



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 6

2nd Session

26th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Wednesday, October 9, 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<br>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<br>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**

October 9, 1985 — 1:30 p.m.

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

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. McDonald:** I have for tabling the 1983-84 Annual Report of the Yukon Housing Corporation pursuant to Section 19(2) of the *Housing Corporation Act*.

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

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill No. 4: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I move that Bill No. 4, entitled *An Act to Amend the Assessment and Taxation Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Education that Bill No. 4, entitled *An Act to Amend the Assessment and Taxation Act*, be introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**Bill No. 6: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I move that Bill No. 6, *An Act to Amend the Financial Administration Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Government Leader that Bill No. 6, *An Act to Amend the Financial Administration Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**02 Bill No. 8: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 8, entitled *An Act to Amend the Business Corporations Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 8, entitled *An Act to Amend the Business Corporations Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**Bill No. 10: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I move that Bill No. 10, entitled *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Government Leader that Bill No. 10, entitled *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**Bill No. 18: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 18, entitled *Fine Option Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 18, entitled *Fine Option Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**03 Bill No. 20: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 20, entitled *Funeral*

*Directors Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 20, entitled *Funeral Directors Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**Bill No. 22: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 22, entitled *An Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 22, entitled *An Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**Bill No. 24: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 24, entitled *An Act to Amend the Insurance Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 24, entitled *An Act to Amend the Insurance Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**Bill No. 26: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 26, entitled *An Act to Amend the Summary Convictions Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 26, entitled *An Act to Amend the Summary Convictions Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

**04 Bill No. 30: First Reading**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I move that Bill No. 30, entitled *An Act to Amend the Sale of Goods Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 30, entitled *An Act to Amend the Sale of Goods Act*, be introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

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

Are there any Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Workers' Compensation Board reorganization**

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The departmental reorganization by the Pearson government in July 1984 placed the administration of the Workers' Compensation Board within the Department of Justice together with that of the Yukon Liquor Corporation. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs was also folded into this department.

Because I have reservations about the legality of the reorganization of the Workers' Compensation Board, in line with its legislated mandate, I wish to state in this Legislative Assembly that the entire matter is under serious review by my officials and the board itself, all under my direction.

<sup>05</sup> We are meeting with the board, not with the aim of creating problems but resolving any that may now exist.

The Legislation, laying out the board's mandate, is being reviewed so that the legal and accountability needs are met without interference in the autonomy of the corporation.

The arms length concept must be protected, especially in the areas of fiscal responsibility and adjudication of claims. Accountability must, at the same time, however, be structured in such a manner that the Minister may, indeed, be responsible to the Legislature in a credible manner.

**Speaker:** This then brings us to the Question Period.

### QUESTION PERIOD

#### Question re: Native Courtworkers Society

**Mr. Phelps:** I have a question for the Minister of Justice, again with regard to the Native Courtworkers Society and the issue of arbitration. The Minister continues to state that he and his department have indicated their willingness to take their part in an arbitration. The federal Minister of Justice states that this government says it is not interested in having an arbitrator appointed.

In view of this obvious misunderstanding between the governments, would the Minister write the federal department and advise that he would like to have an arbitrator appointed and offer to pay the cost of such an arbitration?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** No. The position of the government is as I have stated it. When we are aware of an issue that is arbitrable within the meaning of Section 25, in accordance with the contract and the motion, we are willing to take part in arbitration in accordance with the guidelines in the *Arbitration Act*.

**Mr. Phelps:** The problem with the previous answer is that one party to the contract feels there are *prima facie* issues that ought to be arbitrated. The other party is saying that there are not. Would the Minister of Justice kindly reconsider his position to ensure that he is not prejudging the case and placing himself in the place of an arbitrator.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to know from the Leader of the Official Opposition if it is his position that it is appropriate that the federal government act as an arbitrator...

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Lang:** On a point of order. The Members on the front bench of the other side are required to answer questions, not ask them.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** On the same point of order, I would point out that Members opposite are required to ask them, not give speeches.

We have now had a protracted debate on this subject for several days. In some cases, I think we counted seven sentences in a preamble to a question, which is not permissible under our rules. The kind of debate which the Leader of the Official Opposition is seeking to precipitate at this point is far more suited to the estimates committee than it is to Question Period.

We have no objection to answering questions in Question Period. They should, however, be phrased as questions. The one just put by the Member opposite was not a question but a representation, which is illegal under our rules.

**Mr. Lang:** On the same point of order. A question was very firmly put to the Minister of Justice. It is required, under the rules, that he answer the question, not ask questions of this side of the House — contrary to what the Leader of the Government has presently put to us for the sake of filling up Question Period.

**Speaker:** On the point of order, the Ministers should not ask questions of the Opposition side.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The real issue here is, should there be a delivery of the courtworker service in rural Yukon, and should there be either a control or a measure of control over that service by local communities, which may include and probably would include Indian Bands. That is the real issue. It is not the place of any arbitrator to decide that question. That question is a political question and a responsible political debate should occur about that issue, the real issue, not some legalistic sham about misunderstandings.

**Mr. Phelps:** I ask the Minister of Justice if he would kindly admit that, on the face of things, several clauses in the agreement were breached. It would be for the benefit of all Yukoners to have this matter cleared up, once and for all, by the implementing of arbitration under the contract. Would he agree with that?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The problem is that the Leader of the Official Opposition is choosing his words in a most contorted way. He used to practise law, he should know better. He is asking about

the perception of things, or on the face of things. Either there was a breach of the contract, or there was not. I assert that it is our position that there was not a breach of the contract. That is the beginning and the end of it, until that is brought into some proper arbitration or a court or whatever form is appropriate under those contracts.

#### Question re: Block Land Transfers/Alaska Highway West

**Mr. Phelps:** I have a question for the Minister of Community Affairs. I understand that the federal government is proceeding with the lot expansions on Alaska Highway West and that there is a meeting tonight in Whitehorse about that very issue. I also understand that if the federal government takes the lead role, which is the only way that the expansions can go ahead, that the cost to the persons making applications for lot expansions would be significantly greater than would be the case if our government were taking the lead role in obtaining a block land transfer and then selling them their lot expansion.

May I ask the Minister of Community Affairs why this government is not taking the lead role?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I am not sure about the existence of the meeting tonight. If that is correct then I will check into what is specifically on the agenda.

The Member is quite correct that should the people in that district be forced to purchase the required land from the federal government, they will be required to purchase it at full market costs. If the people were to purchase it from the territorial government, they would be purchasing it at development costs.

To date, my understanding is that the legal survey and planning for the lot enlargements will be complete very soon, if it is not complete already. We have requested a block land transfer from the federal government to meet the requirements of the people in the area of Alaska Highway West that the Member referred to.

That is where it stands to date. I will have to check into the details of the meeting tonight. I am not familiar with what the Member is referring to.

**Mr. Phelps:** I thank the Minister for his answer and look forward to further discussions with him, perhaps outside the House.

A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture dealing again with the issue of land and obtaining land from the federal government: can he give us any idea of how many applications his department will be taking before the Federal Lands Acquisition Committee in the next two months with regard to agricultural applications on federal lands?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I thank the Leader of the Official Opposition for his question.

In response to an earlier question that he raised in the House, I would like to take this opportunity to reply to that question as well. There was a question put as to how many applications were put before the FLA Committee by this government since it assumed power. The answer to that, I am informed, is that there were six applications put forward since April.

In response to the question as to how many applications we will be bringing before the Committee in the next two months, I do not know that answer and I will check with the department officials and get an estimate as to how many they think will be brought forward. I will bring that information to the Member opposite.

#### Question re: Watson Lake schools amalgamation

**Mr. Coles:** My first question is for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister make aware to the House when the Catholic and public schools in Watson Lake arrived at an agreement for amalgamation?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I might have the exact date in my briefing notes. I believe it was in the early 1960's when the territorial government and Catholic schools, and the local Bishop, came to some agreement as to the funding of Catholic schools. I do not know the details of that original agreement, but we are still, obviously, as the Member knows — I sent him a memo today — detailing the arrangement with respect to at least a teacher in Watson Lake. The details of this agreement I am not sure of, but we are still feeling the effects of that agreement today.

**Mr. Coles:** I wonder if the Minister of Education could produce a copy of the formal agreement that was made between the Department of Education and the Catholic Church?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The extent to which the agreement is written, whether in legislation or in a form of agreement, I will endeavour to research, and provide the information to the Member for Tatchun.

**Mr. Coles:** I would also like to know what other similar agreements have been made in other communities outside of Whitehorse with respect to the Department of Education and Catholic schools.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** It is my understanding that the Catholic schools affected include the ones in Watson Lake and Christ the King Elementary/High School in Whitehorse.

#### 10 Question re: Placer mining

**Mr. Lang:** I would like to direct my question to the Government Leader in his capacity as Minister of Economic Development. It has to do with the placer mining industry in Yukon.

Quite frankly, I was waiting to see whether or not there would be a statement from the government side on this critical industry. There has been no statement forthcoming. As the Minister knows, the Klondike Placer Miners Association has withdrawn from the joint committee on Placer Mining Research and Development over a number of misunderstandings between the Government of Canada and themselves, yet the Government of the Yukon Territory is involved in that committee, which was set up in 1984.

What position did the Government of Yukon take with respect to the fluctuate study that was to be undertaken under the EDA over the objections of the Klondike Placer Miners Association? Did they support the Government of Canada or did they support the objections put forward by the Klondike Placer Miners Association?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I do not know the precise answer to that question. I will get back to the Member on it.

It seems to me, if my memory serves me correctly, that the objections of the KPMA were made after the decision was made. We, of course, are represented in the decision-making process. I will find out what position we took and whether we expressed any comments at the time, if they were at all in concert with the ones expressed after the fact by the KPMA.

**Mr. Lang:** For the Minister's information, there were a number of meetings that took place. One on April 30 and one later on in the spring. The then government was taking a position that that particular study should not go ahead. There were other studies that could be done in its place that would serve a practical purpose as far as the placer mining industry was concerned.

In view of the present position of the KPMA, and the fact that they are no longer part of that particular committee — in fact, they have withdrawn from the committee — what has the Government of Yukon done to see what can be done to get the placer miners involved, once again, as far as the process is concerned? It is going to be an important decision as far as the placer industry is concerned.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I take the Member's point. On Monday, I and some of my officials had a meeting with the Yukon Chamber of Mines to discuss this question, among others. Clearly, if the organizations representing the industry do not choose to participate in forums like this, they are of limited usefulness.

I took that occasion to raise, with the Chamber of Mines, the question of the inactive advisory committee on mining established by the former government and their preferences as to that. I have, on two occasions, had contact with Mr. Ross — the one occasion shortly after we were sworn in — in Dawson City. The subject of our conversation, at that time, was almost entirely on the matter of a fuel tax decision that the House may offer on fuel tax. That was the strongest representation to me and that was the thing of which he most wanted to speak to this government most clearly about and have this government's position. As you know, we made a decision which was to the satisfaction of that organization.

Mr. Ross was subsequently at a meeting that I had in Dawson City a month ago. We did not have an opportunity to discuss this particular point. I think it is only since that meeting in Dawson City that I became aware of his letter where he outlined his grievances

on this score.

**Mr. Lang:** I understand that that letter goes back to September 3rd, I believe, so it is fairly recent.

What are the Government Leader's departmental officials doing to try to put the federal government in the position where perhaps they are going to be more amenable as far as the placer miners are concerned. Just to give you an example, I believe they had a meeting. And, at that meeting, there were 17 public servants and six members from the industry — talk about being outnumbered.

Is the Government Leader prepared to take steps to see that, if the Placer Miners Association will participate, fewer public servants can be in attendance so they can perhaps deal with the problems of the industry as opposed to those of the bureaucracy?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** As the situation was described to me the other night by the Chamber of Mines, it was not simply a question of the numbers of public servants. It was a question of what they regarded as fraudulent consultation, or inadequate consultation, or consultation which was after the fact or of no meaning or consequence. That led us, logically, to discuss the future of the committee which the Member is asking about, as well as to discuss the possible restructuring of the advisory committee on mining of this government as to what role we could play in helping to facilitate good working relationships between the levels of government and the industry, so that grievances like this do not arise. Or at least, if they do, they can be dealt with expeditiously.

#### Question re: Land Claims/Fishing and Hunting Agreements

**Mr. Brewster:** In a recent statement to the Fish and Game Association regarding the hunting and fishing agreements negotiated in land claims, the Minister stated that he intends to open up these agreements.

My first question: Can he tell me his intentions on this?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I think I will have to temper future meetings of the Fish and Game Association if the discussions that occur at those meetings are going to come forward in this House as questions.

In response to the question of the agreement-in-principle, the present state in a land claims agreement is that the three parties are sitting at the table trying to reach a memorandum of understanding. I told the Fish and Game Association meeting that because of the status of the agreement-in-principle, in all likelihood, the Council for Yukon Indians may wish to open up the area with respect to the agreement-in-principle that speaks to wildlife issues.

If that is the case, then this government and the federal government will have to discuss whatever issues that they may want to lay on the table. We are not the party that is determining whether or not to open that area. In other words, it is not a position of this government that we go to the agreement-in-principle and open up the AIP as it speaks to wildlife issues.

If the CYI chooses to do that, as an agenda item, we will just have to respond.

**Mr. Brewster:** The Minister is not treating these agreements as a separate issue, could he please explain the policy on that?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The claim process is one process. You cannot take agreements out of the claim process and treat them separately from the overall process. The parties are trying to determine their roles at the table to get some ground rules straightened out between themselves, as to carry out the overall process. There is no discussion on wildlife issues at the Land Claims table now. If it is going to be discussed at the table it is down the road. We have not got to the point to speak to the specific areas of the agreement in principle yet. We are just trying to get an agreement between the parties as to how they deal with the memorandum of understanding.

#### Question re: Crime rate

**Mr. Phillips:** Considering the rapidly rising rate of crime in the Yukon, and especially in relation to vandalism, and the clear message coming from Yukoners about the lack of respect for the judicial system, can the Minister tell this House and all Yukoners that he is prepared to initiate an immediate and independent enquiry into the judicial system, especially in relation to inadequate

sentencing of offenders?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The question of vandalism, especially, is a topical one and a very serious one. It is ironic that the Member opposite has just come from sitting on the Judicial Council, which is exactly the body that should investigate these kinds of concerns that he is raising, if an investigation is deemed appropriate.

It is my view that there is a very serious public debate about vandalism, especially, and the overall response of the system to vandalism, and that includes not only the matter of sentences in the courts, but procedures, policing, probation enforcement and the whole works. I am discussing the question of vandalism with such groups as the recent Riverdale group, and other groups, and I would intend to debate at length the question of the propriety of investigations or what kind of investigations are necessary during the debate on the justice estimates. However, it is inappropriate to take a long time to explain a complex issue during the Question Period, which is Opposition time.

**Mr. Phillips:** I do not think the Hon. Member answered my question. What I am asking is for the Minister to state for the record that he will set up an enquiry, and that the enquiry will be independent. I think that if there is any kind of enquiry that should be set up in the Yukon at the present time, it should be an enquiry into the mess that our justice system is in, and I am asking the Minister if he will set up that enquiry.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I will be pleased to discuss all of the problems in the justice estimates. I am not sure of the nature of this suggested enquiry; if it is a royal commission or a legislative commission or a researcher hired to enquire. I am simply unable to answer yes or no, but for the record I can say on the face of the information available the answer is no.

#### Question re: Yukon College design

**Mr. Coles:** A question for the Minister of Education again. Would the Minister of Education be able to outline to the House what instruction he has given to architects with regard to the designs for the new college, and what percentage of local materials he has set a target for in terms of the materials required for construction of the Yukon College?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I believe that the question of local materials quite rightly should be addressed to the Minister responsible for government services, as the Minister of Education is responsible for space requirements in the new college, and I would be happy to make comments on that. I would also be happy to participate in any general discussion we might have during estimates debate on the same matter, but for Question Period I will defer this question to the government services minister.

**Mr. Coles:** I have the same question for the Minister of Government Services: with regard to the designs for the new college, what target for local materials has the Minister set a target for in terms of materials required for construction.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The target is one hundred percent. We probably will not achieve that, but we will work hard to get as close to it as possible.

**Mr. Coles:** I have to say I am a bit concerned. Putting the political rhetoric aside for a few minutes, maybe two or three years later once again Yukoners will see all this government money frittered away to southern firms. What is the realistic target, the realistic percentage, that we can hope to achieve for spending actual monies in the territory?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** We have not said it is 60 percent or 80 percent or 45 or 95, because we would genuinely like to achieve, ultimately, 100 percent. The chances of doing that are very slim, but we will not be completely satisfied until we do.

#### Question re: French as a First Language Program

**Mrs. Firth:** I have a question for the Minister of Education regarding French as a First Language. When the Minister made the decision to establish the new policy for French as a First Language regarding sufficient numbers, could the Minister tell this House if that was a Cabinet decision?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Cabinet did not express itself on that particular position.

**Mrs. Firth:** I would like to direct my supplementary then to the Government Leader, and ask him if this is the kind of responsibility he is going to give his Ministers, to make decisions of major policy changes, without total Cabinet participation, that have a tremendous impact on all Yukoners?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I am not quite clear from the Member what kind of decision she is talking about. Clearly there are major policy decisions that affect more than one department that Ministers ought to bring before Cabinet. There are some major policy decisions that only affect one department, which are significant enough to bring before Cabinet if there is not an established policy.

Clearly, if a Minister brought every decision they were required to make to Cabinet, he or she would not be a very useful Minister, from my point of view. That would just be dumping off the decisions, or taking the decisions upstairs. The Ministers have to take responsibility for matters within their portfolio, and have to make decisions. Key and critical policy decisions, yes, will be made by Cabinet. They will always be made, I would assume, on the recommendation of the responsible Minister.

**Mrs. Firth:** This was a major policy decision that was made that created great inequities within the Yukon, that created classrooms with 35 kids and one teacher in one room, and seven children and one teacher in another room. It was a major policy decision that had implications on the whole Yukon Territory and that was watched by other Canadians.

I would like to know, from the Government Leader, what kind of leadership and direction this government is going to take Yukon if he allows his Ministers to make major policy decisions that obviously are not reflecting one direction for his government?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** The Member opposite started to talk about great inequities in classroom sizes. She would know, because the people of Yukon experienced her as Minister of Education for some time during which time those inequities existed. Nothing was done to rectify them, nor, in many cases, could there be, because we have rural schools with a few number of students; we have rural schools with maybe one or two people in certain grades. That situation existed before and will continue to exist. We have certain economies of scale which lend themselves to the situation in Whitehorse. That situation continues. Nothing the Minister has said or done changes that hard reality.

#### Question re: Pupil/Teacher Ratio

**Mr. Lang:** I want to follow up on the question put forward by the Member for Riverdale South. Does the Government Leader believe that a pupil/teacher ratio of seven to one for one special class in the City of Whitehorse is appropriate in view of the other large classes being experienced throughout the rest of the city.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** There are certain standards about pupil/teacher ratios in the classes which the department tries to meet. They are not met in every case though. Some classes are smaller, and I fear that there are some classes which are larger. In cases of questions where there are dislocations or inequities of that kind, they do not come to Cabinet for discussion.

**Mr. Lang:** What does go to Cabinet? Maybe that would be a more appropriate question.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I could read the agenda for tomorrow, but I fear that I would be in breach of my oath of office so I had better not.

**Mr. Lang:** I am sure that it would not take very long.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** There would be considerably more content than there has been in Question Period this week.

#### Question re: School Computers

**Mr. McLachlan:** My question is for the Minister of Education. The Department of Education realized some time ago that there were some things lacking in the computer programs in the schools, and the schools needed more than just a basic computer. To help fill part of this need, the Department of Education entered into contracts to purchase colour monitors for the computers. Can the Minister tell this House why that direction has been reversed and why he has cancelled the purchase of those colour monitors?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** First of all, the decision to not enter into

contracts with local suppliers for certain pieces of equipment was made largely because there was no policy around which the decision to purchase more computers could be justified. The decision has been made that the computer program, to date, will be provided with sufficient equipment to survive, but that new computer equipment, which would reduce the computer/student ratio, would be delayed until such a time that the policy had been reviewed by the government and then communicated to the department.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I just want to be sure that we are not buying a lot of toys because others are doing it, and that something meaningful will be instilled into the computer programs in the schools. Many of us in this Assembly would not buy a new car without the manual to go with it. Can the Minister tell the House when teachers in the territory might expect to receive, then, some sort of curriculum guide for use in the classrooms, or at best a Department of Education philosophy statement as to where we intend to go with computer instruction in four or five years?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I can assure the Member that we are not buying microcomputers for the purposes of giving toys to students in the classroom. These are learning aids. We are buying them consciously with the desire to provide extra instructional material, extra instructional devices which can assist them in their day-to-day activities.

It is interesting to note that the computer-to-student ratio in the territory is the highest in the country at the present time. That is one of the reasons why there was a hold put on the purchase of new computers until a policy had been established. We intend to ensure that the policy itself does fit our needs in the territory, however complex they might be, and wherever the school may be, wherever the classroom may be, in Whitehorse or hundreds of miles from Whitehorse. We intend to address those issues in the policy, which we will be hopefully designing for the end of this calendar year.

**Mr. McLachlan:** Granting the need for teachers who can competently teach computer literacy, what steps has the department taken to ensure that some sort of in-service training be given to teachers who are already in this field, to assist them in making these choices and possibly eliminating the need for bringing in more teachers from outside?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member may know, and certainly previous Ministers of Education may know, that a great deal of effort has been made into putting good instructors into the system to allow for significant in-service training in the territory so that all teachers who might use microcomputers as an instructional aid will have the facility, an understanding, of how to use them, so that we will not be put in a position in the future where we will have to hire outside in order to find the necessary competence to use the microcomputers as an instructional aid.

