



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 36

4th Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Wednesday, November 14, 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; Public Service Commission; and, Finance.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Community and Transportation Services; Education; and, Government Services.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Economic Development and Tourism; and, Renewable Resources.
Hon. Andy Philipson	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Justice; and, Health and Human Resources.

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

### (Progressive Conservative)

Clarke Ashley	Klondike
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South
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, November 14, 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 at this time to the Order Paper. Are there any returns or documents for tabling?  
 Reports of committees?  
 Petitions?  
 Are there any reports of petitions?

#### REPORTS OF PETITIONS

**Mr. Clerk:** Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the Assembly, I have had the honour to review a petition, Petition No. 6 of the Fourth Session of the Twenty-fifth Legislative Assembly, as presented by the leader of the official opposition on November 13th, 1984. This petition meets the requirements as to quorum of the standing orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any bills for introduction?

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill No. 102: First reading

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that a bill entitled *An Act to Provide for Affirmative Action and Equal Pay for Work for Equal Value within the Public Service Commission of Yukon* be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that a bill, entitled *An Act to Provide for Affirmative Action on Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value Within the Public Service of the Government of Yukon*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

##### Bill No. 103: First reading

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that a bill entitled *An Act to Amend the Expropriation Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre that a bill entitled *An Act to Amend the Expropriation Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further bills for introduction?  
 Notices of motion for the production of papers?  
 Notices of motion?

#### NOTICES OF MOTIONS

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would give notice three motions: one concerning the treatment of impaired drivers; one concerning property rights in the constitution and one concerning the detention of persons alleged to be mentally ill.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any statements by ministers?  
 This then brings us to the Question Period.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

##### Question re: Cyprus Anvil closure

**Mr. Byblow:** I know that the subject of Cyprus Anvil should come as a shock.

Yesterday the federal government appointed an investment consultant to investigate and recommend ways to get the Cyprus mine reopened. In his speech yesterday, the government leader suggested that Yukoners prepare for a shutdown of Anvil. Why is the Yukon Government taking a position of doom and gloom while

the federal government appears to be working quite positively to get the mine open?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not taking a position of doom and gloom at all.

**Mr. Speaker:** What I am being is very pragmatic and very, very realistic. It is a well-known fact that the president of Cyprus Anvil has told this government, and in fact, has told residents of Faro, the workers at Faro and the Government of Canada that they have every intention of closing the mine down on December 31, 1984, unless they have, at that time, a partner who is prepared to participate with them in the management of that mine. I am very hopeful that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, who undertook to do everything he could to find such a partner for the company, will be successful. I am doing everything that I can, and this government is doing everything it can, to make sure that he is successful. But, notwithstanding that, the fact of the matter is that we, as Yukoners, have to face the facts that time is growing very, very short, and it is a sad message to have to deliver, but it is a fact of life that is far beyond anybody's control in government because it is a decision that will be made by the company, by private enterprise. It is a private enterprise operation.

If they decide that they are going to close on December 31, that is going to be it.

**Mr. Byblow:** The government leader says that he is not spreading gloom and doom, but he did say in yesterday's speech that Yukoners should expect the mine to close at least temporarily. Now, I want to ask the government leader if he has given up all efforts to have that mine operating past December 31?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is obvious that the member for Faro was not listening to my previous answer. I said that we are doing, and will continue to do, everything we can to entice, or to help the company to operate, or to stay in operation after December 31; however, it is not I who am spreading the doom and gloom, and the member for Faro has to know that the president of Cyprus Anvil Mines has made a decision. He has made it very, very publicly. He has stated, unequivocally, that unless certain things are in place by December 31, they are not going to open; they are going to be closing down.

**Mr. Byblow:** The government leader draws reference to December 31st. I want to ask him: has he urged Dome to continue the operation of Faro past that date?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am going to repeat myself once again. The president of Cyprus Anvil Mines came here and met with the Government of Yukon. At the same time, I know that he went to Faro and he met with the people in Faro, and he told them the same thing: unless certain things were in place on December 31st, they were going to close down that mine. Now, that is a corporate decision that has been made by a corporate audit.

##### Question re: Cyprus Anvil closure

**Mr. Byblow:** My question continues on the vein of the December 31st closure. I asked the government leader if he had urged Dome to consider extending the operation. I want to be more specific and ask the government leader if he has made any persuasive effort toward either the federal government or Dome Petroleum to have the stripping program extended past December 31st.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The stripping program, according to the information that we have, will actually have enough money left in it - both federal and Dome money - to go to the end of January. However, that does not detract from the corporate decision that has been taken by the Cyprus Anvil Mining Company Limited, and that is that they are going to close down on December 31st unless they have a partner. The company has said they are not interested in prolonging that stripping program unless they have a partner to continue it with them.

**Mr. Byblow:** Has the government leader urged Dome to end the lock-out which has closed the operation two months early, and ought to allow for extension of the program?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I am the minister responsible for mines, I guess I will answer some of these questions. I spoke to Mr. Forgues today, a couple of hours ago, about the lock-out. Mr.

Forgues informed me that the union has never asked Cyprus Anvil to go back to the bargaining table.

<sup>95</sup> If it was the other way around and the union was on strike, the company would go to the union and say, "Let us go back to the bargaining table", when they decided that they wanted to talk again. In this case, the company says the union did not want to go back to the bargaining table. I have since then talked to Mr. Clark from Faro, and he says that they have been interested in going back to the bargaining table and have been attempting to contact Cyprus Anvil in that regard.

However, I do not know what the situation is, or what the conditions are of going back to the bargaining table, whether there are any. But I do know one thing from talking to Mr. Forgues: if something is not resolved within the next week or two, we can consider the mine closed until next summer, at the very earliest, because if it is not opened within the next two weeks, they fully intend to close it for the balance of the winter. And even if it does reopen, there is still no guarantee that it will go past the 31st of December, because they have made that corporate decision, that unless they have a partner, they will not run the mine themselves. So the best that we can hope for right now is that within the next two weeks we can get back to work until the end of December.

We are still working very hard, the federal government is working very hard, to try to keep the mine operating, and perhaps if there is an interested buyer, something can be worked out to continue the stripping program through until next spring.

The critical thing right now is that if something does not happen within the next two weeks the mine will be closed and it will be closed until next summer.

**Mr. Byblow:** The Minister of Labour opens up an interesting avenue of questions, but I want to return to the December 31st date with the government leader. I want to, finally and for all time, find out exactly what this government has done to urge the continuation of the stripping program and to urge the continuation of the operation this winter. Am I correct in assuming that this government's position is that it can and will do nothing to pursue extension of operations at Faro past December 31st?

<sup>96</sup> We put a sum of money into that present stripping proposal. There has not been another one initiated yet. Certainly, we would be very interested to hear what kind of participation might be expected of this government. But, Mr. Speaker, you must recognize, and the member for Faro must recognize, that it does not fall within this government's responsibility to keep that operation going. It is a private enterprise function. We have done everything we possibly can in respect to making things better for the people who live in Faro, making things better for the company. We have tried to be conciliators. We have negotiated. We have talked on behalf of the company and the people of Faro, to the government of Alaska, to the government of Canada, to the people of Skagway, to the people of Haines. We have done an awful lot of lobbying.

There is not really too much more that we can do at this point in time but we can continue that lobbying, in respect to whether or not there may be a continuation of the stripping after the 31st of December. The last time that that issue was raised with the president of Cyprus Anvil, he made it very, very clear to us that there was no way, unless they had a partner, that they were going to be prepared to continue that stripping operation. Dome is not prepared to continue that stripping operation after the 31st of December.

**Mr. Byblow:** I want to pursue with the government leader his comments surrounding his lobbying efforts.

#### Speaker's ruling

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. What is happening here is, I think, a violation of the practices of the House in conduct of the Question Period. The questions that are being asked are in violation of the Question Period. I would draw the attention to members who wish to review Annotation 171 fourth edition, found under 357 of *Beauchesne*. It points out that in putting a question, a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits. In making a question, observations which might lead to debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question.

I would say, from the Chair, that it would appear that this continual line of questioning is leading to debate among members and it is very clear to the Chair that this is what is occurring. I would suggest to the hon. member that if a debate is desired on this or any other question, there are other ways in which deal with this matter, perhaps, through motions on the Order Paper or, shall I say, that the members have adequate and varied choices in this regard.

<sup>97</sup> I would also point out that it is a violation of the Question Period to, again, multiply the slight variations of similar questioning on the same point. This would also appear to be happening and perhaps, with members taking this into consideration, we could also resume the practice of a member asking a question, with two supplementaries, and allowing another member to ask a question. Thank you.

**Mr. Penikett:** I welcome, on this point of order, an opportunity to engage you, sir, in some discussion at an appropriate occasion, on the rights and prerogatives of private members to ask questions, especially on matters of urgent and pressing necessity, which is clearly the subject before us today. In reading our rules for Question Period and taking note of the rules adopted by this house, which include Number 16, this case is now provided for with these guidelines in usages of the customs of the House of Commons Canada, as enforced at the time, shall be followed.

I would draw your attention to the frequent practice in the House of Commons of Canada, where it is an urgent and important question of the day, of members in the house directing their questions to ministers — singular and plural — on that particular question, until the substantive questions of policy and positions of the government on that particular matter are made clear to the satisfaction of the members asking the questions.

I would submit that the questions being asked today are urgent; they are suitable for Question Period, and are of the type and occasion in which we do not have any other way of exploring these particular matters, particularly as it is a matter of considerable urgency and the House has not sat for some time. There is no other occasion; there is no other way for members to extract from the government the particulars of its positions and its actions that it has taken on this question which is most important to the Yukon economy — literally a life or death question.

It seems to me that the only opportunity for us to pursue some of these matters is in Question Period. It seems to me extremely unfair and unworthy for the presiding officer to tell members of this House that they can not ask questions about some of these important issues.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would like to draw the attention of the member who has just spoken to the thoughts just stated by the Speaker. As a listener to the ongoing debate between the two members, and one other at another period of time, I, and perhaps, some other members on the other side, will agree that it is becoming very repetitious. Now, that is not to say that the question before us is not serious, but I agree with the Speaker that there are other methods that can be employed, that have been duly agreed to by all members, unanimously, on how to proceed in this House if there is an issue that is urgent and pressing. There are procedures on how to present it to the House. From my perspective, as a member of this House, I agree with your comments, because, if that was not a debate, I would like the member opposite to define a debate for me.

**Mr. Porter:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, and citing section 357 of *Beauchesne*, which you cited, I would like to quote subsection 2 of that, which states that many of the traditional limitations on questions are now applied more strictly to written questions than to oral questions. In the words of one speaker, one need only look at citation 171 of *Beauchesne*, which you have done, for tradition, in which will be found, numerous, and in many cases, inoperable restrictions covering the form and content of questions. I suggest that if each and every one of those restrictions were applied in every case, very few questions would ever reach the Order Paper. That would suggest to me that Question Period is largely in your hands.

<sup>98</sup> The Question Period, as we come to understand it, is a forum in which members of the House can address important issues of the

day that affect the public at large. I do not think, in respect to the issue that is raised in Question Period, that anyone can deny that it is indeed an immediate and pressing issue to the people of Yukon. And so with that, I say that in all probability, we would implore you to review your ruling and to see if we cannot proceed with this very urgent and pressing matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would thank all the hon. members who have spoken to this point and given their thoughts and their advice in this regard. I think it is only fair, as your servant in the guidance of these proceedings, that I must enforce the rules that we have set down for ourselves. In this case it is so abundantly clear to the Chair that the rules or the objects of the principles behind the operation of Question Period and the freedoms, of course, which are allowed in Question Period, are not being operable in the way that they ought to be.

The Chair knows of no parliament, historically, that would permit this type of Question Period, where a member would rise and be given the opportunity to once again rise in favour of any other member, to pursue a question at least more than two times. I think it would be very unusual.

The importance of the question as raised by the hon. member for Campbell has not occurred to the Chair. My duties in the Chair are to enforce the rules, again, that have been set down by all members. I think that the question of urgency ought to have been answered by the opposite sides of the House. The questions asked seemed, to a point, to be reasonable, but they have now become repetitive; they have now become a matter of debate. Again, I would suggest to members, that if members wish to debate and find a situation so urgent, while I could express ways and means you can get that to the floor of the House in a parliamentary way, that is not my duty to the House. My duty, again, is to enforce the rules. I would suggest that members consult their rules, and the procedures, and they will find ways to bring debate to the floor of the House, and I am sure that perhaps in this way you may find a solution to your problem.

