason. I should also add that most of these campgrounds, which we are talking about here, in old gravel pits and things like that, are something that have just developed because we did not have campgrounds so we put up tables and outhouses in these areas and developed them over the years. However, once we have built the good campground areas we would just as soon dispense with these because they are costly to the taxpayer to maintain.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$138,000 agreed to

On Conservation Officer Service

Mr. Porter: Are there any vacancies in the conservation officer areas?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, we have one vacancy.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister indicate as to where that vacancy is?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I believe it is Ross River.

Mr. Porter: Are there any vacancies within the department in Whitehorse? Is the position of chief conservation officer still maintained?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, there is still a chief conservation officer in Whitehorse. However, that is one of the areas where there will be some changes made. The only vacancy we have, at the present time, is one vacancy and it is not in Whitehorse. I believe it is in Ross River.

Mr. Porter: There was also, I believe, a vacancy with respect to the director of the biological section. Is that still a vacant position?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, we do not have a vacancy in the biological section.

Mr. Porter: Is there such a thing as a director of the biological section presently within the department?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, Manfred Hoefs.

Mr. Porter: Is he not referred to as the chief biologist?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: He might be referred to as the chief biologist, but he is the head man of the biological section.

Conservation Officer Services in the amount of \$1,152,000 agreed to

On Parks Operation

Parks Operation in the amount of \$513,000 agreed to

On Special Services/Information and Education

Mr. Porter: Maybe this is an area that we can talk about in terms of special services. Largely that has been an area that has been cited for specific investigations in, for example, a few years ago the sheep fiasco in the Klouane area where people were going in and illegally hunting sheep. A special services officer was very much involved with the RCMP in apprehending the individuals who were involved. The conservation officers are only hired for a certain specific time to do their jobs, Monday to Friday. One of the biggest problems, with respect to poaching, is the weekends and the long weekends. That is when that really occurs. Is the special services department able to fill in where the regular conservation officer cannot be expected to be on duty because of the nature of their contract with the government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The conservation officers, although they are supposed to be working a regular shift, are also required, when necessary, to vary their shift to cover these problem areas. That is the reason why we have them out in the outlying areas, so that they are close and can be contacted and can become involved. The special services officer, as the member across the floor said, investigates certain things like the poaching of sheep in the northern Yukon or any other special project, or special investigation that is going on. He is not out doing a regular job as a conservation officer.

Special Services/Information and Education in the amount of \$215,000 agreed to

Wildlife and Park Services in the amount of \$2,018,000 agreed to

On Subsidiary Agreement

Mr. Porter: I understand that what is being provided here is the phasing out of those subsidiary agreements. The funds largely flowed from what was known as the GDA and that agreement no longer exists. In the eventuality that some day, maybe after the economic development minister's return from Ottawa, we will have an economic development agreement, does the minister expect that EDA will provide for further funds for his department, in the same fashion as the old GDA provided?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, it will provide funds for my department. As to whether it will be in the same manner as the old funds, who is to say? I think we are all aware that the federal government is becoming more interested in funding and managing its own programs so, if we are fortunate enough to have an agreement the same as the old one where we managed all of the money, I think we will be fortunate. But it is hard to say what will happen.

Subsidiary Agreement in the amount of nil agreed to

On Resource Corps

Resource Corps in the amount of nil agreed to

On Yukon River Basin Studies

Mr. Porter: This program, as I understand it, has been a cost-shared effort between the two governments. Can the minister give us an indication as to what percentage both governments are responsible for or, if this is not a cost-shared program, is it simply one that is totally recoverable for the efforts put in by this government from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, it is cost-shared, on a 95:5 basis.

Mr. Porter: This particular agreement has been going on for a number of years and I suspect that what we are talking about now is the last leg of that particular agreement. Does the minister anticipate a final report coming forward from the Yukon River Basin Study and, if so, can he give us some idea as to when that report will be completed and available to the public?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The reason for the \$92,000 here is to extend this program until September and hopefully, by September, we will

have all of the final reports done. That is the intent. I am hopeful that it will be completed by then.

Yukon River Basin Studies in the amount of \$92,000 agreed to

Mr. Porter: I have some questions in respect of the revenue and recovery section that I suppose should have gone along with the debate in the department with respect to Yukon River Basin Studies. What is meant by the northern oil and gas assistance program? Why are funds flowing from that particular program to this department of government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: If you will recall when I talked about the Herschel Island park, that is recoverable under the northern oil and gas assistance program. It is set up for development in the north.

Mr. Porter: The pelt recovery that is listed here: is that wolf pelts?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes.

Mr. Porter: It seems like a good industry for the government to get into.

⁴⁸ What about the Gyrfalcon recovery? Are those funds from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. In regard to the wolf pelt recovery, do not forget that we pay \$200 per pelt out. We pay out more than we take in.

Mr. Porter: I have just one last question. This department did not increase dramatically over last year's expenditure. Funds for renewable resources have always been relatively miniscule compared to other areas. There is no question that areas like education are clearly priorities, and therefore demand a greater share of the government's resources, but it would seem that there is a real need for funding in renewable resources. Is there any effort being taken by the minister to seek further funding from other institutions than this government, such as the federal government or private foundations, to increase the government's ability to manage the resources more effectively?

Mr. Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes. In fact, we try to receive money from others, such as the Wild Sheep Foundation. We are now involved in a program with the Canadian Wildlife Fund and the federal government on our predator-prey program, and are trying to recover some money there. We will take money from wherever, if we can get it. One should recognize that, actually, the department, although it has not increased significantly in budget in the last year or two, has had a lot of work done with the people now there. Through our reorganization, I am hopeful that we will be able to become even more efficient and accomplish more with the money we have, and also that we will be able to put together programs and projects that we can fund through our O&M and capital budgets. I expect in the future to see that this department budget will be growing a little faster than it has in the past.

Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$4,805,000 agreed to

On Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Last year, during the budget debate, I referred to the new Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources. With the various changes that have occurred during this past fiscal year, a reference can again be made to the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

We have had some organizational improvements that were effected in forming the new department. One, a result of the recommendations of the Green Paper on Recreation, the recreation branch was transferred to this department. Two, the tourism branch was studied and a complete reorganization has taken place in that area. After my general comments, I will elaborate further on that.

⁴⁹ Number 3, with the retirement of the territorial librarian, Library Services and the Yukon Archives were amalgamated under one director with the additional position being reclassified to a staff position.

Number 4, *The Financial Administration Act* and the reorganization somewhat changed the relationship and the structure of the Yukon Visitors Association and Tourism Yukon. Presently we are awaiting a Yukon Visitors Association response to our invitation for programs on an industry government committee that would have the

mandate to advise on development projects as well as marketing.

The government continues to recognize the Yukon Visitors Association as a strong industry association and continues to financially support the association, but additionally we want to broaden the mandate and the base of industry advice to include all sectors of the tourism industry.

In this general debate, I want to highlight a number of initiatives. One with very significant budget implications is the new direction in recreation. The *Recreation Act* passed last fall reorders the delivery of recreation services in the territory, giving much more authority and responsibility to the communities. The increase in responsibility has been accompanied by an increase in funding. In 1983-84 recreation assistance program contributions to communities totalled \$127,006,500. This fiscal year, there will be a total over \$252,000 for contributions to the communities. This increase in contributions and the expanded mandate for lottery funding will greatly assist the communities in fulfilling the priorities they wish to establish.

Probably the most important economic factor to report is the strength of the tourism industry. You have received a copy of the 1983 tourism industry highlights and the advertising response conversion study that accompanied it. This document is intended to report on the health of the industry and, while it paints an optimistic picture in terms of visits and expenditure figures, we must still be diligent in our marketing and development activities.

The 1983 tourist expenditure figure of \$77,000,000 was based on new data resulting from the 1982 visitor exit survey. The previous two years' expenditure data was extrapolated from the 1981 visitor expenditure data. Also during 1983, a record number of border crossing were made by visitors and Yukoners across Yukon's various borders. These represented an eight percent increase over the previous year. The border crossing figure is an accurate one and can be compared from year to year. The previous high figure was in 1981 at 386,772. These figures are then broken down on the basis of other information and are fully explained in the industry highlight report.

The enquiry statistics are up 21 percent to an all-time high of 50,236 enquiries to April 30th of 1984. It looks like the 1983-84 marketing efforts will result in another good tourism season. The 1984 marketing package is presently being developed. Tourism Yukon's agency of record is being reviewed and some very creative ideas are coming forward during this review. The 1984-85 budget has a number of new initiatives in addition to continuing the ongoing successful programs such as the Alaska-Yukon marketing program. In addition, it makes provision for a vertical advertising campaign.

⁵⁰ That is advertising and specialists publications and so on. We will also be participating in the Canada West and Rendezvous Canada programs. Another step will be made into the Japanese travel market. Yukon hosts a group of Japanese travel wholesalers this summer. This is the next step in luring the Japanese to visit Yukon as a destination, a careful process, but one that could reap considerable financial benefit.

In looking at the tourism budget, you will notice the budget document indicates a decrease of four percent for tourism activities. This has resulted from the fact that the special projects added during the 1983-84 fiscal year were considered as part of the base budget when making yearly comparisons. Thus, one-time expenditures resulted in the budget having the appearance of having had the decrease. Some of these expenditures were for brochures, for research staff, for extension of hours at information centres, additional travel manuals, and so on, that were added into the base 1983-84 budget.

Discounting the special projects, the budget increased 7.9 percent. Including the special projects in the 1983-84 base, and comparing that figure with the 1984-85 base, resulted in the percentage decrease.

The recently-announced tourism incentive program has received an overwhelming response to date. The department is processing applications presently and we are most anxious to work cooperatively with the private sector in further improving our tourism infrastructure to attract and hold tourists longer. Applications and

enquiries have come in from every part of Yukon to date. We have found that Yukoners have read the entire brochure and are familiar with it and its contents and objectives. Once again, the direction given to the department is to assist the applicants.

While our small businesses are thankful for the incentive program, they have also voiced an opinion that their preference would be to have an interest forgiveness or a loan guarantee program, rather than an outright grant. These, and other options, are being actively studied in order to arrive at a more responsive system.