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

## 17 ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

**Clerk:** Item No. 1, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

**Speaker:** Is the Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 1?

**Mr. Brewster:** Yes.

#### Motion No. 2

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Member for Kluane that the Yukon Legislative Assembly, in recognition of the importance of the trapping industry in Yukon and in Canada, make immediate representations to the Government of Canada urging the federal government to take an active, direct role in opposing the anti-trapping lobby in Canada, the United States and in Europe in addition to funding trapping organizations to help combat the biased propaganda disseminated by animal welfare groups that could ultimately destroy the life and livelihood of thousands of Canadian trappers.

**Mr. Brewster:** I think my motion speaks for itself. I feel it is a

motion that every Member of this House can wholeheartedly support.

Trapping has become an important livelihood and industry for many Yukoners, especially for the Yukon Indian people. Its social, culture and economic importance cannot be measured merely in dollars and cents. Its value goes far beyond that. As Members of this House, we must do everything in our power to protect and reserve this vital industry and way of life.

I congratulate the Member for Old Crow for her statements in this House in response to the Speech from the Throne regarding the importance of trapping to the people of Old Crow and other Yukoners. I think she spoke very well and I thank her for it. I also like the support from the Minister for Renewable Resources on this issue. I know we see eye to eye on the importance of the trapping industry to the Yukon and to Canada. I thank him for his efforts to protect the trapping industry thus far, and I pledge my support in this regard.

I would like to warn every Member of this House that although some Greenpeace organizations have said they are pulling out of the anti-trapping movement, we must be very careful and not let our guard down. Greenpeace is responsible for the complete destruction of the sealing industry. That is a lesson we cannot afford to forget. Such groups care very little about people's livelihood, heritage or culture. They prey and beat upon the public's ignorance. They have the full backing of the media because they manufacture headlines and create havoc all over the globe.

I find it very odd that these organizations pay no taxes, obtain government grants and receive billions of dollars in donations from an ill-informed world public. They have the ability to literally put honest, hard-working people on the bread line. It is high time that all governments bite the bullet and stand up to these groups to protect the livelihood and economy of thousands of Canadian trappers.

Frankly, I am very disappointed by the recent stand of the federal government on this issue. They still do not appear to be aware of what they are dealing with and the power of animal welfare groups to mould world opinion. The federal government has to wake up, and wake up fast. I think a good kick in the backside may accomplish the job.

18 They have to wake up to the fact that these anti-trapping groups are picking off one industry at a time. Seals were first. The trapping industry is second. What is next? The killing of domestic animals for food? The elimination of predator control? The elimination of wildlife farming? One thing is for sure; these groups will not stop interfering in other people's lives and livelihood. We have to stand up to them, and we have to stand up to them now. I urge every Member of this House to support this motion.

**Ms Kassi:** First of all, I have to thank the Member opposite for submitting this motion.

On behalf of the Vun-tut Kutchin of Old Crow, I am in support of motion. It is of great importance to our people, especially in my village, where ninety percent of us depend on trapping as our main source of survival. Trapping is a traditional activity of our people. Along with trapping of animals such as lynx, marten, mink, beaver and wolverine, Old Crow has the largest muskrat trapping industry in the Yukon, and maybe all of Canada. Every spring from March to June, our elders, men, women and children, move to the Old Crow Flats, each family having its specific area for the muskrat season.

We make sure our younger people come with us to Crow Flats as this is the way we maintain the culture and tradition of our ancestors. In June, when everybody returns to the village, we have a celebration for a successful trapping season. The whole community gets involved in this joyous occasion. The furs are then sold to the Yukon Trappers Association. Thousands of muskrat pelts are sold and then shipped outside to tanneries, only to find in recent years that the price of these furs has dropped drastically and, because the cost of gas and food is very high, we very rarely break even at all. Yet, the people continue this procedure every year, to hang on to our cultural survival, hoping that each season the prices will go up.

The anti-fur campaign around the world is very powerful, yet they have little or no understanding of wildlife. I find it very ironic and disappointing that the Yukon's MP, Erik Nielsen, along with the federal government, has done very little in support of this important issue that affects so many northern Canadians.

The biggest problem I see with the federal government is the Department of External Affairs. Last spring, the department cancelled, virtually without warning, its support for a six-person, fact-finding trip to Europe. The trip had to be cancelled, and this was another setback for Canadian trappers.

Right now, groups like Indigenous Survival International want External Affairs to become pro-active and actively support Canadian trappers. External Affairs says it will not become involved unless the governments of European countries get involved. I and native groups see External Affairs as too sensitive about criticism of Canada. They are too worried about Canada's image and are not sensitive to criticism from within Canada. What trappers in Canada are afraid of is a strong lobby by the anti-fur movement groups in Europe, a lobby that could result in governments of European countries banning the sale of wild furs in their countries.

<sup>19</sup> Switzerland, for example, buys 22 percent of all Canadian wild furs. This is one country where the animal rights groups are very active in campaigning this fall.

In closing, I support this motion because of its call to Ottawa to get directly involved in fighting this anti-fur movement.

**Mr. Coles:** I, too, would like to congratulate the Member for Kluane for bringing forward this motion, to which we will give our wholehearted support.

As the Member for Kluane said, the motion does speak for itself. Both the Member for Faro and I are in support of it. I am just happy to see that both the other parties in this House have recognized the reluctance of the federal Conservatives to make any type of movement towards the problems that we are having with this in Europe. I urge the House and everyone in it to support the motion.

**Mr. Phillips:** I, too, would like to commend the Member for Kluane for bringing this motion forward here today. I thank the other Members for their comments and I, too, will be supporting this motion, as I realize that trapping is one of the more important industries in the Yukon.

I would also like to put on record that I do not think that these groups are going to stop at the trapping movement. These groups are much more widespread than that. They want to stop hunting, they want to stop fishing; they just do not believe that anyone should ever live this type of lifestyle that we in the North are used to. We should be conscious of it. The sealers are gone, the trappers are gone, it just moves on down the line until eventually no one can hunt or fish or trap anymore. We should be very conscious of this and we should urge our federal government and we should urge everyone to take a very strong stand against these, I would call them, environmental terrorists, with the kind of tactics they use. I think we should take a strong stand against this.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** In standing, I would like to state that it is very obvious that this motion is going to receive unanimous consent of the House. I would like to thank the Member for Kluane for bringing forward such a measure that engenders cooperation in the House, and instills a spirit of attempting to work on issues of commonality.

With respect to this issue, as I have stated in the past, this is clearly an issue that has priority with this government. We are committed to doing something about protecting the trapping industry. As the Member for Riverdale North pointed out, the issue is not simply trapping. The evidence is clear, and the sealing question gives us ample ammunition to understand that that is the trend with respect to the "anti-" movement. When we look at this question, we have to look at the cumulative impact of the various strategies of the various organizations that are involved. We are not just talking about trapping, we are talking about all uses of wildlife.

In terms of the question of the groups that are involved, we have just received word in the last few days that a chapter of the

Greenpeace organization has pulled out, and rightly so. However, as pointed out by the Member for Kluane, that is only one organization that has pulled out of the campaign. There are many other chapters of Greenpeace that, if I understand from the information I have received, are still quite active on this issue. <sup>20</sup> There are also many other organizations other than Green Peace, such as the International Fund for the Welfare of Animals, that are very much engaged in this particular campaign.

As to the question of the role of the federal government, I have been critical of the federal government, and this motion clearly puts it to the federal government that they have to get off their rear ends and represent the interests of those of us who are Canadians and who depend to a great extent on our economy for an interaction between ourselves and animals. Unfortunately, many of the people we do see in government, primarily in the Department of External Affairs, themselves, in all probability have no connection with wildlife. Many of the people who do go on to work in External Affairs have other particular issues that they are concerned with, and have other interests. They are more interested with what goes on in the UN and the disarmament talks, although, not to demean its importance, I think that very few of those individuals have the capability to understand the real impact of the trapping industry.

In terms of the federal government's position in pulling out, and not supporting the fact-finding tour in Europe, I mentioned at the time that that occurred that that was not a wise decision on the part of the federal government. I think that, like the sealing issue, it gives you the impression that they are not going to react until the wolf is at the door, when the issue is about to overwhelm them. Then we see in those cases where they wait for the issue to come to them, and in many instances it is too late, we have already lost the battle.

That is why they should be criticized for not moving on it sooner when they had the opportunity. Now we are saying as a Legislative Assembly in one part of the country that we urge them to get on with the job and hope that they do have a change of mind.

If there is credit to be given, I think that credit obviously has to go to the organization called ISI, Indigenous Survival International. Despite the position of the federal government, and despite the warnings of External Affairs in terms of going out and raising the concern or profile over this issue, they decided that the issue was important enough that they had to go to Europe. They went to London. George Erasmus appeared on international television and spoke to this issue, and stated the position of the Indigenous people. He spoke about the importance of trapping and the use of wildlife to this country, and as a result of that initiative, that is why we have the dilemma that the Green Peace people found themselves in with this question. They had to make a decision as to whether or not they were in fact supporting the rights of aboriginal people as represented by ISI, or rights of animals, as they put it. Obviously, in this instance we have won a minor battle but I think that the war is going to go on and we must prepare for that.

With respect to the question of the impact of the aboriginal groups, I think that they are quite organized. We see an ISI representation from Greenland, Alaska, all of northern Canada, and all of the provinces of Canada are also represented in that organization. One of the roles that I see this government playing on this issue is to act in many instances as a mediator between the various groups. On this issue, if we are not careful, we are going to have so many of our own groups preparing a campaign and strategies, and going off to other countries to speak to other governments, that we may be blown all over the map, and that we may lose the central theme of what it is that we are speaking about.

<sup>21</sup> I see, as one of the roles of this government, to bring people together, to bring ISI with the Fur Institute of Canada, to ensure that there is dialogue between the various interests, to ensure that people are talking to each other and that we develop overall a common strategy when we talk about taking initiatives in Europe, and taking initiatives in the United States, because they are not to be forgotten. There are powerful lobby groups involved in the United States as well. I see that as a critical role and one that I have committed myself to.

In my discussions with the Minister of Renewable Resources in



the Northwest Territories, we are in agreement that that is an important factor. We have made representations to the provincial Ministers and I am not certain yet but, in the next meeting of the provincial Ministers of wildlife, there may be a particular evening set up to discuss this issue and the responses of the Canadian governments to it and how, collectively, we, as governments, can deal with this. That meeting is going to take place in January. Hopefully, if we are out of the Legislature by then, I will be able to attend the meeting and represent the opinion of this Legislature directly with the other ministers.

**Some Member:** Bill should go along.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Certainly, I would be more than prepared to take Bill along if he wants to come.

In terms of the meeting of the ISI, they have also decided on a major meeting between themselves in January. That meeting, if at all possible and if it does not conflict with the ministerial meeting, will have attendance by myself. I have been invited by ISI to co-chair the meeting with the Minister from the Northwest Territories.

I think what you can see from the north is that we have an opportunity, because of our experience with it — it is very much a part of the history of this part of the world — to lend a lead role in this issue.

In terms of the actors in the Yukon who are most concerned, I have been given representations from such organizations as the Fish and Game Association, the Outfitters Association, the Yukon Conservation Society, Council for Yukon Indians, and various Bands, that they want to be involved, and we will make sure that they are involved. I have proposed a meeting and have gotten a response from a number of the organizations that are amenable to such a meeting taking place. Hopefully, that can be announced in this House, possibly within the next couple of days, if we can get the organization together. That is going to be taking place within the next couple of weeks.

At the conclusion of this speech, again I would like to thank the Member for Kluane for taking the initiative and I like to see that he is in fact demonstrating the opinion I have held of him all along that he is an independent and simply does not toe the party line.

**Speaker:** It is my duty to advise the Assembly that the Hon. Member is about to exercise his right to close debate, and afterwards all Members will be precluded from speaking to this question. Therefore, any Members wishing to speak should do so now.

**Mr. Brewster:** I do not have too much more to say on this. I thought that we would have a unanimous agreement on this; however, the Hon. Minister of Renewable Resources kind of spoiled it at the end.

*Motion No. 2 agreed to*

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

**Speaker:** Is the Hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 2?

**Mr. Lang:** Yes.

*Motion No. 3*

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek East that it is the opinion of this House that a minimum of fifty percent of the money set aside under the Economic Development Agreement for Tourism development should be allocated in such a manner that a revolving fund be set up which will provide a low interest loan program for the tourism industry.

**Mr. Lang:** Members will recall that I referred to this area of concern in my Reply to the Speech from the Throne last week. I gave a number of reasons at that time as to why I thought that the present system should be looked at with the idea of changing it to make it more equitable and make it more accessible to the general public and, in particular, the business community involved.

You will recall, back in May, the tourism agreement under the Economic Development Agreement, was signed between the

Government of Canada and the Government of Yukon. The then Minister, the Hon. Tom McMillan, indicated at that time he was prepared to look favourably at a business loan program, as far as the Economic Development Agreement and the tourism dollars were involved. We are talking \$10 million here. We are not talking small change per se. We are talking a significant amount of public investment in the tourism industry.

In the past, as you know, we have always had programs which have been grant programs. They have caused inequities. It has been a very difficult situation for those who are applying, because they are not too sure what the rules were, how the rules applied, when they applied, who made the decision, and how it related to their other financing. It would seem to me that if we are going to provide a significant program, we should be doing it in such a way to provide a revolving fund for capital ventures, as opposed to the present situation where, once the \$10,000,000 fund has been exhausted, there is no more financing available.

I do not think that I am asking too much of the Members of the House. When you take a look at the context of the motion, you will see that I have just asked that a minimum of 50 percent of the \$10 million be set aside as a revolving fund. The reason for that, primarily, is that there is a marketing component of the present agreement which has to be done by government, in conjunction with the federal government, in this particular case. That allows for those dollars to be expended in that manner.

It also allows for a number of dollars to be set aside for working with municipalities and non-profit organizations in programs that are really public programs, rather than private sector.

Take, for example, the Target Downtown program. Obviously, that is going to require an outlay of capital dollars by some government, particularly this government, as far as the economic development agreement is concerned.

That is why I left it general, but giving them a minimum amount of money. Another reason for choosing 50 percent is that the other capital program we have with this government has already been presented to the House. The government has seen fit to directly allocate \$2,782,000 towards tourism ventures. That is direct public investment, grant money, to these programs whether they are being administered by someone else or by the Government of Yukon.

I think it is logical to request that a minimum of 50 percent be set aside for a revolving fund for the tourism industry. This would have long term benefits for the tourism industry, because it would be replenished by the investors. In that way, the people who have access to public monies through, perhaps, low interest loans, or whatever guidelines are set, will have to pay back a portion to a fund administered by government. Hopefully, it would encourage people to go to other banking institutions for the purpose of requiring other assets or making other investments in conjunction with this. You would see that many more dollars invested in the tourism industry.

Instead of having a five year agreement, we could see this going on for 10 or 15 years, depending upon the success of the program that I am introducing here.

I have not intentionally put guidelines into the motion. I have left that to the government, because I believe that to be the government's responsibility. They have the tools to bring the necessary legislative requirements to this House so such a revolving fund could be put into place. I also think it is imperative that the government consult on the guidelines with the Yukon Visitors Association, which represents the industry here in Yukon.

I think the Yukon Visitors Association and the Klondike Visitors Association would be the organizations to present these three or four options to and ask them for their opinions, because they are actually managing the industry. If anyone is under the illusion that it is the government, that is not true. It is the businesses involved that are managing the tourism industry and are the success of the tourism industry. I think it is imperative that they be involved in helping to set up the guidelines for such a revolving fund.

I have heard what the Minister of Renewable Resources, the Minister of Tourism, stated in his Reply to the Speech from the Throne. He is looking very positively towards such an initiative. I brought the motion forward because of the positive response from

the government. I look forward to hearing what the Liberal party has to say regarding the loan program as opposed to a grant system. I think it is important that political parties, at times, pass over our partisanship and work towards a common goal. I think that common goal should be something for the tourism industry that will not only be there five years from now, but that could be there 10 or 15 years from now for young investors down the road here.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Speaking to the motion delivered by the Member for Porter Creek East, philosophically, I have no problems in supporting the motion. Neither does the government, in terms of what is called for.

The idea of taking funds appropriated by the government, public funds, for the use by the public, and then having those funds in some way realize a return, so that there be a continuation of flow of funds to allow other people to have access to them, is a good idea. As I stated, we have no problem with that idea.

However, there are certain aspects of this issue that we have to look at. Number one, we are talking about a bilateral, five year agreement between ourselves and the federal Government of Canada. This issue of a revolving fund means to have it continued on. The agreement specifically is for five years, which we have a legal commitment for. We are talking about money out of that agreement and ask that it continue on after the life of that agreement. That is only one argument.

In respect to the other issue, and that is the cost-sharing of the agreement, 80 percent of the funds that are expended under this agreement are expended under the authority of the federal government. Twenty percent are as a result of the Yukon government.

The position I take is that there are two parties to the agreement. Both parties should move in concert, should move together, to discuss, to put in place, whatever amendments that we have to make to that agreement. This is the case. If we are going to initiate a move like this, in which we take 50 percent of the allocated funds of the program and determine that it is going to be spent for this purpose, we must reach an agreement with the other party to the agreement, which is the federal government. They must agree, before we will be able to do that. That will take an amendment to the existing agreement to accomplish that.

The other issue that he talked about is the area of marketing. That is clear. There are some areas that we have to take a responsibility for. There is not the strength in the industry and within small business to foot the bill to be able to market the product, to be able to do the training, to be able to bring in the consultants to do on the job training, to give seminars to small business. We cannot expect small business to take that burden all by themselves, so we have to recognize that, in those instances where the small businesses have a capability to shoulder the responsibility, we have to come in and provide that kind of development fund.

One of the concerns we heard when Jack Murta was here with respect to public meetings on the question of tourism development, not only in the Yukon but in Canada, is a question of education. We are not educating our young people. We are not providing accredited courses in universities to be able to turn out professionals in that area. We are not, most importantly, educating the people in the industry.

To arbitrarily decide that we are going to take 50 percent of all the funding that is there and appropriate it to a revolving loan fund may not be a good idea. Forty percent may be better, 30 percent or 60. We do not know. I propose that the best way to do this is simply to incorporate this idea in the review process that has to take place between the federal government and the Yukon government with respect to the agreement. There is a provision for an annual review. I suggest that this issue be central to the review process.

#### *Amendment proposed*

With those words, I would like to move an amendment to Motion No. 3. I would like to amend the Motion by deleting all words after the word "that", and substituting for them the following: "during its review of the Canada-Yukon Tourism Sub-agreement, the Government of Yukon should give consideration to advocating a minimum of 50 percent of the monies set aside under the Economic

Development Agreement for tourism development to a revolving fund, which would be utilized to provide a low interest loan program for the tourism industry".

I have a copy for the Clerk and, as well, copies for the Members.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Minister of Renewable Resources that Motion No. 3 be amended by deleting all words after the word "that", and substituting for them the following: "during its review of the Canada-Yukon Tourism Sub-Agreement, the Government of Yukon should give consideration to allocating a minimum of fifty percent of the money set aside under the Economic Development Agreement for a tourism development revolving fund, which would be utilized to provide a low-interest loan program for the tourism industry".

**Mr. Lang:** I have a couple of comments. First of all, I want to make a couple of points on the arguments put forward by the present Minister of Tourism. First of all, it is a five-year agreement and that we cannot make any changes because it is a five-year does not hold any water. That, in my view, is a bureaucratic argument and I have to say it is not as though I have not heard it before. I do not believe that holds water as far as the agreement is concerned.

The reason I have raised the issue here on the floor of the House is because it is the politicians who are going to have to make that decision. I know that the federal bureaucracy, and in some cases internally within the bureaucracy of YTG, are going to resist some changes to a loan program. It is going to have to be political will — the political will and the political decision — to make it happen. It is not going to happen within the bureaucracy and that is why I brought it forward here.

The argument that it is an eighty percent/twenty percent split as far as the YTG and the federal government is concerned: yes, there is that differentiation as far as dollars are concerned. I think the past Minister of Tourism, who is no longer with us, has to be given full marks for the amount of money he was able to negotiate under the agreement. All I want to say here is that, regardless of the amounts that are put in by the various governments, the principal is: how do we spend it? What mechanism do we set up for the purpose of spending it? I think it is safe to say that we can support this amendment, under the understanding, and from the words that the Minister has spoken, that he supports the principal that there be a revolving fund set up.

If I can have his assurances that he would be setting up maybe a type of working group between the government and the tourism industry in the interim, to look for guidelines for a revolving fund, as opposed to waiting for May for the annual review, I think that would be a step in the right direction. I do not think we can afford to wait till May and then all of a sudden we have lost another season. If we got things moving now, we could possibly have something in place by early spring so people can apply through the normal channels, or whatever channels are set up, for the purposes of making the investments they wish to make and are approved by government.

I think it is safe to say we are prepared to support the amendment as put forward in the spirit it was spoken to as far as the Minister of Tourism is concerned. I just want to conclude by saying that as a Member of this House, I will not accept the argument that, if it strictly goes to the bureaucratic level, YTG and federal, and that we cannot do it, I say that that is bunk. I want to say to the Member opposite, it is going to have to be from his office to that of the present Minister, Jack Murta, who I believe would be very interested in looking at a program of this kind, and I think you will find that, with some compromises, you can come to an agreement that will be in the best interests of the tourism industry.

