



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 3

2nd Session

26th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

Thursday, October 3, 1985 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

## CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West	Government Leader. Minister responsible for: Executive Council Office; Finance; Economic Development, Mines and Small Business; Public Service Commission
Hon. Dave Porter	Watson Lake	Government House Leader. Minister responsible for: Tourism; Renewable Resources.
Hon. Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre	Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.
Hon. Piers McDonald	Mayo	Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Bureau.

## GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

### New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassi	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

## OPPOSITION MEMBERS

### Progressive Conservative

Willard Phelps	Leader of the Official Opposition Hootalinqua
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East
Doug Phillips	Whitehorse Riverdale North

### Liberal

Roger Coles	Liberal Leader Tatchun
James McLachlan	Faro

## LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Hansard Administrator	Dave Robertson

**01 Whitehorse, Yukon**

Thursday, October 3, 1985 — 1:30 p.m.

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

*Prayers*

**DAILY ROUTINE**

**Speaker:** We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper.  
Introduction of Visitors?  
Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

**TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I have for tabling the response to written question number four.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I have two legislative returns for tabling, which are in response to two questions from Mrs. Firth, the Member for Riverdale South.

**Speaker:** Are there any Reports of Committees?  
Introduction of Bills?

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill No. 40: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I move that Bill No. 40, *Third Appropriation Act, 1985-86, be now introduced and read a first time.*

**02 Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Government Leader that Bill No. 4 entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 1985-86* be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Speaker:** Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?

Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period.

**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I rise on a point of correction to yesterday's *Hansard* on a question that was asked by the Member for Porter Creek East in respect to block land transfers. The numbers that I gave in answer were numbers that were supplied to me incorrectly by the department. I have the correct numbers which I will read into the record.

Of the agricultural land applications received currently proceeding to the Federal/Territorial Lands Advisory Committee, or the Lands Advisory Committee set up under the Government of Yukon for federal lands, there are currently six, which are going to be dealt with today. There are currently five for Commissioner's lands.

In the review process, which is examined by the departmental officials looking for possible conflicts, on federal land there are 143 and on Commissioner's lands there are 12. Those that have been withdrawn or rejected for a multitude of reasons: 34 on federal land, 34 on Commissioner's land. Those applications that are currently on hold: 18 on federal lands, five on Commissioner's lands. Those in the process for an agreement for sale or land that is in the process of being transferred: on federal lands seven, on Commissioner's lands, 23. The number of applications with respect to federal lands, 208; with respect to Commissioner's lands, 83. Total applications that have been received to date, 291.

**03**

**Question re: Federal/Territorial Lands Committee**

**Mr. Phelps:** I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources, arising from the rather confusing figures we are getting. I understand the Minister to be saying that there were six

applications going before the Federal/Territorial Lands Committee today?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes, that information is correct. Six applications are to be reviewed by the Federal/Territorial Lands Committee today.

**Mr. Phelps:** As my supplementary to the same Minister: since this new government took office, are these not the first agricultural applications brought before this Committee?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I am not entirely sure on that particular question. There have been a number of applications; as to whether or not the six that we are talking about today represent the only six applications that have been brought before the Federal/Territorial Lands Advisory Committee since the elections occurred, I do not know the correct answer to that. I will undertake to bring that information to the member opposite.

**Question re: Land Claims/land transfers**

**Mr. Phelps:** I have a question for the Honourable Government Leader, which has to do with some questions and answers yesterday about the working group established from the Land Claims table to develop a process for dealing with land transfers. I am wondering whether he could advise this House as to who sits on that Committee.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I am going to have to depend on my memory slightly, and if I am in error, I hope that the Leader of the Official Opposition will forgive me and I will get the correct information later. I believe we are talking about Mr. Bob Friesen, from the federal government; Mr. Fred Privett, from the Yukon government; and Glenn Brady for the Council for Yukon Indians.

**04 Question re: COPE Environmental Review and Screening Committee**

**Mr. Phelps:** A question for the Minister of Renewable Resources: in June, Mr. Crombie, the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, asked your government to name a member to the COPE Environmental Review and Screening Committee. I asked about this in July, and am wondering whether you have named a member as of yet and, if so, who?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes, we have named a member to the committee as well as to the arbitration board, and the other environmental review committee that is necessary under the COPE final agreement. The process, as it works, is that we must make a decision regarding our nominees; then we have to inform the Minister of Indian Affairs by way of a letter seeking concurrence with those nominees from the Minister of Indian Affairs, which we have done.

**Mr. Phelps:** You did not answer us as to whom you named. Is that because you just sent the letter out to the Minister, or are you in a position to tell us the names of these people you have appointed?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** We have made a decision as to who we think should sit on it. We have asked the people; they have agreed. We have sent it to the Minister of Indian Affairs, and I think that, in all due respect to the Minister of Indian Affairs, we would like his comments with respect to those nominees prior to making the names of those individuals public.

**Mr. Phelps:** My concern simply is that Yukoners need jobs and this is an important step in getting something going on the North Slope. The Minister asked for the names on the Review and Screening Committee in June. Can you tell us when you advised the Minister of your proposed appointments?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The request may have been made by the Minister in June, but the delay in immediately responding to naming members to the committee and getting those committees off the ground was that the necessary implementation funds for the final agreement of the Inuvialuit lands settlement had not cleared the federal Treasury Board. As to when we advised the Minister on an official basis regarding the names that we had put forward as our nominees to those boards, I signed those letters to the Minister of Indian Affairs today.

<sup>05</sup> **Question re: Director of Alcohol and Drug Services**

**Mr. Coles:** My question is for the Minister of Health and Human Resources. Will the Minister inform the House on the procedure she followed to determine which applicant was more qualified for the position of Director of Alcohol and Drug Services?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I am not really sure what the procedure is. That is done through the Public Service Commission and I would have to find out from them the process that they followed. If the member would like that information, I would certainly be happy to bring it back to him.

**Mr. Coles:** Thank you, I would like that information. Did the Minister take into account that the Yukon applicant has lived in our territory for ten years, much of this time spent doing social work along with drug and alcohol counseling in all the smaller communities? Was the invaluable experience, which has been acquired by this applicant, not taken into consideration when the position was filled?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I was not involved in the interviews that were taking place. As a matter of fact, some of the things that the member is asking are strictly confidential. If I do have that information, I would not be prepared to talk about it here.

**Mr. Coles:** These things are not confidential to anyone who has known this person for any length of time.

I would suggest that a serious blunder has been made in the Minister's department by going outside the territory to hire this person. It seems that we have a most experienced and qualified person in the territory who has applied for the job. I would also suggest that the Minister seriously reconsider the hiring of the outside person and take another look at the applications.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** If I may, as the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, say, with kindness, to the Leader of the Liberal Party that it has not been the custom in this House to discuss personnel matters of individual cases, particularly on the floor of this House. If an individual has a grievance about the way in which he was dealt with in a competition run by the Public Service Commission, we will endeavour to arrange, either through the individual's representative, if they choose to have their MLA speak to the question, or someone else, to discuss those matters in private and review the competition and the file.

I am sure that members who have been here a while will know that every one of us has dozens of such complaints in the course of any year. We have developed some processes or procedures for investigating them, pursuing them and discussing them. Not, I emphasize right off, that we are always happy with the resolution. I think it is best for the sake of the individuals involved that those questions are not dealt with publicly.

<sup>06</sup> **Question re: COPE boards**

**Mr. Phelps:** A question for the Hon. Government Leader, again to do with these appointments to the COPE boards: I am rather appalled that a letter only went out today, and I really do not find the excuse of a federal problem with their funding entirely adequate. Is that the only reason for this unseemly delay?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I assume, because I happen to know in one or two cases there were people whom we were suggesting who subsequently had reason to reconsider the advisability of their serving. I believe it took some time, in a couple of cases, to get a decision from the person we were proposing. There is one person we had approached back in July who gave ready agreement, but we wanted to convey the nominees of all three names to the Minister at the same time.

**Mr. Phelps:** Can the Hon. Government Leader advise this House as to whether this government has had any meetings with Kiewit with regard to their proposed project on the North Slope?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Officials of this government have had meetings both with Kiewit and Monanco/Interlog about their proposals for the project on the North Slope. They have essentially been background briefing meetings from the proponents to the government. The information that we have received to date has been fairly general. Any decisions that YTG may make in respect to support for the project would require further information and discussion with the proponents. I would add, also, that we have had

some informal discussions with federal officials at various levels about certain aspects of these proposals as well.

**Mr. Phelps:** Has this government made it clear to the Minister of Northern Affairs that it is eager to see some development as long as it is not environmentally harmful in the northern area of Yukon, and that it would press to see some development take place and the decisions made?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Phrased in those terms, no, we have not said exactly those words to the federal government. We, of course, as the Member opposite will know, also have concerns about the developments in that area, maximizing local employment and local business opportunities, as well as the concern about the environmental question properly raised by the Member. It is our conclusion that at the present moment the Yukon has received inadequate benefits from the developments that are going on already, and our initiative is going to be maximizing it.

<sup>07</sup> **Question re: Exco Energy Limited creditors**

**Mr. Phillips:** I have a question for the Government Leader also. Could the Government Leader explain why the Yukon government will not provide any assistance other than moral support to the approximately 20 Yukon small businesses that are creditors of Exco Energy Limited?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I gathered the other day that the Leader of the Official Opposition was berating me loudly for never saying "no" to anyone. This was a case where I received a representation. We took it very seriously. We took it to the management board of this government. We discussed it at great length and concluded that we could not set the precedent in the case of bankruptcies of providing financial assistance to claimants. Government officials are in close contact with the Yukon creditors' group and will be informed by the creditors' representatives, who I understand are Mr. Charlie Friday and Mr. Hector Lang, of any decisions reached at the upcoming meeting that is going on, I gather. Until the creditors, of course, decide if they will accept Exco's offer — which I understand is on the table now — there is little more that the Government of Yukon can and probably should do in a financial way.

**Mr. Phillips:** Since the Government of the Northwest Territories is providing assistance to its Exco creditors in the form of paying travel expenses and other legitimate expenses of its Exco creditor representative, will the Government of Yukon at least provide equivalent assistance to Yukon's Exco creditor representative?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** That was exactly the content of the representation made to us by the Leader of the Official Opposition. That was the question which I took to the management board and that was the question that the decision of the management board, with regret, had to decline because we thought it would set an unfortunate precedent that we could not justify in all cases in the future.

**Mr. Phillips:** In view of the Government Leader's concern about creating a negative precedent, could he then explain why he can provide no assistance to these Yukon businesses in the form of a low-interest loan and loan guarantees, and then he can give a \$68,000 contribution to Han Fisheries, an outright grant, that put a local Dawson entrepreneur out of business and cost seven jobs? Just what is the policy of the Yukon Government on this contribution program?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** In a short supplementary, of course, I cannot fully explain the philosophy of the government in respect of the contribution program for Han, which was a project we initiated in part to save 15 jobs but also to protect our position in the salmon industry, which could not be protected by having someone buying fish off the back of a truck.

As the Leader of the Official Opposition well knows, the federal officials we contacted advised us that it would be a potentially serious problem for the Government of Yukon to get involved in bankruptcy proceedings and actions of creditors. We could confuse issues considerably. There is, as members who are trained in the law will know, a considerable body of law there. The legal advice we received and, I may say, the political advice we received was

for us not to do it.

<sup>08</sup>

**Question re: Local hire**

**Mrs. Firth:** I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission. It results from a memo I received from the Minister of Education regarding the question I asked about local hire. In the memo the Minister of Education states, "this government is committed to hiring the maximum number of qualified local people". In a very short response, could the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission tell me what his government's policy is regarding maximum number. I only want a number or a percentage for an answer.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** We have no quota for local hire, if that is what the member is asking. We have no percentage. If ever we could reach the point where 100 percent of our recruitment could be done locally, I think that might be desirable. I do not doubt though that this government is going to continue to need skills which cannot be developed or attained here and, for the foreseeable future, are going to have to bring in some people from outside.

The problem, as I indicated to the member yesterday, is that we may not in the past have committed sufficient training dollars to develop the skills that are needed in this public service. That might be an educational problem; it may be a personnel problem in this government, but it is exactly the kind of thing I want to look at and do something about.

**Mrs. Firth:** I remember very well the member, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, criticizing the former government because they were bringing people in from outside, maintaining a very high standard, which the Minister of Education also refers to in this letter. The Government Leader espouses his local hire policy and makes it sound like a 100 percent local hire policy. Does he really have a local hire policy, yes or no?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Yes. We have it as a major political objective. If the Member is suggesting in the preamble to her question that we should abandon merit principles, then I would have to say that we are not going to abandon the merit principle. We are going to hire people who are qualified for positions. There is, however — and I concede readily and it is something we are going to have to do something about in the next few months and years — the fact that we are continuing to spend far more money on recruitment than we do in training. That is something that I criticized in opposition and, believe me, I continue to criticize it in government.