I still must rule that at this time I cannot accept any further discussion on that particular topic, and I would ask if hon. members would bear with the Chair and the House, and continue to conduct the question period in the manner in which it is designed. We are now up to 20 minutes and have already used up half of our question period.

#### **Question re: Federal-Territorial relationship**

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question for the government leader on a different subject. It relates to the special relationship which this government has praised that exists with the federal government, and in particular, with the appointment of Yukon's MP as deputy prime minister. Can the government leader explain what steps have been taken under this special relationship with the federal government to save the Cyprus mine other than the appointment of Mr. Lassande?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** There is no doubt about it, and I am very proud of the fact that this side of the House does have a special relationship, particularly with our member of parliament, who happens to be the deputy prime minister.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I want to advise the House, seeing I now I have the opportunity to do so, that Mr. Nielsen went back to Ottawa after the election with this subject of Cypress Anvil being the major concern to him.

I can also, without fear of contradiction, advise the House that Mr. Nielsen has spent more time since he has been back in Ottawa on this particular subject than on any other subject. I know that he has personally spent much time talking to people who are involved with this particular subject.

The part that shows the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Crombie has taken action. He came to Faro at the request of the people of the community. He sat down with them; he talked to them and listened to them. He made certain undertakings, and he has followed up on these undertakings.

I do not think I have to list all of those for the member for Faro, because I have been reading in the newspaper where he has taken the credit for Mr. Crombie being in Faro, and he has taken the credit for whatever has been done. I am sure he also has a close special relationship with the Government in Canada.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would like to ask the government leader where he has seen reference to me taking credit for Mr. Crombie coming to Faro, but I would much rather ask the government leader what steps this government is planning to advance to the federal consultant appointed yesterday.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I had been advised by the minister yesterday that he has made this appointment and that the gentleman will be contacting us in the very near future.

**Mr. Byblow:** What contribution is the Yukon Government offering to any kind of multi-party arrangement as it did in the previous stripping program?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is a hypothetical question. It is based on absolutely nothing at all. I do not even know what the man is talking about.

#### **Question re: Cyprus Anvil closure**

**Mr. Penikett:** The government leader has just indicated that the proof is in the pudding, in terms of performance of these questions, and he cited as proof that Mr. Crombie visited Faro as his predecessor did several times.

Could he explain to the House, as a result of his conversations with the deputy prime minister, exactly what particular steps the deputy prime minister has taken to resolve this crisis?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The deputy prime minister is not in the position to take any particular steps. It is the prerogative and the purview of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It is his responsibility. That does not preclude, though, the deputy prime minister, who happens to be our member of Parliament, from being very concerned with this particular problem, and he is doing everything he can. He is talking to people who count. He is lobbying. He is meeting with groups. He is meeting with organizations.

I cannot be specific because that would be saying things that I should not be saying at this point in time.

**Mr. Penikett:** Supplementary to the government leader: he has indicated that Mr. Nielsen is having a large number of meetings, but he has also indicated previously that this government accepts the corporate decision of Dome to close the mine on December 31st. Could I ask the government leader: to what end is this lobbying and negotiation involving the deputy prime minister directed?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** One thing I could say to the leader of the opposition is that Mr. Nielsen is his MP as well, and I am sure that he would be happy to talk to him about what he is doing. He should call him up and ask him, if he has a specific interest in this case. But we have not accepted, and I do not want to imply that we have accepted, as a *fait accompli*, that that mine is going to close up on December 31st. We hope desperately that it is not. But, being pragmatic and being realistic, I said yesterday, and I am saying today, and I will say every day until something changes, we had better be looking for that to happen. We hope it does not. We will keep working to make something happen so that it will not. But the fact of the matter is that it may well happen, and people in this territory had better know that it may well happen.

**Mr. Penikett:** The government leader and this administration previously recommended to the federal government certain transportation and energy subsidies or activities to advance the interests of not only the property of Faro but the Yukon economy as a whole. Is it still promoting those means to a resolution of this problem, and is that to be the substance of their communication with the commissioner appointed by Mr. Crombie yesterday?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** The question of transportation does fall into my bailiwick. I would point out that yes, we would continue to put those issues forward to the individual who will be contacting us in respect to the questions of transportation, and we will see where it goes from there.

#### **Question re: Cyprus Anvil closure**

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question to put to the minister responsible for labour. The minister mentioned just this afternoon that he had a telephone conversation with Brian Clark of Faro on the subject of the lock-out, I believe specifically. He also

mentioned that he did not know what was going on in his response to the public of Faro. Can he tell us why he has not made an effort to find out the reasons for the dispute prior to this morning's conversation on the phone, considering that the lock-out has been in effect for some weeks now?

**Mr. Philipsen:** I am the minister for labour and I believe that the member opposite may be presenting his question to the minister responsible for Economic Development.

**Mr. McDonald:** The minister for Economic Development, then. It was my mistake of addressing it specifically to the minister of labour. I was hoping that the minister responsible would not take the easy way out and play games here. My mistake. I would ask the same question of the minister responsible for Economic Development.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The reason for my call to Mr. Clark in Faro today was to ascertain whether he was prepared to go back to the table, because, as I told the House previously, the next two weeks are critical and if something does not happen and there is not a resolution within this two week period, it is very likely that the mine will be closed down: not on the 31st of December, but at the end of November. That is the reason I called Mr. Clark. They are in a labour dispute with the Cyprus Anvil Mine and, as I said earlier, the union has a right to go on strike and the company has a right to lock them out. It is a bargaining process and a tool that they have.

I wanted to ascertain from Mr. Clark whether they were prepared to talk. Mr. Clark says that they are prepared to talk. I said that I do not know what conditions there are in their talks and I am not becoming involved in the dispute and if anyone in this government were to be involved, it would not be me, but the Minister of Labour.

All I was trying to do was to ascertain whether there was some movement — whether they could talk to one another — and I was prepared to contact Mr. Forgues to try to get something moving, and that is exactly what I was trying to do today.

**Mr. McDonald:** In the minister's remarks to Mr. Forgues this morning, did the minister inform Mr. Forgues of the harmful effects of the lockout, specifically the number of workers who are leaving while the mine is closed.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes. I informed Mr. Forgues of the effect that it will have on the territory. He is well aware of it. I informed him of the danger to Cyprus Anvil Mine and of losing all the work force, but more importantly, the danger to the Yukon Territory of losing the major economic tool that we have here. I made it very clear to him that I would like to see them back at the table.

As the government leader said, it is a private corporation and they are operating fair and square under the rules of the land. If they do not want to go back to work, there is nothing that we can do to force them to go back to work.

**Mr. McDonald:** The minister mentioned that the lockout by Dome is a legitimate collective bargaining manoeuvre. Is it the government's position that Dome's lockout tactic at Anvil will help to reopen the mine in any way?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** It may and it may not. It is the only tool that the company has. If the union were to go on strike — and the member across the floor is well aware of strikes as he led one for nine months; that was the tool that they had to force the company to go back to work — the company is using the tool that they have, the right to lock people out.

#### Question re: Cyprus Anvil transportation

**Mr. Porter:** The Yukon government has, at different times, leaned either toward the railroad or trucking as a means for getting Anvil's ore to Skagway. The choice must be made, now, for the mine to reopen. I would like to know what is the government's position? Is the minister going to toot his horn or blow his whistle?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I assume that it would be inappropriate for me to tell him to get back on the tracks, but I would like to say to the member opposite that our position is very clear. We would prefer to have the railway, if it is possible. Basically, what it means is that the Government of Canada would have to treat this particular rail just like any other railway across Canada as far as the possibilities of subsidizing the rail for the volumes that would be carried in the

interim until the volumes got to the point where the rail was self-sufficient.

I would like to point out that there is a major problem here. The member opposite well knows that it crosses an international line, the United States of America. Seventy-five percent of the work force is on the American side. This poses major problems, I am sure, to the Government of Canada, and for all members in this House.

If a decision were made involving subsidies without the help of Government of the United States, or the State of Alaska, then those jobs would have to be transferred, in our view, to Whitehorse, for the purposes of running the railway, in order to justify such a subsidy.

If that is not possible, and not feasible, then we have made it very clear that we are prepared to very seriously considering opening the highway, if the State of Alaska is prepared to open its section.

Our preferred policy option is that we would like to see the railway operating once again.

**Mr. Porter:** To the same minister, who I assume has responsibility for hydro electric power — and, maybe there may be another member of caucus who has aspirations to power other than the minister who answered: has this government impressed upon the new federal government in Ottawa to adopt the Penner Report on power to facilitate the opening of the Cyprus Anvil Mine?

**Mr. Speaker:** I believe the original question had to do with the railroad and transportation. Is this a new question that is being asked in relation to power?

**Mr. Porter:** The two relate.

#### Speaker's ruling:

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid that it would have to be considered a new question. It cannot be supplementary to another subject.

#### Question re: Cyprus Anvil strike

**Mr. McDonald:** I could not resist standing up on another part of the question, considering what the Minister of Labour had said regarding my participation in a strike. I would like to point out, of course, that this is the first time that he has ever considered a strike to be a legitimate manoeuvre, certainly in conversation with me.

The minister mentioned that in his conversation with Earl Forgues this morning that there was some sort of deadline that would have to be adhered to in two weeks. This is the first time I have heard of such a deadline, and the deadline originally —

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I believe the hon. member is now debating. Would the hon. member please get to the question?

**Mr. McDonald:** Could the minister explain what the deadline is that he is afraid of?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The deadline is actually today. Mr. Forgues told me that they had no intention of reopening the mine because there was no movement on the part of labour to get down to discussion. They have made the decision. As far as he is concerned, they are going to close the mine.

I said "Mr. Forgues, if labour is willing to talk to you, and something can be resolved in the next week or two, would you consider opening the mine"? He said "Yes, we could, but it certainly would have to be within the next week or two".

So that is where the situation rests. Either the union and management get back to the bargaining table and have something settled within the next week or two or we can forget about the mine until next summer, as I have already stated.

**Mr. McDonald:** Did Mr. Forgues indicate to the minister that the labour contract was of primary importance in reopening the mine, and that the real deadline is not December 31st but is two weeks from now?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not know how many times I have to say it. The deadline of December 31st is Cyprus Anvil's deadline. They are not going to run the mine past that time. They are not interested past that date. They feel in order to have a partner, they have to have a better union agreement and they have to have some resolution of the transportation issue. Unless they get those, they are not likely to get a partner. That is the point they are trying to make to the public, and it is unfortunate that perhaps some people

do not believe it, but it is fairly obvious. He said today that the mine is closed.

There are a couple of weeks to make some movement, and if it does not happen, we can forget about the mine.

**Mr. McDonald:** Dome Petroleum has received \$25 million from the government to keep the mine operating and to make it more economic. Does the government leader consider that the current lockout defeats the purpose of spending that money?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes. There is no doubt that it defeats the purpose of spending the money. In fact, that money is not being spent at the present time. They did not receive \$25 million as a lump-sum payment for the operation.

14 In fact they are being paid as the money is being spent, so from the time of the lock-out, there has been no federal money spent at the mine site.

#### Question re: Cyprus Anvil closure

**Mr. Byblow:** The government is suggesting that we should be preparing to see a shut-down of the mine, at least on an interim or temporary basis. Is the government also saying that we should expect that the Town of Faro also will be shut down?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs could possibly answer this much more clearly than I could. We have no intention of shutting down the town. As long as there are people who are going to be using and living in the townsite, the townsite is going to be there and maintained by this government. We have a certain criteria depending upon size of the communities as to what services we provide. They may, at some point in time, come into play, but we have no intention of shutting down the townsite.

**Mr. Byblow:** The government leader is saying that there are no contingency plans, or even plans to reduce the levels of services in the community. Would he confirm that?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Most of the areas that directly affect the community itself are within my responsibilities, between education and municipal affairs, and I would safely say to the member opposite, it would be our intention to continue our services. If it were to shut down and there were an awful lot of people leaving, we would have to wind some services down because the service that the government provides would be dictated by the numbers of people who were taking advantage of the service. I want to impress upon the member opposite that we do have a moral responsibility, and we will carry out that responsibility to the best of our ability.