*Amendment agreed to*

*Motion No. 3 agreed to as amended*

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

#### **Motion No. 4**

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Member for Faro that it is the opinion of this House that the existing *Day Care Act* which

was approved in 1979 is inadequate in its present form in terms of meeting the present-day needs of either the children, parents or day care organizations, and should be amended to reflect the need for:

1. A full-time day care coordinator,
2. Professional child care training for staff engaged in full-time day care services,
3. All full-time day care workers to be licensed, and
4. All full-time day care workers to possess a certificate or diploma in extended child care training;

That it is the opinion of this House that the government should give consideration to:

1. Direct funding or subsidization of child care training,
2. Direct funding of licensed day care organizations in the form of grants to be allowed for
  - a) operation and maintenance,
  - b) complying with stringent building code guidelines,
  - c) child education,
  - d) special needs children, and
  - e) suitable materials,
3. Substituting a needs test for the present means or income test when determining who qualifies for a day care subsidy,
4. Amending or removing the gross wage ceiling of \$1,100 for the day care subsidy to ensure that the subsidy adequately reflects the current costs of living,
5. Increasing the present maximum subsidy of \$250,
6. Making subsidy payments directly to day care institutions, and
7. Granting tax or other concessions to businesses who will operate on-site day care services; and

That it is the opinion of this House that the method of filling vacancies or appointing people to the Yukon Day Care Services Board should be changed to give the Yukon Child Care Association the right to make 50 percent of the appointments.

**Mr. McLachlan:** We in this party believe that Yukon day care programs are presently at the level of what can only be described as crisis proportions. Present standards and funding mechanisms are far below those of most other Canadian provinces. The *Day Care Act* had its birth in legislation in 1979, which was shortly after the adoption of Yukon party politics. After reading the act, I would like to think that the reason it was so poorly done was owing to the fact that party systems were perhaps young and inexperienced. I would like to think that, and I would be prepared to accept it were it not for the fact that I am in possession of repeated requests to the former government for major changes as far back as 1981. The act was twice amended, but in neither case were full requests for changes addressed.

Since 1981, the Child Care Association has repeatedly requested a training program for child care workers and appropriate discipline. Do we value our children and their needs so trivially? Are they not tomorrow's generation, and are they not also our future? It is traumatic enough for toddlers or infants to one day find themselves placed in a strange environment with unknown people without adding to the circumstances by having untrained and unskilled workers who are incapable of dealing with the necessary adjustments.

Children have all the needs we do: physical, emotional, sensorial, and the trappings of a safe environmental home structure. It is not too much of a stretch of the imagination to compare their first day in day care to our own feelings when we move to a new place, start a new job, or our first few days with strangers. When our furniture and things that are familiar to us arrive, we start to feel a degree of comfort and safety, and I ask this House to stop and consider: would you not feel much more comfortable knowing that the individuals who hold the power or influence for good or evil over the lives of the children have been adequately screened, interviewed and trained prior to entrusting them to the need of our most precious resource, our children?

In one sense, I suppose that some may only see them as babysitters, but nothing is farther from the truth. A house is only as strong as its foundations. In the formative years, a child's whole life, its character and its personality, is formed in this foundation period. We, as a society and as parents and as a government, all must share in this foundation building. As the years go by, we all

share and bask in either its rewards or its consequences. Please do not treat this responsibility lightly. If government is serious about wanting women in the workforce then it is high time government stopped asking them to pick up, wholly, the tab while at the same time giving them hardly any economic or social status in terms of their contributions in the home.

I understand why we believe that the act has the day care situation in its current crisis. I would like to relate an example or a plight of one such individual whose circumstances may be untenable under the present day care provisions.

The example examines a single mother, two children, a toddler and an infant, who in a Clerk I position may be in a gross level of income of \$1,500. Her rent, food and utilities may consume \$800 of this, but her day care bill could be as high as \$800. She is already at a deficit. What should she do? The husband has left for parts unknown, the costs listed are for bare essentials. Her wage is reasonable for a Clerk I position, and yet, as we can clearly see, she is in trouble. She does not qualify for a subsidy because the gross wage may well be above a qualifying ceiling limit of \$1,100 to \$1,200 a month.

Under the present scheme, we have left her with few alternatives. She is very obviously almost in a bankrupt position. Should she be forced into an arrangement for accommodation? Should she have to give up her children for adoption? That is unthinkable. Or should she stop work and take the easy way out and go on welfare?

If she goes on welfare, then we as a government will then be paying a whole lot more than if we had looked instead to raising the present subsidy level, or change the present means or income test to that of a needs test. Common sense should easily bring us to this conclusion.

In the past, priorities have been distorted. Some may believe that private washrooms for Deputy Ministers or Judges, first class air tickets, or putting things ahead of people are more important. We do not. Buses taken from children, or denying day care centres in outlying districts may be some people's attitudes of priorities. They are not ours.

If we do not take care of tomorrow's generation now, we can be sure that they will regard us with the same disdain when we are old.

I have examined what the aforementioned individual would realize if she should choose to accept welfare. The social assistance figures available have been very revealing. She would be classified as a unit three, and food, incidentals, clothing, shelter, transportation and play allowances, and the day care costs previously mentioned of \$800, would total \$1,800. Income from her work would give her a net pay of \$1,100, which in her circumstances, would then see her requiring, or being eligible for, a social assistance payment of \$700.

With this in front of you, surely you can see the wisdom of raising the subsidy and its conditions, rather than forcing an individual into the welfare system. Morally or financially I believe that we have no choice but to move forward and make major revisions that the motion calls for.

This example aside, we would like to see the ceiling currently set at \$250 removed, because many parents' fees are currently well in excess of \$400. The means test of determining who qualifies for subsidy should be changed to a needs test. Subsidy payments should be made directly to the day care centres. There are ample precedents for this procedure in the provinces. There is need for a full time Day Care Coordinator with an accessible office and an up-to-date resource library. This position's job function needs to be rewritten in a way that its accountability is much more supportive and encouraging to the growth of the day care community.

We would like to see direct funding given to licensed day care centres, and family day homes on a per-day basis. The funds could be used for operation and maintenance costs, increasing the poverty level staff wages, and encouraging early child education courses for workers, better equipment and improved nutritional standards. Start up grants need to be made available, especially in our rural communities, where the costs of meeting the 1980 building codes are prohibitive.

There must be provisions made for handicapped children to participate in day care facilities with other children. Quality day

care is not just a matter of trust. It must be legislated to protect those who cannot speak for themselves. In talking with other provincial day care people, I have discovered that our own Yukon day care standards often cause many ripples of shock. Let us together, do something for the population of our Yukon children.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like to thank the Member for bringing this motion forward to this House. I enjoyed the presentation that he made. I can almost relate to the situation that he mentioned with regard to a mother with two small children, because I have experienced that and I am very aware of the need for day care in the territory.

The Member mentioned the amendments to the act, and I think that if we are going to be talking about making amendments to the act, then we have to look at it very carefully and that would take a very long time to go over it to find out what amendments have to be made to improve the act.

There are certain things that are included in this motion that would not be very good, or necessary in an act, because some of those things can be changed through regulation. We have to remember that we have that option. If the Member has been in contact with people from the day care society he would be aware that we do have a draft of proposed regulations that includes some of these things that he has asked for. We did offer those copies to interested parties to comment to us on. We did get some back by the date we had asked. Some of them were very supportive, including the Day Care Association. They probably did not support all of them, but in general were quite pleased and offered other suggestions which we are looking at.

In terms of amendments to the *Day Care Act*<sup>31</sup>, there are things that do not have to go into an act to be changed to have some of these things happen. One of the things that the Member had mentioned was a full-time day care coordinator. That should be done through Management Board approval. We would definitely support a full-time coordinator for day care if that is what is needed and we believe that it is. There are no problems there.

<sup>30</sup> The motion also proposes that professional child care training for staff involved in fulltime day care services, and that all full-time day care workers be licenced and that all full-time workers possess a certificate or diploma in extended care training. This is something that the department would dearly love to see in place sometime soon.

A survey done at the end of March, 1985 by the Day Care Services Board indicated that there were 45 day care staff at the time in licenced programs, of 42 full-time and three part-time, only four had a recognized early childhood education training. Yukon College has begun, this past year, to offer courses in early childhood education to presently include, in regulations, the expectations for professional training and licencing, which would, if enacted, lead to the immediate closure of virtually all existing child care programs because we have all of these people who are working in day care centres who do not have the necessary training that Members are asking for. Eventually, it is our hope that we would see that happen and all child care workers in the day care centres would be licenced, because that is exactly the kind of day care centres we are looking for.

The Member has also asked for the consideration of certain things in this motion, including the subsidization of child care. That part of it was passed yesterday in this House. There has been an increase. Because nobody asked me all those questions, I was not able to be specific, but it was included in the budget yesterday.

We do have a bit of a problem with point number three, substituting a needs test for the present means or income test. There could be problems with this. A needs test, as is presently carried out within our social assistance program and we believe that it would be along that same line, is a complex series of disclosure and information that would be time consuming and expensive. A day care subsidy program based on a means test would require the divulging and verification of all forms of income and assets as well as a scrutiny according to regulations and policy as to the specific costs that would be recognized as needs.

I think that we would have to do a lot of gathering of information

to find out whether or not that could be included and whether or not that would be included in an act, I do not know, or whether it would have to go through Management Board, or through as a regulation.

With respect to point number one, the direct funding or subsidization of child care training occur — that is something that we would consider supporting. The salaries of existing day care staff are extremely low; many day care employees are having to seek part-time additional employment in another job in order to make ends meet. We know that happens, because people have come to us and talked about the problems, so we are aware of that. Both the cost and the time pressure on them might wisely be subsidized through this government to show that we are interested in achieving a position where a licencing standard of qualifications can be expected from the staff working in licensed day care programs.

With respect to point number two regarding direct funding of licensed day care organizations in the forms of grants, this is an area that this government could consider very seriously. The following were mentioned in the motion, start-up grants based on a larger number of spaces sought to be approved; ongoing operation and maintenance grants, monthly or yearly, based on the number of licensing spaces; yearly toy, equipment and supply grants and so on. The above list is not intended to be all-inclusive but it does capture the majority of the types of grants presently available in a number of other Canadian jurisdictions.

We do not have any problem of looking at that, because of our policy on day care. We would look at something like that very seriously down the road.

<sup>31</sup> I have a bit of a problem with number four. I think that, in that section, we would probably have to do some more work on that. In preparation for the 1985-86 budget, this department did an analysis in September and October 1984 of the present costs for the components previously used in February 1981 to develop the turning points for the sliding fee schedule upon which the subsidy is based. These turning points are the amount for a given family size with a net monthly income below which a hundred percent of all day care costs are subsidized up to the maximum amount permitted by the regulations. Above the turning points, a user pays fifty percent of the additional net monthly income towards the day care costs and therefore receives a partial subsidy if eligible.

I think there still has to be a lot of work done in that area, and we could not come up with a definite policy or answer for this one. We would certainly have to do a lot more delving into it to find out whether or not we could consider it, but we would have to wait for that.

In point number six, it is recommended that subsidy payments be made directly to day care institutions. As discussed, this would possibly be more convenient for the operators in terms of insured payment of part of the cost that the subsidy covers in most cases, or all of the subsidy. But it does not remove the question of the subsidy being an issue between the government, the provider of the subsidy, and the individual who may require it due to personal financial situations. It would also mean that the operator would be directly aware of the amount of subsidy that an individual is receiving and this might clearly not be acceptable to some recipient individuals because we have to look at both sides. We have to look at the individual when making those payments directly. We have not rejected the idea. We have had representation made to us by the Day Care Association, but we have to look at it very seriously. I am not sure whether or not we will, in time, do it. We could consider it, for sure; there is no problem there.

The motion also calls for fifty percent of the appointments made by the Child Care Association. That would certainly be ideal for the Day Care Association, but I think in terms of what our policies are in terms of making these appointments, we have to look at many other things. As a matter of fact, we have sent out letters to many interested groups and organizations with regard to recommendations for a number of boards, including the day care board. We have got answers back from some of those groups, indicating to us that they would like to see certain people on them. Most of the people who have been suggested to us are people who are very aware of the child care problem, and we certainly look very favourably at having

those interested people there. We would definitely not put anybody on that board who was not interested in day cares. That would be something we would not do.

I would have a great deal of problem supporting this motion in full. I think there is just too much there — as a matter of fact, I have never seen such a long motion in this House. Although there are many good things in it, I could not come up with a motion to amend it because I would not have known where to start. In principle, we do support a number of things in this motion but, in full, we cannot support the motion at this time. I would look forward to another motion next week, or the week after, with regard to the child care situation.

<sup>32</sup> In terms of the day care people not being happy, hopefully there are some things that I have mentioned today that they will be happy with. There are some things that have been included. Yesterday there was a raise in the subsidy. There are certainly other things that I am sure they would be happy with. I am not completely rejecting everything, but we cannot support the motion.

**Mrs. Firth:** As the Minister said, this is a very large motion, perhaps a bit unwieldy. It is because it concerns so many different aspects of day care, and so many different points regarding day cares that have to be dealt with.

I find it interesting because I heard the Minister say several times in response to some of the considerations raised in the motion that down the road perhaps we could do this, or down the road we could look at that, we could look at this, we could look at that, and that she did not have any problems with many of the things. I think that that is the essence of responding to the whole motion, because very often, when you look at something and when you are down the road and you are looking at something, it does not work out and sound as easy to implement and to start as it may now, when we are discussing it in the House.

I believe that there is a consensus among all of the parties who are debating this motion today that society has progressed to the stage where we have to look at being more progressive about the day care services that we are providing as a government. I think that is a consensus amongst all of us.

However, when we come to the specifics of the motion, and the specific points, I would like to raise my concerns on the points, and then I would like to propose an amendment to the motion. I will speak to the motion itself and some of the points, unless perhaps the Members would like to see the amendment and then we could debate the amendment in full.

I will go through the points, as I hear that that is their desire. When it comes to the first opening paragraph regarding the *Day Care Act* that was approved in 1979, and its inadequacies, and how it does not meet present day needs or standards, or what organizations and children and parents are needing, that may be so, but I have always felt, after reading the *Day Care Act* that it was a very basic act. However, we did have regulations that could be applied to the act, and perhaps the avenue to take would be to amend the regulations, which can more accurately reflect present day requirements.

I believe the Minister of Health and Human Resources, Mr. Philipsen, had proceeded with this, and as the Minister indicated, it had been distributed to the day care services board and they had had some input and other interested people could have input.

Also, when it comes to the point of a full time Day Care Coordinator, I think we have progressed in the Yukon and the demand has been increasing, and we could agree with this point. It is not unreasonable that we proceed in that fashion now.

Regarding professional day care training for staff, I found it rather unspecific and a rather totally encompassing comment in regards to how specific the rest of the motion was. When you look at providing professional staff, of course it could be a program that is developed through Yukon College and would take some time to develop. It would have to be done in conjunction with the Day Care Services Board, and with the demand that society is putting on day care today. I have some concerns about that, about how sophisticated the people in the Yukon wish the day cares to be. I do not deny that in time that sophistication will grow and the demand will

be greater. I too would like to see more licensed and professional staff within the day cares.

However, I think if we concentrate a lot of our time and a lot of our energy on that aspect, on that technical aspect of training, that we, number one, as the Minister said, put ourselves in the position of, if we approve the motion or agree to the motion, saying that it would happen immediately that the day cares would all be closed down because there is obviously a lack of that kind of professionally trained, licensed staff.

<sup>33</sup> The second point I wanted to make regarding that is that we have to be cautious because we have to determine whether we in the Yukon, and whether the people in the Yukon want to have educators in their day cares, or whether they want to have people who care about children and who want to look after children and teach them about life and so on. We have to identify how stringent we are going to make the training program and how demanding we are going to be when it comes to having professionals in the day cares.

I know that there is a basic child-care course provided at Yukon College now, and I also know that we do have a lot of early childhood educators in the Yukon who are presently unemployed and who could be the type of individuals who would work in a day care. Although their salaries would be more than our private day cares would probably be able to pay them, I think that as time goes on, and as the Minister said, down the road and after having looked at it, the demand in the Yukon may grow to the extent that that kind of thing will be required here.

The points three and four about full-time day care workers being licensed and having diplomas and certificates, I agree that that is progressive, and that may be the direction that we will head in the Yukon. That is something that we can work towards in time.

I know that the government has considered already the direct funding or subsidization of child care training programs because we have the training program at Yukon College, which is available to individuals who are interested on the same basis as the Certified Nursing Assistant program or other trades programs that are provided through the college, and abilities to take these courses are available through Manpower. We have no difficulty agreeing with the direct funding or subsidization of child care training courses.

When we talk about grants, and allowing grants for day cares, it gets very complicated as to exactly how much grant or subsidization the government wishes to give. In Ontario, the government subsidizes licensed day cares on a per child, per month basis, and we may arrive at that stage here in the Yukon at the time when the demand by the Yukon public and Yukon parents is for day cares that have professionally trained and licensed staff. Until that time, I think that we can provide minimum amounts of money, as have been indicated in the budget, and we can pursue the seventh point that the Member raised in his motion about granting tax or other concessions to day cares, or other businesses who operate day care services. I think that is an area that we have to look at in the Yukon.

When it comes to a needs test, it would always be the intention of this government to provide what we could, and in so doing, allow the individual to maintain their dignity as they were receiving the subsidies.

<sup>34</sup> The needs test I think is a bit harsh for day care; however, if there are shortfalls and they cannot be compensated by increasing the \$250 subsidy, which we can agree to, then I could see where we would have to look at moderating the sliding scale that we are using now which takes into account the number of children parents are claiming for, or they are wishing to have subsidized; it takes into account whether there are one or two incomes, whether it is a single parent family or not.

So, we feel that, as far as increasing the present maximum subsidy, that is a point we could agree to. When it comes to paying the subsidy directly to the day care institution, that, too, may come one day down the road in the Yukon — when our day cares are more government structured and government controlled. But right now they are not; they are controlled by the private sector. It would be the intention that the money still go to the person receiving the subsidy in order that they pass it on. Otherwise, we cut out the

middle man, who, in this case, is the parent.

When the demand for more professionally trained day care staff is there, and governments are giving subsidies to the day care, then I could see that there would be some potential for the subsidy to go directly to the day care; but we cannot agree with the payment going directly to the day care institution right now.

I recognize that there are approximately fifty people who are getting day care subsidies right now, and probably ninety percent of them are single mothers. The situation cannot be solved for those people by imposing a total rapid change on the whole day care system.

I recognize the government is going to proceed in some directions, as the minister has already indicated, to enhance the day care facilities and subsidies already provided in the Yukon. It would be our intention to amend the motion so that we can have a vote on the motion after the Member for Faro has put in a tremendous amount of work — and I would like to congratulate him on his first major motion which he has brought to this Legislature.

#### *Amendment proposed*

**Mrs. Firth:** I would like to, therefore, amend Motion No. 4 by deleting the words after 'THAT' in the first paragraph and substituting the words:

"It is the opinion of this House that the government should give consideration to: (1) a full-time day care co-ordinator;

(2) direct funding or subsidization of child care training courses;

(3) increasing the present maximum subsidy of \$250;

(4) granting tax or other concessions to day cares or businesses who operate day care services."

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Member for Riverdale South that Motion No. 4 be amended by deleting the words after "THAT" in the first paragraph and substituting the words: "it is the opinion of this House that the government should give consideration to:

(1) a full-time day care co-ordinator;

(2) direct funding or subsidization of child care training courses;

(3) increasing the present maximum subsidy of \$250;

(4) granting tax or other concessions to day cares or businesses who operate day care services."

**Mrs. Firth:** I think I have expressed to the House our feelings on this issue. I would look forward to any comments the Members have. We would certainly be hoping that the government and government Members would have no difficulty supporting this amendment.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I wish to address some points raised in the amendment.

The amendment proposes essentially all of the items that the main motion proposes, but I get the direct impression that it, in effect, removes the rug from under a large part of the other parts of the motion. The whole intent of that was to bring the motion forward with the underscoring of the problems that exist in the present *Day Care Act* on the floor of this Assembly. To give consideration to the amendment in the form in which it is presented will not do what the main motion is intended to.

It is for that reason we, in this party, will be voting against the amendment. We believe that a considerable amount of research has gone into, as the proponent of the amendment has admitted, this subject in order to bring out the problems. If pointing out these problems is a valid consideration, why negate them or cut them off at the knees.

The motion, we believe, should be considered in its full context. That is why it was brought forward.

**Mrs. Joe:** I would like to support this amendment. I think, in terms of this motion and the other one, there were certain things we could not do, and certain things which did not pertain to each other so that, in order to support the other motion, there were certain things we could not support but there were other things that just did not tie in together, and which, in the form of another motion, might have. We have no problem supporting the consideration of a fulltime coordinator, direct funding or subsidization of child care training courses. As I mentioned, there has already been an increase

in this House. It was passed yesterday. We would be happy to support this. It is better than nothing.

**Mr. Webster:** I must agree with the Member for Faro when he says that this amendment waters down the original intent of the motion. I would like to see a lot more included, so therefore I agree with the minister's original statement, when she was speaking to the motion, that she would consider it in a revised form when it came back to this House in a week's time. For example, I cannot support the omission of point no. 4, amending the gross wage ceiling of \$1,100 for the day care subsidy. In Dawson City, no one receives that subsidy. It is unrealistically low. I also want to see the subsidy payments made directly to day care institutions. I would like to see that considered, and that is all this motion asks for, to see it considered. I know, in the case of the Dawson City Day Care Centre, which, incidentally, is the only one operating in the rural Yukon, they would like to see this subsidy made directly to the day care centre, for often they have not received the payment from the person being subsidized. They have had to leave on short notice or whatever, and people in such situations often need that extra cash. So I think we are dismissing this rather quickly and I am going to vote against the amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I was originally intending to speak on the main motion and I was particularly interested in asking the Member for Faro some questions because he gets a chance to speak again to close debate on the main motion. I was going to ask, and I will ask, around some of the issues that have been previously identified, but I will rephrase them.