Another initiative we are pleased to announce, is Yukon's participation in Expo '86. Mr. Patrick Dixon, formerly of Foothills Pipeline, is on contract for the duration of our involvement. Yukon has a unique opportunity to present itself in a world showcase to show Yukon is a place with a future. While a great deal of material has been collected to date, it will be the coordinator's function to put that information together and then begin to involve Yukoners in the planning process. Presently, there are meetings in Vancouver involving all Expo '86 participants and, as a result of this week's meetings, we will be developing a firm action plan to bring us to the May 2nd, 1986 opening.

On the background of the organizational study summary, since tourism has continued to take on an increasingly more significant role in the economy of Yukon, and because of this economic prominence and the new combination of the tourism portfolio and other portfolios contained within the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture, the government decided to request a functional analysis be done to ensure optimum efficiency in operation, to define and clarify the roles of Tourism Yukon and the Yukon Visitors' Association and, in so doing, ensure that Yukon receives maximum benefits through tourism.

A firm was commissioned and the review was done. Some of the basic study findings from the assessment revealed that industry liaison had been delegated to the YVA; that there was some overlap in the roles and responsibilities of the YVA and Tourism Yukon, particularly in tourism marketing.

It was also determined that the YVA or Cooperative Marketing Committee was not directly accountable to the Government of Yukon for expenditures on specific marketing programs made on behalf of the government; that, within Tourism Yukon, there was no formalization of the research function, yet it is a very essential component of tourism management. Some of the key activities were not receiving adequate attention under the current structure and some of those activities were evaluating marketing plans and programs, conducting marketing and development research, coordinating private sector involvement in tourism planning and development and communicating overall marketing goals and strategies to the public.

The concept behind the recommendation of restructuring was to create a branch that was a strong tourism branch that can exert leadership and direction in the formulation of tourism strategies and marketing plans. It is anticipated that by combining all tourism-related activities into a cohesive unit, Tourism Yukon can respond to industry and market demands in a more coordinated and effective manner.

Tourism Yukon is to be comprised of four individual sections that represent the primary tourism activities: development, industry community liaison, tourism information services and marketing. The tourism development unit would be responsible for the technical analysis of tourism needs and the delineation of tourism strategies. Included in this unit would be the tourism industry research and analysis in support of various development projects.

The separate industry community liaison section would encompass the policy and public relation components of tourism and thereby facilitate better communication between Tourism Yukon and industry. The tourism information services unit would be responsible for the computer programs, delivery of promotional literature and the management of the visitor reception centres. The marketing unit would handle the planning, implementation and evaluation of marketing programs. The necessity for market research and analysis is recognized and would be an integral part of research function located in the tourism development unit.

Some of the advantages to this organizational structure are: the creation of one branch would promote a team orientation and more consistent direction for tourism activities. The single branch concept reinforces the cycle of research, planning, development, marketing, research, and thereby stimulates a synergy among the various sections. The development of tourism strategies and policies is recognized as a separate activity from day-to-day tourism operations. The industry community liaison group would enhance Tourism Yukon's ability to respond to industry by recognizing the YVA and other reference groups and individuals. The marketing section can focus its efforts on pure marketing activities, and the administrative activities associated with tourism are streamlined into one group for coordination and control.

I have given a very brief outline of the organizational review and I am prepared to answer further questions should the member have any. I hope I have not gone on too long.

Mr. Byblow: No, the minister has not gone on too long and I hope that I will be able to follow suit and be brief as well.

My immediate response to the minister's opening remarks would be to say that I welcome the information provided with respect to the intentions of the department to take a look at itself with a view to reorganization. I appreciate the information provided. I do have a number of questions surrounding that reorganization. In fact, in response in general debate, I want to address the question of organization of the department and the relationship between government and industry; two major themes that the minister dealt with.

One of the responses that I find taking place in tourism circles around the territory is that there is a question being raised about money being spent on the development side. That would appear, on the surface, to be something of a contradiction, because, historically, we have said that we seem to be spending all of our time and money on marketing and not enough money on development.

In the marketing end of things, we seem to have done quite a number of studies. The minister referred to at least one of them, the conversion study, which measures the result of that marketing exercise. I believe it was in 1982 that, in fact, it was calculated that, for every marketing dollar spent, we had a return of some \$96 in terms of what a tourist brought back in who did visit here, on an average basis. I think, historically, we have come to some agreement that the marketing end of our tourism was a wise investment and delivered a good return.

What appears to be developing is some concern about the development aspect of our tourism efforts. We do not seem to have the same kind of a measurement for establishing the value of the return for our development dollar. Now, the minister is acutely aware of the amount of money spent on the development side in the last number of years. We talk about \$6,000,000 on a tourism sub-agreement that took place from 1979 onwards. We talk about \$2,200,000 spent in the last year. We talk about a renewable resource agreement, related in tourism aspects, of another \$500,000. We see virtually millions of development dollars being spent. One of the kind of feedbacks that I am getting is that there is some resentment in the communities about how these development dollars are spent, or about the sort of interference in the marketplace that is taking place. There are allegations that some of the monies given out appear to be selective. There are charges that some of the grants make for unfair competition. There are charges that they are not equitably distributed and available to the territory.

I think the minister is very cognizant of that aspect of the development dollar. At the same time, there is the feedback coming from various tourism circles that we do not have adequate planning in place for those dollars. We have, historically, said that we are pursuing a destination points and corridor policy. Specifically, we are not sure what it is that we are trying to achieve with all of these development dollars being spent. In fact, it has been suggested that some of this money is being spent in a willy-nilly fashion and I, again, understand what is taking place. We have the federal government on the one hand with direct delivery monies. We have the territorial government trying to come to grips with this dilemma of sharing and not sharing the development dollar. In spite of some very commendable tourism development taking place, we have

criticism of it. It raises, in my mind, that we have to be looking closer at how we are spending our development dollar and trying to determine whether we are spending it wisely and efficiently.

So, when the minister talks about a reorganization of the department and Tourism Yukon taking more charge of tourism development, I can applaud those efforts. However, that then leads into the very obvious criticism that will come from industry: that government is trying to take over everything and, maybe, eliminating industry from the kind of participation that it has grown accustomed to through, in fact, the YVA. Those are the two issues that I wanted to relate to the minister in conjunction with her opening remarks and translating some of the information that I am hearing in the communities and in tourism circles.

The bottom line appears to be that we do need to identify our tourism goals in development better. We have to be able to say that we know exactly what those dollars are doing.

We know that they are a wise investment. We know that there is a return and the money is being spent as it was intended. The minister, who sits on the Public Accounts Committee, knows that, in the jargon of the Public Accounts, that what we are talking about are things like value for money and performance indicators, but in street language, we are talking about potentially poor investment. So, when the minister talks about her feedback from the industry that there would be a desire for more interest free money so that there is a sense of fairness and a sense of equity in distribution of development dollars, I can concur with that as being something we are hearing.

At this point, when you are developing a tourism development policy, you have a lot of handicaps.

It would appear to me, from what the minister is saying, that they are looking at their department to minimize the handicaps in trying to put in place a development policy. Obviously you have to look at your staffing, you have to look at the resources available to you, you have to define the goals that you want to achieve, and at the same time you have to respond to the various interest groups that are knocking at your door with their concern.

That, then, leads me to the industry connection and I want to leave with the minister a question that will allow her to describe exactly what is taking place between this government and industry. The minister said, I believe, in her comments, that industry was going to be taking on a much more prominent role in helping to plan tourism direction. I am not sure if those were the exact words but there was the implication that industry was going to be more broadly represented and in conjunction with YTG there would be no loss of some of the precedent-setting participation that has taken place.

To put the question more simply, how does the minister see this reorganization of the department that is taking place, that is in fact addressing the questions of value for money, and how does the minister see that reorganization continuing the relationship with industry that has been traditionally part of tourism development and, at the same time, perhaps she could explain to me what she means when she says that she wants to see industry broader represented?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: As we become more sophisticated in our abilities in Tourism Yukon in our research capabilities, particularly now that we have done some reorganization and we have what we call the single branch concept which reinforces the cycle — maybe we were spinning our wheels and did not have that cycle identified and we were not adhering to it; I think now we will be — that cycle of research-planning-development-marketing-research and so on. We are able to identify now more accurately how many dollars are coming to Yukon. The next step is to find out how many dollars stay here. A lot of the provinces have done this. They talk about multiplier effects and so on and I understand we have to do some homework in that area because our multiplier effect is extremely low compared to, say, some of the western airlines. They may use four as a multiplier effect and we use 1.26 or something. So we have to do some research in that area. Then we can identify true dollars that stay in Yukon.

On the comment about criticism, well, we are always going to have criticism; we are never going to do everything in a manner that

is going to please everybody. There is always going to be criticism about our marketing efforts and about our relationship with industry, about which community gets the money and which community does not, and so on. That is something we have to try and identify and we have to try to keep as many people happy as we can. That is very important, and one of the reasons why we have identified a separate industry community liaison section is so that we have contact with the communities and we have contact with the industry, and we have one individual who is identified to carry on that communication and that contact, instead of various people talking to various other people and not everyone knowing if the agendas of the people are the same. I am not making any accusations, but some individuals make representations and they may be different from what a group would like, and so on. « You always have problems arise when you have those relationships.

It did not take me very long, after I was Minister of Tourism, to realize that the relationship the government did have with the Yukon Visitors Association was going to come under question one day regarding the financial accountability and the financial aspects of it, because the joint marketing council was sitting down and they were being given a large sum of money, over a million dollars, and they were spending that money. I found, as the Minister of Tourism, I was having a lot of difficulty finding all the facts to be able to present to the legislature where all the money was going.

With the discussions of the new *Financial Administration Act* I knew that that relationship was going to have to change, because of public accounts committees, and it will not be long before tourism will be called before the Public Accounts Committee.

So, when the new *Financial Administration Act* was being discussed and was tabled last session, I started talking to the YVA and we started, in a way, to forewarn them. We met with them many times and we tried to address all of their concerns, and there were many of them. They felt the government was going to take over everything and some of the comments that the member for Faro has heard are quite accurate. I do not dispute them because I had people make representation to me with the same concerns: the government is taking over everything and what is industry going to do, and we will not be able to attract members, and so on, because we do not have that big stick over the government.