I want to say, just in conclusion in respect to the comments that have been made, I want to ensure the members opposite that no one is maliciously doing anything to the community of Faro. We are doing everything we possibly can to ensure that steps can be taken to have the mine continue operating.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time allotted for the Question Period has now expired. We will proceed to the Orders of the Day and motions respecting committee reports.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

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

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

**Mr. Speaker:** So ordered.

We will now proceed to government motions.

#### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

##### Motion No. 24: adjourned debate

**Mr. Clerk:** Item number one, adjourned debate, Mr. Penikett.

**Mr. Penikett:** I want to begin my response to the government leader's speech by thanking him for it and, in a small way, thanking him for his services as government leader. Presumably there will be other appropriate occasions in the future to do that, but it occurred to me yesterday that it is possible that this will be the last such address that he will give in his present role.

15 I want to respond frankly, though, by saying that as much as I would like to subscribe to the tone of optimism promoted by the government leader in his speech, I am not as convinced, perhaps, as he might want me to be.

I am one of those people who is eternally optimistic, and I think my political complexion is proof enough of that. I must say that while I welcome the improved relationship between the federal government and this government, I am not convinced that federal cooperation, as described by the government leader, will produce all the benefits heralded by this new occasion.

The government leader, in his speech, talked about an end to colonialism, and I expect that such a development would be enthusiastically endorsed by every single member of this House. However, I think there are different perspectives on what colonialism means to different members of this House. I think we all have a different attitude towards it. Pleased as I would be to see the end of political colonialism in this territory, I am reminded again of what was said in Question Period today: that members opposite do not seem so enthusiastic as members on this side, to see an end to economic colonialism.

It seemed to me that both the rhetorical statements from the members opposite and the statements today in Question Period, do not demonstrate an understanding of the hard fact that Dome Petroleum is one of the colonial powers that operate in this jurisdiction.

If you reflect for a minute, it is really quite an amazing thing, in a democracy, that an absentee landlord such as Dome Petroleum should quite literally have the unaccountable power of life and death over a whole community, the community of Faro.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am optimistic enough to think that it is such appalling situations which inclined people to turn their minds to the ideas of social democracy, because if that situation does not, nothing will.

I want, later, in my speech, to talk a little bit about the difference between the public interest and the private interest in some of these important questions that face us. They make a very strong, hopefully non-partisan, argument for us, making particular common cause in defence of the public interest.

16 I must say, whatever the particulars of the dispute — the local unions or the disagreements about the appropriate levels of transportation costs or the questions of energy costs or the peculiar internal problems of the company, Dome — I have not been impressed by their treatment of the citizens of that community. And my admiration of this company has not been enhanced when I read recently that their board of directors had guaranteed their chairman an option of three million shares in the company, and guaranteed him a profit of one million dollars, even if those shares dropped in value. There seemed to be a kind of double standard operating, in terms of their treatment of people.

By the same score, I must tell the government leader that I was not enthused. I think you will understand this, by his statement yesterday that Yukoners should accept the temporary closure of Cyprus Anvil. I am particularly concerned about that remark because I believe that almost certainly temporary closure increases the chances the closure will be permanent.

I believe, I guess, in the possibilities of recovery through intensive care, but I believe it takes nothing short of a miracle to achieve a resurrection. And I am not sure that we live in an age of miracles.

Yesterday, I think, in a useful development, Mr. Crombie appointed a commissioner, but I was disturbed that that commissioner, while I understand being in frequent contact with Mr. Crombie, is not going to report finally until December 31st, which happens to be the day Dome is due to turn the lights off in Faro.

Now, the government leader has told us with some vigour today, and before that, yesterday, that the Government of Yukon has done all that it can. I hope the government leader will not think that I am being picky, or that we were playing anything other than our proper role in Question Period in trying to find more particulars of exactly what the government has done. The government leader, at some point today, rattled off a number of roles like conciliator, mediator, animator; I do not remember the list. I would very much like to

hear, and I hope I will not be considered churlish for asking this, about some of the specifics. What has been the substance of some of the dialogue with some of the federal counterparts and some of the people in Dome and some of the people in White Pass?

As the government leader knows, we have all had our private conversations too, and I would like to know what the administration of the territory, which is charged with the protection of the public interest, has been doing and what positions they have been advancing.

The minister responsible for transportation indicated a few moments ago that the government had a preference for the rail, and I think, to reiterate what the government itself has said, it is the only rail in the country that has not had subsidies and even by that standard alone some subsidy might be appropriate, but what the level of subsidy is would still be a continuing subject of debate. I would like to know what kind of level of subsidy was promoted. Some of us who believed that was the government's position were confused by a press statement sometime during the summer where the government leader had indicated that he wanted the Governor of Alaska to reconsider their position about the road. Some of us believed that might be signalling a change in the position of the government. We were confused.

Once again, I ask what our MP will be doing on the subject? I was not, I hope, being excessively inquisitive on that point. The deputy prime minister was quoted on the CBC radio one day as saying that it was the last thing he thought about at night, and the first thing he thought about in the morning. Some wag suggested that they wanted him to be working on the problem rather than sleeping on it.

Since the MP basically said that he did not believe in intervention, what exactly is it that we are talking about in our dialogue with Dome?

I think it is quite an important thing — because we have not been through it once, we have been through it many times in this territory — to be sitting in the situation and watching, potentially, a community die. Those of us, and that includes all of us here who have been in the process of trying to build a community, not just throughout the whole Yukon community, but some of us individually building communities, and seeing our sweat and blood, and our lives, and our families' lives, our energies devoted to that process, have to feel a great sense of loss, of devastation, at the potential part of our work will come to naught, and that a community can close and die.

That is especially painful when we understand that in this territory part of our development has been that there are already more ghost towns than there are living communities in this place. That is why I believe that with whatever time we have left, we should all be kicking, fighting, shouting and screaming, doing everything we can, doing this as if our lives depended upon it because in a certain sense, our economic lives do.

It is, I think, for the Government of Yukon — and now that they have friends in high places — as I said yesterday, a do or die situation. It is a kind economic Waterloo we are facing.

If Cyprus Anvil closes, the hopes and aspirations of a great number of people in this territory will be dashed. I believe this and I say this respectfully to the government leader, the optimism that he talked about yesterday will evaporate. There is no doubt the economy of Yukon will go through severe contraction and population will fall. We will lose certain small businesses that are providing services to that community. We will lose some talented workers. We will lose some imaginative entrepreneurs, and the whole community of Yukon will lose something very important.

That is why I was disturbed when I heard the deputy prime minister of Canada tell us on CBC radio recently that the Progressive Conservatives do not believe in intervention. This is the PC philosophy, he said. If it is, then it is a very new PC philosophy, because all of us know that the CPR was built at public expense, with money given to it by the first Conservative prime minister of this country, John A. MacDonald.

The PC government gave them half of western Canada as well, for their trouble. It is interesting that a few years later, when the CPR wanted to transport ore from a lead zinc mine that they owned

in the Northwest Territories, Cominco Mines, John Diefenbaker, a Conservative Prime Minister, put up \$90 million dollars of public money so that CNR could build CPR a railroad to move their ore.

It is interesting to note, to the gentleman who told us he did not believe in intervention, that he was a member of that government — not John A's government, I should say. He has been around for a little while, but it was Diefenbaker's government.

There is a fundamental contradiction here. Perhaps it is a contradiction between the old or conservative view which cared very deeply about the community. They believed in the established order in the community and that people should stay in their places; but they did believe in community. A new conservatism, which seems to be more of what we know of the traditions of 19th Century liberalism, and been infected with a little dose of Friedmanism or monetarism.

It is a serious question and the government leader was quite right yesterday to express his fears about the effect of federal cutbacks on this community, because there is a lot of federal expenditure in this territory. If there is hacking and slashing cuts in the federal budget, there is potentially some devastation of the social fabric that will take place here.

Let me say something which I believe to be a plain fact. The economy of the Yukon will not recover unless governments, federal and territorial, act, and act fast. Now I believe that many of us would agree with that. We may not always agree that it is desirable but I think most of us would agree that it is necessary. We might disagree about particulars, about how it should be done, but I think most of us understand the vitally important leadership role which is thrust upon us at this moment.

That leads me to ask, 'What is the Government of Yukon's economic strategy?' We have talked about the development of strategy in this Legislature at least since 1979. And, in the statement of the government leader yesterday, the stated objectives were to stabilize the economy and to diversify the economy. There was also a reference in the speech to the Economic Council as an element in long-term planning but, as yet, there is nothing that we could describe as a plan. There is no document, nor statement, nor strategy which appears to coordinate various elements, fiscal investment policy, manpower policy, labour strategies. There is no singularity of purpose to harness our scarce resources, no clear statement which will allow us to summon all our skills in the community so we can, in fact, pull together at this very critical time.

I personally think that it may be time again for an emergency conference of business, labour, government, and Indian community, on what is happening now. Perhaps there is a role there for the new Economic Council to preside over such a meeting. But I believe fundamentally that we need, at this moment, the hands-on approach, not the hands-off approach, on the continuing crisis. I think that is especially true with the case of Cyprus Anvil.

You know, when we talked about the situation of Cyprus Anvil, I want to emphasize again that there was considerable public interest then. It was not just the fate of the employees, the schools, the streets, and the sewers. That considerable public investment is ours to protect. Those are the public interests in terms of the life for our community and the economy of our community. I think we should not encourage a situation, we may not be able to prevent it, where the private interests of a company like Dome, an extra-territorial company, should have ascendancy or dominance over the public interests of the people of the territory. That, to me, is the issue. I admit that it is easier said than done but, for myself, it seems to me that we have to be very clear that, on this question, our interests and Dome's interests do not coincide.

Yesterday, in an oratorical flourish, the government leader said the future is waiting to be shaped, that is all. I very much wish that that were true. But I am afraid I have to comment again, as I did in a similar speech last year, that the dark side of partisan politics still rules in Yukon, that some of the things that I find offensive, the patronage, the privilege and the tendency towards one-party government as we shift power from the Legislature to the executive, continues. I want to say on that score how pleased I was at the early initiatives of the new prime minister of this country in this respect,



and how commendable I think were his appointments of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Francis to important ambassadorial posts, and how pleased I was to see his commitment to establishing a wide range of all party parliamentary committees, prescribing a number of important questions. I would only want to say again that I wish there were similar such initiatives and similar such positive and constructive and cooperative spirit operating in this territory.

I will not dwell on that subject because I think there will be other occasions for me to do so. But I would like to make note of a couple of things to our friends across the way. The speech yesterday commented on the village relocation as a marvelous example of cooperation between levels of government. That remark came as a rather bitter bit of humour for my colleague, the member for Whitehorse North Centre, and I. We are two MLAs who have a particular interest in the relocation of the Whitehorse Indian village. Yet we have not been consulted, nor briefed, nor advised at any step of the way. Furthermore, even in my communications with the minister on the important questions which are raised with him, I have no substantial or very useful information from him at all.

I want to compare the situation with one of his predecessors, a previous Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, who was a very cooperative guy, very self-confident about his own intelligence and very self-confident about his own views, and no threat to opposition members. When the new Hillcrest-McIntyre plan was being developed, he invited me, as an alderman and the-then MLA for the area, to participate in the ongoing discussions for the plan at every step of the way.

20 He held community meetings to make sure that the people in the neighbourhood knew exactly what was going on and why. I compare that with the present situation. Of course, I am referring to the former member of this House, Mr. Ken McKinnon.

That was a more admirable way of operating than what is going on now. I might have expected that at some point, as the modest author of a motion that faded in economic council, somebody might have been interested in talking to me about the development of that idea, its operations, some input, some suggestions because, I modestly submit, that I am a person with some knowledge and some experience in this community and areas and instruments like this. But, no, the last I heard of it was the debate in the House. I do not want to dwell on this, but I think —

**Some hon. Member:** (*Inaudible*)

**Mr. Penikett:** You see, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the problem. The minister assumes, somehow, that we are not equals in this House, but that members opposite have to become some kind of supplicants or beggars to his door to make petitions. If he were a government member on this side of the House, there would be ongoing consultations every day about matters affecting his constituency; however, when it comes to opposition members, there is, in fact, a closed door.

It is a pity. It is a pity because there are number of important issues that we, and this side of the House, could have made a useful contribution on in this House and saved the government a lot of trouble. I list land claims, *The Children's Act*, human rights and the ongoing economic problems; just as examples. But, in fact, the government is not interested in our input for some reason. It was not interested because it did not want our input and the views of the whole community. It was only interested in the views of people who were inclined to be sympathetic to them and, therefore, confirm their own prejudices.