The intent of the motion, or the spirit of the motion is clear, and it appears that all Members support the spirit of the motion; at least, all parties do.

It is interesting, that that is a substantial change from the position before the election on the 13th of May. The previous Conservative government did not do these things for years. We have, in the last four and a half months, done more than was done in the last four and a half years.

I remember well, a motion about day care which occurred in the last House about the request of a group of citizens who wanted to use some unused space in the school in Watson Lake for a day care. The Members on the Conservative side, including the Member, who, now in Opposition, is in favour of progressive steps, voted against that measure.

The issue I would like to speak about is the growth or development of the day care system in Yukon from where it was in its infancy some years ago to the long term picture. I would ask the Member for Faro, if he will state his party's general position, not tomorrow, as an eventual goal, to having free day care in the territory as the public schools are free. Is that a policy to strive for, or not, and I would ask the Member for Faro to state a position on that.

I would also ask if the Member for Faro has addressed his mind to the issue of child care, as opposed to day care. Many parents — and many of them are single mothers — work shift work and have a great deal of difficulty in finding day care outside of the normal day time hours.

I would ask if his position is that that is a serious problem or not, and if that should be included as well. It may be appropriate in the long term future to have day care services free and publicly funded and as readily available as the public schools. It could be delivered in association with, or with close proximity to, public schools. I ask the Member his position.

This party has long asked in opposition for increased day care services, increased subsidies. We are putting those programs into place as the Minister has stated. It cannot all be done overnight. As the Minister has stated, significant steps have been taken.

**Mr. Coles:** I find it very discouraging, and some Members of the House would say, appalling, that the position that this government has taken on this issue, after reading for the last two weeks pages and pages of *Hansard*, that they have dedicated themselves toward day care, better day care, more subsidies, more



everything. Now they sit here and take exactly the same position that they condemned in this House for the last six or seven years, and the new Opposition, as the last government, is taking their position.

On everything that we have asked for in here that the Minister will not agree to, it says give consideration to. We are not asking for you to change anything tomorrow. We are not asking this government to change the act tomorrow. We are asking you to give consideration to these seven points.

If you cannot accept that, I want every day care organization in this territory to know it, and I want a recorded vote on this issue today.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I apologize, I feel sorry that the Liberal Leader is getting huffed and puffed about this thing, since I have been around here long enough to remember when I moved motions in this House to support day care funding, and I had Members of his party vote against me. You can check the record and find out that I was alone in this House and stood against members saying that day care funding was creeping socialism. I remember hearing that when I was on that side, in that chair, all by myself, moving the motion. Do not talk to me about parties changing positions.

**Some Member:** (Inaudible)

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** The Member opposite should be careful about withdrawing that remark, because that is unparliamentary and in fact not permitted in the Legislature. But anyway, he is too new to know that that is not permitted under the rules.

The fact of the matter is that the long-standing commitment of this party to improving day care services and day care funding is being acted out. We are quite happy, I think, to give, as the minister said, consideration to most of the things here. But I do not think we would want the public impression created that we would accept, *in toto*, every one of the initiatives proposed in the Member's motion opposite, because we will then have the Members coming back in the next few weeks saying why have you not implemented this, why have you not done this, why have you not done that?

There is no hesitancy on this side to commit more public resources to the operation of day cares, to the maintenance of day cares, to enabling parents to get day care, and if necessary, if it will improve the provision of day care in rural Yukon, capital grants, if warranted. We have argued for those things in this House since 1979. We have been consistent in arguing for those things. We will continue to argue for those things. We will now implement those things. Notwithstanding the rhetoric from the Member opposite, we will be implementing those things. There are some particulars in the motion moved by the Member for Faro with which we have some problems. There are some particulars with which we have some problems. The motion moved by the Member for Riverdale South has nothing in it that is problematic at all. In fact, I think we are probably implementing most of it already. Therefore, it is uncontroversial; there is no way we can vote against. There is absolutely no way we can vote against it. It does not even replace or delete any principles in this bill, it deletes some particulars.

The Liberal Member says it votes against the spirit of the motion. It does not vote against the spirit of the motion at all. It deletes a number of particulars, which are controversial or problematic. Some of them have specific dollar references in them, which may not be appropriate, but I think it is a pity that the Member opposite has stooped to throwing charges of fascism around the House, which is really low-grade stuff and really not permitted under the rules, and really very childish. Very childish.

I am proud to say that I have stood alone in this House, alone in this House, in defence and in the advocacy of day care funding at a time when there was no funding for day cares in this territory. It is a battle I think I am entitled to take some pride in saying I helped win. The fact that that funding has not been adequate, the fact that we are now improving it, the fact that we are considering other ways in which to improve the delivery of day care services to people in the territory, because we have a community with a large number of poor people, a large number of single parents, a large number of unemployed people who cannot get into the workforce

unless there is adequate day care, that is a situation we recognize and want to correct.

<sup>40</sup> I have to tell you that I am not persuaded that the Day Care Services Board ought to be entitled to 50 percent representation on the boards and committees. That is not the way we are going to structure boards or committees. We have previously said, as a matter of policy, that we want regional, gender, racial and political balance. We cannot if we use the Day Care Services Board, get any regional balance at all, just for a start. I know very well the economics of day care. I know the economics of day care workers. I think that it has been traditionally a very serious situation, a bad situation here. There was a day care that I well know, that not too many years had two workers who were operating it were taking home a total of \$13,000 between the two of them. I was recently in the day care in Dawson City, where the workers were telling me what they got paid, and they thought it was quite adequate, but it was considerably lower than most of the people who are working for this government. These people, to reiterate the point made by the Member for Faro, are people who are doing perhaps the most important work in the world, that is, looking after pre-school children. That is something which is very important.

From time to time in this House we have had debate about whether day care funding ought to be under Health and Human Resources. It is a problem that some people have argued, that day cares, because they have been funded and supported and administered and regulated by this department, tend to be seen as some kind of a welfare agency, or welfare service. There is some stigma attached to that. Other people have suggested that day cares should more properly be the responsibility of the Department of Education, recognizing that the education of children starts very early and people might find it easier to justify the support for day cares if they were operated under the umbrella of Education rather than the Welfare umbrella.

I take the view that it is ludicrous that society should accept, when the child is six, 100 percent of the cost of their care and education for a certain number of hours of the day; but when they are a couple of years younger, say that they had no responsibilities in that regard. I think that that is a completely illogical position for society to take. As my colleague, the Minister of Justice, has indicated, we have been moving more and more to an improved consciousness on that score, that in an age of single parents, in an age where two parents have to work in order to get by, in an age where people want to feel confidence and secure if they are going out to work about the care of their children, in an age where we do not have extended families and traditional rural communities, it is necessary to have a quality day care plan. I am sure that the employment potential of many single parents, and many potential workers in many rural communities, is considerably diminished by the fact that there is no day care service available.

<sup>41</sup> We had only just made a start in this territory, it seems to me, in terms of the licensing, the establishment of standards and adequate funding and services. I think if the motions that are presented here today help move us in the right direction on that score, then I am very pleased.

I think the proposals put forward to us today are fit subject for debate. I regret that the Leader of the Liberal Party chose to make some silly remarks about the parties' positions. I take very seriously the initiative by the Member for Faro. I am sure that most Members of the House do. I also find that the amendments proposed by the Member for Riverdale South are, from my point of view, entirely uncontroversial.

**Speaker:** It is my duty to advise the Assembly . . .

**Mr. Lang:** On a point of order. We are voting on the amendment, not the main motion.

**Speaker:** Division is called

<sup>42</sup> Mr. Clerk, would you kindly poll the House?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Agreed.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Agreed.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Agreed.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** Agreed.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Agreed.

**Mr. Webster:** Disagree.

**Ms Kassi:** Agreed.

**Mr. Phelps:** Agreed.

**Mr. Brewster:** Agreed.

**Mr. Lang:** Agreed.

**Mr. Phillips:** Agreed.

**Mrs. Firth:** Agreed.

**Mr. Coles:** Disagree.

**Mr. McLachlan:** Disagree.

**Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, the results are 11 yea, three nay.

*Amendment agreed to*

**Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the main motion?

It is my duty to advise the Assembly that the Hon. Member for Faro is about to exercise his right to close debate. Afterwards, all Members will be precluded from speaking to this question; therefore, any Member wishing to speak should do so now.

**Mr. Lang:** I just wanted to rise to speak to the motion from the perspective of the observations that were made by the government's side. Just so that all Members are aware, as well as the media, I think it is important to realize that once the motion has been put on the floor, and in this particular the motion on day care, and the substance of that motion has been debated, we cannot revert and have a motion a week hence as was recommended earlier in debate. We have to deal with the issue, or adjourn it.

I thought I should raise that as a point for all Members, because it is just not a case of bringing in business then deciding to leave it unfinished and going on to the next week and seeing what else could be presented. I just bring this to the Members' attention.

**Mr. McLachlan:** If anything, this afternoon, I certainly believe we have flushed out some positions and found out some feelings on this motion. I do acknowledge that when the original legislation was brought in in 1979, as many of the Members in the House here today would agree with me, the first kick at the cat, the first hit on new legislation in a new area is never expected to be totally all-encompassing and all-embracing, and to be an expert in all the areas that eventually turn up. Six years later, in 1985, we certainly discovered that.

I am pleased to hear, from all sides of the House today, that we all seem to understand and agree that changes are needed and are long overdue. If anything, we have established that out of this discussion this afternoon.

In answer to a couple of the questions raised by the Minister of Justice, I would like to advise that the position of our party is that we are striving for better day care in the Yukon, not necessarily a free day care system in the Yukon.

<sup>43</sup> I fully realize that there is a great deal of feeling and position towards a universal day care system with the same type of accessibility that we now have to hospitals and schools. In 1985, I believe perhaps that may be a little too realistic, a little too futuristic; by 1995, who knows? Nobody ever thought in 1979 that day care would proceed to the position it is at today.

On the issue of child care, I do believe that some institutions should be structured in such a way that they can look after children on a 24-hours-a-day basis. There are very many cases where there are people on night shift, 12 to 8, and nowhere to leave a sleeping infant. I believe that some institutions, and obviously not all of them, can be structured in such a way to look after this. I hope that still the private sector aspect of this would look after itself. Two of seven might be structured that way, two of eight, three of ten, who knows?

I would like to advise the Minister of Human Resources that no. 6 is in there for a very specialized reason. The Member for Klondike has realized it, and we on this side of the House realized it. I am a little bit surprised that the other government members cannot see it. No. 6 is there simply because of the fact that people run out on their bills. They do not pay. I would like to ask the Minister of Human Resources, or at least suggest to her, that she consult with her colleagues on her left and her right, one of whom would express a legal opinion as to whether it can be done, and the Minister on her

left who can express the opinion because he is responsible for the particular department. But I would like to see the government, if they have a problem with no. 6, jointly issue cheques payable to the individual and the day care institution. We have instances in the territory where people run out on their bills, and run to Montreal. What does the Department of Justice say when the day care institution comes and asks the government to make good on the unpaid bill? It says, "No, we legally cannot pay you. We have got to pay Mrs. John Smith in Montreal. We hope Mrs. John Smith in Montreal will honour her obligations to you". But it does not always happen that way. That is why no. 6 is there; but apparently some cloud is obscuring it.

I welcome the opportunity to be able to air this whole discussion today. I am a little surprised by the reactions where we hear "Great idea, we really support a lot of those changes but we are going to throw it out". We are having just a little bit of a problem digesting that particular concept of the arguments raised here today.

<sup>44</sup> **Speaker:** Are you prepared for the question.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Member:** Division.

**Speaker:** Division has been called. Would the Clerk please poll the House.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Agree.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Agree.

**Mr. Webster:** Agree.

**Ms Kassi:** Agree.

**Mr. Phelps:** I will agree.

**Mr. Brewster:** Agree.

**Mr. Lang:** I will go with you, David, agree.

**Mr. Phillips:** Agree.

**Mr. Coles:** Disagree.

**Mr. McLachlan:** Disagree.

**Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, the results are 12 yea, two nay.

*Amendment agreed to*

*Motion No. 4 agreed to as amended*

#### **Motion No. 5**

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

**Speaker:** Is the Minister prepared to deal with Item No. 4?

**Mr. Brewster:** Yes.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Member for Kluane, that this House strongly urge the Government of Yukon to extend the fuel tax exemption currently provided for mining, trapping, logging, commercial fishing and hunting to include fuel oil used by highway lodges for electrical generation in recognition of the critical importance of these lodges to the safety of the travelling public utilizing Yukon highways.

<sup>45</sup> **Mr. Brewster:** I have presented this motion for consideration of the House in order to correct an obvious injustice. Yukon highway lodges have long been the backbone of our highway system, but all too often their contribution is overlooked or forgotten. I recall fighting for two years to correct the inequalities in the electrical rebate program for highway lodges. The same thing appears to have happened in this particular instance.

I must admit that I was quite surprised to see it happen here because of the well-publicized strike of highway lodges in northern British Columbia regarding their power rate. I thought that all the publicity surrounding this incident would have made the government more aware of the plight of Yukon highway lodges. Unfortunately, this was not the case.

This fuel tax exemption was part of the election platform of two major political parties. I can assure the government that fuel tax exemptions for highway lodges would have been included in our program. Though some of the lodges only operate during the summer months, they make a significant contribution to tourism and to the Yukon economy, in addition to promoting the safety of travelling public.



For those highway lodges that remain open all year round, this fuel tax exemption is even more critical. Expenses for fuel during the winter months is, of course, considerably higher, and those lodges could certainly use all the help they can get. If there were not any highway lodges operating during the winter, we would have a very serious problem indeed.

Therefore, I urge all Members of this House, and especially the government Members, to finally recognize the importance of the highway lodges to the Yukon economy, and to include them in the list of business and industry receiving fuel tax exemptions.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I am in a bit of a quandry as to how to vote on this motion, and I will explain why. To prevent the House putting itself in a difficult position, I think that I will have to recommend voting against. The reason is not that we disagree at all with what the Member is proposing, but the problem is that it is already the law of the territory and has been since 1975.

The proposed exemption referred to by the Hon. Member is already covered in the exemptions under subsection 5(1) of the *Fuel Oil Tax Act*, which was passed in the Yukon Legislature on May 20, 1975. That exemption said no taxes payable on fuel oil purchased for use and subsequently consumed in stationary generators of electricity.

There are currently 20 lodges and motels in Yukon holding fuel exemption permits that authorize them to purchase fuel oil for use in stationary generators exempt of tax. These include the Mountain View Lodge in Haines Junction, the Burwash Landing Resort, the Dezedeash Lodge, the Great Divide Lodge in Swift River, the Iron Creek Lodge at Mile 596, Kluane Lake Lodge, Koidern Gulf Services, Mile 1167 Alaska Highway, Midway Lodge, Mile 142, Rancheria Hotel Limited, Mile 710, White River Lodge at Mile 1169, Bayshore Motel and Esso Service at Mile 1064, Contact Creek Esso and Lodge, Watson Lake, Eagle Plains Hotel, Gravel Lake Lodge, Dawson City, Kathleen Lake Lodge, Haines Junction, Kluane Wilderness Lodge, Mile 1118 Alaska Highway, Leanto Lodge, Teslin, Pine Valley Motel, Mile 1147 Alaska Highway, and the Rainbow's Inn in Watson Lake.

In order to qualify for a permit to purchase fuel tax exempt, the applicant must first make application providing details of the equipment in which the fuel will be consumed, for example, the stationary generators, names, serial number and generating capacity, and an estimate of the anticipated annual consumption.

« Even if, and this is important, the applicant is within an area served by a grid system, he can still apply for such a permit. Some consumers purchase the fuel and pay the tax then apply for and receive a refund of the tax on the fuel used for exempt purposes. The point really is that the off-road fuel tax exemption, which we have recently introduced, is the same exemption for off-road use which has already been enjoyed by the lodge operators, the ones I have just named, for some considerable length of time. So we believe that the motion is unnecessary and therefore we must oppose it.

There is, of course, no indication — from our point of view, it is quite the opposite — that this program is going to be discontinued for lodges. Quite the opposite. There is, as the Member may know, a bulk sales tax rebate, which is a federal program and which is due to expire in 1986, we understand, but we have no particular news of that and our own tax remission, as Members know and as has been announced, is going to be exist to the end of this year but be extended and be made a permanent measure.

**Mr. Lang:** In view of the comments made by the Government Leader, I think it is safe to say we would like to check out just exactly what the situation is. We thought that, from the information we had, it was that they had been excluded; so, with the aberration of the House, I would move that we adjourn debate on Motion No. 5.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I am quite happy to support the adjournment motion, and I will provide my notes on this subject to the Member for Kluane if that is helpful.

**Speaker:** It is moved by the Member for Porter Creek East that debate be now adjourned on Motion No. 5. Are you agreed?

*Motion agreed to*

*Motion No. 5, debate adjourned*

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

**Speaker:** Is the Hon. Member prepared to proceed?

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

**Motion No. 7**

**Clerk:** Item No. 6, standing in the name of Mr. Phillips.

**Speaker:** Is the Hon. Member prepared to proceed with the item?

**Mr. Phillips:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North that the Yukon Legislative Assembly, in recognition of: the high cost of living and of developing northern Canada; the economic benefits which are enjoyed by all Canadians as a consequence of northern development; and the contribution to Canadian sovereignty through the settlement of Canada's north, urges the federal government to implement a fair and reasonable indexed, universal northern tax benefit system for all northerners.

**Mr. Phillips:** I think this is an issue that Yukoners have wanted to see resolved for a long time. As early as September this year a committee was formed which completed a report. It was formed from all Yukon interest groups. They put together a policy called "Fairness in the Taxation of Northern Equity Payments".

I would like to commend that committee for their work on this issue and I would like to urge this House to support this motion today.

For far too long, there has been an inequity in the northern benefit system. A universal northern tax benefit would do several things for northerners. First of all, it would be a very clear signal to Ottawa that the costs of living and development in the north is much higher than in southern Canada. It would also recognize that the development of the north does in fact not only contribute to Canada's economy as a whole, but it also establishes a stronger Canadian sovereignty in our north country.

Thirdly, but just as importantly, it means that by using the taxation system that all Yukoners, not just government workers or those who receive the benefits now, would receive some type of taxation benefit for living, working and developing in Canada's north.

As this policy is now under review, and it seems like it has been under review forever, it is up to us, on behalf of all Yukon people, to send a very clear message to Ottawa as to where we stand. I ask all Members to support this motion today.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** Just briefly, and speaking in my capacity as Minister of Finance, I want to indicate to the Member opposite that we will be supporting this motion. I will speak very very briefly to it.

The Member has indicated that the Government of Yukon has joined together with the Yukon Committee on the taxation of Northern Equity Payments to make a presentation to a group of federal officials representing the federal Minister of Finance.

As the Member indicated, the committee has urged the Government of Canada to develop an alternate method of taxation of northern benefits before the current moratorium is removed at the end of this year. The committee has proposed that an indexed tax system replace the existing moratorium and that those employees presently covered by the moratorium not be adversely affected by changes in the method used to tax northern benefits and that the benefits be passed on, through the new system, to those not currently receiving benefits.

Like the Member opposite, I would like to pay tribute to the group that has done so much work on this thing and perhaps name them, for the record, because I think they deserve that recognition.

They are: Bill Dunbar, President of Yukon Chamber of Commerce; Gary Bauer, then President of the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Truska Gorrell, President of the Association of Yukon Communities; Miss Linda McCann, Director of Personnel

for the City of Whitehorse; Dietmar Tramm, Council for Yukon Indians; Moe Ritchie, Public Service Alliance of Canada; Dennis Prince, President of Yukon Chamber of Mines and representing the Mining Association of Canada and the Yukon/BC Chamber of Mines; Ray Hayes, Department of Finance; Ross Priest, Whitehorse and Yukon Building and Construction Trades Council; Bill Rudichuk, United Steel Workers; David George, MacKay & Partners; Roland Boone, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Sibyl Frei, Yukon Federation of Labour.

There were a number of other groups, including the Klondike Placer Miners Association, the BC/Yukon Hoteliers Association, Yukon Visitors Association, Klondike Visitors Association, Yukon Law Society, Agricultural Association, Yukon Trappers Association, Seniors Information Centre, Yukon Mine Operators and the Golden Age Society who also contributed to the brief referred to. "The committee has been eloquent on the point. They have said, if I may quote a short paragraph or two, 'We are Yukoners who know from first-hand experience that the dollar earned in the North is not the same as the dollar earned elsewhere, in terms of discretionary economic power it bestows on its recipient. The discretionary economic power of the dollar is diminished as a direct result of the high cost of living faced daily by all Northerners. It has been an established and accepted fact for some thirty years that Northerners are in need of some additional remuneration to compensate them for the acknowledged additional financial burden imposed on them due to their isolated environment and its associated cost. Certainly, the federal government has itself for many years acknowledged the inequity and has given its employees equity payment to encourage and compensate them for living in the north.'"