After many meetings and many discussions, we were able to point out to the Yukon Visitors Association that, as we were having to tidy up our bookkeeping and our financial accountability, they too were going to have to. And they, after several meetings, admitted that they recognized what we were getting at.

So, as far as the relationship between the industry and Tourism Yukon, we are still going to continue that extremely good relationship that I think we have had in the past and I think we will continue to have with industry. Some of the impact on the visitors association, according to the organizational review is that, of course, the YVA is recognized as a significant industry group. It also has the interest and staff talent to create and implement specific marketing programs. The YVA makes a strong contribution to the promotion of Yukon and should continue to be utilized by Tourism Yukon. The recommended organization structure for the tourism branch has implications for the YVA in its relationship with Tourism Yukon. The YVA and Tourism Yukon should continue to work closely together. Tourism Yukon would continue to recognize the unique nature of the YVA through general grants in support of its operations, so we will continue to fund their administrative grants.

A new committee, chaired by the government, should be formed and include YVA and non-YVA industry representatives. This committee should review and provide input into the marketing and development plans for Tourism Yukon. In addition to providing input to the marketing strategy, the YVA should be encouraged to develop and administer creative marketing plans and programs through its own funding or through government sources.

Tourism Yukon would contract with the YVA to conduct specific marketing programs for the tourism branch. The YVA would account to Tourism Yukon for the performance of marketing projects and the dollars spent in accordance with specific contracts.

The YVA would continue to promote and service its members with program funds generated directly by them through membership fees, advertising revenues and other sources.

“ They are recognized as significant industry spokesmen but also the government has a more encompassing role and I think the YVA recognizes that. The tourism industry includes groups that are not members of the YVA and the direct benefit of government dollars should not be contingent upon membership in the YVA.

In the last meeting we had with the YVA, they have given us a commitment that they will come to us with proposals and recommendations as to how many members they would like on the advisory council, or whatever we are going to call it; tourism advisory council. We have a service that we pay for, an agency of record, who maps out our advertising. We have officials within the department who can do budgets and are paid to spend their days doing budgets. What was happening was the industry representatives, on the joint marketing council, were having to sit down for a whole day and plan where they were going to spend money and where they were going to take new initiatives and so on. The intention of the government now is to do all that groundwork and the footwork for them, present it at an advisory meeting where they can say to us “you are heading in the wrong direction, we do not think you should identify money for that. We think it should go here”, and so on. We are still going to be relying on industry for that advice and that input.

Tourism Yukon will provide marketing money and efforts. We will provide support for the industry where we can, either in developmental areas or in marketing areas and we look to industry to provide the rest of the component of tourism in Yukon. Then that is the service and they are the storekeepers, and they are the tourism industry.

Mr. Byblow: The minister suggests that the YVA will be the storekeepers; I assume that the government will be the banker and the board.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No.

Mr. Byblow: What the minister has described to me are some pretty major changes that are taking place. In the first instance, it would appear to me that Tourism Yukon is now going to be totally responsible for the development and marketing policies for tourism dollars being spent. Before getting in the YVA questions and industry questions, I would like to go back for the moment and ask the minister if, in the development policy of Tourism Yukon, she feels that they are receiving a strong or good value for money spent in development? I call to attention the list provided to the House a month ago about how this government's portion of the \$200,000 was spent. At the same time, we have the federal government contributing its 85 percent of previous projects and current direct delivery system. Is there a development policy that measures whether or not these dollars are providing an efficient return?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I am not sure how precise a policy the member is asking for. I do not know if he is saying, “do you have statistics in the department that say this?” No, we do not have that.

“ The money was distributed on the basis of the application, the viability of it, the attraction, the marketing and so on. So, each application was reviewed on an individual basis, always keeping in mind the total contribution or attraction that would be made. Because we are young in our growth in tourism, we have potential for development all over Yukon. This is the criticism that the member levied at the government, that money was going into destination areas first of all, and not to all of Yukon. Well, we had to start somewhere, so we designated areas and, along with the federal government, we had to do that before it would give us any money. We had to identify particular areas as destination areas to put funding into. It is since we have had our own allotment of funding that we can be a little more diversified and maybe help some of the people who have smaller incentive programs that they wish to pursue.

Mr. Byblow: I guess what I am being told is that we have all of this money going out for hotels, for this wilderness exercise, for this river trip, for this kind of boat development and that ramp and so, but never are we saying “gee, how does this stack up against the return for tourism as an investment”. That is what I leave with

the minister and I think the minister understands what I am saying and I am sure that this is something that is going to be addressed.

I have a number of questions relating to this industry relationship and, in part, some of them will deal with the YVA. The first question relates to the question of accountability because I do not completely understand what the minister is telling me. From what I understood about the YVA, it sat on a council composed of industry and government that, in essence, planned the budget that normally would be in front of us today.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Only cooperative marketing.

Mr. Byblow: The minister says that it was only in cooperative marketing. Then, to deliver or spend those monies, there was a kind of services agreement that was established between the YVA and government that, in other words, had to be approved by the minister and, before the expenditure could take place, it had to follow the guidelines of a service agreement. All of that appears, in a very general way, to be accountable because the minister has the final say. The minister gave it approval and it is established in a signed agreement as to expenditure. How is that process not accountable, just so I understand better?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: To answer the first question regarding the dollar effect of incentives in Yukon, when I talked about the research capabilities being enhanced and talked about monies that are staying here and multiplier effects that we would be able to identify and so on, that will identify the concern that the member has as to how much contribution an new incentive may make or whether it is really viable or not. We are advancing to that.

“ As for the YVA and the agreement with YTG with Tourism Yukon, the formal agreement we had was for their administrative costs only. Although government and YVA sat on that council, they said where the money was going to be spent but there was never an agreement; the money still stayed here within the government. But they did manage to get some smaller contracts, say \$20,000 or \$30,000, for conventions, for example. They would have that money and they would use it in conjunction with their administrative money. What happened was, when we reorganized and when the relationship changed because of *The Financial Administration Act*, the YVA found that, when they submitted a request to the government for money, they submitted a request that was for more money than we had been giving them for administrative costs. To give you an example: say we were giving them \$50,000 for administrative costs, when we said submit a request for administrative costs but no marketing council money, then they submitted a request and found that when they actually had to operate their offices the request was for more money. So, they were finding money from within that joint marketing council for things like travel, telephone, office expenses, some personnel-secretarial-clerical work, and so on. So it was not an airtight system.

What we are saying is that we will still take direction from industry when it comes to distributing those funds, but it seems like a waste of these peoples' time to me — they are all business people, they need to be in their businesses — to be sitting down for a whole day. They are not specialists in the area when it comes to marketing and budgeting and fiddling with a lot of administrative things. They have their businesses to tend to. So we said to them, we will do all that; there are people in Tourism Yukon who are paid to do that and who are expert at it. When they bring it to you, you are not to rubber-stamp it. If you do not like something in it, you tell us. They seemed to be quite pleased with that, because they will be able to sit down now and spend more time planning for development and planning for new initiatives in marketing and discussing new areas that we should be looking at. We all agreed, when we met last, that that was a much more constructive and a much more exciting way to have the joint marketing council meet.

Mr. Byblow: Let me understand this. What the minister is proposing is that there shall still be some kind of a board representing industry — not necessarily YVA — but an appointed board, by this government, representing its choice of the spectra of industry. And that board will review — I was going to say rubber-stamp but I am not sure if I should — this government's policy and budgeting plans?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes. It would work basically the same way

as the joint marketing council did, but I do not know if we are going to call it a tourism advisory council or a tourism council. I am kind of inclined towards the tourism council aspect. The government will be putting people on that council but will be doing it on the advice of the YVA and I have already asked the YVA to recommend to us who it thinks should be on there. We also make the contribution to Alaska for the joint marketing effort with Alaska and Yukon. We are going to continue to provide that funding. The YVA will provide the representative on it and we will pay for that representative, but we will also send a government representative so that we do not have any conflicts. One of the problems and one of the reasons for doing the organizational review was that peoples' job descriptions were not defined and there was overlap and consequently there was conflict. We found out we were doing the same thing YVA was doing, and then there was something that neither one of us was doing and it was being left out.

So if it is defined as to what is expected of each, then I think we will see a much more positive approach and I think you will see the development of tourism and marketing and just the whole initiative of tourism accelerated because of this new organization.

Mr. Byblow: Previously, the YVA had a direct input into the marketing plans and expenditure and, if I am reading the minister correctly, what we are looking at is a council that is going to be looking at development and marketing together. Could I ask the minister if this is a realistic expectation of individual industry people, to be able to have the time and competence, if you will, in a one-day sitting to look over government plans for a year with several million dollars of expenditure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes I do, because the liaison person will be keeping in constant contact with these people. It is not that we are going to be requesting them to come and sit on a council every week or every two weeks. The liaison person is to continue that communication and that link with industry and then, if new ideas come forward, they can be presented to that individual and they will be brought back to the department. If we are considering something in Tourism Yukon, that liaison person will go to YVA and say, look, we are thinking of moving in this direction, what do you think about it? Think about it for a couple of weeks; we will be having another meeting, and so on, and maybe you could give me some ideas about it. So I see it being a much healthier relationship and a much more constructive and I think a very exciting direction that Tourism Yukon and the Yukon Visitors Association are going to be taking.

Mr. Byblow: I hope so, too. I guess I have some fear that out of this exercise may develop a reduction of involvement by industry. That is the fear I have. The YVA has been a very aggressive, active organization. I gather from the minister's statements she implies that it does not adequately serve all of the industry, and that may be correct if you look closely at the membership. The concern that I would express is that, in this new tourism council that is being established, we have an adequate representation from industry and that in fact we continue the kind of close participation that has historically taken place and which industry has become accustomed to, because they have been fairly influential in directing some of the marketing plans, and the minister will have to admit that the marketing plans of the government today have developed over the last five or eight years primarily as a result of YVA initiative. The sophistication of the stats that we have and the analyses that are in place have been prompted from that body, and I would hate to see a situation develop where government has decided to bring everything under its wing, for political reason perhaps, and eliminate industry from the same kind of participation that has taken place.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I like to regard myself as being a budding politician and learning quickly. I do not think any politician who wants to continue on as a politician is going to start shaking up the industry in Yukon for any political reasons. I always indicated that that was not the intention of this government; that we knew that we had to get the finances in order and that we knew we had to restructure a few things and define a few things and clarify a few things. If the member for Faro thinks that industry was aggressive before, he should see it now. They are even more aggressive and

they are competitive and knuckling down. They seem just as excited by this now as we do in Tourism Yukon. I think that is a very healthy attitude to have because the tourism business is extremely competitive across Canada and, consequently, across the whole world. We have to get the infrastructure in place that is going to do the best for Yukon and we are going to be able to work the most efficiently and the most effectively under it. I think we have that now.