I think that this development is a great pity because it does not have to be that way. I say this entirely seriously. Yukon, at this point today, is in trouble. I think we could all help. I think that we in this House want to help. But we can only help if we are encouraged to participate in the processes in ways — not in the ways we have been limited since the last election in that there have been no select committees whatsoever — that I would encourage the government to explore.

Some day soon, we will be asked to help sell a land claims settlement to the Yukon community; to come into this House and rubber stamp a deal which we have had absolutely no consultation about, whatsoever. I think that it is a pity. I think that this is still a sign of our political immaturity. I think, unfortunately, that there is

some possibility that the community will suffer because of this.

Finally, I want to say something about the public services. The government leader, yesterday, in his remarks, I think appropriately, spent some time discussing the situation. I think he alluded to the kind of turmoil and uncertainty that operates among some quarters of the public service at the moment. He also reported a little bit about reorganization. Let me repeat inside the House what I have said outside the House about this. I think that, in the main, the objectives of the reorganization were commendable. I think there was a widespread view in this community that the Yukon government had the tendency towards being top-heavy and that the steps taken by the government leader in the reorganization were some measure in correcting that problem.

21 However, I have heard from constituents who are concerned and disturbed about the coincidence of the job evaluation with the re-organization. I seriously wonder, and I would be interested in pursuing this at some point, perhaps in Question Period and other occasions, if the job evaluation program is not something that ought not to have preceded the re-organization and if some of the changes were properly thought out.

I was frankly fascinated by the exchange in Question Period yesterday on the contracting-out question. Perhaps it is a debate which we still have to have. I was interested to hear from the Minister of Education and the many other things of which he is minister, that the decision was made not because of any inefficiencies in the performance of the previous incumbents in the jobs. That is what he said. The decision was made to contract-out because the services were available locally. That was a fascinating statement, "that the services were available locally, therefore we should contract them out". Now that is of course directly opposite to the direction in which the Justice department is moving, I think, correctly, by bringing in solicitors who have developed some specialized expertise, but they did that at a time when there were obviously plenty of lawyers available locally, and I gather some of them not as employed as they would like to be.

However, the argument for creating contracting-out was because there were local services. The minister said it was because these services were available locally, but in one case the contract went to a company owned in British Columbia; in the other case the contract went to a company owned in Alberta. They may be registered here but they are owned elsewhere which means the profit from this business is going south of the border.

Now, the other thing I am reminded of in our previous discussion of this question back in the spring, was that there would be no wage slashing, as a result of this new move. But I know the wages have in fact moved downwards from something like \$10 an hour to \$6 an hour. I would say to the minister responsible, I defy anybody to support a family in this community on \$6 an hour. I do not believe it can be done.

It seems to me that we have a situation where the beneficiaries of this arrangement are a BC company and an Alberta company. The people who pay are the people who are laid off, and the people who are now working for less than the work was previously worth. The public benefit was a cost saving. I think was claimed by the minister, in the neighbourhood of \$150,000. But I understand also from people around that there are some increased security costs associated with this new arrangement. There are work interruptions, and there has been quite a change in the way the work is done. I will be very interested, when it comes, in seeing a true cost evaluation of this experiment. I hope there is one done, so that we can make an assessment of this experiment, not entirely on the basis of our, if you like, philosophical regulations, but on the basis of some hard facts.

I raise this matter because I think there was another, if you like, potential contradiction in the government leader's statement.

He talked about no major layoffs. Now, there may be more contracting-out. Potentially, those statements are contradictions.

When the justice facility was announced, legal people were concerned about the principle of independence of the judiciary. In Yellowknife, courts, probation officers and others are in one building.

It may be that the two-part, separation design will satisfy people in that particular respect. I am really quite sure that it will be a

very nice building when it is built. It also occurred to me, when I saw the model in the lobby, that the size of that \$13 million facility in this community also says something about the size of the justice problem that we have in this territory. We are, by building, dealing with the effects of that problem. We are not dealing with the causes. I suspect that it is probably time for us in this House to have a really good debate about some of those problems. We have heard about the problem about youth unemployment and alcoholism and, I suppose, poverty as a source of the problem of crime, and of the alcohol connection with the incarcerations in this territory. This is probably the time that we have a good thorough debate on that question in this House.

The government leader, in his speech, also mentioned a number of other initiatives. There is the Expo '87, the Kwanlin Dun band relocation, and others. Hopefully, I will have an opportunity to speak about some of these matters on another occasion, during this sitting.

I only want to conclude on a sombre note. When the government leader and I were first elected in 1978 when this new government was elected, there was a lot of promise. I think the territory, both inside and outside our borders, was widely regarded as a place with a great future. Increasingly it was, to judge by media reports from the outside world, becoming more and more to be seen as a place with an interesting past. I do not regard this change in the perceptions about us as a good thing. I modestly submit, on behalf of all my colleagues, that we would all like to play our part in changing that perception, and like to play an increased role in charting the course for the territory.

I would say this to the government leader, I hope not in an excessively critical way, that his speech was good precis of the government's actions. It was not an inspiring oration. It was not an articulation of his vision of the future. Perhaps these circumstances, the mundane and the somewhat depressing circumstances that beset us, did not create this environment for such a speech. I believe that we, in this House, need to begin to form and articulate a vision about what we could be. We begin, I think, to talk about what this Yukon community could be and the ways in which this government could lead us to believe our potential. I would like to be as optimistic as anyone about our future. I believe we have great potential in our human resources. We have obviously realized potential in our mineral resources and in our renewable resources, but I also think we have great potential to become nothing less than a model democracy. I think the size of our community, the intimacy of these arrangements in the Legislature, if you like, give us an opportunity to develop something here that has not existed anywhere else in the country. I would only hope that in the time that is left in this legislative sitting, in the time of the life of this Legislature, and given the crisis that persists in our economy, we would have that kind of constructive and positive attitude about our deliberations and our work, and that we could do our jobs better, and do our jobs in such a way that we can see the fruits of our labours, and a reopened Cyprus Anvil mine, settlement of land claims and, if you like, a renewal of the Yukon economy and society.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I consider it an honour and a privilege to have this opportunity to respond to the address by our government leader to this Assembly.

Since it has been some time since we last met in this Chamber, I would like to take this opportunity to respond by outlining the activities that have taken place in a number of areas that are my responsibility, both as a Minister of Health and Human Resources and as Minister of Justice.

It is frequently stated, incorrectly, that our government has no social conscience. I would like to use this opportunity to refute such statements, and to demonstrate that, as we move out of this recession, our government has been doing all that is possible to provide to Yukoners those services which they have clearly indicated to us they feel are necessary.

A representative government does not wait to be pressured by its citizenry; consequently we have continued to provide and continued to research and establish those programs which address the needs of Yukoners without waiting to be pressured into doing so.

The government leader has made some vague reference to a number of these areas, and I would like to take a few moments to elaborate on some of them.

Most members will recall that the Department of Health and Human Resources commissioned a study on rehabilitation and geriatric services in Yukon in 1983, with the report being presented in the spring of this year. Among its higher priorities, recommendations were the need to improve geriatric assessment, the recommendation to enhance benefits to persons with chronic diseases and disabilities and the need to implement a home-care program.

My department has made arrangements with the Edmonton General Hospital for the training of Yukon nurses, social workers and doctors in geriatric assessment. A bursary program has been established to allow this training opportunity. The department has, as well, in draft, the elements of a chronic disease and disability program. Additionally, a proposal has been developed respecting an integrated home-care program, which will include home-making and home-nursing services.

As a further consequence of the recommendations made in the geriatric and rehabilitation service review, my department is currently restructuring the vocational rehabilitation program.

I would also like to point, with a justifiable degree of pride and accomplishment, to the work just now completed on the extension of Macauley Lodge, and to the renovation of the older part of the lodge. The increased capacity, as well as the improvement in the facilities in the lodge, will ensure that the deserving senior residents there are provided with a level of care that will reflect our appreciation for their accomplishments in Yukon's past and a respect for them as individuals.

I anticipate holding an open house and I invite members of this House to take that opportunity to pay a visit to the lodge to see for themselves the love and service afforded seniors there.

Another area where I would like to report continuing progress is the implementation of the *Young Offenders Act*.

Members will recall that on April 2, 1984, the *Young Offenders Act* came into force nationally. On June 1, 1984, *The Children's Act* came into force.

They are going to provide the mechanism for us to put into effect some of the provisions of the federal *Young Offenders Act*. One of the stipulations of the *Young Offenders Act* is the establishment of a diversion, an alternative measures program. To accomplish this we have established a diversion council under *The Children's Act*. I am pleased to report that the diversion council, which encourages community involvement in the responsibility for dealing with their young people who are beginning to run afoul of the law, has already met to begin the process of establishing such a program.

Much additional work has been required of departmental staff by the implementation of this federal legislation since last April. I am pleased to report that contact with other jurisdictions across Canada indicates that we are, in many respects, ahead of some of them. In other cases, we are taking advantage of the development and the work in those jurisdictions to learn and make effective choices for Yukon.

I would like to emphasize that this mechanism is in place as a result of *The Children's Act*. I would also like to, at this point, comment briefly on *The Children's Act*, which members will recall debating at length in this forum last spring. You will recall that it was the focus of considerable public debate and media attention as well. *The Children's Act*, which came into force on June 1st, 1984, has generally been received with a positive response, but has meant extra work for staff of my department, lawyers, and the courts in terms of adjusting to the new legislation. However, I am pleased to report that, in spite of the almost daily media attention for a number of months during the late winter and early spring, there has been relatively little attention paid to the act in its implementation during the more than five months now that it has been in force.

I am also pleased to report to this Assembly that the fear, which was frequently expressed, that this legislation would result in a larger number of children being taken into care, is completely without substantiation. The converse is the case. The numbers of children in care has declined, continuing a pattern which has existed over the past several years. At the end of the month of July, the

number of children in the care of my department was the lowest in all the years that the Government of Yukon has been involved in the provision of child welfare services.

In another area related to this subject, I would like to report that discussions continue between the Champagne-Aishihik and Kluane Tribal Brotherhood Band and the Department of Health and Human Resources regarding the delegation of responsibility for certain child welfare services to these bands. This pilot project is one that has been made possible under *The Children's Act*, section 111, which allows the Director of Family and Children Services to delegate responsibility for specified services to community groups. Still on the subject of children and services provided by my department to them, I would like to inform you briefly of work that has been taking place in the area of daycare. The regulations governing the operation of daycare facilities in Yukon has been reviewed, and consultation with various concerned parties has taken place since the last sitting of this House. As a consequence, we are at a point where the final draft of the regulations can soon be considered by the Cabinet.

As well, I would like to acknowledge the cooperation that I have received from my colleague, the minister responsible for education, in seeing that the training in early childhood development has been implemented by Yukon College. It is my hope that such a program will, over time, ensure that appropriate programs for children at daycare facilities is constantly available.

I would like to touch briefly on another matter which the government leader referred to, that being the issue of health care re-registration. Over the course of years, since its establishment, the administrative and computer system in place in the registration area of the health care insurance plan became outdated.

As a result, it became necessary to review the registration process.

<sup>26</sup> We are in the process of implementing a new registration system. The final implementation step was the re-registration to ensure that we have the correct and current information on the systems files. Additionally, the re-registration allowed us to implement the use of new identifiers rather than the continued use of social insurance numbers for the purpose of identifying members of the health care insurance plan. I anticipate that the bulk of the re-registration will be complete by the end of November with full conversion to the new system, including the issuance of new health care cards occurring early in 1985.

I am pleased to note, the cooperative response that we received from Yukoners to this re-registration process. I would like to assure members of this House, as well as members of the public, that we will continue to strive to deliver a high level of service in this important program area.

I would also like to take this opportunity to report to the House that I have been fortunate in having been able to meet with the hon. Jake Epp, my federal counterpart. Mr. Epp and I spoke informally on such matters as the need in Whitehorse for improved hospital facilities. I have been assured that the Government of Yukon will be actively involved in the planning and construction of a new facility.

Another subject in the health field on which I would like to comment is to do with mental health. The Mental Health Review Board has been appointed and is carrying out its responsibilities in a capable manner. I will have more to say later this session on the status of the development of the mental health legislation.