**Mrs. Firth:** So, I gather that the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission is telling this House that his idea and his policy regarding local hire is exactly the same as it was when he was the Leader of the Opposition, yes or no?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** No. I cannot say that it is exactly the same. I hope that it has improved. I hope that the experience of government has allowed me to mature a little bit and make my ideas slightly more sophisticated.

Of course, I had such a long way to come, compared to the sophistication of the Member opposite. I do my best in my own small way.

I do not expect that I shall live long enough to see a 100 percent local hire. The member opposite may. Good luck to her if she can. I am going to try to move it from the situation it is now in and improve it considerably in whatever time I have in office. It is a reasonably modest objective, but I am committed to it.

<sup>09</sup>

**Question re: Judges**

**Mr. McLachlan:** Yesterday the Minister indicated the complement of Territorial Court Judges is three. Unless that has just changed in the previous week, I was always under the impression it was two. Who is this mysterious third person, from where did he or she suddenly appear, and when?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The confusion in the Member's mind is obviously around the word complement. The word complement means the authorized number of personnel in the department. We have budgeted for the salaries and the other requirements for three judges. Presently there are two appointed, and one vacancy. One of the two appointed is on a leave of absence.

**Mr. McLachlan:** Do I understand the Minister correctly to say that he budgets for three and hires only two within the department? Is it correct to presume that there is at least one-third of the dollars carried over in that particular allotment for Territorial Court judges then?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** No, the intention is to appoint three judges. A recruitment action for the third person is underway, supervised, as is required by statute, by the Judicial Council. When the third judge is appointed, there will be no vacancies.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I think perhaps all the agony over the vacancy of the judges can be answered simply and painlessly by telling us with a straight yes or no: when will we expect the vacancy caused by the departure of Judge Stuart to be filled?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Judge Stuart has not created a vacancy. He is on a leave of absence. As to the vacancy, the appointment will be made, I sincerely hope, very shortly after the recommendations of the Judicial Council are received. I am expecting that before Christmas. The practical vacancy of the leave of absence of Judge Stuart, which the Member is referring to, is being filled by the use of deputy judges. There have been administrative arrangements made to utilize especially two deputy judges on a fairly long-term arrangement, and, practically speaking, there is no vacancy. There is no increase in cost, and there is no increase in court backlog.

<sup>10</sup>

**Question re: Skagway Road**

**Mr. Lang:** I have a question for the Minister of Community Affairs and Transportation Services. It has to do with the question of the year round opening of the Skagway/Carcross Road. As he knows, an agreement in principle had been reached prior to the election, with the State of Alaska, for the purposes of opening that road for year round transportation, depending on conditions that had to be negotiated, and were all practical terms, if I recall correctly, that had been negotiated prior to the change of government. I know that the Minister has had access to those discussions and files relating to it. Since it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, could the Minister table the document that was referred to in the Speech from the Throne?

I am prepared to wait until he gets instructions.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** First of all, the part of the preamble to the member's question was incorrect. I believe the previous government was involved, along with Mr. Philipsen, in reaching an understanding, not an agreement in principle of any sort with the Government of Alaska. They made that perfectly clear to us. I would be perfectly happy to detail in some respects some of the items that have been negotiated in the interim between the time the previous government left office and the new government has taken office, but, I would like to tell him that the Executive Council of this government has not ratified the agreement. Until such time as they do, the administrative arrangements will remain administrative arrangements.

**Mr. Lang:** I was told in a press release, three weeks ago, that the two administrations had reached an agreement, the Minister had gone to Juneau, and that the Executive Council here was prepared to make a decision. When does this government make a decision? Maybe I had better ask the government Leader: when does Cabinet meet and when does it make a decision? When is the decision going to be made by an agreement that was reached and mentioned in the Speech from the Throne? It should be a public document today, not three weeks from now.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I enjoyed the member's statement. The agreement has not yet been ratified by this Cabinet, nor the executive in Alaska, which we will want to have done. The Governor's office and the Executive Council office of this government are trying to schedule a signing arrangement. In any case, I reiterate what I have said before, which is a very, very important fact, that this agreement is contingent on the reopening of the Cyprus Anvil Mine. Since, my experience with the Cyprus Anvil project has been that the minute I nail down one element, and think that we just about have everything wrapped up, something else comes loose and I have to nail it down. We will give final

approval to this thing as part of a package to reopen the mine. That will go to Cabinet the minute I get certain phone calls.

**Mr. Lang:** We understand that the agreement is conditional upon Cyprus Anvil opening up the mine. The question that I have for the government Leader: — or maybe the back-bench can answer — are the principles that were being negotiated, and had pretty much been agreed to by the two administrations, the same in the present administrative arrangement or have they changed significantly and is the cost still going to be borne by some other party than this government? Maybe the Minister for Renewable Resources can answer that?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I can tell the Member that the agreement is better than that which was negotiated by the previous government. The arrangements are not only better but they are less costly.

11  
**Question re: Land claims**

**Mr. Phelps:** Given this new era of open government that will agree that something is contingent on something, the same thing applies to land claims, of course. We made all the information available that we possibly could about the subagreements that were negotiated, despite the fact that they were all contingent upon a final package coming together. But that is a preamble.

The public is becoming increasingly concerned about what, if any, stand this government intends to take on land claims. I would like to ask about the position on a couple of basic issues to try to get some reassurance to the people out there.

Does this government support in principle the one government or co-operative government model that was developed by the three parties over the course of the past six years?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I must say I am appalled; I am saddened. I just had a question from a man who negotiated land claims for, it seemed like, a hundred years. It took me six years as a member of the Legislature to get a briefing as to what was going on. The Leader of the Official Opposition, who never came before this Legislature to explain what was going on in land claims, who is now leader of a party which refused to let the Council for Yukon Indians even appear before this Legislature to explain what is going on in land claims is going to talk about land claims secrecy? He cannot do it with a straight face.

We are now in the process of negotiating with the federal government and with the Council for Yukon Indians a memorandum of understanding about the processes by which we will negotiate land claims, a land claims negotiations which, under the tutelage of the member opposite, had fallen apart; an agreement which had been rejected; and we are having to start over again to put things back together. We will not be negotiating in public any more than the member opposite. However, when we want to talk about broad principles, as he well knows, there are all sorts of new elements which affect what we used to call the one-government arrangement and the governmental arrangements in this territory. They are not only the self-government initiatives, which were pursued and promoted by the Conservative Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs this morning by the transferring of some money and consequently some power to Indian Bands, but also arrangements about our operation here in the territory, which are, in fact, a fit subject for discussion at the land claims tables.

I do not want to close any doors in those discussions; I do not want to take the position of the member opposite, which is that self-government is a non-starter. I think we are all clearly going to have to talk about it, and I am going to be prepared to talk about it. I do not know what it will mean in practical terms, and I do not know whether what we end up with in land claims will resemble at all what the member opposite used to talk about as one government. But we are going to try and go back to the table and get an arrangement which is good for the people of Yukon.

**Mr. Phelps:** I understand that the Government Leader gets tired from all the work he does, and cranky in Question Period, and so on, but he should at least acknowledge one fact: there has been a change, because we made the elements of the package available to the press, sometimes we discussed all the elements except the outstanding issues with the press before agreements were signed. This was something that was done daily, weekly, whatever. We put

out our position and we adhered to our position throughout the land claims discussions, and now this government is saying nothing. I find that appalling. I just want an answer to this question: does this government intend to honour the present subagreements in principle which were signed by all three parties, until they are amended, at least, at the land claims table?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I do not know, that sounds to me suspiciously like a legal question. I do not know what legal effect, if any, or what force in law the present subagreements have. I am saying, as a parliamentarian, that I am appalled at the assertion of the Member opposite that he briefed the press. Because, as a Member of this Legislature, as a person who represents more people in my constituency than anybody else in the House, I was never, ever, given the courtesy of a briefing on land claims by the Member opposite, until the thing was a done deal, as far as he was concerned. For six years I sat in this House and could not find out a thing, because I was told that if I had a briefing I could not ask questions.

This negotiator showed complete contempt for this Legislature in never coming before this Legislature or meeting with the Members, privately or publicly, to explain what was going on. Our negotiator has written to the Member opposite, has phoned the Member opposite, trying to offer to consult with him, and talk to him about it. As I understand, the Member opposite has not communicated back.

**Mr. Phelps:** First of all, you are completely wrong. I did phone and leave a message. I am perfectly willing to meet with Mr. Stuart anytime to consult about any matter he wishes to. The point is that I worked for the government as negotiator, before I became Government Leader. I briefed him fully, and your caucus, on instructions from the government, with whom I was employed.

At that time all the elements were fully discussed with the media, in the press, and you cannot tell me that you or your caucus did not have ready access to these agreements, in any event, given your position with CYI.

I simply want to ask this government if it intends, in spirit, to honour the present package until the package is amended or changed completely by the parties.

**Mr. Lang:** Yes or no.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I love the marvelous simple-mindedness of the Member for Porter Creek East: "yes or no".

If we can negotiate land claims on the foundation, or build from the wreckage of the old negotiations, using some of those materials and using some of those subagreements, and we can resurrect them into a new settlement, I would assume that that would expedite the settlement considerably. It would take less time to conclude. If we can do that, fine, but we have not even got to the stage of talking about the settlements yet.

The Member opposite assumes I know about detailed subagreements. I had one briefing in six years as a legislator. After six years of asking, I finally got one. I got one afternoon. I subsequently was given documents and then told I could not discuss them.

If and when, and I hope it is soon, we can come to an agreement, a memorandum of understanding, which is the first document that we will have negotiated with the Council for Yukon Indians and the Government of Canada, I would have every intention, every wish, from my own point of view, of making it public, and discussing it and debating it in this House.

13  
**Question re: Local hire**

**Mr. Coles:** My question is for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister confirm or deny to this House whether or not his department went outside of the Territory to hire a learning assistant for one of the Watson Lake Schools when there was a fully qualified learning assistant, already a resident of the Yukon, living in Watson Lake who had made an application for that position?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I sent a letter to the Leader of the Liberal Party dated today regarding staffing and teachers in Watson Lake. The question previously had been put to the Department of Education as to three positions: a principal, a French teacher and a person involved with the alternative program at Watson Lake.

If the member is referring to the learning assistant as being the person involved with the alternative program, then the answer is in the letter as I stated it. If the person he is referring to is some other personnel matter in that particular school, then I would ask him to give me notice on questions such as this because I do require some detail. If it is a personnel matter at all, I will not be responding on the floor of the House, but I will respond confidentially to him through the mail or verbally.

**Mr. Coles:** This is not a personnel matter; it is a question of the local hire policy of this government. The question put to your department is not answered in the memo that I received from you. Did your department hire a learning assistant from outside of this Territory for the school in Watson Lake when there was a qualified learning assistant living in Watson Lake who applied for the job?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** If that particular issue is not addressed in the letter, then because it is of a specific nature and because I do not know the details of every hiring of every new teacher or position in this government, or in my departments, I will have to respond in writing or verbally to the member at some other time after I have researched the question in some formal, thorough manner.

**Mr. Coles:** This is the second request to your department on this question. All I am asking is: did this learning assistant get hired from outside the territory? A simple question. This is the second written answer I have received from you and neither one has answered that question.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I do not want to repeat the answer in full. The answer is exactly as I have stated. If it is not responded to in this letter, I will have to get together with the member because he is not obviously making himself clear. We are not obviously responding to his desires. We will get together perhaps anytime today to find out exactly about whom he is speaking. I will research it through the department to determine their reasons for hiring a given person in a given location in a given community.

**Speaker:** The time for Question Period has now elapsed. We will now proceed with Orders of the Day.

#### 14 ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### Motion No. 1 — adjourned debate

**Speaker:** Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Clerk:** Motion moved for address by the Member for Old Crow.

##### Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** It is my privilege and pleasure to respond to the Speech from the Throne, as it was a speech which outlines a very significant agenda for this government and the Legislature to consider. The departments for which I am responsible, and I, have been working hard to promote the clearly stated policy objectives of this government, and to operate in an open and straight-forward manner which I hope will be the hallmark of this government.

I am not appalled that the Liberal Leader is appalled that the Leader of the Official Opposition is appalled at the substance of the Throne Speech. I applaud the Liberal Leader for his recognition of the obvious fact that this government is more open and more fair; it is not all self-serving in the manner of the previous government.

The Leader of the Official Opposition yesterday did not recognize any different policy initiatives from the time that the Conservatives were in office. He did not recognize the significant policy direction in terms of decentralization of government, which this government has championed. He did not recognize the devolution of central authority to elected community governments through a capital formula, which this government has championed. He did not recognize an awareness of the problems association with Indian education, which this government has recognized. He has not recognized the change of policy with respect to the concentration of effort of local hire and use of local materials. He did not recognize the fact that this government for the first time is going to implement a comprehensive training strategy, that it is going to provide coordination to training programs, that it is going to provide real

political attention to a training strategy for this government, and not just accept what the federal government has offered in the past.