I would recommend the document prepared by the committee as reading for, not only for the Members here who will be well acquainted with the issue, but any federal Member of Parliament who is interested in the question. As we have said earlier, this committee is recommending that a northern tax credit system be administered either federally or territorially that would treat all taxpayers fairly. That is something that I think we can support enthusiastically, and will do so.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** It is quite clear that this particular motion is going to pass in the House, I hope unanimously. One of the reasons why I am choosing to speak this afternoon is to give the Member for Faro a chance to collect his thoughts and perhaps participate in the debate. It will be of great concern of the constituents of his riding when the riding expands to its former self. In the early 1970's, the federal tax law was changed to ensure that the federal government would have the ability to tax northern benefits, and it was not until 1979 that a Minister of Revenue actually admittedly promoted the taxation of northern benefits, presumably to ensure that the tax system should apply uniformly to all Canadians. Subsequent to that, Ministers of National Revenue and Ministers of Northern Affairs have indicated to northern residents and persons in isolated posts across the country that they would prefer to have direct support programs, rather than any solution to the matter addressed in the taxation system. This has been resisted by many groups in the past, like the group that was mentioned by the Member for Riverdale North, and by the Government Leader, groups that put a lot of time into resisting any solution which did not satisfy northerners concerned. They have put in as much time as the group did this summer, and deserve as much recognition for their efforts in delaying a decision that would not have satisfied our concerns as did the group this summer.

"The benefits that are referred to historically have been used to attract skilled labour to isolated regions of the country, and to recognize that the cost of living is at times 20 to 30 percent higher than it is in southern urban populated parts of the country, and to also recognize that there are associated costs of living which are not always easily definable, such as high fuel costs, costs of travel between scattered communities, which are daily facts of life for most northerners, and certainly Yukoners.

The tax concession proposal is essentially an equalizing payment to ensure that people who live in isolated conditions should receive

some compensation for the extra hardship that they put up with in terms of a higher cost of living. It has also been quite noticeable for persons who are currently receiving northern benefits and for those who are not, that this is not a universal system in that north. Even though there are persons, for example, such as the residents of Elsa, who receive tax benefits, there are people living 30 miles down the road who have the same cost of living problems, but who do not receive tax benefits.

That is why you will find the membership of the committees that have been struck to address the issue are comprised, in a large part, of those who currently receive the tax benefit, and they have universally at every opportunity insisted that all persons be included in any regime for the north.

This is critical for the unanimity in Yukon society, so that we might present a position to federal government which cannot be shattered on the basis of the fact that we have not got consensus in our own communities.

In 1983, I presented a motion to the Legislature essentially of the same sort, which addressed essentially the same issue, slightly more specific in certain areas, which, I believe, was supported by the Legislature. I cannot remember if it was amended or not, but in any case, it was supported by the Members of this Legislature, as expected. I expect that it will be supported again.

One issue that I addressed at that time, which the working group this summer has also addressed, to at least my satisfaction, is the issue regarding the maintenance of benefits currently being received by some people in the work force in the territory. I do not think it would be wise for anyone to assert that those who currently receive benefits should be penalized for having achieved something close to appropriate isolation allowances.

"It is an issue that is of importance to mining companies; it is an issue that is important to many employers in the territory; it is an issue that has been addressed by all working groups to the satisfaction of all, I believe. The sort of benefit we should be looking for should be one which is sufficient to meet the current level of benefits being received because that current level of benefits in some cases approaches an equitable treatment for workers north and south. So, I would encourage all Members to give that issue consideration. I have pontificated on it before in the House, so experienced Members will know my frame of mind on this matter. I am happy to say that the group studying the issue this summer has addressed it, as I say, to everyone's satisfaction.

In conclusion, I would also like to give my wholehearted support for this motion. I think it is timely. I think the working group's activities this summer were timely. We anticipate that the federal authorities will address the issue and perhaps have a lasting solution to the issue as of January 1, 1986. I think we must express the desires of the Legislature to the federal government as soon as possible so that they have a clear understanding of our views on the matter.

**Mr. McLachlan:** We in this party will have no problem supporting this motion and it, in fact, has appeared in very many of our own party's conventions in one form or another. Certainly, coming from the riding that I do, I know how much the mining companies rely upon the successful implementation of this sort of thing to be of some assistance to them. The only problem I have is with the final word of the motion. We have struggled with this before in our party. If you live in Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie is north. The only qualification I might add is that the federal government should have no problems if we use words like "residents of the Yukon and Northwest Territories" and then let the provinces scramble and fight all they want for their northern residents. But I do not consider this a serious enough problem or issue to move to an amendment. I fully believe in the spirit and the intent of the motion, and we will vote in favour of it.

**Speaker:** It is my duty to advise the Assembly that the Hon. Member is about to exercise his right to close debate and afterwards all Members will be precluded from speaking to this question. Therefore, any Members wishing to speak should do so now.

51 **Mr. Phillips:** I would just like to thank all the Members from all the parties here today who have spoken very favourably for the support of the motion. I think it is appropriate in closing to read into the record the last two paragraphs of the report from the Yukon Committee for Fairness in Taxation and Northern Equity Payments, where they say:

"Yukoners do appreciate that for over 30 years the federal government has acknowledged, through the equity payments made to its own employees, that there is a need to attract and keep qualified people in the north. This need is even more essential today than it was 30 years ago. We are Canadians, proud to be northerners, and we will continue to develop and care for the north on behalf of all Canadians".

Thank you.

*Motion No. 7 agreed to*

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

**Speaker:** Is the Hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 7?

**Mr. Phelps:** No, I would like to stand it over to the next day.

**Speaker:** So ordered.

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

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Government House Leader that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do now resolve into Committee of the Whole.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair*

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

52 And as I see some Members do not have their books with them, we will take a very brief recess.

*Recess*

53 **Chairman:** I will call Committee to order.

## Bill No. 2: Second Appropriation Act, 1985-86 — continued

### Department of Health and Human Resources — continued

**Chairman:** An application has been filed for the appearance of a witness, Mr. Jim Davie, Deputy Minister of Health and Human Resources. Do Members agree?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

*(Witness introduced)*

### On Health Centres

**Mr. McLachlan:** I had raised the issue of the health centre in Faro. I was having a bit of a problem with the \$1,030,000 for an institution in my town that was shut down. The Member for Porter Creek East was entirely correct when he described the situation we have now in Faro with the health centre. We can assist the Minister of Human Resources by blaming the whole mess on the Member to her left. He did not get the mine open, therefore temporary facilities for the health centre did not move back to the major centre. It is all the Government Leader's fault.

Seriously, though, did the Minister of Human Resources have prior knowledge of the close-down? If she did, is she aware of what the situation is in Faro? It is entirely inadequate at the moment for stretcher cases. Before we pass this issue, considering the amount of money, is there anything that can be done to make that situation better, especially if we do not wind up with a mine this winter. What are those 70 or 80 people left in Faro, plus any in the surrounding area who use the health centre going to go through? The government has come to the rallying point well in providing a Yukon Housing Corporation home to assist. It is all right for minor cuts and bruises, but we did have a bad case requiring a stretcher and it just was not adequate. I would like to hear from the Minister before I clear this item of \$1,000,000.

54 **Hon. Mrs. Joe:** In regard to the stretcher problem at the health centre, I was not aware of it and neither was the department as far as I know, until yesterday. We will be looking at the problem and

will investigate it and find out whether or not it can be alleviated. We would not want to see a situation that is hazardous to any people who may want to make use of the health centre.

As regards the health centre, the downgrading and changing around of it, the Acting Director of Northern Health Services has, I think, assured the town that he is flexible and, if there are some changes which have to be made with regard to that health centre there, that possibly down the road when there are more people living in Faro it could be upgraded again. I certainly would not want the people of Faro to have any hardships on account of a lack of services.

I would like to mention that, yesterday, I did not have a listing of all of the health centres in the Yukon and I will list them right now for the record: we have one in Faro, Ross River, Mayo, Destruction Bay, Whitehorse, Pelly Crossing, Haines Junction, Watson Lake, Teslin, Dawson and Carmacks. There are also five health stations. They are at Burwash Landing, Beaver Creek, Carcross, Upper Liard and Old Crow.

*Health Centres in the amount of \$1,030,000 agreed to*

*On Health Stations*

*Health Stations in the amount of \$56,000 agreed to*

*On Communicable Diseases*

*Communicable Diseases in the amount of \$42,000 agreed to*

*General Health Services in the total amount of \$2,026,000 agreed to*

*On Yukon Hospital Insurance Services*

*On In-Patient Services*

*In-Patient Services in the amount of \$10,550,000 agreed to*

*On Out-Patient Services*

*Out-Patient Services in the amount of \$995,000 agreed to*

*Yukon Hospital Insurance Services in the total amount of \$11,545,000 agreed to*

*On Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan*

55 **Mr. McLachlan:** Unless the number is listed elsewhere, where are all the people who work in the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan? Why is it a zero there?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** If we are on the right page, the Member is asking where are all the people who work for the Health Care Insurance Plan. I believe that they would all be under the Administration section of this budget.

**Mr. Coles:** Is the Minister of Health and Human Resources' department taking any steps in looking at the eventual phasing out of medicare premiums?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** As was mentioned during Question Period in the last Session, that is the responsibility of the Department of Finance and the Member responsible answered the question at that time in that it is being reviewed. It is not something you can do overnight. I do not know how far along they are in looking at the situation.

**Mr. Coles:** I realize who is in charge of the monetary part, but since it is the Minister's department I thought she may have some idea of what type of reviews or how far along the reviews have gone, and just what is being reviewed.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I think the Member is wanting me to get specific, and I cannot. I do not know how far along they are. I have not had conversations with him in regard to that situation. I cannot answer that right now.

*On In-Territory Doctors*

*In-Territory Doctors in the amount of \$4,192,000 agreed to*

*On Out-of-Territory Doctors*

*Out-of-Territory Doctors in the amount of \$665,000 agreed to*

*On Reimbursements to Residents*

*Reimbursements to Residents in the amount of \$42,000 agreed to*

*On Payment to Dentists*

*Payment to Dentists in the amount of \$16,000 agreed to*

*Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan in the amount of \$4,915,000 agreed to*

*On Mental Health Services*

*On Mental Health*

*Mental Health in the amount of \$270,000 agreed to*

*Mental Health Services in the amount of \$270,000 agreed to*

*On Subsidized Medical Travel*

*On Travel Outside Territory*

*Travel Outside Territory in the amount of \$381,000 agreed to*  
*On Travel Within Territory*

*Travel Within Territory in the amount of \$282,000 agreed to*  
*Subsidized Medical Travel in the amount of \$663,000 agreed to*  
*On Disease Control*

*On T.B. Control*

*T.B. Control in the amount of \$3,000 agreed to*

*On Chronic Disease*

*Chronic Disease in the amount of \$87,000 agreed to*

*On Pharmacare*

*Pharmacare in the amount of \$205,000 agreed to*

*On Extended Health*

*Extended Health in the amount of \$35,000 agreed to*  
*Disease Control in the amount of \$330,000 agreed to*

*On Communications Disorders Clinic*

**Mrs. Firth:** Perhaps the Minister could give us a progress report on the hiring of a speech therapist?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We do have a fully staffed clinic. In this department we have one speech therapist/audiologist and one secretary based in Whitehorse. We have a supervisor, one speech therapist and one speech therapist/audiologist and a secretary. It is fully staffed now. We had been looking for an audiologist, as the Member knows, for a while and we now have one.

*On Speech Pathology*

*Speech Pathology in the amount of \$231,000 agreed to*  
*Communications Disorders Clinic in the amount of \$231,000 agreed to*

*On Health Promotion**On Family Life Services*

*Family Life Services in the amount of \$55,000 agreed to*

*On Bursary Program*

**Mr. Lang:** Could I just ask for a brief description of the bursary program? I do not recall it.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** That is a program that I think was in existence in the past but was not a line item. I think the funding for that was coming out of another program. It is to expand the training of certain people who work with our senior citizens — nurses at Macaulay, doctors, or whatever — and there is a bursary offered from this government to those people to take that training. The supervisor at Macaulay Lodge, as a matter of fact, has taken that training, plus another nurse and, I believe, one doctor.

*Bursary Program in the amount of \$14,000 agreed to*

*Health Promotion in the total amount of \$69,000 agreed to*

*On Young Offenders*

**Mrs. Firth:** Could the Minister perhaps tell us when she is anticipating that our young offenders be handled here as opposed to being sent out for the secure facilities?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We now, or did last week, have three of our young offenders in a facility in Whitehorse. They were part of the young offenders who were run-aways; we were having problems with them and we had to put them in, I think, the women's section of the Whitehorse Correctional Centre. I do not like doing those things, but we had no choice at that time. We are looking at, as I mentioned yesterday, the possibility of opening up an interim secure facility to hold these young offenders for secure custody, and we hope we might be able to do that in the next few months. It is an interim.

**Mrs. Firth:** I recall the Minister when she was in opposition, asking the past Minister of Health and Human Resources, and the Minister of Justice also, about young offenders who were going to have to go to the Correctional Facility, and what accommodations or what things they were doing to see that those young offenders were being suitably accommodated. I do not have to explain what that means, I am sure we all know. I would like to ask the Minister now, since she is the Minister of Health, what she is doing to see that these young offenders are suitably accommodated in an adult correctional facility, that we all realize is very small and confined and has a limitation of space and so on.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** As I mentioned before, we are looking and have been for a while, at an interim secure facility. That is the

thing that I was hoping that would happen under the past Minister responsible. We are looking at it very seriously, and would hope to open it in the next two or three months. We have to find a place, we have to find the money, we have to find the people to work at it, but it would be one way of keeping our young offenders here in the Yukon, which is something that we would like to be able to do. They would be able to take part in any resources that are offered to them with regard to rehabilitation.

**Mr. Lang:** Talking about finding the money, and whatever, I notice there is nothing in the Capital program that is put forward for 1986-87. Where are you going to get the money for such a facility and where in the town is that facility located? Have you purchased one now?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We have not purchased a building. We are looking for a building. We do have money that is set aside for that purpose, and it was in the last year. I cannot offer a good explanation to that question, so I will hand that over to my witness if I could.

**Mr. Davie:** I can tell you two things. The open custody facility, which is actively being pursued right now, has monies reflected in this particular statement to deal with the increase in young offenders sentenced to open custody. The Department is also considering looking at an interim post-custody facility pending the completion of the community consultation process and funding from that would have to be achieved through Canada in terms of the implementation funds available for a young offenders program and as such is not only an item in capital budget, and may not be in fact a capital item, but an O&M item if a premises is leased.

**Mr. Lang:** That is not an accurate statement. Any decision taken to either purchase or to build either for a permanent young offenders facility or the interim young offenders facility, is going to be money over and above what is estimated in our 1986-87 capital program. Is that not a correct statement? If the Minister cannot answer, then perhaps the witness could.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like to turn that over to the witness.

**Mr. Davie:** I do not have the capital estimates before me. I am at some disadvantage.

**Mr. Lang:** I can give you the answer. A young offenders facility construction is \$1.00 for 1986-87, and in our capital supplementary for 1985-86, it is very clear that \$2,250,000 that was projected expenditure for last year has been deleted for the purpose of balancing the books. So it is safe to say that there has been no money except for \$1.00 proposed to be voted for the purpose of such a facility and would be over and above what is estimated in this particular document that is before us, as far as the capital side of the budget is concerned.

**Mr. Davie:** The dollar is to show intent.

**Mr. Lang:** I fully recognize that. My only point is that if the government makes a decision, a million dollar decision, or a \$2 million decision, it is money over and above the appropriations that have been before us for 1985-86, and 1986-87, and that was the point I was making. It would be a new venture for the government as far as planning is concerned for the appropriation of dollars. That is the point I was making.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We do have a total of \$1,241,000 in this budget, and that could very well be the funding that we would use.

**Mr. Lang:** I think we better get something straight here. This is the operation and maintenance budget that you are referring to. If you are going to build something, it is my understanding — maybe there has been a major change in the financing of the government — but can you also build buildings under the O&M Mains now?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** The Member opposite has a confused mind. This is for the operation and maintenance of the young offenders program. We would hope to open up an interim secure facility if they build one. I said we are looking at the possibility of opening one up; I did not say we were going to build one; I did not say we were going to buy one. Maybe we will rent one. I do not know. But we are looking at that possibility and we are looking at all the other options.

**Mr. Lang:** My point is that it does not appear in this part of the budget. Okay, I will ask a direct question. Is there money there to rent a new facility for the purpose of the young offenders facility,

interim facility, included in the \$1,241,000?

» **Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I am not really sure. I would ask the witness if he could answer that for me.

**Mr. Davie:** The funds are within this budget for the interim open custody facility. The one dollar is in the capital budget to show intent, because of the different nature of funding for a young offenders' facility under agreements with Canada. If you look at the previous figure that was in before, of \$2.5 million for the building of a facility, it was in fact not the cost of building that facility because the plans presented were in the order of \$7 or 8 million. The one dollar is there for a figure to show intent since the cost of the facility that might be built could not be predetermined until you know whether you are building a facility for four kids, 24 kids, or what. That is the best explanation I can give.

**Mr. Lang:** Which of the \$1,241,000 is projected for the purpose of renting a facility? Give me a breakdown.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We do not have that information here — if, in fact, we do have it. Then, if the minister really does want this information I am sure we could come back to him with it. We just do not have it right now.

**Mrs. Firth:** Perhaps the witness, through the minister, could give us the breakdown of what the \$1,241,000 is for. I am sure that in their briefing notes they have the breakdown. What is that money going to cover? I do not care whether it is an open facility or a secure facility. I have a feeling though that it is mostly for open facility group homes, that sort of thing, for young offenders and for the operation and maintenance of them.

I recognize that there was \$2.5 million identified in the capital allocated as a first-year funding towards the construction of the secure facility and I believe that was identified by the previous government. What has happened to those funds if there is only one dollar in the new capital budget? I assume it has been lapsed or put into general revenue.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I think that, when we get to the capital budget, we can talk about capital funding. This program, the young offenders program, is a new initiative resulting from the implementation of the federal *Young Offenders Act* and proclamation of the maximum uniform age provisions effective April 2nd, 1985. This program provides resources, youth probation workers, a facility supervisor, a part-time secretary and for travel costs by escorts and offenders to facilities outside Yukon, the operation of the Yukon Diversion Council and subsistence and maintenance payments to youths in out-of-Yukon facilities as a result of Court order placements. Funding will support the development of effective community-based alternative measures including diversion committees and projects, youth probation, including preparation of pre-disposition reports for youth court and the supervision of the offender providing guidance and community services including community service personnel, service order, restitution compensation orders, supervised temporary release from custody and other volunteer programs. Apart from the 3.5 person-years approved by the previous government, an additional 7.5 person-years and associated daily operational costs have been approved by the establishment of an interim open custody facility for young offenders. It is expected that this new facility will be fully operational before Christmas. The government expects to be entering into a Canada-Yukon cost-shared agreement on juvenile justice services in the coming months.

« **Mrs. Firth:** I understand that it is for the operation and maintenance of young offenders in open custody. It has nothing to do with secure custody?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** As I mentioned before, we are looking at the possibility of opening a secure custody facility for these young offenders who are sentenced to secure custody. We do not know what it is going to be, where it is going to be, or how we are going to open it. We do not know if it is going to be a standing building. I am sure that we are not going to be looking at constructing something new. When we have that information, we will be able to give you the information that you want right now.

**Mr. Lang:** When is a decision expected on the term facilities you are speaking of? You are asking us to vote on \$1,241,000 for a totally brand new program, in the middle of the year, the way it has

been explained to me just now. We really have not had it in place, except for 3.5 man-years. When do you expect a decision to be taken with respect to the facilities?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** Right now, we are asking for the open custody facility to be voted on. The 11 person-years has already been approved.

**Mrs. Firth:** Could the Minister tell me, where the money is in the budget for young offenders who are sent outside and put in a secure facility. Where do they absorb that cost or identify it in the budget?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I believe that would be under Child Welfare Services.

**Mr. Davie:** The bulk of that funding would be found in this item here. There is still some overlap from before the implementation of this act in terms of some funding for juvenile delinquents. The bulk of that funding would be under this item. Given another year of operation, all of it would included within the section of Young Offenders, given a year of the act being in place.

**Mr. Lang:** How much are you proposing for 1985-86?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** If we are talking about the young offenders whom we are presently looking after, we have already gone through that section and it has been voted on.

**Mrs. Firth:** That does not rule out us having the opportunity to discuss young offenders, and because we have voted on it, does not mean we can just dismiss it. I have another question regarding young offenders again with a different theme to the question. I understood that there was some concern about a shortage of probation workers for the young offenders, because when the Young Offenders Act was implemented, it created a need for more probation officers within Health and Human Resources to look after the young offenders, which to me created a over amount of person-years in the Department of Justice, in probation officers, because they were no longer responsible for the young offenders. It seemed logical and reasonable to me that the person-year component for probation officers in Justice would go down, as it would rise in Health and Human Resources. Is the Minister aware of that situation and has she done something with her colleague, the Minister of Justice, to hire more probation officers and reduce the ones in Justice?

« **Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I was under the impression that we did transfer those positions over to the youth probation. If I did not, I would ask the witness to correct that.

**Mr. Davie:** I do not have direct knowledge of what happened there, because I understand that that was a problem prior to the government coming into office. I do not know if there was a transfer of adult probation officers to the juvenile young offenders. I do not think there was.

**Mrs. Firth:** Under the past government, there was no transfer. It was something we were entertaining doing. It seemed only logical, because of the *Young Offenders Act*, that the age of young offenders had gone down. There was a demand for more probation officers in Health, which to me, logically, said there would be a need for less in Justice. I do not know if the Minister feels her complement of probation officers is adequate; they are not going to be getting any more, or the Minister of Justice does not want to give up any of his. I am not sure, but perhaps together they could tell us if that problem has been solved.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I have been keeping up to date with what is happening in our young offenders program in our department, and if there is a problem there and we do not have enough probation officers, then I am sure we are going to have to look at finding some more. I would have to find out about the situation.