An issue that is always a subject of interest to members on the opposite side of this House, is the number of individuals receiving social assistance in the Yukon Territory. I will only comment briefly on this subject at this time. The number of persons in Yukon receiving assistance of this form is much reduced over previous years and this reduction in clients is largely attributed to the success of the job creation projects as well as the economic stimulus reported by the government leader, which indicates that we are moving out of the recession.

Members of this House will recall that I recently released a report of a study into services available in the Yukon to battered women. I announced that the steering committee, which the report recommends be set in place, will be established to ensure that all

recommendations made in the report, which are viewed as feasible and necessary, will be carried out. This is an area of continuing concern to both the departments for which I have responsibility. I would like to ensure this Assembly that necessary services will be provided to those who are victims of this type of assault. In this connection, I would like to remind members that my department continues to fund the Yukon Women's Transition Home and is considering a request for supplement funding for the balance of this fiscal year for that home. I continue to be impressed with the dedication of the members of the Yukon Women's Transition Home Society and the service that they are providing to the community.

In the Department of Justice, we have added three experienced solicitors to its staff in addition to our new deputy minister to assist in rendering legal services to the government. They are active in such diverse fields as reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders, the prosecuting of various territorial offences, land claims, civil litigation and the rendering of legal opinions to all branches of government. We have thus been able to eliminate our dependence upon the private bar and are now able, except in a few rare cases where expertise demands, to provide the government with all its legal requirements.

As you are aware, the new court house complex will commence in the early Spring of 1985. It is to be completed by July, 1986. For years, our courts have been handicapped by wholly inadequate facilities. Our new quarters and the addition of a third territorial court judge will greatly expedite the delivery of legal services to all Yukoners. Our courts, land registry offices, sheriff's office and the court registries will all be able to function more effectively when located in properly designed quarters. We have also revamped our system of court circuits to more effectively service communities outside Whitehorse. Through the complete cooperation of the bench, private bar, Crown Attorney's office, our justice department and all other support services such as Health and Human Resources, native courtworkers, et cetera, we have been able to increase the number of courtworkers and to implement a new system of justice of the peace courts to vastly improve the present court circuit system. All this will be achieved with the current court budget.

For the future, we will continue to strive to improve the accessibility of our judicial system to all Yukoners and to maintain our laws and courts with the standards demanded by an evolving constitutionally independent territory. To that end, is an example of what we are proposing. We will be bringing forward in the spring session amendments to the *Liquor Act* to prohibit the consumption of alcohol while driving a motor vehicle. Statistics gathered by the RCM Police support us in this endeavour as they show that 50 percent of all fatal accidents in Yukon in the last five years involve consumption of alcohol. We cannot continue to allow our citizens to be so endangered by the irresponsible behaviour of a few persons. Our amendments will be aimed at containing drinking while driving.

We propose to introduce an omnibus bill in the spring to bring our legislation in conformity with the *Charter of Rights*. A number of minor amendments were made during the last session and we have now completed our view of the legislation and directions have been given to prepare the necessary bill. These are just a few of the areas in which my departments have been active during the time that has passed since this Assembly last met.

<sup>27</sup> It is always the case that a government will be criticized for not providing each and every program that is requested by a variety of interest groups that exist in any given jurisdiction. It was my intention, in responding to the government leader's address, with the recitation of work that has been done in the social services and justice areas, to provide a background of information for all members and Yukoners. It is my firm belief that the level of services provided in the health and social services area, as well as in justice, clearly indicate our government's commitment to providing an appropriate level of services in these areas, in spite of the fiscal restraint under which we have been operating. I would like to comment that the government leader and my Cabinet colleagues, as well as members of our caucus, have given me support without which these programs could not continue. Thank you very much.

*Applause*

**Mr. Byblow:** It is with some considerable regret that I rise to speak. My regret is that I cannot endorse some of the positions of this government on several economic fronts. Perhaps more accurately, I am disappointed in the lack of positions on several critical matters. In particular I am most disturbed about this government's failure to show any substantive initiative towards the continuing survival of Faro and the resumption of operations at the mine. As was stated in the address yesterday, and discussed in Question Period today, the passive acceptance that Cyprus Anvil be allowed to close without hardly a murmur from this government is clearly unacceptable. In fact, it is unforgivable. Yukoners will remember the reluctance of this government to become too involved at the outset with the effort two years ago, and the broad support that effort endorsed and which, in turn, helped, in some measure, to precipitate the stripping program. I believe that we are witnessing somewhat of a similar reluctance today with respect to the future of the community of Faro. We seem to be hearing from this government that they have done all that they can and that there is nothing else they can do. We heard, in Question Period, the efforts outlined by the government leader in various lobbying exercises. I believe that more can be done and should be done. I say that most sincerely and most passionately in the interests of the community of Faro.

I am concerned that the government seems to be saying that it is perfectly all right for a community to die, for a mine to increase its risk of ever reopening by allowing a closure now and all of this at the whim and will of an insensitive corporate parent.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has, in his short tenure, I believe, done a commendable exercise at attempting to find resolution to the many problems facing the community. I also believe that the community leaders at Faro have shown tremendous commitment and direction of possible resolution to the issues facing the mine. I believe that there are a number of things that this government could do, not only with the interests of Faro in mind, but with the social and economic health of the territory in mind. We constantly seem to be faced with the chicken and egg syndrome in Yukon's economic development. We talk about development tools to encourage industry. We say how we want to provide a climate conducive to business growth.

The problem that seems to be developing is that it is unclear whose responsibility it is to move first. While that is going on, you are not going to have either. Historically, and by precedent, and the leader of the opposition went into it at some length, it has been the initiative and the principal funding provided by governments that have built the infrastructure that promoted and encouraged development. The infrastructure in question are those things like roads, railroads — as the leader of the opposition used for his example — and hydro development and power grids, which encourage industry to grow and develop. Governments have identified those things. They have put their development into place, historically, and these things are fundamental to any economic development. That is universal, whether you are talking about the opening of a new mine in Mac Pass, whether you want to expand the lumbering industry in Watson Lake or whether you want to increase some secondary manufacture in Dawson.

You need certain tools to encourage industry to do their job. I think the reluctance of this government to firmly take, to state and advance a position with regard to the need and mode of a transportation corridor to tidewater is part of this chicken-egg syndrome. The need for a stable, year-round tidewater corridor is not just in Cyprus Anvil's interest, however much it may help, but it is in the interest of Yukon consumers and industry at large. I believe we have to seriously look at what kind of economic strategy we want to develop, and the tools we want to encourage that development. Are we, in fact, looking at secondary manufacturers such as were witnessed in the small-scale plants in several of our communities? Are we planning to continue the pattern of exporting our raw materials, which principally would relate to mining for the most part? Or are we simply floundering around, not sure which direction we are going or what tools we want to put into place?

At the same time, there is no question that the government leader is quite correct: we have to have federal support. Just look at the level of federal support needed to maintain the level of operations in the territory today. However, in the meantime, the private sector, on which this government seems to hinge a lot of its economic opportunity, is certainly bypassing our growth and development without the commitment to the tools.

I submit that the development tools go hand-in-hand and, at best, they can even precede development. That does not exclude the need for industry to work closely with government, the need for industry to state their level of commitment or the need for planning agreements to be put in place. In general, a close cooperation and a fair exchange for the public investment is the government's responsibility. Clearly, I think governments have to play a major role in places like the territory if we are to continue any level of support, or even hope for growth, in the fragile economy that we do have.

I think that, in a nutshell, what I am asking of this government is that they must develop, state and advance their position and level of support for a tidewater corridor. Our position from this side was enunciated by our federal leader a few weeks ago. We, unlike the side opposite that has been oscillating several times in the past few months, would clearly prefer a rail option. We support that it be publicly funded to whatever level necessary to ensure its continuity and stability.

I think a position of that sort enhances the potential for the future where we can interlink with south central Alaska and BC, and we can eventually look towards having a Canadian port for access out of the northern region. In the meantime, we clearly are caught with the need to support the Skagway corridor and we should be doing that quite emphatically to ensure that it does not close in any permanent way, immediately.

Being somewhat charitable to this government, I would venture to say that one of the biggest stumbling blocks to criticism of lack of initiative surrounding the encouragement of the mine's reopening is clearly the current owner of the mine. Again, that has been stated by members opposite and by the leader of the opposition.

Moments ago, we heard some thoughts on the corporate interests of Dome Petroleum not coinciding with the public interests of Yukon. Now it becomes something of a brick wall, I can understand, to get a commitment from someone who is neither interested in operating the mine nor is interested in giving anything firm about anything, unless it means a concession from someone to them. That has been proven to be the case, whether we are talking about other industries related to the operation, branches of government at whatever level, or even the workforce.

I am clearly encouraged by Mr. Crombie's efforts to take a step towards trying to find a workable arrangement, or a proposal for the operation of the mine. Perhaps it is a step that this government could have advanced months ago when we first learned of the anticipated closure on December 31st, if a buyer or partner was not found by that time. I think we need some serious investigation into why the mine is not operating. This morning, I heard on the radio that the president of Cyprus Anvil sees the mine as a viable operation, and we have heard that position confirmed by other officers of the company. Last week, I believe it was, a local economist made the assessment that concluded the mine would be profitable if in operation today, given certain factors. So I raise the question, not just rhetorically, why is the mine not operating today?

Why are we talking about closure? I say with a most passionate enquiry, what are we doing about that? I know what Faro is doing; I know what the federal government has committed itself to doing. I have to ask this government what they are going to do. Are we saying that the community is not worth retaining? Why are we not out there, as the leader of the opposition said, banging heads, digging out information, calling for extension instead of what appears to be something of a death knell, as articulated by the side opposite.

I guess there is some considerable concern in the community that its services will deteriorate, that people leave, that businesses are further eroded in their ability to survive. There is a need for a greater level of performance by this government.

I was disturbed by a statement the government leader made to the

community leaders of Faro, at the time of Mr. Crombie's visit, and during a meeting with the community leaders. I believe the government leader made some assertion that they, as a government, did not have a right to look at Cyprus Anvil's books, and I suppose I have to question that position, because when we are talking about a major corporate interest that has such a stranglehold on a community or a region of the country, you must have some right to ask for those figures. You must have some right to ask about what the real viability of the mine is. The only words we are hearing are all sorts of assertions, and bold ones, that the mine is viable. But it is not in operation. And it is not being bought. Now there has got to be much more to it than that. I support what Mr. Crombie is doing, because perhaps that will in part raise and pull these figures and some of this information out. And that is good.

If we recognize, and if we accept the economic potential of that mine and that community to Yukon, then we have to say to ourselves, "Well if it is really that important, we should be doing more than we are". I do not think I have to try to persuade anyone in this House as to the economic importance of that mine. I am sure every member opposite has stated it for the record himself. So, the point I wish to leave here is that we must be doing more. We must be looking at the transportation question that I have already raised. We must be taking a firm position on the matter.

I believe, further, that we could be dealing with the lock-out. Now we heard during Question Period that there has been some overtures on this, and that is reasonably acceptable. But it becomes something of a major frustration to witness, after two and a half years of support that the community has given to the company — that, in general, government has given to that company — to have a situation imposed that shuts the mine down sooner than anticipated.

<sup>32</sup> In my opinion, that does nothing for labour relations. It is counter-productive. It is unreasonable, and I believe that every effort ought to be made and every urging ought to be done to have that lockout lifted so that the community can return to an immediate operation that then extends the operation through what looks like a grim winter.

<sup>33</sup> We should not allow the opportunity for the place to even go into temporary closure. I believe, if that is allowed to happen, so much higher is the risk of it ever reopening. I feel quite strongly that we could be doing more to continue the operation now. I think we should be challenging the owner to provide the kind of information that we have not had, in order to know what the real numbers are — the substantiated numbers.

What level of commitment does the company need to make it viable to the level that they require? These figures have not been made public; these figures are not available and we ought to be procuring them.

I think we could be taking quite a principal role in finding a buyer or partner, given the position of Dome Petroleum that they do not wish to operate the mine past December 31. Any corporate decision, any decision, is malleable, given the right arguments, and that is what we are not doing.

I believe I drew reference to the special relationship that this government claims to have with the federal government and, again, some statements have been made about that special relationship, particularly in light of the deputy prime minister's election from this riding within that Conservative government. I suppose enough has been said on it, but I would like to see more fruits from that relationship, besides the known statements of no intervention and what appears to be support for the corporate strangulation of that community; certainly not what appears to be a highly supportive position for the continuation of that economic cornerstone.