He did not recognize these issues because, perhaps, he did not recognize them as being issues in the first place. In the last few months we have made significant efforts to decentralize this government. In my own departments we have discussed the provision of capital funding for organized communities around the territory in a fair manner, on the basis of a formula that cannot be manipulated at the political level. We have talked about decentralization of some control to school committees. We are talking about decentralization of some authority with respect to library boards for community libraries. We are looking at the relocation of some civil servants — that is in the planning stages — to some rural communities. I am thinking specifically of the superintendent in my own department, at least, the position of the Superintendent of Education. We have given consideration to the recognition of the problems that Indian children face in the territory with respect to education. We have given consideration to the problems that all children in rural communities face with respect to education.

<sup>15</sup> I am hoping that we will be in a position to report positive results in the very near future on those initiatives. Quite clearly, in a short period of four months it is very difficult to steer the ship of state, to steer the juggernauts which make up the various departments of this government in a direction which is, in some respects, very different from that which was taken by the previous government.

We have made significant effort in terms of enforcing local hire provisions in this government. Quite clearly, as the Members have failingly attempted to point out in Question Period, there is a problem with respect to the ability to fill positions for which there are no qualified personnel. As the Government Leader has stated, we will attempt to ensure that local people are qualified to fill the positions because we do not intend to compromise the merit principle, but we do intend to seriously promote local hire efforts wherever possible.

The criticism from the Conservative side of the House is something which is rather puzzling, in many respects. We have taken, they suggest, their already settled problems and have announced them as our own. The issue we must address, though, is whether or not we have taken issues and have simply restated them as they put them or whether or not we have improved upon them to any appreciable extent. With respect to the Skagway Road Agreement — I believe there is one Member in the House who was involved currently — the previous Government had initiated discussions with Alaska on the road agreement and we have taken that specific initiative and, in my estimation, have improved upon it quite significantly.

It is interesting to note, as well, that this summer the same party has given us to believe that they would want everyone to rethink the rail option, which is an indication of indecisiveness and certainly schizophrenia on this particular subject. In any case, I think that it is important to recognize that the road negotiations were taken well in hand by this Government. A great deal of attention was paid to the many details associated with negotiating that particular agreement and we have responded in a positive way. We have established that this will not be a stumbling block in the general negotiations to reopen Cyprus Anvil Mine.

With respect to the NCP transfer, it is very much the same situation where we have taken an initiative which was announced by the federal Conservative Government. We have established our own working committee. We have formulated a position, which had not been formulated before. We have established a position at the negotiating table and we have done so so expeditiously that the Government of the Northwest Territories is now finding itself behind the eight ball, so to speak, in terms of trying to establish a position so that we can go together to Ottawa to expedite a transfer of that particular corporation.

<sup>16</sup> With respect to the comments made by the Opposition Leader regarding the permanent fuel tax, I think this was an issue which was championed by all parties during the election. I seem to recall all parties, at least in my riding, championing this particular issue. The difference, I guess, between what was championed during the election and what has been delivered is something significantly

different. The Conservatives, as I recall, championed an offer of fuel tax primarily for the mining industry and we have delivered a fuel tax rebate for a number of other industries, including the mining industry. So what we have delivered and what they have promised are, in fact, two different things, and I am happy to say that we have fulfilled the commitment and have done so in a timely way.

I would like to just briefly talk about an issue and indulge in a little constituency politics here — my own constituency politics — as it was not brought up in the Opposition Leader's remarks with regard to status for a little community in my riding, which has deserved some attention by the government and is now finally getting that attention.

The community is, of course, Elsa, as the Member for Porter Creek is aware. It is a community that had desired for some time to receive some status, to receive some consideration by the territorial government, not only through a funding commitment but through attention, and the government, I am proud to say has given the community both attention and will give the community the funding resources it deserves. Hear, hear.

The Leader of the Official Opposition did discuss the issue of the community college and suggested that we were trying to capitalize on a project which was essentially started by the Conservative administration with respect to the building of the new community college in Whitehorse. We have taken that particular ball and run with it and have expanded our sights to include more emphasis on education because, when we came to deal with the issue for the first time, there was certainly a minor rebellion growing amongst the users of that particular facility in terms of their not having been able to provide the kind of input that they needed to make the building a building which they could feel comfortable with. We have, I believe, successfully satisfied the many concerns. We have, as well, satisfied the concerns expressed by many rural people with an indication that we are going to take rural delivery of college courses more seriously than did the past governments. We have added to that a rather exciting prospect, in my opinion, and that is the devolution of the college to the direction of a board of governors.

<sup>17</sup> We would hope to be able to provide a discussion paper which would account for our feelings as to the direction which the College should go by the end of this year.

I would like to turn my sights now briefly on the Member for Kluane, for whom I have had greatest respect in the past. I recall during the summer session that I expressed disappointment in the statements last session and now his statements are not an aberration but seem to represent true character.

The Member said that a lot of people have toured his riding and he has not seen much action. I believe, in the time since assuming Office as Minister of Education and Minister of Community and Transportation, I have been in his riding dealing with his constituents problems, I believe, four times. Four times in four months. We had problems associated with subdivision. The problems were not of our making, but certainly problems for which it was our responsibility to find some resolution. I believe that we have successfully done that. Not only have we done that, but the community and the Champagne-Aishihik Band have in writing shown their thanks and given us the dignity of replies to our requests. They have expressed with integrity their thanks for the kinds of initiatives that we have taken.

I travelled with the Member to Burwash Landing to discuss some of the problems associated with the school in Burwash. These were problems which, for the most part, were solved for a first time in a long time. The community school at Burwash, the Chief, the Chairman of the School Committee, the Member himself, were at a public meeting. But, for the first time, the Government said: we are not going to tell you what your alternatives are, we are going to support you no matter what you suggest, given that all the alternatives that have been considered are reasonable ones. We have said to the people there that if they wanted their school in Burwash, we would give them a school in Burwash. We would provide them with a teacher in Burwash. We said that if they wanted to be bused to Destruction Bay, with only four students, we would bus them to Destruction Bay. This is something that I understand the Member

had not been able to previously achieve for his riding in his previous term in office. It is something that we provided to that community in the short time that we have been in office. This is something to which the Member has not given us the dignity of a response.

<sup>18</sup> The Member suggests that the NDP government should not now only be thinking that it is discovering rural Yukon. It is very much a truism, but we represent rural Yukon. Not only that, if the Member has at all any sensitivity to rural concerns, he will understand that those same rural concerns are being addressed with more alacrity and more expeditiously than they ever have in the past. Certainly there is nothing to suggest that this Member, the Member for Kluane, and anybody in his party has received nothing but close and careful attention by this Minister and by the other Ministers of this government.

The Member has written me a number of letters, probably in the dozens, in the last four months. Most, if not all, have been responded to. I would say at least most. I have a couple here to deliver to him today. The issues have been addressed with due consideration, with sensitivity. Many of the issues have been addressed for the first time in years. The Member still fails to give credit where it is due. It is perhaps an indication that the Member is not going to be true to the principles that we have associated with him in the past, and that is as a good loser, principles which suggest that he is a man of integrity.

There is only passing reference to the many things that have been done by the government. As I say, we have provided the school bus to Burwash. We have done our very best to provide dormitory facilities for the first time in Haines Junction. The Member may or may not be aware of the considerable difficulties that the many officials from the Department of Education had to face with in respect to determining the numbers of people who would be using the dormitory, and difficulty in finding sufficient space in time for the school year. If he is not aware of that sort of fact, I am going to make him aware of it in detail in the future.

He mentioned that he could not detect any policy issues of any kind emanating from this government. In terms of sensitivity to rural concerns, or to the many issues that I thought he was championing in the Legislature in the past, or in response to the many issues that have been championed by other rural Members in this House, both presently and in the past, that, in itself, would be a clear indication of a change of policy. I certainly would like to remind the Member that when I was a Member representing a large rural riding in this territory, not only was I seldom dignified with a response to any written requests I ever made, but I waited in some cases years, and I am still waiting in some cases, for a response. I think I am going to have to research the questions again myself, to determine whether or not an answer can be forthcoming.

<sup>19</sup> The mood in rural Yukon today, is a good deal different than it was prior to the election. I believe that if the Member does not recognize that, he is insensitive to the concerns of his constituents.

The Member has suggested that this is a caretaker government. It is a convenient little piece of political rhetoric. I can tell him that the people of his riding had better hope that we will be taking care of government for a long time to come.

I am proud to be a member of a hard working, forward thinking government, which in four short months has moved in new significant directions. The criticism that we heard yesterday was shallow and dishonest, in my opinion, given the previous government's track record. We have set a solid agenda for ourselves. We are creating a new political climate which I believe, to the Conservatives' horror, has captured the peoples attention. I think, that in the future months, given that we have only been in office for four months, we will have the opportunity to fulfill the many items on the agenda. It is a large agenda because the previous government left such a void in the political environment in this territory that we have had to set ourselves a large agenda.

I am hoping that the civil service and the Members of this House are up to the challenges that we face. I am sure that we will do well. I have every confidence in the ability of my colleagues, both in caucus and in cabinet to fulfill that agenda, and I am hoping that the criticism put forward by the Members opposite is not as shallow

and dishonest as stated already, but is in fact constructive in a manner that we expressed it while we were in opposition.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Brewster:** I would like to rise to a point of order. I did not go out to Burwash Landing with the Honourable Mr. Piers McDonald. I went up on the invitation of the Kluane Band, and I went up in my own vehicle.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** On that same point of order, it is not really a point of order, but I will respond to it in any case. The Member is quite right, he went up in his own car. We met in Burwash and we had a very good talk when we were there. I was pleasantly entertained by his family, while in Haines Junction and it was a very pleasant evening.

**Speaker:** Order. The Chair will recognize the member for Whitehorse Riverdale North.

**Mr. Phillips:** I rose in this house in mid-July in reply to the Government Leader's first Speech from the Throne. At that time, I commented on its lack of content. Today, after reading over and over the new forty-three page Speech from the Throne, I learned my second lesson in politics. We were told, and many times I might add, before, and especially after, the May election, how his government had so many things to do. When I read through the Throne Speech I realized that ninety percent or more of the pronouncements are all initiatives that the past government either began or completed, and he is now wanting to take credit for them.

<sup>20</sup> I realize that it has only been four months, a third of a year, and all his ministers have been travelling all over Canada and the world, so maybe we are a bit premature to expect any new policies from his government-in-waiting. As an Opposition member, we are supposed to provide constructive criticism. This is very difficult in most cases, looking at this Throne Speech and the budget we received last night. Aside from a few changes, it is our previous initiatives. We came here to debate and find ourselves shadowboxing. The Government Leader told Yukoners that he had so many new ideas and so much work that we would sit to, and even after, Christmas. After looking at this budget — which is, in effect, our budget, with the odd change — I cannot believe we will be here very long, unless one of this government's new and few policies is to sit every second day, take the evenings off and take a week or two break every two weeks so they can draft more policies.

The Government Leader stated yesterday that the Yukon economy remains in recession. It appears that his party policy-forming branch is also caught up in this recession. He has proposed in his budget that various committees and task forces be formed on almost every aspect of Yukon life. With these dozens of boards and committees running around the territory in the next few months forming NDP philosophy, you are indeed going to create a lot of local employment.

Although I do not disagree with all the committees and, in fact, in some specific cases they could be of benefit, the Yukon taxpayer, and ourselves, have to be asking two major questions. Firstly, who will carry the enormous cost burden of all these tours of the task forces? Second, and equally important, why are we here? I always felt that when you were elected by the people to office, they really expected us to make some decisions. Is the only new policy of this government to rule by task force and committee? If this is the case, we should dissolve the House and we could save the taxpayers of Yukon an awful lot of money. Does the party opposite not have any policies of their own? What happened to this government-in-waiting? Where is their hidden agenda? Is the plan to travel throughout the Yukon on every issue on committees and task force a way they can see all Yukon taxpayers paying for their policies?

We all knocked on doors. We all held meetings. We spoke to many people and we have, or are supposed to have, some basic party philosophies. Let us just do the job the Yukon people elected us to do. Let us work in this House and let us make some decisions.

Yesterday, in the Throne Speech, the government talked about energy programs. They also talked about more effective energy savings. I support strongly the initiatives in this field and I would like to call the government's attention to the strong concern over the

current problems of woodsmoke in Riverdale. I would hope that all avenues would be explored to alleviate this problem, keeping in mind that the burning of wood has become a major cost-saver to a lot of Riverdale and Yukon residents.

I understand that some work will be proceeding with the upgrading of Alsek Road and I am very pleased to see this happening. I was very distressed to see that the activity room at Grey Mountain Primary School was cancelled in favour of the Elsa addition. I would like to compliment the minister on the Elsa addition, but at the same time I am very disappointed that the Grey Mountain addition was cancelled. If they scrapped a couple of these touring task forces and committees, the children of Grey Mountain Primary School might have a new activity room.