**Mr. Lang:** I do not have a lot of knowledge about this department, but all I see is 11 man-years in a new program. I am told on one hand that this money is spent to send young offenders outside, and on the other hand I am supposed to vote for the pay of 11 people.

I would like a breakdown of the 11 person-years, the amount that is being paid to them, or projected to be paid to them, as opposed to the cost of keeping our young offenders outside. How many young offenders do we have outside?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** Right now, we have three young offenders

outside. We have a need for some more space in the Yukon to hold some of our young offenders who are, for instance, awaiting trial, or have been sentenced to our custody. We are looking at opening a new facility for open custody. These 11 new person-years are for that facility. We do not have the room right now. We have the assessment centre which is filled up. We have a lot more people in there than we would expect to have. There is not enough room there. We have the receiving home that is sometimes over-crowded. We just have a lot of over-crowding.

A new facility to hold these people is needed. We are already looking at a location for a place.

**Mr. Lang:** I want to pursue this. Maybe I am not making myself clear. All I wanted to know is how much money are we spending, projected in this budget, for the purposes of keeping our young offenders outside?

Secondly, have we hired those 11 people? Are they on staff? This is a new program, is it not? That is my understanding.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I do not have a breakdown right now. I will get one and I will bring it back to this House at 7:30 tonight.

**Mrs. Firth:** I would like to know if these 11 person-years are all new person-years that have been identified, or are they positions that are filled presently? I know, for example, that the assessment centre is running out of space. You need another facility for young offenders to go to for assessment. Does this 11 people encompass some new person-years that have not been filled yet, or is this taking into account some people who are already on staff?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We are looking for 11 new person-years. I suspect that the assessment centre right now is filled up, and they probably have more young offenders there than people to look after them. I do not know. We are looking to open a new facility and staff it with 11 people.

**Mrs. Firth:** I raised this, I believe yesterday, when we started the debate on the Health and Human Resources budget, because I believed I understood the Minister to say that it was 11 new person-years. I raised it in context with contracting out services, and encouraged the Minister to contract out the services as opposed to creating 11 new person-years within the civil service.

There are businesses in the Yukon who provide this kind of service. Before I am prepared to agree to 11 new people within the civil service, — if I just do a quick calculation of figures — who are going to take up almost half of that total budget of a million dollars in salaries, — probably close to it, a third to a half anyway — I would like the Minister to investigate contracting it out. Has she investigated it, and can she report that it is going to be more economical to hire 11 people to work for the government than it would be to contract it out to the private sector, to businesses, who provide this kind of service? Is it going to be more economical and is it going to provide a better service to the young offenders than the private contractors would provide?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I think our officials have probably looked at the options as to what kind of a home we want. The Member is talking about contracting out these services to private individuals. We, at present, have two of those homes which we have contracted out to look after some of our patients who need rehabilitation.

We are looking at opening a facility with people there who have experience in dealing with our young offenders. Now, I do not know whether or not it is better to do it through out department or whether we go and find some private individual to give us those people; but what we are looking at right now is hiring 11 new people to do it. That is the plan we have.

I am sure that the department, being as efficient as they are, have looked at the options.

**Chairman:** Order. The time being 5:30, we are now recessed to 7:30.

#### Recess

**Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole back to order. We are still discussing Young Offenders, page 170.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like to clarify some information that was given to the House this afternoon, for the record. Under the budget for Young Offenders I have information that I would like to

introduce and that is under the Personnel line.

The Personnel budget allocation of \$299,000 included the main estimates, and it includes salary and benefits for the following positions: 3.5 person-years approved by the previous government in the spring, including two youth probation officers, one social development worker IV, and one social development worker III. One facility supervisor and a half-time clerk typist II. Due to the implementation of the maximum uniform age provisions of the federal *Young Offenders Act*, which increased the coverage to include youth up to and including 17 years, recruitment proceeded in April to hire probation officers. Both positions were successfully filled by Yukoners by the previous government.

Recruitment is about to proceed for the secretary to support the Youth Probation Unit. The facility supervisor position was prorated and therefore funded for only a portion of the 1985-86 fiscal year. Recruitment action has not yet been taken. Once decisions are taken on the nature of facilities to be built, following the committee consultation process, it is expected the position will be filled to work with the department in planning the new residential programs. Seven-and-a-half person-years are in this budget to handle the interim open custody facility for young offenders. These youth service worker positions parallel those operating the existing admission and assessment centre and 5030-5th Avenue Group Home. One youth service worker III, and 6.5 youth service workers II, are required to manage the programs in Young Offenders on a 24-hour, seven day a week basis.

The funding for these positions is for the remainder of the year only. Recruitment for these positions has not proceeded as the facility is not yet available. However, an eligibility list has been established from recently concluded competitions from youth service workers, and the government is confident that positions will be filled by Yukoners.

Under the line item Other for \$141,000, the funding for the Yukon Diversion Council for meetings and inspections, training and monitoring trips to communities regarding diversion and alternative measures programs and committees at approximately \$31,000, also includes travel outside the territory for escorting and placement of youths to assessment, treatment and custody setting in British Columbia or Alberta. Costs are estimated at approximately \$60,000.

<sup>02</sup> It also includes building rental, utilities, household items, minor renovations, furniture and equipment and food estimated at approximately \$50,000.

Under the line item Transfer Payments of \$801,000, the transfer payments allocation of \$801,000 cited in the main estimates covers subsistence and maintenance per diem payments for court ordered secure custody placement and for court ordered treatment placement in British Columbia and Alberta.

These costs are based on actual provincial per diem charges of \$165 a day and at \$365 a day for the two types of placements. Provision has been made for up to 13 youths to be handled with the budget's allocation shown.

The actual requirements depend entirely, as Members are aware, on the orders of the youth court. Apart from alternative measures, the *Young Offenders Act* provides the courts with many options including probation orders, open custody placements and the most severe of all, secure custody orders. Presently, three youths are being held in British Columbia.

**Mrs. Firth:** Somebody obviously spent their whole dinner hour typing away. I thank the Minister for bringing that information forward. Am I to understand that there are 7.5 new person-years identified out of this allotment? Is that correct?

<sup>03</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Joe:** We have 7.5 person-years and, as I understand it, there were 3.5 person-years that were approved by the former government.

**Mrs. Firth:** So the new person-years, I understand, are to be for additional facilities for young offenders who are going to be kept in open facilities. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** Yes, that is correct.

**Mrs. Firth:** Then I can pick up from where we left at 5:30 when we recessed, again, talking about private contracts. I believe that when we left the Minister had said that she was sure that the



officials had examined all the options. That is all very well, but I want to know whether she has examined the options. Sometimes it is not always in the best interests of the clients, in this case the young offenders, to take the word of the officials. Occasionally, not all the time, but occasionally they will choose the most expedient option, which in this case I can see would be to increase the size of the civil service and, in so doing, create a kind of institutional facility run by civil servants to accommodate the young offenders.

I do not know if that is in the best interests of young offenders, and I do not think that the Minister probably feels that that would necessarily be in the best interests of the young offenders.

I would like to ask her again if she would take it upon herself to research the whole proposal, research the options herself, see if the contracting of these services would be better for the young offenders, better for their living and lifestyle, and could provide a better quality of service to them, as opposed to the institutionalized civil service provided facility. Also, is it more economical, one way or the other? Once she does that herself, when she feels confident that the addition of 7.5 more person-years is in the best interests of the service we are going to provide to these people, then I would feel that I could accept that.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I think that I have already proven that I want to look at certain things before making decisions. I have indicated that in my decision on what I have done with the young offenders' permanent secure facility.

We are seeking that information in regard to that permanent facility. We are looking at an interim open custody facility. We need it right away. As was mentioned this afternoon, we need it because our existing homes are filled up and overflowing. I do not think that, at this point in time, we have a lot of time in which to implement this program. I think that we are looking at something that we know is necessary, and we are also looking at good people to work in that facility to provide the services for these young people in our care.

**Mrs. Firth:** I recognize that we have no time now, because it is identified in the budget now, and the Minister is asking for approval of the House for the 7.5 person-years now, so she should have been doing this research in the past four months that she has been the Minister of Health and Human Resources, if it was such a priority as the Minister has indicated.

I would like to know what the Minister is planning to do. She wants us to approve this 7.5 person-years, which I find very difficult to do when we do not know whether the options of going to the private sector for contracts was pursued thoroughly by the Minister. If she can stand here and justify to me that she knows that the service is going to be better for those young offenders, then I would not challenge that. I would take the Minister's word and say that she has done her homework, but she has not indicated that tonight. She has indicated that the officials have done their homework. That is not where it stops. The Minister has a responsibility to pursue it further, so she can justify in this House why she thinks that we should have 7.5 more people within the civil service to provide this service to Yukon young offenders.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like to thank the Member for all of those recommendations and all of the good advice. I appreciate it. I do know that we need a facility for those young people, and we need it now. It is long overdue. I think that if I can stand up here and justify the need for that, then we are doing something that is necessary for this department to do in order to look after those young people.

I have not gone out personally and done any investigating. I have had conversations with people who run these private homes. They have indicated that they would like to contract with us to run other homes — not young offenders, but other homes for other people. They have given us that indication. The young offenders was never mentioned. As far as I know, that is the only person who is willing and has the experience to set up one of those homes. We did not talk about young offenders.

I think that what we are doing is the right thing and I think it is going to benefit the children who are living in these homes right now. These homes are overcrowded.

**Mrs. Firth:** I do not disagree with what the Minister is saying.

We all recognize the need. She does not have to justify the need to us. What she has to justify to us is that she has done her homework. If the Minister has been out and seen the group homes and seen the facilities that can be provided by private individuals and the environment for these young offenders, who we are hoping — because of the whole concept of open custody and the Diversion Council — to get back into society, I am sure that the Minister could see that the whole concept of a group home-type setting would be a lot more favourable than an institutional kind of setting run by civil servants.

The Minister has said that she appreciated my recommendations. I am asking that she, in future, do that. It is easy to stand up in this House and say that all these wonderful things should be done and these people are suffering hardships. We could all talk about that for ages. The proof comes when you get out and see, and then provide the best service for those people and for the quality of life that they are going to have.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like the Member to know that I have been out to all of the homes that we have. I have not been out to the two homes that are provided by private business. I have not been to those homes because, when I spoke with the person, he did not indicate to me that he was interested in running a home for young offenders.

I was not at those places, but I can assure this House that the homes that I have been in, that are run by this department, have very caring people there. They have people who understand these young people, young offenders or not. I am quite satisfied that if we do open up our facility for these people, it is going to be as best as we can expect it at this point in time, because it is needed now.

**Mr. Lang:** I do not think that the Minister sees the point that is being put across here. We have \$300,000, the way I understand it, voted for the purposes of running this establishment. That is just a portion of the year, I understand, as well. I do not know what the total amount is for the whole year. I guess we are dealing with \$500,000 as far as wages and benefits by the time it is all broken down — in that neighbourhood? We are talking about \$500,000 for this open custody facility that you refer to.

Would the Minister be prepared to advertise and go out for tenders to see whether or not anybody would be prepared to provide a service for what you are attempting to do? We recognize that there is a need. There is no philosophical difference on either side of the floor. It is how we provide for that need.

Unless you advertise, you do not know. Because one person is providing some service for the government and is not, perhaps, interested in providing this service there may well be someone else out there who says, yes, that is a pretty good proposition.

The other point that we are driving at here is not that the people employed by the government will not do their job. Let us face it, it becomes an institution when it is run by government. If you are in a private contractual situation where, depending on the individuals involved, it becomes a family atmosphere to some degree.

**Because of the amount of money we are talking about, and the service that we are asking for, would the Minister be prepared to publicly advertise to find out whether or not there is anyone out there prepared to provide that service and would enter into a contract?**

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I feel that our department has done what they have had to do. I have no problem with taking the advice from the Member opposite and considering it in future homes. I know he is talking about this, but I am talking about what we are doing now. We have a plan in place and we have started on this plan, and we are doing what we have to do to open this facility.

We are also looking at future plans for these young offenders. Maybe that could be part of the information that we are getting from other people who are interested in the young offenders. I would be happy to include that and any other information that we have received as a result of our hearings. I think it is a good idea that we listen to all of these people who are interested. Certainly, I will consider it, but we do have a plan in place right now, and that is what we are debating right now.

**Mr. Lang:** I have to take exception with all due respect to the Minister. She indicated just a little earlier, and correct me if I am

wrong, that this requirement here is all subject to the decisions or recommendations that come through the consultative process that you have launched yourself on.

My understanding is that you and Mr. Coles have quite an entourage and quite a tour to go on. I am asking you, in the interim, for the purposes of this particular area, if you would take three weeks to advertise to see whether or not anyone out there would be interested in contracting. I do not have to ask your officials. I am asking you.

We, the taxpayers, the government, may get a three year arrangement for \$300,000 a year as opposed to \$500,000 and have excellent people running it. What is wrong with that? If there is something happening right now, then tell us, because you have told us nothing has taken place other than the fact that you have hired a number of probation officers and various other things. Fine, I am not going to argue that.

I want to ask the Minister, specifically: will she go out and advertise and see if that service is out there? If it is not, then we are going to have to proceed accordingly, as the second alternative.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I think that the Member is sort of getting carried away with the information that he wants. I cannot commit myself to doing what he has asked me to do, and that is to advertise to find out if there are any interested people out there. We have a plan, and we intend to carry out that plan. It is already in place. It has already been approved, and that is what we intend to do.

I have no qualms about doing what is in our plan right now, and that is finding a home to put these young people in. It is needed. As I said, I have no problem with considering the recommendations or the suggestions made by the Member opposite for future homes. We do not know whether our population of young offenders in our care is going to go up or whether it is going to go down. We are right now dealing with something that is a bit of an emergency, that is needed right now. We are looking, and have been looking, for a place for a while, and looking for those people to work in the facility.

<sup>07</sup> Have you made an offer on some place in town here?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** No, I have not made an offer.

**Mr. Lang:** Has the government made an arrangement with someone already as far as building a facility or purchasing a facility, or renting a facility? If you cannot answer the question, then I would like to put it to the Deputy Minister.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** To the best of my knowledge, we are not going to build a new facility and we have not made an offer to anyone. As far as making an offer to buy a facility from someone, I do not think that has been done either.

**Mr. Lang:** If we have not taken that step forward, why can we not go out and ask for an invitation to tender, or a public tender? It will take three weeks. I recognize you have a problem; if we gave instructions to the Deputy Minister tonight, you could have it in the newspaper tomorrow. The point I am making is that you are asking me, as a Member of this House, and all the Members of the House, to approve 7.5 man-years, *carte blanche*, and say you may have another idea for another group home. I am saying that there may be a possibility for a group home, and that option may be there and if we do not exercise it now, we are committed forever and a day to our own institutions. All we are saying is: would you be prepared to go out and ask for a public tender? If you do not get any, then obviously, you will have to move accordingly. I do not think that it is too much to ask, and it only takes two to three weeks.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I do not think that it is as easy as the Member says. I think that it is much more complicated than that. We do not know whether or not we have the people available in town who could do the kind of job that we want them to do. We do not know that. If they are there, they are probably doing something else in regard to the same kind of thing. I still maintain that we have a good plan and I am willing to sit here and speak on behalf of it.

**Mr. Lang:** You do not know if there is anyone out there who is interested or prepared to do this kind of thing. Unless you advertise you are not going to find out. I am asking the Minister to use her office and put out an advertisement to see if there is anybody prepared to provide that service. If we had those assurances, I would say fine, go ahead. I do not think that it is too much to ask.

It is another alternative and all we are trying to do is give you another option as far as the program is concerned.

The Government Leader says that my mind is made up. I am saying that it is an option and that it should be exercised. If you do not get anybody applying, or they do not meet the qualifications for the services that you are requiring then I do not think that you have any alternative but to go the route of hiring through the government and providing that service.

Perhaps the Government Leader could speak on the record. Or, maybe I should speak.

<sup>08</sup> **Chairman:** Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** The Member is being slightly ridiculous — no more than normal, but slightly ridiculous. The consequence of advertising, as he suggests, is that if you get people applying who then prove, for one reason or another, unsuitable or incapable, you have raised expectations in people's minds. You have submitted yourself to the possibility of putting out a tender. By advertising, it would appear that you have made the decision to go that route, which may not be the right way to go.

**Mr. Lang:** That is like saying, "Well, we have committed ourselves to tender for the particulars on a facility and if it comes in \$10,000,000 over, we are still committed; we have to go for it." I do not agree with that. I am saying that there is an alternative here, and in many areas, such as the one we are speaking of, it is done privately. There is no reason that it could not perhaps be done here. That is all I am saying to the Government Leader. I am attempting to provide another start-up or an add-on to a small business.

I am saying to the Minister of Economic Development, who is going to be opening a One Stop Shop — or the One Slop Shop, or whatever it is — that this is an alternative to maybe get somebody else into business. If the applications do not meet the criteria, then proceed accordingly and provide the service as a direct government program. That is all I am saying.

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** The Member opposite seems to be convinced that running correctional facilities of one kind or another is an appropriate kind of business. There are very few places in the world where correctional facilities are run as businesses and, I believe, nowhere is it done successfully.

**Mrs. Firth:** I would like to respond to that. I really am quite surprised at the Government Leader referring to an open custody facility for young offenders as a correctional facility. The whole idea and concept of the *Young Offenders Act* is to get away from referring to the young offenders as needing to be put into correctional facilities or jail. That is the whole idea of it. The Government Leader is saying that the private sector cannot provide a home, which is what we want to provide, for these young offenders so that we can get them back into society in some way that they can relate to a family and to living in a home as opposed to being institutionalized.

I am sure that the Minister of Justice, who is sitting there behind his paper, is agreeing with what we are saying. I have heard him say many times in this House how he would never send anyone to the correctional institute, after he spent his time there. He did not think it was fit for anyone to go there, let alone young offenders. I know that the Minister of Health feels the same way. I find it quite interesting that every time we come forward with a suggestion of something that could be looked at as a view to creating jobs to stimulate the private sector, to stimulate the economy, the Government Leader stands up and says it is nonsense and ridiculous.

<sup>09</sup> **Hon. Mr. Penikett:** I did not say that it was nonsense and ridiculous. I made specific reference to correctional facilities. The Members opposite have to get their act together. The former Minister is talking about homes. We understand the possibilities and potentials of home situations. The former Minister on the front bench is talking about a business. You may be talking about it. That is what he was talking about. He was talking about doing it for a profit.

There is a group home model, that is one thing we have to look at. There is a nursing home model, which is also, in some places in North America, in serious disrepute because the elderly in some private nursing homes in California, and recently, we have heard,



in Ontario, where profit becomes the priority, and not the care of the elderly. It can become a problem. It is not as simple an issue as the Member opposite seems to say. You put out an ad, have someone come along and apply, saying he can do it. They may not be suited to this kind of work. In fact, if you are talking about troubled children, I suspect you are talking about very special kind of people to look after them.

**Mrs. Firth:** I am going to make one more comment about this. I recognize the position that the Minister of Health is in. I recognize the urgency of having this facility. I do not agree with the Government Leader that we should condemn something before it is even tried here in the Yukon, because of somewhere in California where some nursing homes have been abusing elderly people.

I really do not think that that should apply to Yukoners. Personally, I think Yukoners deserve a fair chance. If there is some potential that there are some Yukoners who can provide these facilities for young offenders through the government, then I think we should pursue that and we should give Yukoners a chance to show whether they are interested, whether they want to do it and whether they can do it.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I find it hard to believe that Members are arguing for other kinds of facilities when they had a plan in place to build a big facility. There were 12 beds for open custody and 12 beds for closed custody. It was almost definite.

Now we are asking for a facility to house some young offenders, or young people who we have who are in need of those. I think if we are going to talk about giving Yukoners a chance, we also have to give those young people a chance. Whether it is done through a private home or done through this department, they need the chance now. I think that what we are doing right now is what has to be done. I will consider all the recommendations and suggestions, and I will include them in the report from our hearings. I will not commit myself to advertising that right now, to advertise for private people to come in to do it. Not right now. I said I would consider it for the future.

**Mr. Lang:** Is it the position of the Minister then that she is going to go out and hire these people whom you are asking us to authorize: 7.5 person-years? You cannot have it both ways. Are you going to go out and hire the people whom you are asking for us to give permission to and grant authority to go out and pay for the purposes of permanent employees?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** That is what I intend to do. We intend to open a facility for open custody, and we intend to hire those person-years to run that facility.

**Mr. Lang:** I just want to say on the record, so much for consultation, so much for consideration. We gave you a recommendation from our point of view that we felt had validity, and you are saying to us, no it does not, but you will consider it. When will you consider it? The year 2000?

I want to say to the Minister on the record right now that I think what she is doing is irresponsible. We gave you an alternative and a method to try to provide a service in a different manner that perhaps would save some money for the taxpayer and provide maybe a better service. That is all we asked. I am sorry I even raised it. Obviously suggestions are not worth anything to the side opposite.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The previous government was in power for six years and they did not do that. They had the opportunity and they did not.

**Mr. Lang:** The Minister of Justice, the judge — it is nice to see that we have a replacement here for the good Lord — should refer to the *Young Offenders Act* that just came into effect here approximately six months ago. That is where it all started, and he knows it full well.