I suggest that it would be advisable for our Member of Parliament to share his Crown corporation ideas for White Pass with someone, because, since last August, the idea seems to have been shelved and I would like to know why.

I have dealt at some length with some of the economics and politics surrounding Cyprus Anvil, and I want to close on the subject of a much more serious tone, the most serious crime of the current scenario, and that is the real impact on the Town of Faro that the past three years has had.

Now, Faro is a community, as every community in the territory.

People who live there have made it their home. They have raised their families there and have made their immeasurable contribution to the community of those things that simply make a community. It has less than 1,000 people now, and that is from a one-time population of about 2,300. The shroud of uncertainty the community has lived under for the past three years, combined with the cyclical patterns of glimmers of hope, then shatterings of those prospects, has taken its toll. In a word, I believe the impact on the community, on domestic life, on students, on businesses, has been devastating. To hear statements about having to expect closure without any major effort to preserve the community, is unnecessary. I think it is ironic that, on the same day the federal minister announces a positive move to try and get the mine going, we hear from this government the prospect of closure.

<sup>34</sup> I think government has a major responsibility to protect not only the public interest in Faro in the form of public works and infrastructure, but it also has a major responsibility to people, and that is our most valuable resource.

I appeal to this government to demonstrate a more aggressive role in the fate of that community and the mine. There clearly are things that can be done. I think we have a responsibility to do them, and I do not think we can resign ourselves to the fate that is in store for the community being placed there by a Calgary giant. I think we have to have the lockout removed so that we can return to some semblance of operation. I think we have to look at extension of the stripping program most seriously, in order that we have more time to resolve the major issues facing the mine. We should be challenging the owner to provide some hard information about what it is going to take to operate, and what it is going to take to assemble the operating package. I think we can be taking a much more aggressive role in finding the mechanism to finance the reopening and whether that requires outside financing or some encouragement from government, should not really matter. There were 2,100 indirect jobs from that community not very long ago. Its operating budget during its last major year of operation was over twice that of the Yukon government's. That is something you cannot allow or accept it to shut down.

**Mr. Brewster:** During my two-and-one-half years as a representative for the people of Kluane, I have witnessed some dramatic changes in the way Yukon government functions, and the attitude of people serving and dealing with our government. No longer do people see the Yukon government as an appendage of the federal government, run by an appointed Commissioner. In reality, the Commissioner has played a more and more substantial role since the Epp letter confirmed the supremacy of the elected Yukon Legislative Assembly and the Yukon Executive Council. Our perceptions and attitudes cannot be changed as readily as the Epp letter changed the status of the Yukon Cabinet.

I have now seen that attitudes are changing and our civil service is adapting to the representative government. I am encouraged by the receptive nature of a number of our civil servants. This period of change has not been without its pitfalls. Yukon is undergoing its political evolution during some of the most difficult conditions. We are seeking our rightful role in the Canadian unit at a time of great economic upheavals, unsurpassed in its magnitude in the last 40 years. The land claims process has taxed the resources of all the parties concerned. The stand that our government is taking against the federal government on a number of controversial issues demonstrates to the electorate that their elected representatives are looking for the Yukon's best interest. I need to only mention the strong position this government has taken on the initial COPE agreement and John Munro's plan to force bilingualism on us.

<sup>35</sup> It is also encouraging to see our local government making steady progress to a better representative government. Many communities are now responsible for their own decisions. Last Monday evening I watched as Haines Junction's new council made a bold long-term decision that was opposed by a number of local residents. Each councilor realized that they were now in a position to make decisions affecting the quality of life in their communities for many years to come, and they would be held accountable for their actions.

I would like to congratulate the mayor and the councilors of Haines Junction for having the courage to face issues head on instead of passing the buck. I would also like to say that all bureaucrats have come to realize the collective wisdom of this House, but I cannot in the light of the failure of the federal medical service branch to act on the real need for a nurse at Beaver Creek. Members of this House and the public have long recognized the need for a nurse at Beaver Creek. This House voted unanimously in support of providing a nurse to our most remote highway community. The federal bureaucrats are holding fast to their refusal to act on this important matter. I very much resent that they have not been more fruitful in their efforts.

How long must the officials of the Yukon Government, the people of Beaver Creek, and myself continue to present a so-called public service with the facts before we get any action? The largest tourism company in Yukon operates a hotel in Beaver Creek. They are now planning to expand their facility to accommodate even more tourists. They are also exploring the possibility of locating their new rooms just across the border at Tok, Alaska. I believe the decision to locate in Tok will be influenced by our intentions to provide a nurse at Beaver Creek. Can we sit back and lose this opportunity to another country?

The argument has been made that there is no nurse available. I personally could show our bureaucrat friends how this could be done, and put another person to work in the same process.

On a more positive subject, the tourism business through Beaver Creek has increased by 14 percent over last year. I am very pleased to hear that inquiries at the Beaver Creek reception centre has increased by 23 percent. The national park headquarters visits have increased from 94,700 in 1983 to 107,219 in 1984. Visitors to the Kathleen Camp and the Sheep Mountain Information Centre have increased from 42,418 to 49,063 during the same period.

I feel that this information confirms my assertion that tourism is the centre of the Yukon. I might also add that Parks Canada is projecting a 25 to 35 percent increase in the coming year. This is in spite of the misguided efforts of the project wolf fanatics who went to great lengths to damage our tourist industry.

On another matter, I am very disappointed that the Yukon Indian land claims have not been settled, but I am very proud of the initiative taken by the Champagne-Aishihik and Kluane Tribal Brotherhood for their efforts to have a final agreement signed. Yukon cannot afford to see another prolonged period of land claims negotiations. It is encouraging to see that some bands recognize this, as well.

I am particularly pleased to see that this government is moving away from the grant system of assisting businesses. A loan system with preferred rates is much more equitable. I am also pleased to hear that the Yukon Housing Corporation is turning the housing market back over to the private sector by selling off a number of its housing units. Programs such as these should be commended.

In closing, I would like to repeat what the government leader said in his closing remarks yesterday. I believe that his comments are so true. We must seize the opportunity to begin to work with a new spirit, a new vision towards the realization of our goal. Yukoners everywhere, from all walks of life and cultures, must begin to make their voices heard and must begin to work for the common good of us all. Above all we must begin to work together, for only together can we build the future of this land.

<sup>36</sup> **Mr. McDonald:** I was planning to be my normal positive and diplomatic self in response to the general motion. I do believe that my record stands clear in that regard. Normally my approach is to suggest alternatives to the government, to criticize positively and constructively, and to encourage the government to take initiatives which I think are important to my constituents and important to the people of Yukon. However, my cooperative approach has been tested severely in the last little while.

The theme that the opposition leader, soon to be government leader, mentioned in his speech about the cooperative approach between the various sides of this House, is something I would like to expound upon a little bit as a preface to my remarks.

I, as a member of the House, feel quite frustrated that the

government is not consulting with me as a representative for Mayo on constituency issues, nor is it considering giving the opposition members of the House any sort of consideration in the basic fundamental policy development. The Minister of Community Affairs, especially, complains that his door is always open and that he is always prepared to read a letter or have a letter read to him, yet the letters that I send go unanswered for months. The contact that I have with the minister is the contact that I have to initiate myself, without picking entirely on this one minister, even though he may be one of the worst offenders with regard to Mayo.

When it comes to a cooperative approach between the two sides of this House, it does not exist. That kind of frustration, even from the best-intentioned members on the side of the House, leads us to be slightly more combative than we might otherwise be.

So, with those remarks I do preface my remarks this afternoon by saying that I do not feel charitable at all towards the government. I will be taking the opportunity to encourage the government to follow through on some of the amendments that it has made, but I would like to concentrate a little more on the areas where I think that a great deal of improvement needs to be made.

Yesterday, we heard the government leader expound on the several limited virtues of the government. We heard that in our wretched, desperate economic state, we were once again stabilizing our economic position. I think some unkind persons might suggest that the word "stabilized" was interchangeable with the word "stalled", and that the economy was once again stabilized or stalled at some level that was characterized by high unemployment and limited economic opportunities.

We heard the government leader wax poetic on the new positive era in federal-territorial relations, which will supposedly end the dark cloak of colonialism, in his terminology, which has restricted development and freedom. Simultaneously, of course, the first ministers were meeting near Ottawa without the benefit of the presence of the government leader himself. Surely this fact is not an omen of things to come. We heard the government leader say, without batting an eye or expressing a nervous twitch, that their relationship with the civil servants, was characterized by cooperation and general good feelings. The speech, in short, in some respects, was an exercise in double speak.

It was interesting that the government leader felt it was necessary to praise Yukon civil servants for a job well done. He may have felt his government's continuing attacks on the public service, their scapegoating of this public service, as a major component of Yukon's economic woes, needed to be redressed in some manner. Actions are a more true indicator of this government's intentions, and when push comes to shove, the employees will remember the kick in the pants long after they remember the slap on the back.

I would like to spend some time briefly addressing some concerns which will be dealt with more expansively later on in this session. The government likes to fancy itself, despite numerous indications to the contrary, as one which knows how to promote economic development, and how to identify growth potential in private sectors of the economy.

<sup>37</sup> It is interesting to note that the two communities in Yukon, whose base is primarily industrial, are represented by opposition members in this House. The efforts of these members, of which I am one, to promote the continued viability of the mining ventures has been largely ignored by the government. The acid test, so to speak, of this government's ability to deal with and promote this kind of development can essentially be seen through an examination of its dealing with the communities of Elsa and Faro.

In the latter case, we are now aware that the government is better prepared to accept Anvil's failure than it is prepared to go the extra mile to keep it open. If Anvil, despite its profitability, closes its door on Yukon, then the signal to Yukoners will be unequivocal. The government did not have the will to play a significant part in ensuring its continued viability and, perhaps as significantly, did not have clout in Ottawa to make any difference at all. We will know with certainty that the Erik Nielsen umbilical cord of nourishment is nothing more than a dry shriveled political promise. We will know that the Yukon government cannot, despite its political allegiance to Ottawa, maintain or nurture those rare sources of



wealth that are Yukon's.

One serious irony is that the one community in Yukon that is more self-sufficient than any other in the territory, is not even recognized by the Yukon government. It inhabits that twilight zone in the darkest recesses of the government's mind. It is this mysterious source of revenue which requires no attention or understanding. It is a source of riches around which to wrap a budget speech and towards which you can direct insults. It is a living example of this government's attitude toward the industrial communities that do exist today.

It is possible to travel north on the Klondike Highway to Carmacks where you will see a sign which points to Watson Lake, hundreds of mile away. You travel a little north on the Klondike Highway and you come within a stone's throw of Elsa and you will find no sign that indicates its existence. Now this fact is one trivial manifestation of the serious problem that exists for Elsa. There are people in that community who are considering a tax revolt as the only way of dealing with this government.

What are the citizens of Elsa asking for? They are asking essentially for fair play; they are not asking for a special deal. They are asking for some sort of help with all their resources, company and personal resources, and are directed in keeping the mine open and developing the ore reserves for the future. They are not asking for money to support the production process to give the company an added advantage over its competitors. They are not asking for money to support or expand municipal services. They are asking for some help to upgrade seriously deteriorating community recreation facilities. They are not asking for more than other communities would get. They are asking for the same that other communities would get.

The minister has stated, I am sure, with all the sensitivity that he can muster, that the people of Elsa, if they want to take advantage of this government's *largesse* must pull up roots, must leave Elsa, and move to some other community. The minister quite possibly mentioned, perhaps, that Mayo might be that community. I am not sure whether we should translate that proposal into a policy statement that the government issued, suggesting that, perhaps, we should centralize our rural centres in some artificial manner. I am sure that the minister received some reaction from the public, from his friends and allies, to suggest that people thought that he was being somewhat unrealistic. Certainly, the people of Elsa screamed at the insensitivity of the suggestion. People of Mayo shook their heads and even the United Keno board of directors raised their eyebrows. Everybody seemed to be united in awe of this silly position.

<sup>38</sup> In any case, the minister has also suggested at one point or other, that because the company in Elsa can afford to pay for the cost of these services, that they should pay. I think it would not take a very wise person, or even a person of very limited intelligence, to understand that the financial position of the company in Elsa is somewhat precarious, for they are definitely going out on a limb to ensure that ore reserves will last well into the future years.