Mr. Byblow: Did the YVA, or any other aspect of industry, have input into the departmental study that took place about this reorganization?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, they were interviewed as department employees were.

Mr. Byblow: Because of the shift in role of the YVA, it would appear to me that there are not longer going to be any services agreement for marketing purposes, at all; that all this government is now going to be providing is the administrative costs of the YVA. In other words, they are going to be providing grants towards the maintenance of their office. Could the minister clarify just what support they are going to be providing to the YVA under this new reorganization?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The member was not listening to me very well when I was reading very quickly, because I did say that we were waiting a response from the YVA for proposals on an industry-government committee. We are also waiting for them to come forward if they have a certain idea or a certain program or project that they think we should pursue. If the council reviews that project and they agree that it has lot of merit and a lot of value, then they would be able to proceed with that. The government would provide funding. They would, in turn, spend that funding and be accountable to Tourism Yukon for where the monies went.

Mr. Byblow: I will leave this subject. I do have a number of specific questions on tourism, but I will leave them to the line items because they are more appropriate there. I have one more general debate subject that I wanted to touch on and that is on the subject of the wilderness aspect of Yukon, as a promotion. The government has participated this past year in putting together a brochure for wilderness guides.

There has been some concern expressed within the wilderness guide group that, because of the nature of our advertising where we are coattailing a lot of American advertising, we are abusing Yukon as a destination point. I realize the contradiction that may exist here but, at the same time, I understand full well the value and advantage of coattailing on American dollars for the advertising. Has the minister had any representation from the wilderness people on this aspect?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, we assisted the wilderness guiding association with a brochure. That has been published. I believe there was some-20,000 copies that were made for them and have gone all over the world. It is interesting the comment about us coattailing on Alaska. That has been a concept and something that you often hear. People say, "why do we spend any money in tourism in Yukon, because people are going to Alaska anyway and they are going to stop here". Well, I am not prepared to risk that, because they just may not stop here.

Something very interesting for the members opposite to know is our participation in Expo: Alaska has not yet given a commitment to participate in Expo. We are presently looking at where the Yukon pavilion is going to be. I will be getting in touch with one of the legislators in Alaska and we have such a positive feeling about the numbers of visitors who we are going to get to the Yukon pavilion that we are going to be saying to people, "Come to Yukon and, after you have seen Yukon, then you can go to Alaska". There is a whole attitudinal change that is required amongst Yukoners. We have to stop thinking of ourselves as a stop on the way to Alaska and start thinking of saying to people, "Come to Yukon and you'll love Yukon. Then, if you have time, you can go to Alaska".

Mr. Byblow: The minister did not really respond about whether or not Yukon wilderness guides have approached this government with respect to that concern that they have. I believe that the feeling is that they are being short-changed on a couple of counts, one being that, because of the nature of our advertising, which requires

cards to be filled out in American publications, to be sent to Canada, because, in some instances, they will only get Yukon information after a second inquiry, which is first made to Alaska; there is a delay process and a handicap process to receiving wilderness and tourism information. That was a concern brought to my attention.

The second concern that was brought to my attention by the wilderness people was related to the high numbers of extra-territorial people in wilderness business. Even in the brochure that the minister refers to, and that I raised, there are a number of outside territory guides being advertised. In the Yukon publication, the publication that we put out and pay for, there are a tremendous number of outside Yukon and outside Canada, in fact, tour guides who are advertising packages and so on. This is a concern that the wilderness people have.

²² I think the concern has to be respected, as one of the most appealing features of our tourism market is the wilderness appeal of Yukon. The people who are involved in it feel very close to it and very strong about it. When they see an invasion of this unique feature of the territory by outside interests, it is something that we have to pay some attention to, especially when we are using public funds to advertise for the exploitation of the wilderness travel side of things.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: They have not made representation to me. They may have to department officials. They have not raised those concerns with me.

The officials were in correspondence with the wilderness guiding association to do a brochure for them, but I have never had them come to me to talk about tourism. The first conversation or correspondence I have had with them was in regard to the tourism boycott incident. I have expressed to them that I would like to meet with them and they assured me that they thought that would be a good idea. I have not heard from them, but I expect I will.

On outside advertising, we do not solicit it through Tourism Yukon. It is done through the YVA. It is the one that sells the advertising for the travel guide. It would derive part of its revenues through selling that advertising, so we are taking our direction in Tourism Yukon from the industry. We just pay the bill.

Mr. Byblow: I think that the point being made to me was that public funds do help pay for this, and the concern of the wilderness people was therefore raised. In this publication, there are several out-of-territory guides who are advertising. Does the minister support Yukon wilderness guides over outside wilderness guides? That is almost a motherhood question.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: This government has always had a Yukoner-first policy. Of course we would support Yukon wilderness guides. However, I say again that we take direction from the industry and the industry includes people who are selling the advertisements. They are saying that they want those people advertising in the magazine. They are prepared to pay. They are making a contribution. They come to Yukon, and they bring people to Yukon. If they said no, they would be criticised.

Through the reorganization, we are looking at the responsible spending of the taxpayers funds, and all of these things will be discussed in the council.

²³ **Mr. Byblow:** I do not believe the organized wilderness guides feel that YVA adequately represents them and that certainly the minister will have to address the question in the new council of making sure that wilderness guides are adequately represented. Probably a final remark on the wilderness subject is that my information is that the brochure produced was a most useful exercise, much appreciated, and seems to have turned out quite well, and is the kind of wilderness exposure that we historically have not taken advantage of. Certainly, from that side of the industry, the feeling is that we are spending our dollars on hotels and not on the wilderness. There may be some legitimacy if you actually take a look at the development dollars. I leave the remaining specific items I have to the line items.

Mrs. Joe: I just want to speak briefly on recreation and culture and heritage.

In regard to recreation, it appears that, as a result of *The Recreation Act*, the past work that was done by the Green Paper

Committee, the government was able to put together some legislation that people appeared to be quite happy with, which is not to say that there will not always be no problems. I am tired too. If the minister would just be quiet and let me finish talking, we would get through a lot sooner. There will always be problems. Nothing is perfect. Okay? If she wants me to go on about the imperfections, then I will, but I was trying to compliment the department on what they were able to do. However, I think my colleague from Mayo may have something he might want to add in regard to recreation.

I have one question I would like to ask, and I am not sure whether it comes under tourism or under recreation. It is in regard to an article that was in the paper concerning \$10,000 that was given to some association to bring the Edmonton Oilers up to Whitehorse. I do not know whether that was a rumour. I do not know if the government did donate that kind of money to anybody, but it was in the paper and I am just wanting some clarification on it.

²⁴ **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Not this government. I know we have had representations from the association that wants to bring the Oilers up here and they have been in contact with the tourism recreation culture department to see where they would be eligible for some funding. They are eligible but not for \$10,000. We have not distributed that amount of money to them. I am positive of that.

Mrs. Joe: I did have some calls with regard to that amount of money. We were a bit curious and so are the people who called. I believe that the article was in the paper on Monday. There was a little story in there and we wondered why the Oilers, who made a lot of money, were asking for \$10,000 to come up to the Yukon. I have nothing more in recreation, but I am sure other members do.

I would like to speak, just briefly, on culture and heritage. The minister had indicated to me, in an answer to a series of written questions, that legislation could be tabled in this House in the fall regarding heritage. Could the minister tell me how far along that is? Can we expect it in the fall? I would also like to know about the results of the presentations throughout the communities. I was not able to keep tabs on what was happening. I was also away when they had the public meeting in Whitehorse so I was not able to attend that. However, I did get a copy of the submission from the Yukon Historical and Museums Association. I thought that they had done a fair job of letting the government know what they would like to see in legislation to protect our culture and heritage; to protect it and to preserve it. Could the minister let me know what is happening with that? Then I have a couple of other questions that I would like to ask her.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The Yukon Historical Museum Association did an excellent job with their presentation to the government regarding heritage legislation. We, as you know, put out a general policy paper and it was picked up by many people who were interested, and reviewed. Because of the extensiveness of the homework that the YHMA did, we are now starting to have some second thoughts as to whether we will be able to proceed with heritage legislation in the fall. It is at the direction of the YHMA that we are doing that; it is at their request.

We did not anticipate getting such an extensive review and we want to look at it more thoroughly. After we had the visit of Mr. Jacques Dallibar, he also recommended that perhaps we should consider some other methods of getting public input for the legislation. I am not at liberty to say what that is yet, because I have not brought it forward to my Cabinet colleagues for a decision. I was just talking with the heritage director last week about it.

We are looking at some more input. The public meetings went fairly well. They were, of course, very small. Small numbers of people turned out to them. The heritage director went to all of the communities and received some input from virtually all of the communities. I was at the Whitehorse meeting and the Yukon Historical Museum Association made their presentation there and it was extremely interesting.

²⁵ It was extremely detailed. I supposed what I am saying is that the legislation, in all likelihood, will be delayed this fall.

Mrs. Joe: I have no problem in waiting for good legislation. I have had a chance to go over the submission two or three times and, if the department is considering a lot of the things that were in

there, that is great.

Would the minister comment on some things that I would like to ask of here. It is with regard to an article that was in the paper and there are some things that were written in the paper and there were some concerns that the Yukon Historical Museum Association has. Jeff Hunston talks about Yukon's past and he says that Yukon's past will be part of its future. He goes on to say that there are people who have a total dedication to preserving Yukon's heritage and people who really do not give two hoots and would rather bulldoze something in their way rather than preserve it. It is true. A miner ran his bulldozer through the historic site of Dalton Post, knocking down old buildings, a couple of years ago. He talks about instances like that.