I mentioned earlier in my speech that I would not rule out all committees and I would encourage this government to initiate a study or an investigation into Yukon's justice system. This one, however, should not be political. You do not have to go far in the Yukon to find many people very emotionally upset over this issue. There just does not seem to be justice any more. Vandals get off with a slap on the hand. Sexual offenders are told they should not do it any more. It just seems that the people who are forced to pay the price are the public itself. Last week the Minister of Justice seemed to be putting the blame on the Crown prosecutors and lawyers. That may be part of the problem, but you only have to talk to the RCMP and these lawyers and you will find them as frustrated as the rest of the public.

<sup>21</sup> I find it ironic that the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, who was once a Judge, has now made a major flip-flop and become a hard-liner. I suppose right now, for him, that is politically wise.

From flip-flops to floundering around; that is what we are getting from this Government. This lack of policy is beginning to hurt many Yukoners and cost Yukoners jobs.

Take the \$88,000 Han Fishery contribution as an example. The government pontificates about local hire and claims to the general public that it has saved 15 jobs by propping up this company. What it did not tell the public is that it put Han Fishery's competitor out of business and cost seven local jobs in Yukon.

Further, next year, when the Dawson area fishermen are trying to sell their catch, they will only be able to sell it to Han Fishery. With no competition, the price for their fish is bound to go down. This will hurt the Dawson Fishery. In effect, the Government, unwillingly, has created a monopoly. Is that their intention?

I asked a question about the Han Fishery contribution during the short session last July. At that time, I did not know what this new contribution program was, as I had never heard of it before. I was told by the Government Leader that it was a direct gift from the Crown, or from government, to some interest. It would appear, however, that there are no definite criteria for this program which entitles a Yukon company to receive a contribution which leads one to believe that the criteria may, in fact, be political. If the government likes you, you receive assistance. If they do not like you, get lost. Is this the policy of this government?

I am deeply disturbed by the Government Leader's refusal to consider providing any assistance whatsoever to the 20 small businesses that our creditors of Exco Energy in view of the government's outright gift to Han. There are over 60 jobs involved in these creditors. If there is a policy, would the Government Leader please tell the Yukon public and the Yukon businesses what that policy is.

You can talk about using local materials and standing for local hire all you want, until you are red in the face, but you have to know what you are doing. You have to be credible and competent. I would have a red face, if I were on the government side, from embarrassment for this gross bungling and governmental incompetence that the new government has managed to display over the course of the last four-and-a-half months. Yukoners do not have much to look forward to in this regard.

In my response to the Speech from the Throne in July, I stated that the Government Leader had a strong responsibility to give us some direction as to where his government is going. We were waiting then and we are waiting now. There is no direction and

there are no policies. I suspect that Yukoners will be left waiting for quite some time.

Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to take this opportunity, as it is the first Throne Speech debate that I have entered since the last election and the first one in which I speak as a Minister, to thank the voters of Whitehorse South Centre for electing me for the third time with an increased majority.

<sup>22</sup> I would like to say that I am taking very seriously the responsibility of making the goals and objectives that I have as Minister of Justice and Minister of Government Services public and subject to debate both here and among the general public.

As Member for Whitehorse South Centre, I recognize that I am extremely lucky in that the Legislature is within the riding. I do not have the burden of travel as the rural Members do, and there are many Whitehorse Members here and the burden of representing the interests of the city does not fall on my shoulders alone by any means.

The constituency issues that are important seem to boil down mostly to municipal issues, or issues that also involve a municipal jurisdiction. In that area, I am expressing now a resolve to promote the interests of the waterfront development plan, initiated and spearheaded primarily by the municipal government in Whitehorse, and the general improvement of the downtown area, which is promoted ably by Target Downtown.

As Minister, I wish to respond specifically to the comments made about local hire. It is the resolve of the government to do a substantially better job in the future on the local hire issue than was done by the previous government. It is our resolve to, in time, show objective measures of that. We will deal firstly within the civil service, and secondly, there is also a significant area for improvement in the private sector. The government has a very important role in that area. A prime example is the role of the private sector on government public works. It is our resolve that, not through any flamboyant political statement, but through responsible consultation and development of our policies, that the civil service in Yukon reflect the population of Yukon, that it be less a colonial civil service, and more a locally based civil service. That is something that will be achieved by degrees, and not overnight.

<sup>23</sup> It involves hiring policies, hiring practices; it involves especially training and development of the existing civil servants and potential civil servants in the population. It will involve affirmative action in order that the gender balance in the civil service reflects more accurately the gender balance in the population and similarly for the racial balance that exists here.

The Leader of the Liberal Party spoke about problems in the justice system and the Member for Riverdale North, in July and today, is calling for an investigation of the justice system. He attacks the judges for lenient sentencing. It is ironic that the Member for Riverdale North criticizes us for the extensive consultation process that we have followed in many areas, and then calls for another investigation.

I will say now that, without the need of any investigation, I am personally aware of significant problems in the system and, without the need for investigation or task forces or other public consultations, we have policies to address those problems. I will deal with them now in the general sense, but first let me say that I had no interest in becoming a politician until approximately five-and-a-half or six years ago; I went into politics specifically because of the problems that I perceived in the justice system.

<sup>24</sup> I am thankful and honoured that I am now in a position — perhaps the best position of all — to do something about them. I will not, however, simply be imposing my ideas on the various segments of the system to the extent that it is possible. I will advocate strongly and I will promote the general principles which I will be talking about. I would hope that there is a healthy debate this session about exactly these principles. I would suggest that it would be most efficiently done in general debate in Committee on the budget for the Department of Justice.

The departmental objectives in the budget have been altered from previous years and that document has already been tabled here. The

first principle is that the system must be responsive to the community needs and the expressions of what is needed in individual communities. There must be significant control by individual communities over what happens in the justice system. This can be achieved by promoting, developing and advancing to a greater extent the use of locally resident JPs. It can be achieved through the local control of the Native Courtworker Program and by the responsiveness of the Legal Aid Program to local concerns. <sup>25</sup> These are our primary objectives of the department, and I will signal not only a willingness but an eagerness to talk in greater detail about that objective during the budget.

It is my view that one of the most important things that the circuit court and the territorial court system should be doing immediately, and perhaps the most important right now, given the situation in Yukon today, is to look seriously at the question of the delay involved in the processing of criminal cases through the courts.

I have had consultations already with all segments of the system and I will be speaking at greater lengths about the policies that can be put in place to reduce the delays. I am absolutely confident that substantial improvements over the present delays can be made. I consider it as an objective measure of my success as a Minister or of my performance if that is achieved or not. It is a very fundamental goal of the government. I am putting substantial energy into that goal.

Secondly, the system has, in the past, spent too much attention on the convicted criminals and indeed occasionally, accused persons, and not enough attention on victims of crime and potential victims of crime. I totally agree with the statements made by the Leader of the Liberal Party yesterday. The attention to victims will be very substantially increased; that will have budgetary implications. I am hoping to debate constructively in this House in the weeks ahead the ways that that increased attention can result in concrete programs.

<sup>26</sup> I have some ideas myself, and I am eager to pursue that debate. I would also mention, mostly because the Member for Klwane mentioned it, that it is a goal that I have that the Corrections System can be very, very substantially improved. We are spending a lot of money on the Corrections System. It is my view that it would be a better system if the convicted persons worked, and I have a philosophy of this, or a goal that is opposed to the statements made by the Member for Klwane yesterday.

Persons in jail, I think, should be put to work, and, subject to the debates that may occur in the future, I hope to achieve that in a very, very concrete way.

The Member for Klwane criticizes that goal. I may say that I have a letter from the Town Council in Haines Junction supporting the proposal that I have put to them to establish a work camp in his constituency. Perhaps, if he is not in favour of it, the Member for Tatchun would like it in Carmacks, or perhaps, Mr. Speaker would like it in Teslin. We can debate those points, but, I am welcoming the exchange of views about the proper correctional philosophy with the Member for Klwane.

I will not go on too long. I have been very general, but I have made those statements because the criticism has been put to us that we have no policies. Those things are policies of the department, and are proposed to the Legislature, and I look forward to a debate in the future about those policies. Thank you very much.

<sup>27</sup> *Applause*

**Mrs. Firth:** The new government has tabled its first major Throne Speech, and it is the one that was to reveal the real identity of the government, I believe the Government Leader said. Instead we have received 42 pages of words, words that I think are kind of silky and soothing, but have no real substance. In politics, substance is everything.

The public does not need to be soothed, it needs to see some action. For right now it is very disillusioned, apathetic, and generally fed up with political leaders, politicians, politics and slick imagery. It is fragile and vulnerable. There is no premeditated move to instill some sort of question of confidence in the public's mind, as the Minister of Renewable Resources had accused us of last session. It is already there. However, we see now who is taking

advantage of that fragile condition and trying to capitalize on it, with silky soothing words, talk of consultation, talk of job creation, talk of social, economic and gender equality; silky and soothing talk.

Talking about job creation does not create one job, no matter how long you talk about it. Here we have a minority government so desperate to hang onto power, with two Liberals over here even more desperate to hang onto power, in bed with the NDP, one day saying their ideas are in the Throne Speech, the next day criticizing it as nothing new, selling their principles for a few thousand dollars. Well, they will not be around after the next election anyways. We have done it once before in the Yukon and it is going to happen again.

This government is so desperate that they are afraid to reveal their ideas, their opinions, their so-called vision, if they have any. Somehow I just have not seen any evidence of it. I am sure that the most spoken line in Cabinet these days is: you cannot do that you might offend somebody, you will lose us some votes. This results in having a government and the whole NDP compromising themselves to the point of not standing for anything. It is just desperation to hang onto power. All this government is concerned about is its own image, which is not necessarily in the best interests of Yukoners, because they are not working for the Yukon, they are working for themselves. They are talking a lot to us, but not working for us.

The new government has to prove its political stripe, and show the people what they stand for. They should be strutting their stuff. Instead the Member for Watson Lake, the Renewable Resources Minister, says, "We have people assembled in government to be able to assure the public that we have the ability to govern". That is not good enough. What assurance the public gets they should be getting from the politicians, not from assembled people who can write fancy words, silky smooth, soothing words.

<sup>28</sup> The public expected more. They expected something fresh, something new. They expected some enthusiasm, a new direction, some leadership, something that they could grab onto and believe in. Instead, what did they get? They got a bunch of confused, lackadaisical, do-nothing, make-no-decision politicians. Where is the leadership and the direction of this government? Where is the government taking Yukoners and the Yukon Territory? Sure, the NDP want to consult with everybody. They want to ask everyone what they want. They want to form a task force. They want to ask people what the problems are. They want to study us.

As the Member for Riverdale North said four months ago, we all knocked on doors; we all found out what people wanted, what they thought the problems were. The north has been studied and studied and studied to death. We do not need a government that wants to study the north some more. The longer this government delays decisions and the more they study, the more our future suffers for it.

I do not want to leave the impression that I am not in favour of consultation. I demonstrated in the past, as a Minister, that I believed in responsible consultation. There are two kinds of consultation: responsible and irresponsible. It is not up to the public to write government policy. To be a responsible government, a responsible government does not just go out and say, "Tell us what you want and we will give it to you; we are going to make everyone happy, particularly the noisy interest groups." A responsible government presents their ideas to the people; presents their points of view, presents their philosophy and presents it proudly, presents what they stand for and what they represent. Then they say, "Here are our ideas; this is what we stand for. If you do not agree, if you think it could be made better, tell us and we will make it better for all Yukoners." That is consultation that is responsible.

We are elected to represent our constituents and Yukoners, and, at times, after consultation, make decisions on their behalf and at times make decisions without consultation. That is what we are here for. But some politicians do not want to show the public what they represent, what they stand for. They assemble people within the government to assure the public of their ability. Well, it is up to the politicians to demonstrate his or her ability and to earn his or her credibility. We must be honest with Yukoners.

The Member for Mayo was talking about honesty. It is time we

were all honest with Yukoners, and show what we stand for. You cannot fool the public forever, because they are far too wise and far too critical for that. They know that Conservatives and the NDP are not the same, and the NDP and Conservatives do not stand for the same ideology. You are not fooling the public. We cannot be meshed and homogenized into one collective council as the Government Leader would like. We each have our own philosophy. The Conservatives have shown their political stripe. It is time for the NDP to stand up and show theirs.

*Applause*

<sup>29</sup> **Mr. McLachlan:** I wish to express my thanks for being able to deliver my first speech in the Assembly today. I would like to thank the voters of Faro, too, wherever they may now be, from Newfoundland to British Columbia to the Mexican border, for bestowing this honour upon me, for representing them in their hour of greatest need. The task is onerous, and I hope that I may indeed be worthy to rise to the cause of the time when a strong voice is needed in this Assembly for Faro.

I stand alone here today, perhaps as the only one of fifteen among us who has seen his or her riding decimated by a population exodus and shocked by a roll up and departure of industry since the May 13 general election.

The events in the Faro riding since May are familiar to you all, and I shall not bore recital of those problems again. There are people left in Faro, not many I grant you, but they are there; they are human beings and they deserve treatment as such. The most common question that I hear from people outside of Faro these days is, "how many are left"? The next obvious one which you might easily anticipate, is, "what are they doing"? The answer could be any one or all of the following: they are hoping, they are praying, they are anticipating and they are waiting, they are hanging in, they are hanging on, they are bracing themselves for a Yukon winter; but, most of all, they are hoping, hoping that this nightmare of the past year will end soon, positively rather than negatively.