It should also be noted that, while the minister may suggest that the company, because of its resources, should pay for the cost of these services, this is not a policy which the minister would like to extend to his own constituency, or the constituencies in Whitehorse. When there is a proposal for a public facility, the minister does not go out and canvas the Rolf Hougens of this world to see how much they are going to put up, because they are the people who are supposed to be paying.

It is a public responsibility and that public responsibility extends to the people of Elsa, as well — the citizens of Elsa, not the company at Elsa, but the citizens of Elsa.

The minister has expressed some concern about the extent of the ore reserves in Elsa as being of some significance in determining whether there will be any public investment. Of course we have dealt with this before; the company as some members may know, is currently engaged in an exploration program — some twelve million dollars plus — to develop new reserves and to expand on the existing reserves. They are doing more through deficit financing to ensure the survival of that community, of that area, and of that component part of this territory.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** With taxpayers' dollars.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development seems to think the company in Elsa is using taxpayers' dollars to expand their exploration program. Of course that is nonsense. The exploration program is being supported by shareholders and it is being worked by the workers in Elsa. The workers in Elsa are extending their own efforts, and I understand the productivity is way up there, to ensure the viability of that community, that mine and that component part of our economy, and they are paying taxes to boot.

The reciprocal action from this government is not forthcoming. I am sure that we cannot expect in the future that this government, when faced with the development of a community, based on mining, will take a hands-off approach entirely simply because those citizens happen to be working in the mining industry, or because their landlords happen to be mining companies. I think we are going to have to explore that further.

Let me get on briefly, now, to the issue of northern benefits. To be perfectly frank, I do not feel at all comfortable with this government's position on northern benefits. Some two years ago, you may remember, I sponsored a motion which stated three things regarding northern benefits.

One was that we should recognize the value of subsidies to northern people who face a high cost of living. We should, secondly, provide a tax break or tax credit to all citizens in Yukon. Thirdly, we should protect the existing value of benefits in the industrial communities.

The point regarding the protection of existing benefits is that those benefits were negotiated in response to the severe costs of living. We should all be encouraging the Government of Canada to be reaching to provide an equitable standard of living between the north and south in this country. Now, this government took my motion and amputated a very important part of it. They stated that, by amputating the portion which dealt with the protection of industrial communities, they were not interested in protecting those benefits for those industrial communities.

<sup>39</sup> Now, this is very worrisome to people in Faro, and to people in Elsa. People in Elsa already feel that they are under the gun with this government, that they are being ignored by this government, and now the government is not only engaging in defensive attacks on the people of Elsa but is now seriously considering being offensive in its attacks. To be honest, I have more confidence in the federal Conservative government in protecting the value or understanding our situation, than I do with the territorial Conservative government. My only worry is that the federal Conservative government may consider adhering to the claims that people across the floor have made with regards to the benefits schedule of the territory. I am worried, and there is good reason to be worried, about the government's position on northern benefits, and I think the people of Elsa and Faro should be aware of that. People of any other industrial centre in Yukon, the people who do receive this around the territory, and the people who may receive benefits in the future of the territory should be quite aware of this government's position. The government's treatment and understanding of Yukon's major industrial centres leaves a lot to be desired.

Perhaps the rudderless mine task force could do something useful and critically analyze the Yukon government's own policy regarding its sole responsibilities towards these two industrial centres in Yukon. It should do this before it examines the ways that the Yukon government can swallow more responsibilities. I am sure that the government could make a strong case to Ottawa, to assume more responsibilities for mining if it did not just look helplessly on as one mining community dies, and face tax revolt in its other mining community. As I would prefer to deal with these subjects and many others in a more expansive way and perhaps a more give-and-take atmosphere, I would like to close with a brief statement about agricultural development.

I would like to finally congratulate the government on its decision to move the responsibility for agriculture to Renewable Resources, where it has belonged all along. I recall the discussion we had in the House previously where the now minister of Community Affairs argued strenuously and with all the passion that he could muster to

defend his decision to keep agriculture in the Department of Lands. The argument was that agricultural development was all about distributing land. Cooler heads have prevailed and sophistication of the government's understanding of the agricultural industry has increased somewhat. For that, I am grateful.

I am now prepared to give the new minister the benefit of the doubt, and will attempt to debate agricultural issues openly and thoroughly. I would like to throw in a brief cautionary note. I would like to ask the minister to expand his knowledge of territorial agriculture beyond the meager understanding of his predecessor. Of course, that means he must do more than memorize names and job titles of the members of the Department of Agriculture. He must appreciate that the last two years have been very frustrating for me and, if it were not for the high calibre of people in the public service devoted to agriculture, I would be tempted to criticize the government for showing no interest in the industry whatsoever.

A second cautionary note is to ask the new minister to please refrain from giving away Yukon's domestic market for agricultural produce to the Alaskans, before giving Yukon farmers a fighting chance to compete. The Alaska farmer has a headstart on the Yukon counterpart. He has the land, first and foremost, and he has benefitted from massive state support. It really does not seem to be quite fair for the minister to travel to Alaska and give up critical local Yukon markets to extra-territorials before the Yukon farmer is prepared to compete.

40 If the minister would heed both these cautionary notes, we could look forward to a somewhat fresher start in our debate on agriculture. As an aside, I would like to say that I would prefer to hear some clearer general statements coming from the government leader. In announcing his support for agricultural development, perhaps we can allow this session to give every one a clearer understanding of the government's attitude towards this industry.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would like to begin my speech by commenting on some of the government leader's remarks yesterday, and then carry on with some of the comments and remarks I have heard from some members in the house today.

I believe there has been a change in mood of the people of the territory. I certainly sense it. The economy has been picking up; tourism is up about 16 or 17 per cent. It has been a good year as far as tourism goes. In fact, it has been a good year as far as the mining industry goes, regardless of the fact that Cyprus Anvil was closed down recently.

We have, this year, exceeded by more than 100 percent the projected amount of dollars that were to be expended in the operation in the territory. We have one mine that will most likely open in the spring, and we have another one down in the Mile 710 area that looks very promising, and will probably be opening within the near future. So, all in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe that things are looking up in the territory and despite the gloom and doom emanating from the other side of the floor, I think we have to look at the positive side of what is going on in this territory.

The population is increasing in the territory and has been increasing for the last year or so. We are on our way back up again. Things are looking good. Houses in Whitehorse are hard to find now because people are moving in, so things are not all bad.

We now have, in Ottawa, as the government leader said, a government with a new sense of purpose, which gives us a new sense of purpose, as well. I think that they have shown that to us in the past, and one of their resolutions is that the Yukon can have provincial status within their first term of office if we so desire. I think that is an example of their support for the people of this territory and the government of the territory. There is certainly a reduced colonial attitude expressed by those people, which leads us to expect that transfers such as fishery and forestry, mining, health, justice, can be expected within the next few years. Regardless of whether we go for provincial status or not, we expect some of those transfers.

Another very ticklish issue that the government leader raised yesterday was land claims. We are very sad, actually, that the native people have taken the position that they have on land claims. There have been a great many years of negotiation that have a good

possibility of going down the drain over the land issue, and if it does I think the people of the territory, the native people, especially, will rue the day that that decision was made because it may be a good many years before it gets back on the table again. Perhaps the next time around it will not be as good for the native people. Certainly there are negotiations that take place between an agreement-in-principle and a final agreement, the crossing of t's and dotting of i's, but I think, all in all, it was a very fair agreement. It was about as much as was possible for one side to give the other in order to reach an agreement. It is unfortunate that it has reached the impasse that it has.

41 We also have some other potential economic development on the horizon. The Peter Kiewit proposal on the Beaufort Sea and also the Gulf Resources' big find in oil in the Beaufort has everyone in that area feeling very confident. It is almost a sure thing now that there will be an oil pipeline built up the north coast. It is, I think, practically assured that the port on the North Slope of Yukon will go ahead. The production in the Beaufort was the main reason for having the port put on the north coast. I think that it is very likely that we will see that develop within the next few months.

The government leader also mentioned the Alaska inter-tie. It was also mentioned by members across the floor today. That will have a very beneficial effect on the Yukon Territory if we can inter-tie with Alaska. It allows us to sell our energy resources to the State of Alaska. It will also, perhaps in the future, allow for an extension of that grid into northern British Columbia and further areas of southeast Alaska so that we can also tie into the British Columbia grid, and therefore be able to import power, as well as export power if that is necessary in the future.

We have put in place, as some people have mentioned, rather than the grant system, low interest loan programs. I can assure all members of the House that as long as I am the Minister of Economic Development and have anything to do with handing out of dollars in the territory, it will be my intent to make sure that we have as few grant programs as possible and as many loan programs as possible. I would like to stimulate the economy but I do not feel that grant programs are fair. They are discriminatory and I, as much as possible, will try to remain away from them.

One of the aspects of the trade show that we put on was agriculture and recommending to Alaskans that perhaps they could sell their agricultural products here. If we expect to sell our resources, our potential, or our business to other countries, then we certainly have to expect that those countries will also try to sell to us. It has to be a two-way street. It is exactly the same situation as we see between Japan and the United States. The United States and Canada put the quota on Japanese cars because we do not feel that they are trading enough with us. That is exactly the same with Alaska. They are not going to help us promote our trade in Alaska without, at the same time, looking to trade with us. One of the areas of trade is certainly agricultural products, which we do not produce enough of although we would like to. It is certainly my intention to help it develop. We do not produce enough of our agricultural products today, and that is a potential sale that they have to us at the present.

We also have an economic development agreement that we are spending a great deal of time on, trying to put together separate agreements under the economic development agreement. One of them is the tourism agreement. The former federal government was attempting to direct deliver, rather than the Government of Yukon, who has been in the delivery business for years and years. Now they are going to deliver it themselves. We are presently negotiating with them now to try to turn that around. I will be in Ottawa next week. One of the major reasons why I will be there is to speak with the minister responsible for that.

42 We have park and campground development on which we have expended a lot of money throughout the territory. We have spread the money around and tried to disperse the jobs to various areas of the territory. We have been very successful and that will be continuing in the future.

43 I would like to talk about the economic council for a second. The member for Kluane is the chairman of the economic council. It is certainly a very worthwhile committee to have in the territory, and I



commend the leader of the opposition for raising it, regardless of whether he feels he gets enough credit for it or not, but he is not the only one who thinks of these things. Perhaps because he puts it on the floor of the House, he feels he is the one who has raised all of the issues. Regardless of that, the economic council is a very worthwhile committee in the territory. I intend to do my best to try to stimulate that council and to provide it with the research capability that is necessary in order for it to do the job for the people of the territory. In that regard I am very hopeful that the first researchers doing work for that council will be on staff very shortly.

The government leader also mentioned the municipal status that has been given to the various communities in the territory. As the member for Tatchun and being from Carmacks, I am very appreciative of what has happened. I am a firm believer in responsible government, and in people accepting responsibility for their actions, and I am one of the first to say that we should be taking responsibility from the federal government and having it here in Yukon where it belongs, and I feel this as strongly, that communities should have community governments and they should accept the responsibilities for their actions in the communities.

I am very happy to see that they have, especially in my community of Carmacks. I am very happy to see them take on that responsibility, and I am very confident that they will do a good job. If they do not do a good job, the people in the community will take whatever action is necessary to get someone in there who will. That is the democratic principle and that is the way it should be.

The leader of the opposition raised the question of a private corporation having life and death power over a whole community. There has been a great deal of mention from across the floor today about what the government should be doing. The government does have a responsibility to these communities, and to these companies, when they develop, and I think that the government has exercised that responsibility. One of the responsibilities is to provide infrastructure. A great deal of infrastructure was provided to the Town of Faro. A great deal of infrastructure is still being provided. Roads were operated to make it possible for the ore to be hauled at a quicker rate. The weight restrictions were lifted on roads so that they could haul larger ore loads. There are a great many moves that the governments, both federal and territorial, have taken to make Cyprus Anvil mine a viable operation. But one thing that we have to be very cognizant of is, if the federal government or the territorial government is to step in every time a business is going broke, or going down somewhat, and provide money, I do not know where everyone thinks the money is going to come from. Businesses go broke every day. If they are not viable they go broke, and the member for Faro keeps raising the issue that the government should step in and do something.

<sup>48</sup> For example, if the member for Faro was going broke and his hotel was going to shut down, would he expect that his employees should go to the government to tell Maurice Byblow that he has to keep the Faro Hotel going because they have a job there. I do not think that the member for Faro would like that too much. The reason he would be closing the hotel would be because he could not afford to operate it. That is exactly the position of Cyprus Anvil mines.