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I certainly hope that this is the end of it. I was not expecting this tirade from the Member opposite. I have listened to his suggestions. I have not completely ignored them. I said that I would add them to the report that we have from holding our hearings — the Member is being silly — and I stand by my convictions and I think that what we are doing right now is the right thing and I will consider the suggestions at a future time.

**Mr. Lang:** I am looking forward to the report, and we can read it together three years hence.

#### *On Young Offenders*

*Young Offenders in the amount of \$1,241,000 agreed to*

#### *On Women's Bureau*

#### *On Administration*

*Administration in the amount of \$57,000 agreed to*

*Women's Bureau in the amount of \$57,000 agreed to*

#### *On Revenue and Recoveries*

**Mr. McLachlan:** I have some questions for the Minister. Health and Human Resources is usually an expenditure. How do we get recoveries? Are these recoveries from the federal government for all their programs?

**Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like to turn that over to the witness please, to answer those questions.

**Mr. Davie:** There are recoveries, yes. The Department has arrangements, as all the departments in Canada, with Canada, under the Canada Assistance Plan, the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Agreement, and the *Young Offenders Act*, to share the cost of program delivery as mutually agreed upon between the territory and Canada. Each one of these represents a different type of recovery. Most of it represents a 50-cent dollar, where Canada covers 50 cents, and the territory covers 50 cents.

*Revenue and Recoveries in the total recovery of \$7,180,000 agreed to*

#### *On Grants, Contributions and Other Transfer Payments*

*Grants, Contributions, and Other Transfer Payments in the total amount of \$7,389,000 agreed to*

*Department of Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$35,013,000 agreed to*

**Chairman:** We will now go on to the Department of Justice.

**Mr. Lang:** Could I beg the indulgence of the side opposite? Unfortunately Mr. Phelps and Mr. Phillips are going to be late. They had other business that they had to do. I was wondering if we could perhaps move to Renewable Resources, if it is okay with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Renewable Resources, who I know is always ready to jump into the fray.

**Chairman:** The witness may be excused.

*(Witness excused)*

#### *On Department of Renewable Resources*

**Chairman:** A certificate has been filed for a witness to appear before Committee, Mr. Bill Klassen, Deputy Minister of Renewable Resources. Is Committee agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

*(Witness introduced)*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I have a prepared text with respect to the opening of these discussions which I would like to read into the record.

In formulating the 1985-86 O&M budget, my department has renewed its commitment to the goal of planning, developing and managing Yukon's resources by establishing branch, sectional and project objectives, thus ensuring, in strong terms, that all funding requests can be directly related to the achievement of our stated objectives.

Our total budget reflects only a seven percent increase from the actual expenditures for 1984-85. Of the \$5,444,000 included in the budget, 63 percent is payment of salaries and wages. The remaining 37 percent is distributed throughout the following classifications of expenditures: transportation and communication; professional and special services; rentals and repairs; materials and supplies and utilities.

This budget represents the first year my department has functioned within a reorganized structure designed to effectively address the broad range of renewable resource needs of Yukoners.

Through our reorganization work and through our programs, we have identified areas that we see as being important to Yukoners. We will be requesting the assistance and participation of the public in either reinforcing or redirecting their priorities. I will be providing the Members with greater detail on the proposed process later this Session.

I would like to stress the commitment my department has made in adhering to this government's philosophies on both hiring and distribution of funds. I will proceed with an outline of the programs

and projects included in the mandate of Renewable Resources.

The administration branch defined their fiscal and human resource base to meet the objectives of providing the senior managerial component of the department, and providing the administrative, personal and financial services to all branches of the department and to central Yukon Territorial Government agencies as required.

As can be expected of this type of staff, rather than line functions, 74 percent of the estimated expenditures for the branch are for personnel costs.

<sup>12</sup> On personnel costs, the cost of Ministerial advisory committees such as the Wildlife Advisory Committee and the Agricultural Advisory Committee are included in the administration budget. Funds were also identified in this budget to provide by contract this government's membership in the International Salmon Treaty negotiations.

The cost of providing revenue documents such as campground permits and hunting licences, office supplies and rental of office equipment are also included.

In the Policy and Planning Branch, prior to this budget the department did not have a defined policy branch. Certain components of the branch, such as information, education and regulations, were maintained by the department, but they were within a line branch. The policy branch has department wide objectives for formulating policies, regulations and legislation, to develop and manage the natural resources of the Yukon and to provide information education services to the public.

The branch has also identified the need to evaluate resource management programs to ensure efficient and effective use of public funds. The staff of this branch has been involved in both COPE implementation functions on behalf of the department and this government, and in Economic Development Agreement, the EDA, as it is known, the Renewable Resource Subagreement and implementation of the management are also responsibilities of the department.

Because the policy branch combines line and staff activities, it develops a higher percentage, 41 percent, of its overall budget to non-personnel expenditures and the solely staff function branch of administration. Personnel costs for the staff of six person-years and budgeting casual support totals 59 percent of the budget. The information education projects within this branch may have been well received throughout the Yukon. Pamphlets, Renewable Resource information bulletins, regulations, short films, slide presentations, school visitations, public meetings and hunter safety training presentations are also valuable projects prepared and presented by the Information Education staff, with the involvement, cooperation and technical advice from other members of the department.

In the Lands, Parks and Resources branch, we need to plan, develop and manage Yukon lands. Water parks and outdoor recreational resources for the optimum use of the territory's natural resource base was established as an objective which could be translated into projects my department and I believe to be necessary to maintain the lifestyle Yukoners appear to value.

This fiscal year, the structure of this branch was revised to include both the parks planning section and the parks development section. Previously, these two sections were in different line branches, and I believe an improved outdoor recreation and parks program will result from this realignment. In addition to the parks program, the branch has devoted considerable time and resources to this government's contribution to the land planning committees operating in the territory.

Agricultural projects are included in the lands, parks and resources budget. Personnel and non-personnel costs totalling \$140,000 were allocated to projects such as crop research, development, information and demonstration. My department is working closely with the agricultural community to identify the future needs of this developing industry.

The branch budget is \$1,286,000. It covers a total of 23 projects within the categories that I have mentioned.

<sup>13</sup> On the Fish and Wildlife Branch, the objectives of this branch is to provide for the wise measurement, conservation, protection and

utilization of Yukon's fish and wildlife. This is mirrored in the projects identified. This budget is the first one placed before the Legislative Assembly since the branch was restructured to allow the management and field services section to report to the same director.

We will spend 59 percent of the branch budget on personnel costs. Of the 46 projects submitted for this budget, the largest single project is a predator-prey study being conducted in Game Zones 7 and 9. This is a multi-year project which addresses the problems of low and declining moose numbers in southwest Yukon. I have requested an assessment of the current year data to be completed prior to my review of the department's budget for the next fiscal year.

Of the 41 percent non-personnel costs, \$472,000 is for rental of local aircraft for the minimal amount of time, and amounts for local vehicle rental. The branch has continued its efforts in such areas as fur harvest, caribou, fur bearer, birds and sheep, and goat management. This budget also provides for the projects completed by our conservation officers in the communities. It allows for field patrols, community meetings, facility maintenance and for territory-wide campground maintenance.

In conclusion, I believe this budget to be well-coordinated with the objectives defined for the 1985-86 fiscal year. We have concentrated on contracting and hiring locally wherever possible. Our ability to contract local small aircraft charter firms has assisted in supporting an industry which is currently working strenuously to ensure its survival in the Yukon. By working closely with the Public Service Commission, my department is able to fill all seasonal-hire positions locally. This provided employment in campground development, in campground maintenance, for wildlife technician assistance, for park planning, for agricultural assistance and seasonal office assistants.

On my firm instructions, the department has continued its efforts to ensure that programs are responsive to the needs of Yukoners, both in terms of program activities and objectives, and in terms of program staffing with qualified local people.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the department, particularly in the areas of administration, for the excellent work they have done in terms of preparing the budget and for the excellent work that has been carried out in the department.

Thank you.

**Mr. Brewster:** The young lady who sits over there, I have had a few conversations with her but I am not about to get into too much here. There are a few little things that I would ask in the general debate. As I understand it, the grizzly and wolf program will go on for 1985-86 and then be reassessed?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** There has not been a decision made as to the predator control program in Game Zone 7 and 9, which the member is talking about. Winter is setting in and we are going to have to make a decision very soon. I have sat with the department. I went out to the study area this summer and saw first hand the activity that took place in the area, assisted in the process where I could — and possibly made a nuisance of myself, I do not know — and appreciated what the members of the staff were doing with respect to that study.

Since that time, I have asked that they compile the data that has been collected this year. I want to do an analysis of the present data that is brought in and compare them with the previous year's study. As well, there are some political decisions that will have to be made with respect to the program. In terms of the answer, at the present time, the predator control study has gone on this summer — the tagging and collaring of moose calves, the cow moose and grizzly bear — and there is a process of compilation of data that has not been concluded. Once the data have been received, I will sit down with the officials and will make a determination as to where the program goes.

<sup>14</sup> **Mr. Brewster:** Do you think that we could receive these reports so that we could look at them. The thing that bothers me on this is that we have spent three years and a lot of money on this study and if we do not finalize it, have we not just wasted an awful lot of money?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I appreciate the Member's concern. Any time that you put out the kind of money that has been put into this particular study, and decide that you should cancel the program, in many instances it will be seen by some quarters of the public as a waste of money. It should also be appreciated that some of the data that has been gathered can be used wherever in wildlife management matters. We have not made a decision so I would caution the Member to please wait us out, and let us wade through the data that has been gathered and we will make a decision. I have indicated that, in the process of the decision, with respect to this program, I would like to have public involvement. I think that one of the things that can be done is to have direct meetings with groups that are concerned and possible statements with respect to alternatives to the program discussed openly in the media, with the press, and just be up-front with the people of the Yukon as to what course we are going to take. In the end, I recognize that it is the decision of myself and the department and the government that has to make it and I do not intend in any way to hold the issue out in public and have it immersed in debate and then simply slide away. We will make a decision on the program.

**Mr. Brewster:** You did not actually answer the one question as to when we would be able to see the reports. I presume that you will be able to tell us that. Another thing that I might advise you on is that sometimes politicians are a little hard on animals, just to get votes, and I am quite sure, knowing the Minister, that he would not be in that position.

**Mr. Porter:** In terms of reports, what we could do, although this has not been a direction that we have actively pursued, is release the accumulated data as a result of this year's studies. I will take that under advisement and I will discuss that with the Department officials and I will say that I will allow him to look at it as soon as it is compiled. I will look at making those numbers available to the public if that is so desired.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would have to square up the little remark you made before. For a free and open government you seem to be trying to hide reports pretty good.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** What I had said to him was that as soon as it is finished, I can have him come up and take a look at it. We can sit down in my office and go over it. If it is desirable, the report can be made public. Any public consultation process that we envisage, naturally, we are going to have to put that kind of data out to the public so that they get a full view of the option and information that is available.

That has been a problem with the program, not only in this jurisdiction, but in other jurisdictions. There has been a tendency to withhold information from the public, and I think that has been a mistake. I am not interested in duplicating those mistakes; I think we should learn from them.

**Mr. Lang:** I still have not had a reply to the question. When is the report going to be compiled so that a layman such as myself, or yourself, can go through it? When is it projected to be completed?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** As to when it will be prepared, I would refer that question to the Deputy Minister, Mr. Klassen.

**Mr. Klassen:** We are in the process of compiling that information now. I anticipate that we will be coming to our Minister with that information within the next couple of weeks. Then the decision would rest with him.

**Mr. Lang:** As far as this budget is concerned, if the decision is in the positive, how much more money would be allocated toward the predator control program?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I believe that the monies that have been appropriated for 1985-86 has been largely spent, if not in its entirety, then I would suggest a major portion thereof. For further detail, I would like the Deputy Minister to comment.

**Mr. Klassen:** We have sufficient funds in the 1985-86 fiscal year to carry out the program, regardless of what decision is taken. There would be some funds yet unspent, and those then would either be reallocated or would lapse at the end of the year.

**Mr. Lang:** I am asking how much. Are we talking \$100,000 remaining to be spent this year? Are we talking \$50,000, depending upon the decision? I am asking specifically how much money is going to be left to spend in the department if you do not proceed

with the remainder of this year as far as studies are concerned?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I do not know if this is the correct number that is available, but I have a summary sheet here that speaks about 1985-86. We are talking about a subtotal of \$360,000 and it says here, in terms of the wolf inventory and reduction program, we are talking about \$80,000. I suspect that that is the amount that would be left to spend in the program.

**Mr. Klassen:** My notes indicate that that is fairly close.

**Mr. Lang:** I would just like to move away from that predator control program for a minute. I think it is a major concern of the people of the Yukon Territory. It has to do with the question that was asked in Question Period today, a question of the hunting and trapping agreements that we have in the land claims negotiating team.

Is it the position of the government that if requested by CYI you are prepared to renegotiate and open up that particular portion of the agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I think that is covered under the budget with respect to the ECO branch of government, which we have already passed before this committee. I will respond to the Member's question out of deference to his increased knowledge, and hopefully contribute to it.

The process that we are talking about at the land claims table is not a process by which the parties are directing themselves to the specific areas of the Agreement-in-Principle. The only issue that we have dealt with so far, and are dealing with today, without an agreement at this point, is the issue of a Memorandum of Understanding. We have not dealt with wildlife issues, health issues or any other issues that have been covered under the proposed AIP.

We have to, as I stated today in Question Period, leave it up to the other parties, principally the party of the Council for Yukon Indians, to give us a sense as to what they want to do with it. Until they do that, until they tell us specifically in what particular area they want this kind of movement made or propose whatever change it is, at that point we will deal with it. We cannot deal with it in advance. We cannot hypothesize and say that we are going to take a specific position on 72 subagreements. That is for the future negotiations to determine.

At this point, all we are concerned about is getting the process off the ground, achieving a Memorandum of Understanding, and that is what we are working towards.

**Mr. Lang:** Do I take it from the Minister, or the Government Leader can respond, that the position of the government is that the agreements that are in place now will be honoured until they are modified at the land claims agreement table through the land claim negotiating process, whatever that process may be, and how you set it up? I recognize that is down the road. Is that a fair assessment?

**Hon. Mr. Penikett:** If the meaning of the question is: are we going to unilaterally change any agreements, no. We are going to, yes, basically honour the agreements. It is a purely hypothetical question to know what will happen if they get put on the table.

**Mr. Lang:** What I am saying is that the agreements will not be altered or changed or modified, except through the land claims negotiating table. I think that the Government Leader has answered.

**Mr. McLachlan:** The Department of Education, with a budget seven times more than this one, has two in policy planning and evaluation. How do you justify six person-years in this department in that slot? It seems very high.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** In terms of what the Department of Education has or has not, I really do not know that. But, in terms of what shows in our budget, there was no policy and planning department prior to reorganization. Since the reorganization, it has been clearer. I think the last government commissioned a study by a firm called Peat, Marwick. One of the recommendations that came out of the process was that there had to be reorganization. One of the focusses of the reorganization was that the department had to do more work in policy and planning.

This department, aside from the other areas of responsibility such as fish and wildlife, lands, parks and resources, is a department of government that is heavily bent toward policy and planning, or else it should be. That is one of the criticisms that I have had in the past; there has been no concerted effort on policy and planning. I think

that the increase that has been represented there — and that is not an increase that I, as a Minister, initiated. It was an increase that was initiated as a result of reorganization — is an increase of support staff that I would support. I think we have to move in the area of developing better policy, and we have to begin to plan more effectively. I think that a lot of the issues we are dealing with now in terms of predator-prey control, predator-prey relationships, in terms of the anti-fur movement that we see happening elsewhere, the whole need to educate not only the public at large, outside our jurisdiction, but also to educate our own public and our trappers. All of that is policy related. It is not buying a computer or simply buying a truck to get your job done. It is a people oriented department. There is an awful lot of planning.

I would suggest that the six allocated person-years are definitely needed in the department, and I support them.

**Mr. McLachlan:** You have these six people working in policy. I am curious if you, perhaps in concert with the Minister of Justice, have any plans to institute an appeal process for convictions under the *Wildlife Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** We are allowed in general debate to move through the line items, are we?

In terms of that particular issue as to whether or not there is an appeal process, I know that there are some powers of discretion that are allowed in the *Wildlife Act*. As to a specific process I do not know about that other than redress to the court system. If there is an appeal process maybe the Deputy Minister would like to address that.

**Mr. Klassen:** The *Wildlife Act* is a territorial statute like any other, and if an individual convicted of an offense under the *Wildlife Act* is dissatisfied with the disposition of the case then my understanding is that he has leave to appeal that as he would under any other statute.

**Mr. Lang:** I would like to address a question to the Deputy Minister, if I can, through the Minister. Basically, I would like just a brief outline of the results of the studies to date from his working knowledge of the studies; for example, the moose population, and things of that kind. The reason I ask is that in many cases people who I know have gone out to hunt and have come back empty-handed, to the point they have not seen any in certain areas of the territory. Are you seeing an increase in our statistics as opposed to a year or two years ago? I would just like to get a general observation from the departmental official if I could.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I take it this question is with respect to overall Yukon. The only tool of measurement we have, largely, for that determination, is the hunter questionnaire, in terms of the success rate as opposed to previous years. That information usually does not come in until almost a year later. I will maybe put the question to the Deputy Minister as to whether or not any of that information is available. Are we seeing any trends?

**Mr. Klassen:** I do not have that information at my fingertips. Let me just check some of the notes I have on moose populations. There is always anecdotal information about who got moose where. The information that has been made available in the past through the questionnaires is that 30 percent of the moose that have been taken by Yukon hunters have been taken in zones 7 and 9 and enhance our increased efforts in that area in determining the relationship between the moose and their predators.

The general information regarding moose populations, just checking my notes, I do not have here. I do not know whether it is appropriate for me to give an undertaking to provide that information. I do not have the information readily at hand here. As I say, of the successful hunting, 30 percent of it takes place in these two zones in the southern Yukon. The rest is distributed generally along the highway systems and, therefore, those game management zones that border on those highways are affected.

**Mr. Lang:** I would like to know, from his knowledge of the working surveys that were done. I am not talking about the hunter surveys, the moose surveys that we pay a great deal of money to have done. In the last three years we have had quite a number of them and I know that they have been concentrated in zones seven and nine, to the most degree, but I am sure that can be extrapolated to other parts of the territory in a general sense, does it appear that

our moose population is increasing as opposed to last year?

**Mr. Porter:** Games zone seven and nine cannot be seen like any other part of the Yukon. There has to be a clear distinction made. Games zone seven and nine represent an area of the Yukon where traditionally 30 percent of the hunting pressures have been exerted on them, and I think that the cumulative terms of all predators, which includes us humans, has resulted in a situation where the moose population has suffered drastically as a result of the predation on that species. I think that we cannot make the mistake of looking at the Yukon and extrapolating density figures from one particular zone to other areas, because the Yukon from the north coast to Watson Lake and Teslin burn area are entirely different areas with their own ecological systems and different plant life, different species, different conditions altogether.

With respect to the general results of the studies, and the data that I have read on the area, clearly there was evidence in the past that the calf mortality rate exceeded in last year's study in excess of 80 percent. When I was there this summer, and talking to officials since I have returned this fall — although the final numbers are not in — I think that we have seen a trend where those numbers have declined. The calf mortality numbers have declined and that suggests a rejuvenation. As to exactly how much, I really do not know yet. If Bill can add to that I would ask him to.

**Mr. Klassen:** The information that we have to date in those two zones does support what Mr. Porter has indicated. The calf mortality in those two zones has declined. That is to say, more calves are surviving. Approximately in the range of 50 percent of the calves are surviving thus far. In the two previous years, up to 80 percent had been killed or had died by this time in the year. What little information I do have with me indicates that moose populations in the remainder of the territory are generally stable. You understand that wildlife censusing is not an exact science, that surveys will indicate a trend over a period of years. The information that I have with me is that moose populations in those areas that we have been surveying are tending to being stable.

**Mr. Lang:** I have a question in a different area. It may be a combination of Government Services and Renewable Resources. It has to do with the cabins that are in the possession of Renewable Resources and, I think, are administered through Government Services. There was serious reflection within the government a year or so ago about the prospects of selling those particular facilities. If I recall correctly, one of the impediments was the legal survey and the federal land situation. The land, in some cases, I do believe, was territorial and was, therefore, not private, or something of that nature.

Is it the intention of the government to put those particular facilities on the market: Rose Lake, Claire Lake and I believe there is one down by Watson Lake. There are three of four of them.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** That question is being actively researched and I will be bringing a proposal to Cabinet, I would expect, during the winter.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would like to have the Minister tell us where he figures that agriculture fits into this, and does he not think that with the position it is now in that it would be better off in a branch by itself?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I agree with the Member opposite. It should be given separate branch status. I have spoken to the department officials about that. So far, our plans are that the proper place in which to reflect separate branch status for the agricultural branch would be in the 1986-87 mains that will be brought in this spring.

**Mrs. Firth:** Is the Minister giving a commitment that it will be reflected in the 1986-87 budget with its own branch status?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I give the undertaking to the House that I, as the Minister, would support such a move. I recognize that, within the limitations of the decision-making process, major reorganizations that do take place in separate departments must meet with Cabinet approval.

**Mrs. Firth:** If the Minister agrees with it being a separate branch and having its own area, it does not necessarily mean that it will be there. I recognize the difficulty that the Minister is in when it comes to giving this House a commitment that agriculture will have its own identity. Again, if it continues to be buried under

Lands, Parks and Resources, and the direction is given to the department, it sometimes takes a bit longer to do things than it really should take. As some of the Ministers, I am sure, have found, when you give a direction, it does not always get implemented immediately.