Is she listening to me, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes, I am.

Mrs. Joe: He talks about our past disappearing and about a number of other things. One interesting thing that he says here is that the Klondike is certainly the most visible part of the Yukon's history; the buildings, the riverboats, and government programs are largely oriented to it. He said, "But, I think that the government should recognize that the goldrush is only part of the Yukon's heritage. The European presence here dates back 150 years. The natives have been here for 30,000." And, he talks about the lack of the native presence in the Fort Selkirk restoration and he calls it "an appalling oversight". He goes on to talk about the lack of Indian culture being recognized as much as it possibly should be. Could the minister comment on that?

Another thing that I would mention is that the Indian Women's Association and the CYI, over the years, have objected to the imitation Indian art that is being sold in Yukon stores and all over Canada; imitation art that has come over from China, Japan or wherever. Has the department ever considered doing anything in regard to that area? I know the Indian Women's Association had objected very strongly to the Yukon government asking for some kind of research or study to find out what we could possibly do about it.

Those are just some of the areas that were mentioned by Jeff Hunston and it was in this newspaper article. Could the minister comment on some of these things that were said, especially with regard to the lack of the Indian culture being recognized.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I just looked around to see which of my colleagues had bulldozed through the heritage site. They all looked innocent to me, to my relief.

I have not read the article that the member is speaking about. I have talked to Jeff Hunston several times, and I attend the Yukon Historical Association annual meeting, and I have some exchange with the association. I have never had any representation with the Yukon Indian Women's Association. They may have been in touch with the department, however.

I really do not have a response regarding Indian culture. We have talked to Willie Joe about the tourism aspect of native peoples, and he has some ideas on how he wants to develop and increase the tourism industry for Indian people, but I have not had anyone come to me with the concerns the member has expressed. If she belongs to the Yukon Indian Women's Association, perhaps she could have them make a request for me to meet with them. I am always prepared to do that sort of thing, in order to hear the concerns first-hand, rather than try to respond a newspaper article that I have not had an opportunity to read, or have not had a chance to discuss the issues with Jeff Hunston.

Mrs. Joe: The request is an old one, before the minister's time. I hope that because one of the issues in the CYI election is cultural heritage, the possibility of setting up that kind of portfolio, after the elections tomorrow, is a possibility, and that there will be more communication between the government and CYI in that area. As a member of the Yukon Indian Women's Association, I would certainly talk to them about meeting with the minister.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I would encourage that because that is the kind of input we are looking for. We have not had much representation from CYI regarding heritage and I think that that is also one of the factors influencing us to maybe wait a bit until they can bring forward some of their major concerns, so we are looking

forward to that.

Mrs. Joe: In regard to Expo '86, is there going to be any kind of Indian input?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The coordinator, Mr. Dixon, is going to be meeting with many people in Yukon, and the CYI would be among those contacted.

Mr. Kimmerly: In the early days of this session, I made a representation concerning tourism and I made it in French. Recognizing that my accent was not perfect, perhaps I should repeat it. The purpose of rising now is that I wish to ask a very short question. I will not go into the statistics, but concerning the origin of the visitors to Yukon, it is clear, from the government's statistics, that very few came from French Canada. I suggested, approximately two months ago, that consideration be given to translating our available information, or some of it, into French to attract French Canadian tourists. Is any action contemplated on this proposal?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have just sent one of the pages to get, for the member for Whitehorse South Centre, one of our tourism brochures that we have published now in French and one in German. I had intended to bring those to the House, so that I could present the members opposite with them.

Also, I remember the member for Whitehorse South Centre asking about French Canadian visits and I had some statistics for him of approximately how many French Canadian visitors we had. I am not exactly sure of the numbers but it was within five to seven percent of the Canadian visitors; which really is a fairly high number, I think.

On Administration

Mr. Byblow: The question I would have is to ask the minister, with regard to the reorganization we discussed with regard to opening remarks: is there a reorganization already in place administratively? What are some of the major changes that have taken place? I am not calling on the minister to break it out to fine detail, but more or less in terms of shifts in structure.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I can be very brief. We have a new position, director of tourism, and that has been filled effective June 1st. That has been filled by Mr. John Lawson. I am sure that you saw that in the newspaper. John Lawson will be the new director of tourism. Then, four positions, who will report to the director of tourism, are now being reclassified by the Public Service Commission and recruitment for those positions will begin as soon as possible. Those directors will be for the four areas that I previously mentioned: the tourism development, industry-community liaison, tourism information services and the marketing unit.

Administration in the amount of \$241,000 agreed to

On Library and Archives Branch

On Technical Service

Technical Service in the amount of \$211,000 agreed to

On Public Library Services

Public Library Services in the amount of \$471,000 agreed to

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$91,000 agreed to

On Archives

Archives in the amount of \$284,000 agreed to

Library and Archives Branch in the amount of \$1,057,000 agreed to

On Heritage Branch

Mr. McDonald: I assume that the museums to be funded this year are the same as they were last year. The question that I have is a constituency question. The minister will remember that one museum in my riding had made some requests for funds this past year for the future operating year 1984-85 for some funds beyond the O&M funds. There were a number of projects that they had in mind for development. Does the minister recall the situation and can she elaborate on the department's actions?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have total recall. The museum will continue to get its traditional O&M grant and, then, under the tourism incentives program, the museum will be eligible — as others will

— for submitting an application for their new incentives.

Mr. McDonald: I understand that the new incentives program, for which the government would pick up 100 percent for heritage sites, has a maximum limit on those projects of \$10,000. Should the Keno Museum, for example, wish to put a new roof on the museum, which is badly needed, which is greater than the \$10,000, can accommodation be made for such requests?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I cannot make that commitment here in the legislature. The museum would have to come forward with the request from the department and have it analyzed on an individual basis.

Mr. McDonald: I was hoping that the minister did have total recall, because, of course, the request has been made to the department. This was obviously before the new program was announced. The request, in fact, stipulated a specific price that is well over the \$10,000 limit. Obviously, in this case, on this program, if the \$10,000 limit is to be rigorously applied, the museum would be wasting its time to make application for funding for that particular upgrading. If they cannot make funding for that upgrading, is there any other avenue that they could use to search for the necessary funding to effect the very immediate repairs that are necessary?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The department has not brought to my attention any particular submission that has come from the museum that the member is concerned about.

⁶⁹ My immediate response is that if they had received a submission, it would have been held until the tourism incentive program was announced and monies had become available, if that is what they were identifying the assistance for. As to whether they are going to get it, I do not know. I can find out for the member tomorrow, or the next day what the status of the application is.

As to other places to look for funding, they could look to various communities for donations, I suppose, or for some volunteer assistance; maybe some people are prepared to donate time, materials or whatever. I do not know of any other avenue within the department from which we would be able to offer assistance.

Mr. McDonald: That is how the museum got started in the first place. It was totally a volunteer effort. The building itself was donated, and all the work that went into it in the first place was almost totally donated. There were some minor operation grants given to the museum by the government to help it get on its feet.

The minister, of course, does not have total recall on this issue, because I let her know myself in a letter about the funding request for the museum, prior to the session, I believe. I would take the minister up on her commitment to get back to me on the status of the request for funds for the museum roof, amongst other things.

The minister, I believe last year, mentioned that the government had no funding at that time for the upgrading of historic sites around the territory. I assume that with this new program we can now accommodate such projects as the upgrading of historic cabins, or sites that have proven historic worth. Is it worthwhile for people in the riding to make application for funding for those sites that are commonly regarded as having historical worth so that they may be upgraded?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: There is one other minor question, and it may not be that significant, as I may have received the answer already, in effect.

There is a very old steam tractor located in Keno, which people do consider is worth some effort to upgrade. Is this a project that the minister would consider worth making application for for funds, to upgrade or refurbish it. I know that the museum has already made application for funds to upgrade this particular piece of equipment. Is it worth the trouble of the museum to make application to the tourism assistance program for this?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: If the museum people feel it is worth refurbishing, I am sure they will feel it is worth the time to make the application.

⁷⁰ My question really regarded Tourism Yukon's reaction to their request. Are they going to look upon that request as being as legitimate as other requests for funding regarding the refurbishing of historical sites? Does this count as an historical site? Will it get

the same consideration as other applications for fixed buildings, et cetera, for the more traditional historic sites?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Could the member for Mayo indicate to me why it would not get the same consideration?

Mr. McDonald: Perhaps the minister's cheeky question answers mine. Thank you.

On Historic Sites

Historic Sites in the amount of \$73,000 agreed to

On Art Gallery

Art Gallery in the amount of \$46,000 agreed to

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$69,000 agreed to

On Museums

Museums in the amount of \$78,000 agreed to

Heritage Branch in the amount of \$266,000 agreed to

On Tourism Branch

Mr. Byblow: I have six questions. I will try to be brief. Is there any budgetting for convention coordination?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No.

Mr. Byblow: This is 1(a): why not?

Some hon. members: No, no, no. That is two.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: It is being reviewed with the Yukon Visitors Association. We had intended on identifying some funds for it and we may have a \$20,000 allotment in the marketing money. But, the YVA seems to feel very strongly that that is something that they should do. We are discussing that with them and, hopefully, we will get convention coordination off the ground this year.

Mr. Byblow: Will the advertising arrangements that are in place with Alaska in the cooperative advertising program remain under the new reorganization?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have already answered that, yes.

Mr. Byblow: This is 2(a): who is going to be providing the input to that agreement for the advertising now?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have already answered that. The YVA will have a member on that and will be providing input and Tourism Yukon will have a member. We will be paying the bill. We will be supporting the YVA's membership there and we will be sending a department official.

Mr. Byblow: From earlier debate, a question has arisen about the *Financial Agreement Act*. What exactly cannot be done under the *Financial Agreement Act* that was being done between the YTG and the YVA? Could the minister explain that?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I will explain it, but he will never get it. The YVA was in a joint partnership with Tourism Yukon. We paid for the travel guide. The YVA sold advertising to the travel guide and made revenue of approximately \$90,000 in a government-taxpayer paid publication. We are no longer allowed to say to the YVA, "you can keep that \$90,000 to add to your \$50,000 that the government gives you in administrative costs", because it now has to go into the public purse. So, we have had to make alternate arrangements.