We have seen a great deal of books about Cyprus Anvil's viability. He keeps raising this. There have been expert companies that have studied Cyprus Anvil's books. They have studied White Pass books. We have all of that information. We know whereof they speak, and we have done a great deal to try to keep Cyprus Anvil mine operating, regardless of what the member across the floor says.

I stated today that I spoke to the president of Cyprus Anvil. I also spoke to the president of the largest union in Faro. We have met with Cyprus Anvil. We have met a great many times at Cyprus Anvil. As the government leader says, we have gone to Alaska. We have talked about the roads. We have met with the City of Skagway. He can keep saying that as long as he wants. I think the general public, the people of the territory, will recognize that this government has been very much involved in trying to keep Cyprus Anvil operating.

The government leader says that this is a territory with a great

future, and it is. If we have more small companies like Mount Skukum Mines or Regional Development or Mac Pass, and if we can spread the business and the mining around the territory, I think it is going to bode much better for us than having all our eggs in one basket at Cyprus Anvil. I am not suggesting that Cyprus Anvil should close down. I am suggesting that, if we can spur the economy and help the mining community to diversify, and help smaller mines open up, I think in the long run, the territory will be much better off than relying on one operator because, every time it makes a move, people of the territory, especially the opposition members, are saying the government should step in and do something.

We need the tools to encourage the industry. Unfortunately the territorial government does not have that many tools to encourage the industry. Certainly one of the tools that I do not consider necessary to encourage the industry is subsidies. I think there are other methods of encouraging the industry. Exactly as I said, I do not believe in grants. I believe in loan programs. I believe that the government has an obligation to provide infrastructure for these communities or for these developments. Once that is provided, it is up to the private corporation to maintain its viability. If it is not viable, then it faces the fact that it has to go broke, and it has to close down, the same as I face in my business. If I do not run a viable business, I am going to have to close the doors, or the bank is going to take it over and sell it to someone. It can do that. That is the situation that we are in. I do not think that we are going to get out of the situation in the foreseeable future. I certainly do not agree with the socialist idea that the government should be buying into everything in order to keep it operating. If it cannot stand alone, then it should not be standing at all.

<sup>49</sup> The member for Faro also said that we should support the rail option and he talks about subsidizing the rail option. I agree that we should support the rail option. I would like to see the rail maintained. That is the government's position and has been for years and years. Subsidizing the rail to the tune of three or four million dollars a year — or five million, or whatever it happens to be — how long is that supposed to carry on?

We have a road running beside the railroad that everyone can use, or should use. It is also an access to tidewater and ends up in the same place as the railroad. Is it our responsibility, or the taxpayers' responsibility, to subsidize a railroad that runs right beside the road, unless there is some commitment to extend the railroad to make it a viable operation?

If the railroad is not a viable operation, and there is no intention to extend it to make it a viable operation, then why should the taxpayers be putting their money into something when there is a facility right beside it that can be utilized without spending the money?

Although, I am a strong supporter of the railroad, I have a hard time supporting the railroad at any cost. I believe, on personal conviction, that there has to be some commitment to the railroad. There has to be a commitment by the federal government and by the territorial government that that railroad will be utilized in the future so that it is a benefit to everyone. Otherwise, I have a real problem with subsidies.

The member for Faro made the statement more than once that the people of Faro are doing all they can for the mine and what is the territorial government doing. All I can say is: what is the reason for the mine being closed right now? The mine is closed because there is a labour dispute. And, who are the people involved? The people of Faro are involved.

Perhaps the people in Faro are right. Perhaps labour is right. Perhaps the company is right. But the main thing is that they should be at the table talking about it. If the people of Faro, who are the people represented by the union, want to work, then perhaps we have to get back to the table regardless of who is right and reach a solution that allows it to work.

There have been a great number of questions raised about the housing in Faro; whether the people of Faro should get their housing at \$5 a month and free power and free fuel. Some people consider it a legitimate question as to whether or not they should get that. Perhaps they have negotiated it. They have it in their

collective agreement right now, but maybe it is time that they took another look at it. Maybe, in order to keep that community going and in order to keep their jobs, they are going to have to make some changes. Those are the facts of life. That is what you negotiate on. When things were going great at Faro, it was "Give us more money; the company is making lots of money, let us have our share". Unfortunately, in the last 15 years of operation of that mine, it has only shown a profit in two years. Perhaps it is time that the labour people took a serious look at this and said, "Perhaps the company just cannot afford it". Maybe they are right. I can assure you that studies have been done, although they are confidential because they are done for private companies and they are not public knowledge. We have had the opportunity to see them and the projections that have been made. They do show that Cyprus Anvil has to have some cheaper form of transportation and some cheaper form of labour in order to be a viable operation.

<sup>50</sup> Now, that is unfortunate but it is true. So there are only two ways to go about it. Either the government puts money in there to make it viable, which I do not believe they should be doing, or the people and the suppliers have to cut their costs. Unfortunately, although people never like to give up some of the things that they have and the companies do not like to give up benefits or prices that they have, it is the law of supply and demand. If your demand goes down, the prices go down. The demand goes up, the prices go up. And that is exactly the situation that it is in right now.

I would certainly hope that the union people in Faro will sit down with Cyprus Anvil — and I am not casting any aspersions on anyone, whether they should give up anything, but at least they should be there talking, there should be some talking — because, as I stated earlier in the House, it has just about reached the deadline. The day is here when it will be shut down and it will be shut down next spring. Those people who are affected by the lockout are ineligible for unemployment insurance, and the next thing will be they will be after the government to look after them in another form. I would implore that those people get back to the bargaining table. I will, as I have already, be speaking with the president of Cyprus Anvil, and asking him to get back to the bargaining table. We have been in constant contact with the federal government with regard to Cyprus Anvil. I think the deputy prime minister has probably dealt with Cyprus Anvil more than he has with any other situation since he was elected. If we expect that mine to reopen, everyone is going to have to give their everything in order to make it work.

**Some Hon. Member:** (*Inaudible*)

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** He is suggesting cutting expense allowances for members across the floor. I think it was four or five years I subsidized the people of this territory on my wages to work for the people of Yukon. I do not believe that that is my responsibility, nor is it expected of me by the territory.

While I am on the subject, if the member across the floor would like to know what the increase of the expense allowance was to members who are required to travel as ministerial representatives, or are sent out by the Yukon Legislative Assembly in 1982-83 fiscal year, if they all got a \$25 a day increase, it would amount to \$1,300. And for this year, so far, it would amount to \$925. That is what all of this hullabaloo is about, \$2,000.

I think the member for Mayo raised a point with regard to the mine in Mayo and what it was doing — or, Elsa.

**Some hon. Member:** (*Inaudible*)

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** He wants to move it to Mayo. Perhaps he is right, he should move it to Mayo. That might be the answer.

He talked about the exploration that is being done there, and he is suggesting that the government should also be contributing there. One member, for Faro, says that because the company is losing money and because everything is closing down in Faro we should be subsidizing Faro. The other member for Mayo, where the company is making money, is saying we should subsidize there. All I ever hear is subsidy, subsidy, let us give us more federal government money.

<sup>51</sup> The money that is being expended on the exploration work in Elsa is only being done because of the tax advantages that were made available to them. So the taxpayers are indirectly subsidizing that

exploration work at Elsa. It is flow-through shares. It is tax deductible to the taxpayers, which means the federal government is not reaping the tax benefits that it ordinarily would off of those transactions. Therefore, they have passed this on to the mining companies so it is a subsidy to the mine. It is a subsidy by the taxpayers to the mine in order to do that exploration. Regardless of the arguments that the mine is doing all of this and all of that, there are taxpayer dollars involved. I think that concludes my remarks today.

*Applause*

I will be happy to stand up and argue with the member opposite at any other time.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** After that rambling, I am sure that all members are eager to listen to a lengthy, well-researched, rational speech.

I was so pleased with the news of the changes to the *Liquor Act* that I am going to confine myself to only one issue, after making a very small comment about the *Liquor Act* announcement. It reminds me of a motion that occurred on November 17, 1982, and I will be extremely pleased to watch the other member from Porter Creek vote for the Bill that will be introduced in the spring. However, I do wish to question whether the minister has considered the very beneficial effects of bringing legislation like that forward just before Christmas time. Statistically, many alcohol-related motor vehicle accidents occur around the Christmas season and it is an extremely simple amendment. There is a possibility there will not be a spring session and, God forbid, there is a possibility that the legislation will not be ready, so I would encourage him to bring the amendment forward at this session. I assure him that we will go for it and assure a speedy passage through the House.

After saying that, I am going to confine my remarks to essentially one issue and that centres around the announcement about the courthouse. We, of course, were very, very pleased to hear about a new court building. It has been discussed here on many occasions, and was very accurately and appropriately stated, by the minister and the government leader that it was long overdue and the present accommodation unacceptable and the administration of justice will be enhanced by a courthouse. However, this is the time, obviously, where we get an opportunity to comment on what was done, and to make a statement about whether or not it was well done. Or, to put it in the words of a past minister, now a backbencher, it is the job of the opposition to suggest improvements and suggest ideas. Well, I do have a few ideas on the subject of the courthouse. I have previously expressed some of them and I am going to very briefly mention some others.

<sup>52</sup> First of all, on the general question of whether or not it was well done, I wish to comment on the problem, or the discussion, around whether the building that the court is in should be an entirely separate building, or if other government officials should be housed in the same structure. If that occurs, it gives the appearance that those government probation officers, government lawyers, or whatever have an inside track, or are closer to the establishment — if I can phrase it that way — than are the litigants in the court, accused people, witnesses and private lawyers.

It is a serious issue and we have answered it historically a long time ago, and we have built separate courthouses for the judiciary all across the country and, indeed, in all the commonwealth countries, and also other countries. I know the Law Society is discussing that issue with the minister and I offer those comments that there is a serious enhancement of the public view of justice if there is a courthouse and not a government office. I see the minister is indicating that it is already too late.

It probably is already too late to have a constructive effect on that building. I would like to make a comment on the architecture of the building, and the nature of the building. It is extremely important because the building which was announced is a steel girder structure. That is extremely significant because it practically means that the construction work will be awarded to an out of territory construction company, the same as the Whitehorse airport. That is what it practically means. We should have a designed building with a specific consideration to the kinds of work the Yukon builders are able to do now. It was not well done.

Another issue is the building materials. There are some kinds of

Yukon rock that are extremely good for building. Rock buildings or stone buildings are unusual in the territory. There are a very few of them, but there could be more, and it would involve a new Yukon trade of quarry Yukon stone. It would be very long lasting, and it would be extremely practical. I mentioned logs as well. Rock and logs are extremely pleasing combinations and in public buildings, we should consider local materials, local builders, and local architects. That is a Vancouver building, as is this structure. It is a shame that it is probably too late but, in the future, I hope there are Yukon buildings built by Yukoners. It is a shame that this one probably will not be.

<sup>53</sup> We are all pleased at the economic stimulus of a new building, all of us are, and we are not criticizing that. However, we should pause for a moment and consider that there is \$13,000,000 being spent here on the justice system, and our leader mentioned that there are 22,000 or 23,000 people; that is a lot of dollars per person.

It is interesting that the official statistics Canada figures show the Yukon, especially some of the smaller communities, as having among the highest crime rates in Canada. Now, the dollar figures and the crime rates are interesting statistics, but all of us know this is basically a law-abiding community. There is no organized crime at all here. It is a good community to live in. You can walk on any street at any time in the Yukon and be safe, with one or two very, very minor exceptions to alcohol abuse. And we are experiencing this tremendous expense and these crime statistics, and I say simply that I ask if it would be more beneficial and a better expenditure of our time, effort and our money, the taxpayer's money, and achieve a greater result, if we paid attention to the justice programs, and the preventative programs, especially around the areas of child abuse and family violence and alcohol abuse.

If those social problems were addressed with the same amount of dollars that the buildings get, the ultimate result would be tremendously better, four-fold, five-fold, ten-fold better. There is even concrete information about that, scientific information, from the United States and the larger provinces. Some things have been done; they have not been well done. They could have been done better, and I welcome at this opportunity to express the views I have about that particular area.

<sup>54</sup> *Motion agreed to*

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

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

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

*Motion agreed to*

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

*The House adjourned at 4:45 p.m.*