In 1982 the people of Faro watched their TV screens as the iron ore industry in Northern Quebec and Labrador collapsed and came apart at the seams. Many watched moving vans being loaded up and wondered if any of those being forced to move would move to Faro. They never dreamed that they could find themselves in a similar situation some day. Well, some of those people did come to Faro, but now they have had to move on again as they became caught up in the cyclical nature of the mining industry's downward price spiral.

Streets that used to bubble with the laughter of children, now remain empty and deserted. Gardens have gone unharvested, lawns remain uncut, windows are boarded up, doors remain nailed shut. It is not a pretty picture. What used to be the second largest community is now probably the second smallest in the Yukon Territory.

The difference between our case and those in northwestern Quebec is that we still have a chance. The flame has not been extinguished for Faro, but it must be fanned, it must be fed, it must be nurtured. My community cannot survive without a massive economic transfusion. It cannot, at least as we know it as a community today.

The transfusion needle must be held and administered by governments. Its contents will be dollars and regulatory changes to allow the wheels of industry to turn again; industry that will pump much needed economic revitalization into Faro and Ross River directly. Those of you who represent the Whitehorse ridings, you too will feel an effect, because all of you have people resident in those ridings who used to work at the mine or other mines, and who could qualify for jobs in Faro again.

<sup>30</sup> An indirect effect would also be found in the ridings of Tatchun and Hootalinqua, to which the concentrate would logically pass in its journey to tidewater.

The issue of the mine's reopening is really too big to divide us along party lines. It is too great an opportunity for the Yukon to pass up, and it is too big not to demand detailed ministerial attention to solving all the inherent problems.

I wish to make a few brief comments on the Throne Speech. If

this government intends to reduce the amount of outflow of dollars spent on energy consumption, it must, as a very natural consequence of a move in that direction, look at the heating system of its own buildings, both presently owned and to be built in the future. Is the new Law Courts building being heated with a Yukon renewable resource, like wood or a wood-chip system? Not a chance. There is a huge oil tank storage capacity built into the basement of that building. And what of Yukon College? A facility that is being designed to be a pinnacle of learning and of broadening of the educational needs of Yukoners should embrace the latest of all energy saving concepts in its design and in its heating system. I would certainly hope that the Minister of Renewable Resources remembers the philosophy of the Throne Speech of Tuesday when planning is done on the heating system of the new facility being planned to comply with the *Young Offenders Act*.

Although the objective of lowering the power cost to Yukoners is commendable, all the particular mechanisms by which this objective is to be achieved are not entirely clear. It seems to me that everybody wants the power transmission, operation and maintenance of the lines, but would be very reluctant to take on the high cost of the power delivery system, namely the generation facilities or the building of those transmission lines themselves. At least they would be extremely reluctant to take on the particular infrastructure with the present debt load that is attached to it. The nature, the form and the substance of a particular development corporation to be created is critical to the success of the whole scheme.

I do not envision the grandiose plan of having all of the Yukon's assets of NCPG being transferred to this government in a gift-wrapped form without some strings attached. It may be quite imaginative to think that we would get it debt free, but it may be quite practical to realistically suspect something else.

In any event, because the resolution of problems surrounding the future of power generation and transmission within the territory is so fundamental to solving the problems in my home riding, I will offer my services to this Assembly in whatever way possible that they can be of use to facilitate the proposed transfer.

In closing, I would like to leave two thoughts with this Assembly. The Government of British Columbia has recently realized that to keep white elephants sitting and stagnating is costly and non-productive. To that end, a critical industries program with its own commissioner, has been set up. That program has recently resulted in two mining operations being restarted at Granisle and Peachland. It may very well be that a similar type of program would have to be instituted at the local level here in Yukon if current plans to open the mine should ever get sidetracked.

When the mining communities of Schefferville and Uranium City were closed, they had lived 30 to 35 years of useful productive life. Faro is barely half that; 15 and 16 is just too long to fall by the wayside and die.

Thank you.

*Applause*

**Mr. Lang:** I can sympathize with the people the previous speaker represents and with the plight that he finds himself in, as a Member, in view of what has developed. I concur with him that the solution to the situation in Cyprus Anvil, if it can be attained, should be seen from a non-partisan point of view. It is in everybody's best interest that it be resolved if it is within the financial and economic capabilities of government and business. I just want to make one cautionary note. We must make sure that any arrangement entered into will be done in such a manner that government will not be called upon for financial assistance again.

I hope the political will and the business will is there to make it a viable operation, because it is definitely in everyone's best interest.

I will say this as well: I concur, at least in part, with one of the principles in the Speech from the Throne and that is the diversification of our economy. I refer specifically to the Mount Skukum project which is quietly underway with very little fanfare and providing quite a number of jobs to the people of the territory as well as being a long term prospect for Yukon.

I think, as governments — federal and territorial — we have to be encouraging these kinds of developments. I think we are in a much

better situation if we can get five, six, eight small mines operating in Yukon as opposed to one large one which we become so dependent on that if something does go wrong, as in our case with Cyprus Anvil, everyone — forget partisan politics — suffers to some degree.

To that end, I want to make an observation to the Government Leader, and I hope he takes it constructively. I want to put to him a concern I have about his office and the staffing of his office. I am not questioning the integrity of anyone involved. What concerns me is that there are very few people in the advisory capacity at the political level who are seen to have, if you like, pro development ideas, ideology or philosophy. That concerns me because I know that in government we have to rely, to some degree, on our advisors. When I look across this floor and I see the Minister of Education, the Minister of Community and Transportation, the Minister of Housing — the list goes on — I know how busy his days are because I have been through those days, through those weeks, through those years. I just want to say to the Government Leader, from a non-partisan point of view, it does cause concern.

Perhaps, to bring some levity to the proceedings here, I did not realize that the side opposite had such a good relationship with one of the local newspapers to the extent that they have, when looking at their staff complement.

Going further, I want to refer to the comments that were made by the members opposite when they talk about an open government. I heard the Leader of the Liberal Party giving a C-plus to the government prior to even sitting in these Chambers. I have to honestly say that, in Question Period, I do not believe we have got a straight answer to any of our questions and I am saying that for all the questions that were asked by the two political parties in opposition. I just say to you that, given another day, you may be down to a C from C-plus by the Leader of the Liberal Party if this continues; and you may go down even lower. Who knows.

Just as an observation I think perhaps we sat too soon; maybe the members opposite have not had the time. I notice the Minister of Community and Transportation talks about "only four months" — maybe it is too soon for the members opposite to be able to answer the questions that have been put forward.

I think it is a legitimate observation from this side of the House, and I think it is an observation that is being made by the public. We have had set before us, effectively, a budget that is less than one percent change, incorporating, in most part, if not in totality, 99 percent of Conservative policies that were instituted over the past years and, of course, culminate in a budget on an annual basis.

While I am on that subject, I want to say this, and I guess I say it from two points of view. From an envious point of view, I see members on that side of the House put into a situation where they can make some very broad decisions because they have the financial backing of a very good public treasury that was left to them. I do not think that the Government Leader and the Minister of Finance would argue with that statement. At the same time, I am very proud to know that I was part of a government that, when I left that office — and I left the responsibilities that I had the privilege of exercising for a period of time — I left the public treasury in such a state that the government could operate, and operate efficiently, by bringing in a budget which did not require major taxation measures.

I want to put a warning forward to the side opposite. When you leave that side of the House, whether it be in retirement or returning to opposition, always keep uppermost in your mind that you have a responsibility to that public treasury, because it is the taxpayers' money that we are dealing with. You should leave it in a situation where the next government can operate and operate efficiently and, when they have new policies, they can be brought in.

I want to talk about economic initiatives. I want to say to you today that I was disappointed with the propositions that were brought forward by the Minister of Finance and in the Speech from the Throne. I thought there would have been some new initiatives brought forward on behalf of Yukon, some new ideas incorporated. Perhaps some initiatives could have been brought in regarding the private sector, but that did not happen.

We want to put a proposal forward to the side opposite. I want to refer to the Economic Development Agreement. There is a lot of

latitude in the disposition of that, I believe it is, \$18 million agreement in totality; \$10 million for tourism and \$8 million for other programs. There is a lot of latitude about how those dollars will be allocated. I recognize that, in some cases, straight contributions to non-profit organizations — i.e., Target Downtown — could, can and will be the recipients of dollars from that agreement. I think there should be a lion's share of those dollars set aside for the principal of a low interest loan program that could be revolving. A revolving loan fund could be brought forward to this House for consideration. Those dollars then could be utilized in such a manner that they would not be a one-shot \$10 million investment in tourism. It could well develop into a situation where you could have a \$50 million investment, as these dollars are utilized in the next five to ten years.

I also think that it will solve some of the problems that I see out there in the street, where if one person knows how to make out the applications, he or she can get the grants. If somebody else is too busy, or does not know which office to go to, or does not apply, or is not knowledgeable, he or she does not get the grants, and then it becomes a 'them and an us' situation. I do not think that is good for Yukon. I do not think it is good for the business community and I do not think it is good for the people involved.

I see the Minister of Community and Transportation nodding his head. I assume that he is agreeing with what I am saying.

What I am proposing to the side opposite is: why do they not bring something forward? Designate a lump sum of money and move in that direction. I have no question in my mind that overall you will get full cooperation from the business community because they recognize the problems inherent in the present system. I know that the Members opposite will get the argument from the bureaucracy that they should not proceed because it is too costly to administer. I do not agree with that argument, and quite frankly, if we had formed the government that was one of the objectives that we were going to go forward with, to put that type of a program into place, offsetting the present program of low business loans.

There is one other area in which I think that steps should be taken, and I would like to reinforce the comments that were made by the MLA for Kluane. It is the fuel tax remission order that the Government Leader so proudly proclaimed here, I believe yesterday, and in the Speech from the Throne, as the thought of including the lodges along the highway in that particular category. I want to say that I think it is a very constructive observation and I think it is one that would be in the best interests of the general public. Those people who are working in those lodges, putting in those 24 hour shifts, seven days a week, for the minimal amount of money to take home at the end of the year, should get some breaks from government.

31 I think that that is one that could be done without any major financial consequences as far as the Public Treasury of Yukon is concerned.

I want to also point out two programs, as an example of how government can make things happen. I want to harken back to when we were the government and we brought forward a much criticized policy, if I might add, on agriculture, fought by the now members of the government. In most part it was a land disposition policy which permitted people to apply and to obtain land under certain terms and conditions. When you are in government, it takes a year, or maybe two, or maybe three years to really see the long term effects of a policy decision that is taken. I want to use this as an example. The other day I had the opportunity of going down to some people's land that had been cleared along the Takhini River. That put some people to work cutting firewood and selling firewood. It put a cat skinner and a "Cat" to work. It also probably set up, or helped offset a business for the purpose of selling seed, so there were numerous spinoffs you could actually see when you went down to see the results of that policy decision. It concerns me when the government side opposite kindly takes the attitude, well, it is not really that serious, and not that much of a problem as far as standing up and trying to do everything you can to encourage the federal government, primarily, to release land.

I think it is imperative that if our regional government does not stand up for the one guy who has an application, because he is not

organized, he does not happen to belong to an interest group or anything, all he wants is to get his application in, get the land under the certain criteria that has been set down and go to work, then a government is not standing up for him or her.

I think that it is not in the best interest of Yukon if we have a government that is only prepared to listen to an interest group. The final outcome of that kind of governing is that those individuals will coalesce, and then you will have an "anti-" situation, as far as the government is concerned.

I recognize the Council for Yukon Indians and that there could be a land claims settlement in the future. I also recognize, that in most cases the land that is being applied for — land selections under the past land claims negotiations process — have been identified. If it is not conflicting with the land selections identified under the land claims settlement, what is the problem? What the Hell is the problem? Frankly, I cannot see why the government side opposite cannot stand up and say land will be disposed of. That is all we are asking.

Is it the Government of the Yukon Territory that has so proudly stood here and said they represent the people of the Territory, and rightfully so they should say that. Then they should also say that they will represent those interests, and represent them well. I have not seen any notification of it. All I have is the Ministry of Natural Resources coming in yesterday with a list and then today coming in with another list. That is how much interest is being demonstrated by this side opposite. All I can say is that we are very, very fortunate that this House is sitting now for the perspective of making this government do something.

Another example is the one the MLA for Kluane raised; the question of the Agriculture Agreement that has been with this government since June. No action has been taken.

35 They say that they have been consulting; they have been moving around the territory. That agreement, that particular agreement, affects people's ability to get into agriculture. The guy who cannot apply for a grant, the guy who does not meet the criteria, because he does not happen to be born somewhere else or somebody who does not happen to be related, et cetera, et cetera. That has been with this government since June.

Yes, I will say to the Minister of Community and Transportation, it has been with you since June.