Mr. Byblow: This is 3(b).

Some hon. member: This is six.

Mr. Byblow: The minister said that, because the YVA was collecting some funds and expending them, this would not be permitted under the new financial agreement act.

Will it also apply to the marketing monies that were under the services agreement between YTG and YVA?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No, because those will now be contract agreements with the YVA. They would come to us and say, "We are going to contract to provide conventions and we have a proposal for \$20,000; do you like it?" We will say, "Yes, we do and here is the \$20,000; submit your financial statements after."

Mr. Byblow: A number of people have asked whether or not we in fact have 400,000 tourists. It comes about as a result of the kinds of statistics that are produced, that reflect border crossings. When I investigated the actual numbers of tourists, it looks more in the 20,000 or 30,000 range, and not the 400,000 border crossing range. Could the minister clarify, for the record, how the border crossing statistics correlate to actual tourists, and perhaps make some comment about

tourists who are Yukon residents?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: The only people whom we do not recognize as tourists are Yukoners who are travelling back and forth. We are able to keep a closer eye on that, now that we have the registries, and so on.

The statistics that we are getting now are extremely accurate. We can break them down to: where people are coming from, where they have entered and left, and so on. We are identifying Yukon visitors as well. That number accurately reflects visitors to Yukon. The smaller numbers are the Yukoners visiting back and forth to Alaska.

Mr. Byblow: This is my fifth question, Mr. Chairman.

It was brought to my attention that there was some confusion and a lack of planning in a recent show in Toronto that was, in part, co-sponsored by this government. For the record, what happened?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I have a memo about this. I cannot read it all; it is long, and I am not really prepared to table it.

Apparently, it is "Rendezvous '84" that the member is referring to. The Yukon contribution to it was \$7,500. The reception was co-hosted by Edmonton Tourism, Travel Alberta, Travel Arctic, Tourism Canada and Tourism Yukon. There were some problems, I gather, with the organization. Most of it was done out of Edmonton. A committee was supposed to organize finger food, rather than a banquet, and it ended up providing banquet food. There were no utensils, the hall was too big; there was a combination of things. It was planned, basically, by Alberta. I understand that we did not have a lot of input into the planning and therefore, we will not take a lot of the credit for the disaster. We will only take \$7,500 worth of credit.

Aside from it being brought to our attention that there were a lot of problems with the whole evening, I was pleased to hear on the news media the next morning that the media we received was very positive and apparently the media had not gotten hold of this problem that had occurred.

Mr. Byblow: My last question. How does the minister explain the four percent reduction in the budget of this branch when, added into this budget, is a line item that appears to be the money collected in advertising by the YVA, which was never in the budget before? If one considers that as part of the budget in terms of new money that always was there but in fact was over in YVA's budget, it would reflect something more than a eight or nine percent reduction. The minister explained to me earlier that it was because of financial juggling over the incentive stimulation over the last year when money from this year's budget was stolen to advance projects.

If that is the only reason, I could accept that. The only problem is that it does not indicate any major priority or emphasis to the tourism development and marketing that we are trying to prioritize in our economy today.

While the minister is responding to that, I wish she would clarify for the record the entry of that new line item, which appears like new money, but is really someone else's brought into this budget.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: That is not correct. The member from Faro has misinterpreted it. I have explained already what the four percent change is. The 1983-84 forecast was developed from period nine, and it includes those special projects, but they are not part of the base budget for the next year. That is why it looks like there is a decrease in the budget. Actually we are reflecting a 7.9 percent increase in Tourism Yukon's budget.

New programs have been identified under this and in the organizational review I read those four areas, and they are all in here. The industry community is the person-year for that liaison person who will be under that section. Information services will be the visitor reception centres and the fulfillment of mailing, and then the program coordination.

Mr. Byblow: I apologize if I am belabouring this point but when I look at the original estimates they are in fact more than the forecast. Perhaps I will stand corrected. The original estimates in last year's budget were not more than the forecast.

The minister did not, however, respond to the entry of this new line item, which was the advertising money of YVA. Is that in this portion of the budget?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Byblow: If you will permit some latitude, Mr. Chairman, I will not have any more questions on the line item. What, then, is the industry community \$120,000?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: That includes a person-year. I just said we did a reorganization, and there will be a person identified to carry on that liaison. He will need support staff and it will be one of the four departments under the new director of tourism.

Mr. Byblow: Is that Mr. Kostelnik?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: That is one of the positions that are being reclassified and I do not know who will be in that position yet. I do not know if Mr. Kostelnik will be the industry community person or not.

Mr. Byblow: So, in neither the industry community line item nor in the program coordination is the advertising money that normally YVA collected for this publication. That is what I am trying to establish. If the money that YVA normally collected for the advertising, which also incidentally is in the amount of \$120,000, is now entered into the budget because of *The Financial Agreement Act*?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Not that I am aware of, because they have not collected it yet. They have collected it for the past magazine; it has been published. They have to do that again.

Mr. Byblow: But the fact remains that, when they do collect it, they really cannot collect it because it is going to have to come into this budget. It is going to be a recoverable item in this budget. Is that correct?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No, we have not worked that out yet with the YVA and with the Department of Finance as to how that is going to work. We are still discussing how we are going to allow them to sell advertising or if that is what we are going to do and so on. We are still in discussions and I cannot elaborate any further for the member. As soon as we make a decision, I will let him know.

Mr. Byblow: Okay, but in principle, the fact is that calculated into this budget is an estimate of the advertising recovery from this magazine?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: No, it is not and if I am mistaken I will clarify it tomorrow. But I am not mistaken; I am pretty sure.

Development in the amount of \$164,000 agreed to

On Marketing

Marketing in the amount of \$788,000 agreed to

On Industry/Community

Industry/Community in the amount of \$120,000 agreed to

On Information Services

Information Services in the amount of \$423,000 agreed to

On Program Coordination

Program Coordination in the amount of \$172,000 agreed to

Tourism Branch in the amount of \$1,667,000 agreed to

On Recreation Branch

Mrs. Joe: I would just like the minister to tell me briefly what happens to this one million dollars?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: You want to know what happens to the one million dollars? I do not want to say this, but \$112,000 goes to administration, \$505,000 goes to community programs ... I am not sure what the member wants. Could she be more specific?

Mrs. Joe: There is a budgeted amount here of \$1,014,000, and I can see that \$112,000 goes into administration and \$505,000 goes into community programs; I would like her to briefly specify what kind of community programs, sports, games and fitness that takes in.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: All of the money is distributed to sports groups and arts groups. If you look at the statistics on pages 257 and 258, you will see where all the money goes; most of it is distributed to the communities. As the member is aware, arts did not have its own identification before. With the new green paper and the new *Recreation Act*, they have their own formula under *The Recreation Act* now. Sports, games and fitness are all identified. That would cover things like the pool program and when we are going to have Arctic Winter Games, and all the funding that goes to the community programs. If you will look on page 258, I would like to point out for the gratification of the member for Mayo that the government identified Keno-Elsa as a local authority and they

have the largest grant, of \$9,710.

Mr. McDonald: I would just like to point out on behalf of all the people in the Keno-Elsa area who worked so long and so hard for their own local authority that they finally managed to convince the government that they, too, are an area deserving of a local authority and we should applaud their efforts.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Not to be confrontive but just to indicate to the member that I appreciate they did work very hard; however, it was through the initiatives of the Green Paper Committee that it was recommended to the government that we do that, and we took the recommendation of that Green Paper Committee because we recognized the efforts that community had made and that they were very deserving of this.

Mr. McDonald: Of course, the Green Paper Committee may have been one vehicle to transmit the desires of the Keno-Elsa people to the government. It was certainly not the only vehicle. The people of that community and the people of the entire Mayo district had communicated the desire for two recreation bodies long before the Green Paper Committee was invented, long before it started its work and long before it made its final recommendations. So, we should applaud the efforts of all those people who perhaps did not take part in the Green Paper Committee report but who worked long and hard over the years from the mid-1970's onward to encourage the government to take this very appropriate action. We should thank them. We should applaud them.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$112,000 agreed to

On Community Programs

Community Programs in the amount of \$505,000 agreed to

On Sports, Games and Fitness

Sports, Games and Fitness in the amount of \$298,000 agreed to

On Arts

Arts in the amount of \$99,000 agreed to

Recreation Branch in the amount of \$1,014,000 agreed to

On Expo '86

Expo '86 in the amount of \$107,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Before we clear the total, are there any questions on pages 262-263?

Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture in the amount of \$4,352,000 agreed to

On Yukon Housing Corporation

Mr. Kimmerly: I think we could probably be very brief in this particular item or this department. It has been expressed by this side before that the corporation in our opinion is not fulfilling its mandate in the social housing area, although it is certainly providing facilities in the staff housing area. I could make a long speech about all of that but it would only be a repetition of previous speeches, so I will not make it now, although I do not promise to not make it again next year.

I have two questions. They are not party critic questions but primarily constituent questions and are of a fairly specific nature. I would understand perfectly if the minister could not answer immediately, but probably he can send along a response in the mail.

I am interested in the waiting list for Greenwood Place, or 3098 Lambert Street, and the waiting list for 6095 Sixth Avenue; not the names but the number of people on the list. I have asked in the past about the policies and the planning for additional facilities and I will simply ask for the recent waiting lists.

The second question is also concerning my riding. There are a number of Yukon Housing units on Jeckell Street and Taylor Street in the south end of Whitehorse. On the west end of those two streets, there is open space just under the escarpment and in the units there is an extremely high number of children. The children play on the street and in that open space, and I would ask if the corporation, considering the peculiar occupancy of those units being primarily young families, has given any consideration to consulting with the city to improve the space on the west end of Taylor and Jeckell between there and the escarpment? There is possible an acre there and it has been reclaimed under the escarpment program. The

number of children who use it is extremely high and a consultation concerning some improvements would be useful with the city of Whitehorse. I simply raise that as a possibility. I have no other questions as we go through the department.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: To the first question, regarding the waiting lists, I certainly do not have them but I will certainly get that information back to the member opposite.