**Some Hon. Member:** *Inaudible*

**Mr. Lang:** That is not right. It is the people out there whom we represent who are reaping the benefits of doing nothing.

There is one other area that I should raise in that same vein. I have to express my disappointment when I heard the Minister of Renewable Resources stand up today and say that they just sent off a letter today regarding their appointments to the various boards required by the Inuvialuit land claim. It was back in May, if not early June, that this government received a letter asking for nominees, and this is October. To the public they would sit there and say, "So what?" The point is, the law requires those procedures on any application for the purposes of development on our north coast. Those boards must be set up.

The Minister of Renewable Resources said they have to be funded. Then why was the Government of Yukon not standing up saying, "Here is our nominee; we want to meet". But no, he wants to sit back and say that it is a federal problem. It is not a federal problem. Why do we not take our responsibilities, exercise our responsibilities and force the Government of Canada to make their decisions. If a regional government, the Government of Yukon, is not forcing the Government of Canada, who is going to?

We are talking about people's access to jobs. This delay could well have cost us another year, and all it was was a question of appointing three people from this government. No big deal. If the Minister of Renewable Resources wishes, I will send my nominees to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, if they do not have any interest in the development of the North Slope. This side does have an interest.

Did the Minister of Renewable Resources say to me just now in the public forum that he is more than happy to accept our nominees if we put the names to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development? Yes or no?

Once again, they backpedalled — the story of their life.

**Some Hon. Member:** No Development Party — NDP.

**Mr. Lang:** There are other areas of concern, I think, with the actions of this government. It was touched on last session, and it will be touched on later on over the course of this session. That deals with the Department of Education.

<sup>36</sup> As the MLA for Porter Creek East, I am very concerned with all the major changes which have taken place in the administration. It is making it very difficult for the teaching staff and the day-to-day running of the Department of Education, whether it be here in Whitehorse or in Watson Lake. I think it is time that the government got their act together in that particular area. I want to also warn the government, and I refer once again to the statements made in the Speech from the Throne, about the consultative process they are going to go through for the purposes of the *School Act*. I want to go on the record here to say I am very, very much opposed to setting into place another system or another bureaucracy which is going to, in effect — if it does not initially, it will in the long term — bring in another taxing regime with certain authorities. I cannot see how the Minister of Education can stand up in this House and say that more authorities are going to be given away without any accountability or responsibility. I personally do not believe that the public of the Yukon Territory, contrary to the NDP task force — and I think that stems from the two annual school committee meetings held, which rejected school boards — that anyone wants to go in that direction. To save the Minister of Education from some folly, to save him from some political fall-out, I think he had better stay away from it.

My colleague from Riverdale North touched on the question of justice and I want to reinforce to the Minister of Justice what I have heard on the street, similar to the Leader of the Liberal Party. Everybody seems to be taken care of except for the victim. I think the Minister of Justice has missed the point of what has been presented to him: that there appears to be no penalties being put forward as far as the crimes that have been committed. The perception in the street is that there is no justice. Now, the Minister of Justice has outlined a plan about civil legal aid, how he is going to compensate the victims, et cetera, et cetera, and one element about perhaps putting people to work. The general public has perceived, from the sentencing that has gone on for quite some time and is culminating now obviously in this discussion in this House because it is a very delicate area to discuss, that the criminal, the one who is convicted through our court system, appears to be getting off scott-free. I think that message has to get out to those who are administering the judicial system because, in order for a democratic system to survive — whether it be in Yukon, whether it be in Ontario, whether it be in Canada or the United States of America — you have to have respect for your judiciary or you have nothing.

I just want to bring that concern to you because I think it is a valid observation out there in the street and from the general public. The general public does not feel they are being served.

<sup>37</sup> Concerning the justice system and the appointment of a judge to the land claims negotiations. I think it should be reviewed on the perspective that the present incumbent either stay a judge or become the land claim negotiator. Otherwise, in my view, you are politicizing the judicial system because it is the most major political issue, as the Government Leader will attest to, probably facing Yukon.

I say it from two points of view. My colleague, the MLA from Riverdale North pointed out the statement that was made by the Chief Justice of Canada. His feeling was that they should not be politically involved if they are a judge, and not take political appointments such as inquirers, et cetera, as the case may be. I know that the side opposite will stand up and throw out, "look what the Conservatives did in Ottawa with respect to the present banking situation". I do not agree with that, either, quite frankly.

The other point I wanted to make is that perhaps at the national level you can get away with it to some degree, because of the numbers of people you are dealing with. I want to get down to a local situation where our population is so small. I have to say to you, who is going to stand up and criticize or feel that they have the

right to criticize when they know that the incumbent will be going back to the courtroom? I am nervous, quite frankly, standing up here right now.

I think there has to be a decision made. I am not going to comment on the merits of the individual involved. We will have to see exactly what is brought forward as far as policy is concerned. I think that that is an area where there is validity to the arguments that have been put forward, and I think it should be reviewed.

That brings me to just touch lightly on the land claims issue that is facing Yukon. It is a disappointment that I have to express here this afternoon that the Government of Yukon did not see fit to bring forward a position to the task force reviewing the claims policy across Canada. This side did. Now, maybe the side opposite disagrees with the principles that we espouse, the principle of a one government system. I think it is incumbent upon the side opposite to bring forward, in a very general sense, the principles that they stand for in land claim negotiations so that the general public, and us in this House, are aware of what their position is.

I want to assure the Government Leader that I am not asking to negotiate the land claims in this forum. I recognize down the road here fair discussion should take place and it will take place. There are some responsibilities inherent in governing, and one of them is to take positions, and that position is all important to all Yukoners, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

<sup>38</sup> The style, the direction it takes, will determine what kind of a place Yukon is to live in in the years to come.

I am asking the side opposite to take the comments I have put forward in a constructive vein; you have that responsibility.

I want to refer now to the lack of overall positions that have been taken by this government. I will accept the premise that the government-in-waiting has been helping the government for four-and-a-half months. But there seems to be an attitude prevalent, and I have heard it secondhand through the bureaucracy, that "We cannot make any decisions; we do not want to rock the boat, because we are in a minority government situation". In fact, in some quarters, it is being referred to as 'pretend conservatives'.

The Minister of Community and Transportation Services talked about a solid agenda; I would like to refer to the hidden agenda — the agenda which the side opposite has not deemed necessary or politically wise to bring forward at this time. Questions have been asked *vis-a-vis* distribution of land, *vis-a-vis* land claims, *vis-a-vis* the question of private power versus public power; the question, for example, of local hire raised by the Leader of the Liberal Party. The list goes on, and we have not had one definitive answer. Not one. I think, in the true tradition of Parliament, that we deserve answers; we deserve a description or a brief policy description of where, in particular areas, this government is going. I do not want to see a situation where policy decisions are made behind those closed doors and then hopefully six months goes by before the House sits again and there will be no major policy debates on it. I do not think that is too much to ask.

Some thought should be given by all sides of this House about local hire. I want to make it very clear when we talk about local hire that it has to be through the Public Service Commission. It has to be done through that particular arm of government, otherwise we will see a politicization of our civil service which I do not think is in the best interest of any party that is serving as government. More importantly, I do not think it is in the best interest of the general public and I do not believe it to be in the best interest of the public service.

I just caution the side opposite that they be very careful in how they institute their social justice, affirmative action and various programs of that kind. I also want to express the concern that, in the largesse of what we are doing, be very careful that we do not pit Yukoner against Yukoner.

<sup>39</sup> Do not forget the major element of what we are looking for, and that is the capabilities and competency of being able to do the job.

Another area that I want to refer to is the question of regionalism in Yukon. The common thread throughout the Speech from the Throne, and in some of the roundabout answers we have received from the side opposite, is the question of the rural communities versus the urban communities, "Whitehorse". I think that it is safe

to say that previous governments did the best they could with the dollars they had and the distribution of those dollars, to the communities outside "Whitehorse". In fact, when I take a look at my short political career — in more ways than one — when I go to communities such as Watson Lake, Dawson City, Mayo, I can see the results of projects which were started by the government that I was part of. Whether it be the arena in Mayo, whether it be the curling rink in Dawson City, the tourism centre in Dawson City, the arena/curling rink complex in Watson Lake, the water sewer programs, which of course do not really cause a lot of debates in this House because it is very difficult to get excited about water and sewer unless it is shut off, unless you are in Dawson City. When you take a look at those programs, I think that in ten years, probably fifteen years, a lot has been done to improve the quality of life in those particular communities.

That is not to say that more things cannot be done. I do not disagree with that. I caution the side opposite to start utilizing Carmacks versus Dawson City, as the Minister of Justice did with the MLA from Kluane, the MLA from Tatchun; do you want this, take it or leave it, we will throw out a few crumbs to the side opposite to keep them happy. I caution the side opposite not to use that approach, because one of the things that it proves that it is lacking is policy and the ability and the equality across this territory to apply for territorial programs.

I want to refer to the statements that were made by the Minister of Community and Transportation Services. I think his intentions were good in announcing he is prepared to look at block capital funding to the communities. I also caution him that we do not put ourselves in a situation where money is being committed on an annual basis and in such small amounts to the various communities, because the pot is only so big that if you have a major problem in a community such as Dawson City that requires two million dollars, that all the money has already been committed to all throughout the communities where perhaps a project in a Tatchun could be delayed for a year to offset that in Dawson City. I think that it is important, and I am saying this as constructively as I can, that those dollars have to be carefully managed, and managed in the best interest of the public that we serve in the territory.

<sup>40</sup> In our rush, and in the rush that is being exhibited by the side opposite to try to win the rural communities through spending their own tax dollars for them, I think that you have to take that into consideration.

The other thing that I resent, and I want to put it on the record once again, is the positions that have been thrown back to us that, "Oh, you just represent Whitehorse." I ran in Porter Creek East and I am the MLA for Porter Creek East, but when I stand in this House I also have a responsibility to a territorial-wide political party and I also see my responsibilities to the territory as a whole, to constructively bring forward alternatives to this floor for debate as far as the issues are concerned that will affect the territory as a whole. I think we have to be very careful that we do not become so incestuous from the point of view of the side opposite with the constituents they represent that they forget they have an overall public interest that they must represent.

I am very concerned about the attitude taken by the side opposite with respect to what I stated earlier about being pretend conservatives. I think the side opposite has a responsibility to bring forward policies that they stand for and they believe in. I do not think they should be bringing policies they think the general public wants, just for the sake of staying in power. We represent a political party similar to ourselves, and there is definitely no question about it that there are ideological differences between ourselves, as far as issues are concerned. That is why I have to stand back and smile when I hear the Government Leader talk about consensus government. The result of consensus government is that nobody is responsible for the bad decisions. I was part of a government where there was a consensus government.

**Speaker:** Order. I would just like to remind the Member that he has three minutes left.

**Mr. Lang:** I am just getting going, Mr. Speaker.

I was part of a consensus government and nobody every took any responsibility, including myself — being human as I am and as

humbly as I have to admit it here in these Chambers — that the best thing was not to take responsibility for the decisions that were not popular or, more times than not, you did not make a decision. I wish the Government Leader was here to hear this, because he knows it is not in the true sense of the parliamentary tradition that consensus government should be instituted in these Chambers. That is the reason for this aisle and that is the reason for the Speaker. Otherwise we would have a round table here, like we had years ago.

In conclusion, I want to say this: the side opposite has a responsibility to govern; start governing.

*Applause*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I would like to begin speaking today by thanking and welcoming the new Members to these Legislative Chambers and I would like to tell them that they all, I think, did a very good job in their initial presentations to the House and wish them luck in the next few years or for whatever time they sit here and assist the process of making, hopefully, good decisions on behalf of all the people of the Yukon.

<sup>41</sup> In terms of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I am sorry that the Member for Porter Creek East has just left. When I was sitting here waiting for the debate prior to Question Period, he had written me a note and suggested a change in the lineup of speakers today with respect to the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. To not forget, I sat down and started to write them out, and when I got to his name, I somehow spelled it incorrectly and it came out "Dang" Lang, and I guess that it was probably a premonition on my part that he would give us one of his theatrical, blood-rushing speeches. I should inform him through *Hansard*, that if he keeps it up he just may give himself a medical problem.

In terms of the department responsibilities that I have, I am very proud to have been given the responsibilities of Renewable Resources and Tourism, two areas of government that I see as very exciting. I must admit, I have had an awful lot of fun working with those departments over the course of the summer, and continue to do so.

With respect to the issues that are being looked at in those departments, in the Department of Renewable Resources, one of the main concerns that we have as the department responsible for the management of the renewable resources for the people of the Yukon, is the question of lack of policies. I would be very quick to admit that there is a great lack in that department of some real clear, comprehensive policies as they relate to the renewable resources of the territory. So, one of the major initiatives that this government will undertake, and that is something that I stood in opposition and asked for from the previous government, is to set in place a public dialogue as to the best use of the renewable resources.

Unlike the Members opposite, I do not agree that there should be no consultation with the people of the Yukon. I think it has been pointed out to them on more than one occasion that when you stop talking to the people of the Yukon, when you lose touch with the people, that is when the people ask you to leave office, and ask someone else to take over. Essentially, I think that during that electoral process, that message has been delivered and I am glad that the Member has received the message so well.

In terms of the renewable resources issue, this particular effort, hopefully, will generate an educational process on the part of the people of the Yukon to the issues that affect renewable resources. Hopefully, what will result in that process is that there will be some form of consensus as to the general direction we take. We understand, in the process, we are not asking people to make specific decisions. We are asking them for their input, asking them for their ideas, as to how they think their resources — because it is not this government's resources, or the Members' opposite, or this Legislature — the resources belong to the people of the Yukon. It is our responsibility to ensure that the people of the Yukon have input into decisions that affect their resources. That is what government is all about.

In terms of the issue of trapping, that is another major issue. I am glad to see the Member who represents the community of Haines Junction and the riding of Kluane has demonstrated on many

occasions his support for initiative with respect to speaking about this issue vocally and in the public. Clearly, that is a major issue that is affecting all of our country. There have been some recent moves by the extreme environmental groups that have resulted in a resurgence of press attention. I think that, clearly, we have got a massive battle on our hands. They have initiated a new round in Europe with respect to trying to give their focus to their side of the story. Fortunately, we have a situation where the aboriginal groups that are represented by Indigenous Survival International and the Native Council of Canada, have taken upon themselves to speak to this issue. They have representatives in Europe and they are attempting, through their resources, to be able to articulate the position of the Canadian people.

«Unfortunately I think that was the responsibility that should have been led by our federal government and I must say that I am sorry to see that that leadership is not there on that issue. I suspect that we are going to be speaking more about this issue in greater detail.

On the anti-trapping issue, I think that we must be cognizant of the fact that it is not simply a trapping issue; it relates to all harvesting of wildlife. It relates to sport hunting; it relates to recreation hunting, subsistence hunting. Every use of wildlife that has been happening for thousands of years is threatened by this new so-called extreme environmental movement.

I am sorry but I am doing all of this with consulting, but, I have to do it in my view. I have talked to the Fish and Game Association about the issue; I intend to talk to the Yukon Trappers Association, the Bands, Council for Yukon Indians, and focus the Yukon strategy, how this government, through all of the areas that are affected, will react to this issue. Are we going to be putting forward public literature in terms of our position? Are we going to be developing video materials, film materials? Those kinds of decisions have to be made. I am sure that everybody wants to help out on this issue. I think that this is one area where we can lose all the partisan rhetoric that flows along with politics and get people working together on this one issue. We can cross lines from aboriginal interests, through the interests of sport hunters and the environmentalists. I think that this is one area where there can be a collective effort.

I look forward to having discussions with all those groups concerned, and eventually put together a strategy team that hopefully, collectively, we can work together to bring about a proposal that is supported by the people of the Yukon.

During the discussions and the debates that preceded my speech, the Member for Porter Creek East talked about agriculture. One area of concern that we are having to deal with is the question of acceptance of responsibility. In the past, political parties have simply waved the flag of provincehood and said, "Look, we want provincehood", and depended on that rhetoric to try to gain electoral success. They have never, I think, given real thought to the process by which responsibility is taken on. One of the primary focuses has to be the process by which one achieves full responsible government. In that process, we have to begin a discussion with the federal government upon taking on responsibilities on a graduated basis.

We, as a government, will ensure that, along with the devolution of responsibility, the resources are there to go along with the responsibility. I think, to a large extent, this is what has happened in the area of agriculture. We have had a situation where the responsibility has been developed; unfortunately, the land has not been there. The Yukon government has never been afforded the land base along with the responsibility. That is something which we have got to work out. There is no question in this specific area, there is a shortage of policy and a shortage of legislation.

«That is something that we, as a government, are going to commit ourselves to do. We are going to bring forward policies that address the agricultural area, that put in place a need for management plans that the people who wish to develop agriculture must come forward with. As well, we are going to put in place policies that will ensure that there is agreement when we talk about land transfers. We are not interested in talking about a situation of forcing transfers down the throats of people. What we are trying to do in this whole process is get agreement from the major players as to a process by

which land transfers take place, a sensible process.

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

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** If you just did not stand there and criticize, but helped out, maybe it would add to the process. That is one thing I cannot understand of the Opposition, they are always criticizing.

In terms of the legislation we are going to bring forward, I can report that we sat down with the Agricultural Association and we have gone through the generalities as to what the legislation will address. I believe that meeting occurred last night and the report to me is that it was a very positive meeting.

There are many other areas in renewable resources that we have been working toward and developing. One of the areas is the question that the Member for Tatchun raised and that was the question of a park. The previous government had moved for the development of a park and when we took office we looked at the question. Clearly, there were some violent reactions on the part of the constituents in the area about the issue of a park. A lot of people said, "We do not want a park. It is not necessary in this riding so why is the government trying to force the concept of a park on us?" We consulted with the people. They said they did not want it, so we came to the decision that if they did not want it, then why should we proceed with the park. What we have done is reach an agreement to be able to continue the construction of the Frenchman/Tatchun roadway system. That roadway is being done in the Carmacks area. Hopefully, we will have a road prior to winter setting in. If it is not completed by this winter then obviously it will be completed in the spring.

On the question of consultation, we have travelled throughout the Yukon. I think that, unfortunately, the only area of the Yukon I have not been into is my colleague for Mayo's riding. I did make it to Ethel Lake, though. I travelled throughout the Yukon and spoke to many groups affected by the areas of renewable resources and tourism, and I think that that is something the people of the Yukon appreciated. Many of them said that that had never happened in the past and they were appreciative of the fact that ministers of the Crown did have the time, and did have the care to come out and speak directly in their homes with them to find out what issues concerned the people.

«That is something that you will see this government continue to do.

In terms of the use of committees, that is a specific charge that was leveled by the Member for Riverdale North. He said basically that what we should be doing is dissolving the Legislature and just turning things over to committees to discuss. I think that that would be a highly wrong process to look at. I think that clearly he did not know what he was speaking about in terms of government. We have sat on the opposition. We have asked for committee discussion in the past, and the principal reason for committee discussion is to afford the people of the Yukon some access to the kinds of laws being put forward to be considered by government, to give them the ability to sit down and speak to a specific part of the committee and to have input into the legislation that is being drafted. That is the use of committees. It is for those reasons that in the past we have sat as Opposition Members and said that there should be greater use of committees. There will be. We think, principally, that it is in the best interests of the decision-making process to allow the people access to that process.

I guess there is a philosophical difference here because it seems that the view of the side opposite is simply you get elected every four years, you go in the office and you just simply make decisions, not involve the people, then you go back in four years and ask for participation at the ballot box. Obviously, that does not work. It did not work in the past. I think there should be some re-examinations of the basic philosophy in the question. I think that if you do that you may come to an understanding and a change of position eventually.

I hear the Member for Porter Creek East asking for a job. Maybe we will put him on one of these committees if he is in that bad of a shape for something to do.

In terms of the question of the venture capital loan fund, I think of the many issues put forward by the Member for Porter Creek East that was one of the more positive elements of his speech.

Actually, on the whole, the tone was good, then all of a sudden he just went crazy, again, for a few minutes. The venture capital loan fund is an idea that has been looked at in other jurisdictions by other governments, for example, the Alberta government with respect to the oil sands development. It has worked in other provinces and I think that there is ample precedence for the kind of venture capital loan funds that can be examined and can work. I do not know if I would agree insofar as to the simple establishment of a venture capital loan fund would result in megabucks like the \$50 million that was suggested by the Member opposite. It depends on the economy, and it depends on the kind of investment that you make. You get yourself a venture capital loan fund that implies some degree of responsibility to management of the kind of investment that you make and unfortunately there are going to be, along with the winners, losers.

<sup>45</sup> I think that that idea we would have no problem considering as a government. I am sure that the Yukon Economic Council, the Department of Economic Development, probably are looking at ideas like that, but I would like to thank the Member for his positive contribution on it. That area is something that I believe is useful for government and something that government should be looking at getting involved in.

On the question of the claims area, one of the kinds of criticisms that have been leveled at us is that we have been conducting the negotiations in total secrecy and that we have not been letting the parties know what was going on. We are not negotiating specific areas of land claims, per se. What is occurring is that this government, the federal government and the Council for Yukon Indians are engaged in a process of attempting to reach a Memorandum of Understanding that will lay out the degree of participation by the parties to those negotiations. That is something that the Minister of Indian Affairs said he wanted to see occur. We have agreed with the process. We have agreed to sit there with all the parties and find out how we are going to work together. I think that the best way in which to describe previous negotiations is that one of the greatest problems with them is that they had been conducted on an adversarial approach, that we win, win, win and you lose, lose, lose. That is not a process that the end result is conducive to a good working agreement that everybody can live with. I think that you have to design the agreements in such a fashion that people, all the parties that negotiate, do take a positive approach with the view that everybody wins. I think that that is the theme behind the efforts of this government, to put in place a cooperative approach that people can go to those negotiations with.

I hope that the side opposite does not attempt to take a very regressive and negative stance toward the negotiating process and attempt to derail the process at all. I hope that is not their plan of attack, because I do not think that the people of the Yukon are in any way, shape or form conducive to that kind of adversarial approach. That is something that has been associated with the previous government. That is something that is behind us now. We are a new government, and I think that we have the ability to inject new ideas into the process.

A lot of the criticisms we have heard for the last couple of days have been surrounding the O&M budget. Nobody is being fooled. We have told you straight up front that to a large extent the budget that is presented to you has been an effort that was largely designed by the previous government under the previous Government Leader, Mr. Pearson. He set in place the original design for the budget. We are under an obligation to fulfill that budget, bring it forward to the House and then give it legislative approval.

<sup>46</sup> For the members opposite to stand there and criticize us for simply going ahead with ideas that were in the process is, I think, totally ludicrous. Are you counselling us to simply chop everything in government and start afresh? Unfortunately, it does not work that way. The Member for Porter Creek East, one of his direct quotes is that, "When you are in government, it takes two to three years to see results from decisions made." I would point out to you that we have been here for about five months — four months — in office. By your calculation, we are going to have to wait two or three years down the road. But we are in the process of making decisions now and I think you are going to see immediate results.

Here is the capital supplementary. Read it. There are decisions here that have been made by this government. Capital mains will be coming Monday. There are decisions in those capital mains made by this government, not the previous government on the side opposite. So I think there is ample evidence of a decision-making government that you are going to have the opportunity to speak to. And, if you want to criticize those positive decisions, that is your prerogative. You will have the next couple of weeks to do that, but hopefully some of you are going to take a positive attitude and be able to give credit where it is due.

I think I have to, while I am standing, express concern over the overall negative attitudes that have been taken by the speakers — not all of the speakers. I think, in terms of this sitting of the Legislature, there was an opportunity for them to avail themselves of a positive attitude to try to bring forward some constructive criticisms as to how we proceed and I say that not all of them went in that direction.

I think the days of fed-bashing are over with. I think the attitudes expressed in the past where some people thought it should be a constitutional right to fed-bash are gone. That is out the door. Although there is a different government in Ottawa, Conservative, like the Member for Porter Creek East, although he says today he disagrees with what is being done, and some of those decisions that have been coming out lately, we, being a government of a different philosophical stripe, to a large extent have had a very professional working relationship with them. We will continue to have that kind of working relationship as long as the side opposite gives us that kind of response. When we make decisions that are good for the Yukon, if the federal Conservatives are involved in the decision-making process, that is fine with us. We are not prepared to criticize them simply for the sake of getting air time. That is not what we are interested in. We are interested in making progress and get decisions that are of benefit to the people of the Yukon, getting programs to Yukon, getting a land settlement to the Yukon, getting Cyprus Anvil rolling, getting other mines rolling — that is what we are interested in. We are not interested in philosophical debates that break down and simply spill guts all over the floor like some Members of the House like to do.

In terms of the approach taken by particular Members, I think that in a concluding note on that particular issue there is time for you to reassess the kind of attitudes you have taken and there is time to strike a new kind of mood, to take a new direction. We have time ahead of us to make those kinds of changes.

<sup>47</sup> In terms of the efforts before us, there is no question that, as a government, we have an enormous task in front of us. We have the responsibility of dealing with large problems that many governments in the past have attempted to deal with and have not been able to resolve those issues to the satisfaction of the citizens of Yukon.

I just hope that all of us, collectively, including the members on the side opposite, can, somewhere down the line, strike major compromises and major agreements on some of the very important issues that the Yukon people face. Hopefully, when we do, the decisions we make in the end will be for the betterment of all people of Yukon.

*Applause*

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I move that we call question.

*Motion No. 1 agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I move that the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be engrossed and presented to the Commissioner in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Government Leader that the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be engrossed and presented to the Commissioner in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor.