On the second question, I will talk with the officials of Yukon Housing Corporation to find the exact location of where he is talking about. I am not from Whitehorse so I am not totally sure where it is. I believe it is above the row housing in Whitehorse, but I will have the officials of Yukon Housing discuss that with the city and see if it is possible.

Mr. Byblow: I have one question — with several parts. It is a constituency matter and the minister knows the issue. It relates in one part to maintenance of the existing units and secondly to expansion of the number of available units on the one hand for staff and on the other hand the examination of a public housing program.

I realize that the latter two items are capital, but the minister may wish to give me some reassurance that he is continuing to review — for what should be less than 15 years, as it has been in the past — a development program, and whether or not the maintenance program will be adequately funded to correct some of the deficiencies that have been identified. The minister has advised me that two of the units are being taken off the market, so that should perhaps eliminate a couple of problems we are having there.

Regarding the budgeting of the maintenance of a number of units that are considered deficient, could he respond? And, if he feels in the position to respond, on further development?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The Yukon Housing Corporation has a five-year plan. I believe it is in the third year of that plan on the maintenance for the units all over Yukon. I know Faro is on the list again as part of that. I am not sure which units. I just do not have that information. I can certainly get that information to the member opposite though.

As for the two units — the member opposite is right — I advised him that the two units being taken out of Yukon Housing stock are not adequate or sufficient and I also would advise the member, at the same time, that Yukon Housing Corporation would be looking at the present stock for staffing to see if the mix is right. We have been advised it was not by the member opposite and by the teaching staff and we will be attempting to see what we can do about that as well. I believe next year's budget is what that budgeting is for.

Mr. Chairman: Before we close the line item off, are there any questions between pages 267 and 272?

Some hon. members: Clear.

Yukon Housing Corporation in the amount of \$1,579,000 agreed to

On Loan Capital and Amortization

Loan Capital in the amount of \$3,253,000 agreed to

On Loan Amortization

Loan Amortization in the amount of \$1,817,000 agreed to

On Schedule A

Yukon Legislative Assembly in the amount of \$1,241,000 agreed to

Executive Council Office in the amount of \$2,911,000 agreed to
Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$939,000 agreed to

Economic Development in the amount of \$2,777,000 agreed to
Education, Advanced Education and Manpower in the amount of \$31,889,000 agreed to

Finance in the amount of \$3,352,000 agreed to
Government Services in the amount of \$9,303,000 agreed to
Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$33,278,000 agreed to

Highways and Transportation in the amount of \$30,712,000 agreed to

Justice in the amount of \$11,869,000 agreed to

Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of \$7,380,000

agreed to

Public Service Commission in the amount of \$1,827,000 agreed to

Renewable Resources in the amount of \$4,805,000 agreed to
Tourism, Recreation and Culture in the amount of \$4,352,000

agreed to

Yukon Housing Corporation in the amount of \$1,579,000 agreed to

Loan Capital in the amount of \$3,253,000 agreed to

Loan Amortization in the amount of \$1,817,000 agreed to

Total in the amount of \$153,284,000 agreed to

On Clause 2

Amendment proposed

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 12, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, be amended in clause 2, subclause (1) at page 1 by substituting "but including the sum of \$14,423,000 provided for in the *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, and the sum of \$14,423,000 provided in the *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1984-85, No. 2*", for "but including the sum of \$14,423,000 provided for in the *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1984-85*".

Amendment agreed to

Clause 2 agreed to as amended

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, with amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, is cleared out of the Committee of the Whole with amendment.

Bill No. 9: Financial Agreement Act, 1984

Mr. Penikett: I would move that Bill No. 9 be deemed to have been given clause-by-clause reading.

Clauses 1 to 7 deemed read and agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 9, *Financial Agreement Act, 1984*, out of Committee without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 9, *Financial Agreement Act, 1984*, has cleared the Committee of the Whole without amendment.

Bill No. 34: Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowances Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: At second reading of the bill, I was very emphatic about the point that this bill reflected exactly the recommendations of our Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges. I would like to advise committee now that, in fact, it will be my intention, when we come to the appropriate section, clause 7 of the act, to propose an amendment that will repeal that section from the act, thereby taking out of the act the provisions in respect of severance allowance.

¹⁵ Since tabling the legislation, we have had, and I understand members on the other side of the House as well have had, a number of representations made in respect to the severance allowance. After giving those representations consideration, we deem it the most prudent and advisable thing to do.

Mr. Penikett: Just briefly on the matter addressed in general debate by the government leader, without referring to clause 7 — which I am not allowed to do — the subject of that clause has been the matter of critical public comment and the government leader deems it prudent to delete it. There may be those who would regard it as suicidal not to do otherwise, but it will at least demonstrate the interests of all 16 of us in not collecting it.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have just a very brief comment. The committee reported, and the report was tabled, but there was no motion in the House for concurrence in the report. I am aware that the bill would make a motion of concurrence almost redundant but I would briefly recommend in the future for my benefit and the benefit of members who are not members of the committee that a concurrence debate may have avoided the confusion of presenting a measure in a bill and withdrawing it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: With respect to what the member for Whitehorse South Centre has said, there is in fact quite a bit of precedence in this House in respect to dealing with recommendations from standing committees, if in fact they are to be dealt with in legislation, to in fact table the legislation or else not concur, and then put the motion of non-concurrence. It has always been the method used, and I understand what the member is saying but it does in fact eliminate one set of debates, normally, to do it this way.

Mr. Penikett: In general debate, I feel bound to make one more point on behalf of my caucus. It is an argument on which I have given the government leader notice and I think the government leader will recognize one point of contention between some members opposite and some members on our side. It is with respect to the financing of the bill. Notwithstanding our differences, I feel bound to record the fact that we would like to go on record that we would have preferred a method of financing that is an adequate and probably sensible pension provision.

¹⁶ The method would be by foregoing a pay increase for members this year. There will no doubt be some continued public comment about the financing of pension measures. Few members in the public will be aware of the actuarial problems that surround the difficulties of providing pensions for as small a group as this, and a group with such uncertain futures. I do not say that in any negative way, but it is a situation that is impossible to forecast accurately.

However, I think that even those of us who believe the pension system is entirely deserved and warranted, especially for members with very long service, there are those of us who — I hope the government leader will understand — would have felt more comfortable if we could have been seen to be paying for it by some public demonstration, such as the foregoing of a pay increase, which, of course, would have been an increase we would have foregone not only this year, but for time to come.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We did, when we made these proposals in the first instance, a couple of years ago, look at the possibility of contributions.

If we had gone to the tremendous expense of an actuarial study and gone into a contributory plan, the end result would have been that the cost to the taxpayer would have been exactly the same, because the pensions, themselves, would have been larger. This is a very, very modest pension plan by any standards. The reason for its modesty is because it is exactly that: a non-contributory plan.

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5

Clause 5 agreed to

On Clause 6

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Amendment Proposed

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 34, entitled *Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowance Act*, be amended in Clause 7, at page 3, by deleting Clause 7, and the heading immediately preceding it, and appropriately renumbering the following clauses.

Amendment agreed to

¹⁷ *Clause 7 agreed to as amended*

On Clause 8

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There is a typo in the heading "Regulations", which we can treat as a typo because headings are not considered to be part of the text of the act. The heading

"Regulations" should really be between the old sections 8 and 9, rather than between the old sections 7 and 8.

Mr. Chairman: Is it agreed to deem it a typo?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Clause 8 agreed to

On Clause 9

Clause 9 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report Bill No. 34 with amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 34, *Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowance Act*, is cleared through Committee of the Whole with amendment.

Bill No. 28: Young Offenders Agreement Act

Mr. Chairman: We will now continue with Bill No. 28, *Young Offenders Agreement Act*.

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: This piece of legislation will permit us to sign our agreement and get the implementation money. There is \$500,000 over a two-year period, with which we will be able to begin the pre-engineering on the secure facility for young offenders.

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report Bill No. 28, *Young Offenders Agreement Act*, out of Committee without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 28, *Young Offenders Agreement Act*, is cleared out of Committee without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: We will now proceed with Bill No. 32, *An Act to Amend the Business Development Assistance Act*.

Bill No. 32: An Act to Amend the Business Development Assistance Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This bill will allow the government to enter into a loan assistance program. It is one of the idiosyncrasies of the *Yukon Act* that we can give people, businesses or organizations conditional or unconditional grants at any time that we wish. All we need is a line item in the budget.

However, if we want to give someone a repayable loan, it must be done by way of a piece of legislation. This is the legislation that will allow us to enter into a loan assistance program for business development in the territory.

Mr. Byblow: I believe it was at second reading that the Minister of Economic Development and I exchanged some comments about the bill. We said that we would be entirely supportive of this measure. It is quite conducive to some of the feedback we are getting in the communities.

Before he left, the Minister of Economic Development provided me with a considerable amount of information on the bill, in terms of the guidelines intended and it is self-explanatory. I see no problem, at this point, with deeming the bill to have been read.

Motion agreed to

Clauses 1 to 5 deemed to have been read and agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 32 without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 32, *An Act to Amend the Business Development Assistance Act*, is cleared out of Committee of the Whole without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: We will now go on with Bill No. 31, *Energy*

Conservation Assistance Act.

Bill 31: Energy Conservation Assistance Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This bill is a little bit different than the last one, in that the last one was amendments to an existing piece of legislation. This bill is a new piece of legislation that will allow us to enter into two specific programs, with respect to energy conservation. One of the programs is Saving Energy Action Loans, and the other is the Yukon Energy Alternatives Program.

Once again, the legislation is for the purpose of making loans to businesses and people who are involved in energy conservation programs.

Mr. Byblow: I would like to ask a couple of questions in general debate, then I would be prepared to deem it also to have been read.

One of the eligibility criteria for this act is that one applies for and uses federal program money. Why is this taking place this way? My understanding of the energy programs was that they were a joint exercise between the federal government and this government, administered by this government and delivered to the public at large. Why is there a shift in the nature of delivery?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It has been our experience that people who have made application and taken advantage of the federal program to the maximum, still do not have, for our climate here, enough insulation. The federal program just does not go far enough for Yukon conditions.

This program is designed to add on to the federal program. We want to make sure that everyone who is eligible takes advantage of the federal program. You do not have to be eligible for the federal program in order to be eligible for this one, but if you are eligible for the federal program, you must use up that eligibility first. This is simply an add-on program to the federal one.