*Motion agreed to*

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

**Bill No. 2: Second Reading — adjourned debate**

**Clerk:** Second reading, Bill No. 2, adjourned debate.

**Mr. Phelps:** I think I can be fairly brief this time. We had a lot of verbiage in the Chamber today. I do not want to go on and on and repeat the remarks I made during my remarks in the my reply to the Speech from the Throne.

There are a few comments that need to be made, a few items that have to be reinforced. This budget, as is apparently admitted by all, is the Pearson budget. It was put in place by Mr. Pearson some eight or nine months ago. We have a new government in power, a government that was talking in the summer of coming back with a lot of policy and a lot of changes to the budget itself. Yet, what have we got? Less than a one percent change in the budget, and thus the policies of the Pearson administration.

The budget that we have here simply reinforces that fact that this government has not been governing; they have not been creating new policies; they have not been demonstrating leadership or new direction or new initiatives for the people of Yukon.

<sup>48</sup> We are here as the Opposition. We are here to examine your policies, your initiatives, and to give constructive criticism where necessary, and to try to defeat your policies where necessary, but the people of the Yukon deserve leadership, deserve new policy initiatives, deserve an ongoing government. One wonders what the NDP stands for. If it is not the "No Development Party", is it the New Democratic Party, is the Socialist Party? What is it? We do not know whose policy it is.

I applaud the fact that you have been listening to the people. Politicians should. I believe very firmly in that. I do my best to listen to people. We all do as politicians. No one can say, for example, that Andy Philipsen did not listen; that was one of his great attributes as a Member from any party in this House.

My concern is that time is going by and I am asking that you roll up your sleeves and get to work. Provide us with some new policies. Provide us with some meat. We are willing to sit down and constructively examine your new initiatives. It is really laughable, unfortunately, that we hear that we are expected to sit here until Christmas because the same arguments that came forward from your side of the House in July — that surely we cannot stand here and criticize our own policies and take all that time — apply now. There is very little, very little in the budget, on the plate, that is not ours.

When we get into Committee of the Whole, and speak to this budget and examine in clause-by-clause, I am prepared to give credit where credit is due. I am prepared to say that you have done some minor things, some good things. Everything you do is not bad. I know you are caring people, you believe in Yukoners and believe in the future. I say that about all the Members here. Hopefully, everybody here is here to serve the Yukon and serve the future of Yukon.

What is at issue is the responsibilities on your side and whether or not you are fulfilling them. Roll up your sleeves, get to work, come out with some policies and let us forge ahead in the interests of Yukon.

Thank you.

*Applause*

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I would like to say a couple of things to assist the debate. I will speak briefly.

<sup>49</sup> I have a couple of things I want to say in response to the Leader of the Official Opposition since he gave basically the same speech two days in a row; although, he was a little kinder today than yesterday. Perhaps it is the sun-spots.

The observation that this budget was originally crafted by the Pearson administration is one that we conceded since July, and we make no apology for that. Clearly a government cannot come in in midstream and replace every single program with new ones, nor would that be desirable.

The big numbers which I would like to read into the record, because they would be useful when the Members get into the committee stage, are that the dollars that were originally allocated in the Pearson budget were \$160,154,000. There were \$700,000 additions during the Phelps administration, and there have been \$108,000,000 added by this administration. That is offset by an

adjustment on the health services costs based on new estimates received from National Health and Welfare, which was done since we came in of a reduction of \$2,240,000 and a miscellaneous adjustment of approximately \$73,000 which gives us a current budget of \$160,154,000.

Some numbers which may be of interest to Members, is that we have reduced the ECO budget, from our point of view, by \$75,000. The \$143,000 — which is an increase — is for support staff for opposition. Salary pay-outs for orders-in-council of the previous administration is \$228,000. We have provision for dangerous goods, \$38,000. Old Crow water and sewer funding \$121,000; Han Fishery \$68,000. The One-Stop Business Shop which we will be calling the Business Development Office, \$68,000 is provided for that. Tourism additional funding \$87,000. General health funding - \$282,000. Native languages centre, \$100,000. Canadian job strategy, \$125,000, and French first language - \$123,000. Young offenders cost \$119,000; human rights, \$70,000, and Justice, \$142,000.

There are some major items which are in the budget which Members will want to look at. There is a \$269,000 cost for the election; social development worker training at a cost of \$205,000; Arctic Winter Games cost of \$210,000, and a couple of other items, additional insurance cost being \$171,000.

The Leader of the Official Opposition complained in July that we had a Throne Speech which was too short; he complained yesterday that the Throne Speech was too long. For a man who has accused me of inconsistency, he is remarkable in wanting to having it two ways. He has complained that, one, there is no change, and two, that we were changing things that the Conservatives wanted to; or, he just wants to complain when we do change things. Clearly, as my colleague, the Minister of Renewable Resources, said, we are not planning to change everything overnight nor would we want to change everything even if we were here a very long time.

<sup>50</sup> I want to say, and I say this not as a partisan shot, but when the full implications are known and worked out of the initiatives we have taken in the last four months, I believe I will be able to stand in this House and say, and demonstrate, that we have done more for job creation in this territory in the last four months by decisions that we have taken and actions that we have taken, than the previous government did in the last three years. I look forward to being able to prove that.

The Leader of the Official Opposition talked about Cyprus Anvil, about oh, it was a dumb deal, real easy, just had to walk into it. I would remind Members of the Opposition, who may have developed convenient memories, that that mine has been shut for a number of years now. The community is near death. We were told that virtually every issue was resolved. Nothing was resolved. The road issue was not resolved; the power issue was not resolved; the housing issue was not resolved, the tailings issue was not resolved; the townsite issue was not resolved, not transportation, not taxation, not finance, nothing. Nothing had been resolved. Nothing had been done.

Going back to the debates of the last few years in this House show, and I believe events show, my former colleague, the Member for Faro was in endless arguments with Members opposite about whether they were prepared to commit the time and the energy to making that mine go. I have learned a few things in the last three months about the kind of commitment that it takes to put this deal together. If it does go together, it will not be something that was done over coffee, or over breakfast, or over a couple of lunches, but has been a massively time consuming project, something that will not come cheap, nor will it come easy, even if it comes.

The Member opposite made some comment yesterday about the development corporation proposal having been their idea. My party has had a development corporation proposal on its policy books for many, many years. Just because the Conservatives happen to agree with us does not necessarily make it a bad idea. I would suggest rather the opposite. That fact that the two large parties in the territory agree on such an initiative, even if not on all the particulars, may suggest that it is an idea whose time has come. We have proposed the development corporation with a wide mandate for a number of years. It so happens that the particular circumst-

ances that we are in now make it a viable proposal.

It so happens that the Leader of the Official Opposition is proposing that a development corporation take over NCPC, which I will confess is not my party's policy, because we had proposed a Yukon Energy Corporation to do that, may be a more practical way of going about it. I concede that readily. In this respect I am quite a shameless plagiarist. If someone has a practical, sensible idea about the way to do things, I will be happy to borrow it. That governs my approach to every citizen in this territory, and that is why this government is prepared to consult, continually and widely, not just in respect to one project, but in all sorts of them.

<sup>51</sup> The Opposition Leader managed to suggest yesterday, with respect to a number of our initiatives such as the one-stop shop, that somehow it was his idea, or that somehow he would have done it. What nonsense. The Leader of the Opposition had a classic choice back in April. He had a choice about whether to call an election eighteen months early or to do the things that he is now saying somebody else is doing. Well, he made a choice, and he has since conceded that he made the wrong choice, but I think he has to live with the consequences of that choice. Someone else is now having to make the decisions and implement, in some cases, other ideas. In some cases, campaign commitments of my party, were our ideas and in fact we are putting into place right now.

Let me say something about the Member for Porter Creek East because I cannot resist the temptation. I cannot tell you what exquisite delight it gave me to listen to the Member today talk about the lack of policy development. A wonderful warm feeling just permeated throughout my body as I listened to him discuss this. This is the Minister who, since 1978, I have been trying to get to make a policy statement on something one would think there has been a fair amount of work on, the squatters' situation.

**Mr. Lang:** All the work has been done.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** If all the work has been done, why was the policy never announced in the many times he was the minister responsible since 1978, since 1974. No. We discovered that some work was done, but it is not quite adequate. That was the reason he never announced it, so we are having to, in effect, start from scratch, and believe me it will not take us six years to get a squatter policy.

I must say I was quite impressed with the intellectual insights of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I think he described, more precisely than perhaps anybody else on the Opposition side, the reason for the previous government's defeat; the fact that it is a view that is widely held ...

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Lang:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Member is not talking to the principle of Bill No. 2, the main estimates. Maybe we should stay to the principle of the Bill, and not reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I confess to an error immediately. It was just that I was led astray with the Leader of the Opposition who seemed to wander aimlessly over both territories. I will come back immediately to the point and address all my remarks from now on to the budget.

The budget is \$160,000,000 approximately. When the Liberal leader was talking about the previous government's defeat, he used the word "arrogance". The fact that there are ten thousand other people in the territory who also used that word to describe it, I think is very accurate. I think it was arrogant of the Leader of the Opposition, if I may dare say so, to suggest that the people on this side were a caretaker government. It is not such a bad description. Given the choice between a dictator and a caretaker, I would rather be a caretaker.

<sup>52</sup> If we are the caretakers of this land and our resources and the public treasury, then I am quite happy to have that description. We will take care, and we will proceed with care, and we will proceed with caution, and we will take care of our responsibilities, having in mind our duty to our children and our grandchildren.

It was an arrogant observation by the Leader of the Official Opposition, and I want to say this because it has an important bearing on this budget. The Members opposite should not be

saddened and appalled because they lost an election. There is no such thing as the divine right of Tories. There have been various royal lines governing different theories of society throughout history, whether it is the divine right of kings, or whatever. There is no such thing as the divine right of Tories.

#### Point of Order

**Speaker:** Order. There is a Point of Order.

**Some hon. member:** I believe that we are dealing with the main estimates. Please have the speaker address his remarks to the budget.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Considering the \$160 million item that is before us, it is very important as we consider this, in a parliament, which is what we are, to understand certain parliamentary principles, certain parliamentary conditions. One of them is, part of the genius of the parliamentary system, periodic changes in the government, to refresh, to renew, to reinvigorate the system. I think it is important to say, because I want to say this to Members opposite, there is no doubt in the course of a parliament that the parties will change from time to time. I have no doubt that the Conservatives will be back in power one day, as will we. So might the Liberals. We have to understand that change came.

As individual MLA's, as individual representatives, as individual leaders, we are not terribly important, in the long run. As I was discussing the other day with the Leader of the Opposition, the other evening at a pleasant social gathering, we have to understand that when television comes in, live television, and we have to have press conferences out there in front of a bank of television lights, a lot of the people here will become irrelevant: the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party, and I, among others. We will all be replaced by skinny people with piles of hair and big teeth, who have flashy smiles, and a glint in their eye and lip gloss. I know I will be washed away along with the Leader of the Official Opposition as well as the Liberal Leader.

I want to say something, because it is important to say with respect to the budget, in respect to the \$160 million before us, it is very important to understand that I have some experience as an opposition leader. I would like to give the new opposition leader the benefit of my experience. With respect, I think he is doing it wrong. I think he is being too negative about it. I do not think people like that. I think the fact that I managed to graduate, was either because as the Liberal Leader says I was doing such a lousy job at it and had to be kicked upstairs, or it is because and this is quite possibly true, because we did propose positive alternatives. <sup>53</sup> Occasionally, it has been suggested by some people such as some people opposite, in 1982, that I was some kind of Marxist pariah. I seem to remember some radio ads about that. Or, that somehow I would give the territory away to the Indians. I seem to remember some newspaper ads about that. That was the famous "Vote White, Vote Tory" ad some of you may remember from the 1982 election. One Member remembers it in particular, of course, since he signed it.

*Laughter*

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could he please proceed to the main budget?

**Speaker:** Point of order, then.

**Mr. Lang:** Or lese I will put a motion forward on the floor that we can all debate the budget on one side and conversation.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** For someone who spoke 47 minutes this afternoon, that is an amazing assertion.

**Mr. Lang:** That was the Speech from the Throne.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I was hoping to be able to respond to the observations from the Leader of the Official Opposition about our ideology and our purposes, but since Members opposite are going to refuse me the privilege to respond to that point, I will have to defer to another occasion.

May I recommend to you, this budget, which comes to you through the joint parentage of Messrs. Pearson, Phelps, Penikett. It just goes to show that you have to have a name beginning with "P"

in order to be Government Leader. I am sorry to say that, Danny, but that is the way it goes. Thank you.

**Motion agreed to**

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I move that the House do now adjourn.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable House Leader that the House do now adjourn. Are you agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

*Motion agreed to*

**Speaker:** This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 Monday.

*The House adjourned at 4:52 p.m.*

**The following Legislative Returns were tabled October 3, 1985:**

85-2-2

Service Contracts (Kimmerly) (W.Q. No. 4, 1st Session)

85-2-3

Government Leader's personal political support staff (Penikett) (W.Q. No. 3, 1st Session)

85-2-4

Travel by Government Leader (Penikett) (W.Q. No. 2, 1st Session)