Mr. Byblow: I appreciate the distinction the government leader made regarding eligibility. That gives it an even stronger usefulness for Yukon residents. It should probably be noted that in Part 2 of this bill, with respect to alternate energy programs, there is no requirement to have to meet federal guidelines first.

I think that is a very useful consideration.

Before we clear general debate, I would like to ask the government leader if he could describe what kind of projects he would consider the government anticipates would be taken advantage of under Part 2?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There are quite a number that we anticipate: using wind, different kinds of hydro alternatives — stream hydro, and so on — there are quite a number. I anticipate that we will probably get into some joint ventures with other organizations, with respect to really searching for alternate energy opportunities.

Mr. Byblow: The Minister of Economic Development advised me that he anticipated approximately \$200,000 for the alternate energy program, and about \$300,000 for the retrofit or energy savings program. If the government leader can confirm that, I have no other questions.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is correct.

One of the other alternatives that I probably should have mentioned, and one that is going to be fairly active here in Yukon, is woodchips; various methods of woodchipping.

Mr. Byblow: I would move that we deem the bill to have been read.

Motion agreed to

Clauses 1 to 6 deemed to have been read and agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report Bill No. 31.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 31, *Energy Conservation Assistance Act*, is cleared out of Committee of the Whole without amendment.

Bill No. 30: Legal Services Society Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Ashley: The purpose of the proposed *Legal Services*

Society Act is to create an independent society for the delivery of the legal aid programs in Yukon. It will replace the existing *Legal Aid Act*, which, in contrast, provides for the administration of a rigid statutory legal aid program by legal aid committees appointed by Order-in-Council. I have one amendment I would like to table at this time.

Mrs. Joe: The changes being proposed meet some of the concerns that we had, and we look forward to talking about them.

I am still a bit concerned about the budget for the legal aid and the society and how it is going to operate. I am still worried that there are not going to be enough funds to do the work that we are hoping that it is going to do. I would like to know if the minister can indicate to me when he expects that this bill, or structure, or society will be in operation, so that we would have a better idea about when the monies are going to be spent and, possibly, have a general idea about the money and whether or not it is going to be enough. As I said before, I still worry about running out of money and people, at the end of that period, being left without resources to help them in courts.

At this time, I would also like to mention that we are very pleased at some of the things that the society will be doing, in terms of legal education and other things that are mentioned in this act.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: As I advised yesterday, this being the first year, sometime during the year. Hopefully, by September or October we will be able to implement this and get it put into the Legal Services Society. In the meantime, we will be running the program, as we have been doing, so we may very well have to put a supplementary estimate in for that reason.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a few comments to, essentially, put on the record, by way of explanation.

I made a speech, at second reading, and I made various points then. I will not repeat it, but I wish to make two points here and now.

First of all, in clause 4, which is the makeup of the board of directors, negotiation has occurred and the minister may wish to speak about it. I am aware of the government amendment and we are supporting it wholeheartedly.

For the record, we are perfectly well aware of the intention that the society be independent of government and, consequently, independent of the minister. However, we were concerned, as we stated at second reading, that the society was dominated by lawyers, or dominated by the deliverers of the service, and the voice of consumers, or the clients of the service, were, perhaps, under-emphasized. It is for that reason that we pushed for the amendment.

We considered the possibility of specifically naming representatives of various bodies, for example, possibly the Council for Yukon Indians or the Consumers Association or agencies like that, to speak for groups of the clientele of the Legal Services Society. However, upon reflection, it is our view that it is obvious that the minister would consider those kinds of things in finding the four nominations that he will make, and it is obvious that he will consider, primarily, the public interest and especially the interests of the clientele of the society, as they may be slightly different from the interests of the legal profession.

I wish to put those comments on record. We support the amendments for those reasons and we believe that the independence of the society is not really compromised.

The only other controversial area is around section 15. The minister stated that the old bill was rigid and it is interesting that the old act was mandatory and that it provided that legal aid services shall be delivered in certain circumstances.

This bill is permissive, as opposed to mandatory. It is much more flexible and it may be argued that the program is weakened, somewhat, in that it is open to the society to not deliver the services. However, we are satisfied, partially because of our awareness of some of the abuses in the past, and partially because of our knowledge that the concept of legal aid is an entrenched and necessary service, we are not searching for a bogeyman, in the Minister of Renewable Resources' language, in this section. We are confident that the intent of the act and of the society is to deliver services and we are not arguing the speculation of possible abuse.

In any event, the extent of the services is, primarily, a budgetary matter and it will come up yearly, on the allocation of funds to the society. The minister is, ultimately, politically accountable and, frankly, if we were government, we probably would not do it very much differently. We recognize the change and accept the political quality of the budgetary decisions here. The criteria for legal aid are responsibly stated and we have no serious argument.

Mr. Chairman: Any more general debate?

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Amendment proposed

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have an amendment. I move that Bill No. 30, entitled *Legal Services Society Act*, be amended in clause 4, at page 2, by deleting subclause (1) and substituting the following for it:

"4(1) The society shall have a board of directors consisting of
(a) three persons nominated by the Law Society,
(b) one person nominated by the Attorney General of Canada, and
(c) four persons nominated by the Executive Council member, at least three of whom shall not be lawyers."

Amendment agreed to

Clause 4 agreed to as amended

Mr. Kimmerly: I move that remainder of the bill be deemed to have passed committee.

Motion agreed to

Clauses 5 to 35 deemed to have been read and agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I move that you report Bill No. 30, *Legal Services Society Act*, out of committee with amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 30, *Legal Services Society Act*, has cleared Committee of the Whole with amendment.

Bill No. 23: An Act to Amend the Government Employee Housing Plan Act

Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 23 be deemed to pass the committee stage.

Motion agreed to

Cluses 1 to 11 deemed to have been read and agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I move that you report Bill No. 23, *An Act to Amend the Government Employee Housing Plan Act*, out of committee without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 23, *An Act to Amend the Government Employee Housing Plan Act*, is cleared from Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go on to Bill 24, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*.

Bill No. 24: An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is a very, very short amendment, but it is quite significant in that it will allow the Yukon Electrical Company Limited to pass on to their consumers in the territory the additional costs that they are incurring for the purchased power that they have to buy during the course of the year.

I am aware of the statements or the arguments put forward by the opposition at second reading in that they deem this to be unfair, but the problem is that this is a very severely and very strictly regulated industry. Their rates are in fact set for them; they cannot charge what the market will bear, if you wish. Their rates must be justified before the board, and it is the opinion of the board that it is fair and equitable that these rates be allowed to be increased over the course

of this year, notwithstanding our 6 & 5 percent restraint.

Mr. Kimmerly: We made our points substantially at second reading. The sections of the bill are indeed very simple. Our objections are not particularly about the fairness of passing on the costs, but the overall unfairness of prices going up and wages not going up, or exceptions being made in the pricing area but not in the wage area. We feel that the public sector restraint concept is unfair in the general sense but especially unfair if the letter of the law is imposed on public sector employees and their wages, and exceptions are made concerning prices and their costs. However, all of those points were previously made and I only repeat them now.

Mr. Byblow: I have a question of a general nature. Does this amendment mean that the rate increase imposed by NCPC in February will be allowed to be passed on retroactively by Yukon Electric?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: What it means is that, effective April 1st 1984, there was a five percent increase; effective May 1st 1984, there will be a 2.75 percent increase; and effective May 1st 1985, there will be a 2.27 percent increase.

» This is effective, given that Yukon Electrical does not have another purchase power cost increase placed upon them, prior to this May, 1985. If we do not do this, there will be the April 1st five percent increase and the next one, on May 1st, 1985, because that would be at the end of the restraint legislation, would be a 7.98 percent increase.

Mr. Byblow: I am a little unclear because, if there was an April 1st five percent increase by NCPC to Yukon Electric, then they ought to have been allowed that increase under the guidelines. Why are we dropping the restriction?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The member should not confuse NCPC with Yukon Electrical. We are talking about Yukon Electrical. They are the only ones that purchase power; NCPC does not purchase power. Mind you, NCPC is restricted to five percent, in any event. Yukon Electrical must purchase power. We require that it purchases power.

Mr. Byblow: From NCPC?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: From wherever; and they do purchase it from NCPC.

If we do not allow them to pass on that cost — well, we have gone through this twice already — of the purchased power, now, then we will face a 7.98 percent increase on the first of May, 1985. It is, mathematically, much better for everyone in the territory to have a 2.75 percent increase, now, and a 2.27 percent increase, on the first of May, 1985.

Mr. Byblow: If I am understanding what the government leader is saying, he is saying that the April 1st increase to Yukon Electric is immaterial to this bill, because they were allowed that under the guideline, and that is fine. So, what we are now allowing is an additional rate increase, to take place in 1984, to prevent too abrupt, or too sharp, an increase in 1985, and that that is the technicality of this bill.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is correct.

Clause 1 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that you report Bill No. 24 without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Penikett: Can I move that you call it a day?

Mr. Chairman: Would you mind if I get through this bill, first?

Mr. Penikett: Would you accept my motion as notice, then?

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 24, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*, has cleared out of Committee of the Whole without amendment.

Mr. Penikett: I 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: Prior to 9 p.m., the Committee of the Whole passed the following motion: "THAT the Committee of the Whole and the Assembly be empowered to continue to sit beyond 9:30, until such time it is agreed to adjourn, for the purpose of continuing consideration of the bills before the Committee of the Whole".

Further, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*; Bill No. 34, *Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowance*; Bill No. 30, *Legal Society Act*, and directed me to report the same with amendment.

Further, the committee has considered Bill No. 9, *Financial Agreement Act, 1984*; Bill No. 28, *Young Offenders Agreement Act*; Bill No. 32, *An Act to Amend the Business Development Assistance Act*; Bill No. 31, *Energy Conservation Assistance Act*; Bill No. 23, *An Act to Amend the Government Employees Housing Plan Act*; Bill No. 24, *An Act to Amend the Public Sector Compensation Restraint (Yukon) Act*; and directed me to report the same without amendment.

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. today.

The House adjourned at 1:31 a.m., May 17th.