I would like to know whether the department concurs with the Minister, or if he is meeting with some obstruction, when he is being so emphatic in saying that he feels it should have its own separate identity.

<sup>21</sup> My opinion is that it is the best department in the government. I have received no obstruction whatsoever on any issue to date.

**Mrs. Firth:** I would be able to then reassure the agricultural community that in the new budget, in 1986-87, the Minister is giving a commitment that agriculture will be high profiled and given its own identity.

**Mr. Lang:** Perhaps you could give us a brief outline as to what he sees as the plans for the Renewable Resource side of the Economic Development Agreement. What are the Minister's plans, and what can he see taking place in the area of agriculture?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Whether or not I, as Minister, have sat down and said to the people who sit within the Management Committees and have a responsibility to administer the Renewable Resource Subagreement of the EDA, and have come to them and said, "look, you are going to spend the money this way", I have not done that. In most areas we have proceeded with caution, particularly in the tourism area. The season was under way and there was an awful lot of activity out there that you leave, simply just because having to want to make changes, for sake of changes, obstructs the process and denies people access to programs. Therefore, caution has been the word that has been used with respect to the changes of direction with respect to the subsidiary agreements.

There is, as we discussed earlier today, a process for review that is clearly laid out in the Economic Development Agreement. We are obliged as a partner to the agreement to live within the confines of that review process. As I understand the EDA so far, it is functioning well, we have received somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 applications for the renewable resource side of the subagreement. In excess of \$100,000 has been allocated in the various areas. For detail I would like to refer to the Deputy Minister.

In the area of agriculture, I think that with agriculture we should let the industry dictate the pace as to where we go with it and how far we go with it. We are limited because of the climatic conditions that we live under. We are limited by the soil conditions that we have in the Yukon, and we must recognize that and approach it with a sense of realism. I think that our approach has been to allow the industry to dictate the pace, by which agricultural development takes place in the Yukon. We as a government understand that our role is to facilitate the growth of that industry. We are going to be doing so by bringing in an agricultural products act, in which to give us the tools to assist the industry as it develops. For instance, one area that we are talking about is the production of red meats. There has to be a realistic view as to whether or not we go the traditional route of bringing in cattle, which has been proven to be quite expensive. Some of the figures that I have heard in discussion with people in the industry and people within the department are in excess of \$700 per head to feed the cattle in the Yukon. On the other hand, elk cost \$100 per head.

<sup>22</sup> It would seem to me that that area would suggest that wild game or wild game that has been domesticated is the route to investigate in terms of red meat production in the Yukon. To that extent, we are reviewing the whole question of elk ranching. There is a private entrepreneur who has initiated the idea and brought in some elk of his own. We are going to look at the idea of a government feed herd, because of our connections largely with the people who produce elk, to look at bringing that in, discuss and analyse it in terms of feasibility and costs, and how we apportion the products of that seed herd to the people in the industry.

I think that is an example as to some of the thinking that is going on. In terms of other areas, we would like to utilize the EDA to look at the whole business of setting up tanneries, looking at the furrier part of the industry with respect to our wild furs. I think it is

time that we looked and did some real hard number crunching as to whether these are feasible ideas, or can they be done in the Yukon. If private industry, or groups like Yukon Trappers Association, do not take the initiative, and we will encourage them to take the initiative, where we do not see initiative in the private sector, we will ourselves initiate those kinds of studies to take place so that we can determine future possibilities for the economic linkages to renewable resources.

**Mrs. Firth:** On that same subject, I would just encourage the Minister to perhaps consult with the Whitehorse Economic Initiatives Committee, the committee that the City, I believe, established because they have done some research into tanneries and so on.

The subject I wanted to ask the Minister about is something called Project Wild. I wanted to know if the Minister had any information about it. I see him looking through his briefing notes.

Is he familiar with the program and has he investigated it at all? Is there any potential that Project Wild is going to be introduced into our schools? For the record, and for the benefit of the Members in the House here who are not familiar with it, I would like to just read a brief background: "Project Wild is a program of learning consisting of a set of teaching materials which may be applied to all grade levels and all subject areas within formal and informal educational settings. Professional educators describe the material as a supplementary, interdisciplinary, education program directed at providing learning experiences for young people at elementary and secondary school levels. The goal of Project Wild is to assist learners of any age in developing awareness, knowledge, skills and commitment to result in informed decisions, responsible behaviour and constructive action concerning wildlife and the environment upon which all life depends".

<sup>23</sup> Three provinces are already using the program: Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Two additional provinces are planning to initiate activities later this year, 1985: Newfoundland, Labrador and Prince Edward Island. Evidently, other provinces have indicated a strong interest in this project. I wanted to know if the Minister was familiar with it. If not, is he going to research it, and is he about to make any presentation to look at introducing this into the educational system in Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I thank the Member for her question.

This particular project is actively being researched by officials in the Department of Education and the Department of Renewable Resources. As a matter of fact, a departmental representative was in Ottawa; I believe it was from August 18 to the 21. The purpose of that trip was to receive training on how to introduce project materials to teachers, how to develop leadership workshops and train facilitators, how to develop implementation plans for their jurisdictions.

The obvious question is that once you have done your analysis, when would you make a decision on it. I do not really know when the report will be coming forth from the analysis so I would be hesitant to give a commitment as to when a decision will be made.

Philosophically, I think the project is a very good one, and I think, from my perspective, it will receive active consideration and support from me as a Minister.

**Mrs. Firth:** I would like to thank Mr. Porter for his comments. I will continue to follow up on this.

**Mr. Lang:** I want to refer to his comments about seed herd of elk. We have elk, as he well knows, in the Tutshi River area, the Stoney Creek area. I understood that there had been some agreement made with the Fish and Game Association with the idea of bringing in further species of elk to augment that herd and to see whether or not it would increase in size. If I am correct, is that not going to take place this winter?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** It is a pity that the president of the Fish and Game Association is not with us tonight to embellish this discussion.

This issue was something that was just presented to me maybe three weeks ago. The Agricultural and Livestock Association invited me to a meeting in the Takhini Hot Springs area. They said that they wanted to bring elk into the Yukon and wanted to know if I could help them. I sat down with them; I said that I would look at it. That was followed by a request from the Fish and Game

Association. They came to me and said that they wanted elk as well. They wanted elk, not for the production of protein, but they wanted to put elk into the bush for sport.

The department had anticipated this area. They had advised me of a possible solution to meet the needs of both of the groups. I concur with it, and we will be working in that direction. Governments have a greater degree of ability to get and transport domestic and wild animals than private individuals.

Private individuals have a lot of red tape, and a lot of time delays. I understand we are on the reserve already with Elk Island, where a lot of the elk in Canada is produced. It is much more simplified, because we are a government.

What we proposed to both organizations is that the government initiate the process to bring in a seed herd, and maybe we would take care of the elk ourselves or, as I am sure as a philosophy that is dear to the heart of the Member for Porter Creek East, look at a contract, put it out to tender to individuals who have the skills, have the facilities, to take care of the herd, and manage the herd on behalf of the government. Then the calves that are born as a result of the animals that are in the seed herd, ensure that they are of a strength capable to survive in the wild, and take those calves and transplant a percentage of them to the wild. Then take the remaining percentage and farm that out to individuals who want to look at commercial elk ranching.

That, in its simplest terms, is the idea as it exists now. That is what we are pursuing. As I understand it now, we are talking to the officials at Elk Island. We are talking to other operations throughout North America that have gone the route of elk ranching and we are basically collecting data and looking at the feasibility of doing such a project in the Yukon.

**Mr. Lang:** The other area you can look at is the Province of Alberta. We had an agreement, just for the record, I believe it was three years ago, an agreement with the Province of Alberta to bring in 30 elk, and we would pay the transportation costs. That was to see whether or not we could increase the size of the herd out in the Tutshi River area.

I do not think the Minister still has answered my question. I thought there was an agreement with the Fish and Game Association that we would bring up elk and offset that herd. That had something to do with the lottery. I just want it clarified for the record here. Are you changing that agreement that was entered into, or the understanding between the government and that association?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I know of no such agreement, although I may be wrong. There may have been an agreement prior to this. My involvement was simply a discussion with the Fish and Game Association. Just to make sure I do not get into trouble on this, I will refer the question in its entirety to the Deputy Minister.

**Mr. Klassen:** There is at least an understanding. I do not know that it is a written agreement. A portion of the funds generated by the lottery for the elk hunt that has been held the last two autumns would go towards the improving of the stature of the wild herd of elk in the Yukon Territory. It was with that in mind, the honouring of that obligation, that the approach that the Minister has outlined of some of the progeny of elk coming in from Elk Island, and it is with Elk Island, not the government of Alberta, but Elk Island Park that the agreement exists to provide elk to the Yukon when we are ready to receive them. It was with the understanding with the Fish and Game Association that has been referred to that the proposal was discussed with the Minister of some of the progeny going into the wild, some of the progeny going into private enterprise in elk ranches.

**Mr. Lang:** Do you know the number of elk? Are we talking 30, 40, 50 animals? What numbers are we speaking of?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I do not think that there is a limited number that we are talking about. If the previous commitment of Elk Island has been 30 now, then maybe 30 is what we will take. Maybe, as the need continues and the demand increases, then we will attempt to satisfy the demand.

**Mr. Lang:** For the record, it was with the Province of Alberta. Elk Island, I believe, is the federal Government of Canada. The agreement that I had reached when I was Minister — and that is three, four years ago now — was with the Province of Alberta. I

believe it was 30 animals. At that time, I gathered that the elk did not appear where they generally wintered because of the weather, so it did not materialize.

When does the Minister expect a decision to be taken on this?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** On a lot of these issues, you really have a difficult time to capsuleize them by timeframes. When you do, there can be all kinds of repercussions to that. You say, well, I will do it tomorrow or the day after because, if you do not, then there is a real problem with that. I would not want to be nailed down to naming a specific time in which a decision will be made. My government is philosophically supportive of development of the renewable resource. We are supportive of looking at issues like animal husbanding, such as elk ranching. Specifically, on this question, we have made a commitment that we will research this question. We will make the contacts with the relevant officials who have the elk. Then we will make the determination as to whether or not this will happen before Christmas. I doubt whether we would have a decision before Christmas. I would suspect that the best I can do is to say it would be a decision that would be made early in 1986.

**Mrs. Firth:** I have a question to ask about the elk farming or elk ranching. I understand that the Minister gave a commitment to the Yukon Livestock and Agriculture Association that if we go in the direction of encouraging elk farming, that it would come under the management of agriculture as opposed to wildlife. Would the Minister like to confirm that now?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I do not really recall whether or not I made that specific commitment. However, it makes sense to me. I see no problem. It depends. If they are up running around on Tutshi or Stoney Creek, they are wildlife and that is how they will be managed. But, if they are in someone's enclosure and they are being fed and fenced and petted and given names, they are going to be managed under the agricultural section.

**Mrs. Firth:** I believe that when the Agricultural Association was positive and responsive to the suggestion, it was based upon the elk ranching being considered under Agriculture and not under Wildlife. I thank the Minister for his commitment.

#### *On Administration*

Administration in the amount of \$774,000 agreed to

#### *On Policy and Planning*

#### *On Director and Policy Planning*

Director and Policy Planning in the amount of \$275,000 agreed to

#### *On Information and Education*

**Mr. Brewster:** Perhaps the Minister could explain that drastic increase of 121 percent?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The best answer that I can give is that it is a very complex area and I do not have a handle on it yet. It is that it is due to the reorganizational effort. Within certain areas of the Department we have never had Policy and Planning for example. That has been created as a result of reorganization. We have had shifts of funds and that is where you see an 80 percent change in that area, and the additional person-years to those areas. Most of the changes are reflected as a result of the reorganizational efforts. As you notice, the overall person-year numbers have not changed drastically at all.

**Mrs. Firth:** Since that significant change of 121 percent is in Information and Education, I hope it would not be because the Department of Renewable Resources was embarking on its own public relations program. Perhaps the Minister could enlighten us regarding that, or the question could be put to the Deputy Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** There has been an increase in the information area and that has been a result of the Department making a decision that there has to be more done in the area of education. Whether or not we are starting our own public affairs bureau, I really cannot answer that. For example, we publish campfire news. We also publish wildlife bulletins that receive wide circulation. Our information officers travel throughout the Yukon's schools, and I think that what calls for more expenditures is that it is better to educate people about wildlife matters than to basically use the legal ruler over their head and to simply go the enforcement attitude, and pushing enforcement on people. That philosophically has been the



reason for the change as to the specifics of the program. I would appreciate the assistance of the Deputy speaking further to that.

**Mr. Klassen:** The points the Minister makes are entirely accurate. It was seen that there was not enough information about the wildlife renewable resources in general. Because the information and education officer in the unit of Policy Planning Branch within the department provides that information service to all branches within the department. In an effort to acquaint the public with what was being done, and what the renewable resources available in the territory were, the *Yukon Campfire News*, is a newspaper that was handed out at campgrounds and at the information booths run by the Department of Tourism. For the green Renewable Resources Bulletin that comes out every three weeks or more often, some of that money is used to publish the regulation synopsis, some is used to print the information brochures that we put out on a range of topics: furbearers, a small cookbook, things like that.

A portion of that money went towards the public presentations that the information and education officer puts on. A portion of it was spent on the firearms safety program. Audio-visual slide presentations have been put together. Those are not inexpensive.

The information and education officer produced non-technical wildlife management summaries to provide to individuals who had questions about, for example, the predator/prey program. I think those are the bulk of the areas in which that information-education funding is going towards.

**Mrs. Firth:** I have no doubt about the educational material that is being presented to the public, and I totally agree with educating the public. I do have some concern that there is a difference between education and public relations. The philosophies are two different philosophies when it comes to the message that you are trying to get across. I do know that there was some talk of all of the public relations being done through a central department, the Department of Public Affairs. Some of the departments within government were having a great deal of difficulty with this, and found it a bit of a struggle.

I do feel that there is probably a bit of funding identified in there for public relations; however, we will just have to see how it is handled. We will have to watch it and see what comes forward in the new budget that is presented.

*Information and Education in the amount of \$208,000 agreed to On Regulation and Legislation*

*Regulation and Legislation in the amount of \$48,000 agreed to Policy and Planning in the amount of \$531,000 agreed to*

*On Lands, Parks and Resources*

*On Director*

**Mr. Brewster:** Could the Minister explain why there is such a decrease there?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Again, it was a result of reorganization and I understand that this used to be a very large area, and now we are just down to a Director and a secretarial support staff person. The other people who used to be there have been moved to Resource and Regional Planning.

*Director in the amount of \$90,000 agreed to*

*On Parks and Resources*

**Mr. Brewster:** Could you explain the large increase there, and does this include some new parks being constructed, and if so, where?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes. We have seen a 14 percent change in the department itself. All the change of numbers within this particular area of Lands, Parks and Resources are the result of the reorganization. This area has obviously received the bulk of the increase at the expense of the Director area. In terms of new parks, we are working on the Cold River park concept. At Herschel Island, we are doing that jointly with Tourism. As well, we are doing further work on Kusawa. Whether or not we have initiated any new parks since I have taken office, I do not think we have. The Deputy Minister may want to speak to that as well.

**Mr. Klassen:** There have not been any new initiatives beyond the ones that — I am sure Mr. Brewster is familiar with the Cold River Springs development — some work in the Tatchun-Frenchman area, Herschel Island, some field work in the Kusawa

park recreational area. Part of the funding will be spent this winter in developing a park systems plan which will look at an orderly development of additional parks.

**Mr. Coles:** Can the Minister tell us if the Tatchun-Frenchman Lake area has got park status now?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** As I understand it, the original intention of the previous Minister was to designate that area as a park; however, we received a lot of complaints from the residents of Carmacks. We initiated a public consultation effort. We went to Carmacks and asked the people if they supported the idea. From the public meetings that we had and the private discussions were carried out with the various groups in the area, there was a clear indication that the people were not interested in a park. Their primary interest was to see that the road was completed.

With respect to that decision, I think we will not pursue park status for that area, but we will probably end up calling the area a recreational area.

**Mr. Coles:** Is this referring to the wood bison compound in the Nesling Valley west of Carmacks?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes, it does.

**Mr. Coles:** Could the Minister elaborate on that? Is it going to be finished by November 1985. I know that it is a couple of years late now. Are there any buffalo left to put in it?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** My understanding is that it is going to be complete. There is very little work left to be done in that particular area.

While I have the opportunity, I would like to publicly thank the Katimavik group for assisting us in that development. I had an opportunity to meet with them individually when their work was completed this summer. Under the direction of a Carmacks resident, they were responsible, to a large extent, for doing all of the work on the fencing program there this summer. From all accounts from the department, they did a good job, after we sorted out the permafrost problem.

It seems to be a project that is near completion. Hopefully we will be through with it in the next couple of months. The pens will be complete. It will simply be then a question of getting the necessary wood bison trucked to the area and introduced into it.

My understanding is that the target date for the transportation of those animals to the Yukon is the end of February.

**Mr. Coles:** The previous Minister in Carmacks a couple of years ago advised the residents that the project would cost a total of about \$200,000. I wonder if there has been any change in that.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** There has been a change in the figure. Maybe the deputy has the specific figures on hand.

**Mr. Klassen:** Could I have a moment to check my notes on that?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The research continues.

**Mr. Brewster:** On a point of order. The honoured gentleman from Carmacks and the Minister keep referring to the previous Minister. I was the previous Minister and I did not make either one of those decisions.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The point of order is totally in order.

I apologize to the Member for referring to him as being the person responsible. I think that it should be clear that he was not responsible.

In terms of the wood bison project, the only other comment that I wanted to make in this area is that contrary to some of the opinions that have been held, we are not introducing a new species to the area to compete with the species that inhabit the area now. As a matter of fact, the research done by the previous government indicates that this was an area that was heavily inhabited at one time by wood bison. It may have been a few hundreds of thousands of years ago, but it was a species that was indigenous to that part of the Yukon at one time.

**Mr. Klassen:** The amount that was anticipated to be spent in this fiscal year on that particular project was \$25,000. A portion of it would have gone toward the evaluation of the habitat in the area for release of the bison. A portion of it would also have been spent on completion of the site enclosure. I do not have with me a final figure that rolls up the amount that has been spent over the two or three years that that project has been underway.

**Mr. Coles:** Just on the Member for Kluane's point, and I do apologize, but he was there for such a short time that it just slipped my mind.

I would appreciate it if the Minister could give me the total cost of what that project did end up costing the taxpayer.

**Mr. Brewster:** I was going to bring this up a little later, but I see we are on the wood bison. Can the Minister assure me that this is the wood bison that is coming in here. I have read several reports from different biologists and as usual, biologists disagree. Is this not a strain of the plains buffalo?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The biologists I talked to tell me it is the wood bison.

**Mr. Klassen:** I have a degree in biology, but as a wildlife manager, and that may not make me any different than the rest. The bison that we are bringing in are from Elk Island, and we are assured that this is a pure strain of wood bison. These are the tremendously large bison that existed on the northern fringe of the Great Plains. They are substantially larger than the plains bison, and size alone is one distinguishing characteristic. We are as confident as we can be that these are, indeed, wood bison that, who knows how long ago, did live in Yukon.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would suggest, and I realize the Minister would not have the answer nor possibly the Deputy Minister, that he check the history of this. The plains buffalo were brought into that area, Elk Island and then afterward, Buffalo National Park, in the years 1900 and 1920 in Kalispell, Montana. Then all of a sudden a biologist finds in Wood Buffalo National Park in 1950 another strain which he claims is the wood buffalo. They brought them back to Elk Island and have been taking them out since.

If you read the two reports on it when you study the measurements, they all fit within the same thing. I also might qualify that I have no objection to the buffalo whether they are wood or plain being brought in to the country.

*Parks and Resources in the amount of \$477,000 agreed to  
On Regional Planning  
Regional Planning in the amount of \$115,000 agreed to  
On Development and Operations  
Development and Operations in the amount of \$503,000 agreed to*

*On Agriculture*

**Mr. Brewster:** Perhaps the Minister can tell me, does this mean that there will be no transfer of any of Forestry at all from the federal government as there is no money appropriated there?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** No. I do not really understand how they put these things together. I think that it is an anticipation that we will get Forestry some time down the road and that we had better have it in the budget if we are going to put any money into it. The discussions have not been concluded on Forestry and it is anticipated that some time we are going to begin negotiations.

**Mr. Brewster:** Just before you clear this item, on the page in Statistics, is that a typographical error, you have 1984-85 and that you have 1,098 campground sites then 1984-85 you have 876?

**Mr. Porter:** In all probability it speaks to the design efforts of the drafters of the overall budget. I believe that the extreme right column should read 1983-84 as opposed to 1984-85.

*Agriculture in the amount of \$101,000 agreed to  
Lands, Parks and Resources in the amount of \$1,286,000 agreed to*

*On Fish and Wildlife*

*On Director*

*Director in the amount of \$109,000 agreed to*

*On Small Game*

*Small Game in the amount of \$495,000 agreed to*

*On Big Game*

*Big Game in the amount of \$966,000 agreed to*

*On Technical and Planning*

*Technical and Planning in the amount of \$28,000 agreed to*

*On Field Services*

*Field Services in the amount of \$1,187,000 agreed to*

*On Special Services*

*Special Services in the amount of \$68,000 agreed to*

*Fish and Wildlife in the amount of \$2,853,000 agreed to*

### 32 On Revenues and Recoveries

**Mr. Brewster:** I notice that on Canadian Wildlife Service there are nothing on Recoveries. Are they not helping you bring these buffalo in, and did you not get money from them? Is this not a joint project?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** It is, I understand, a joint project, but I do not know if they are funding. I will ask the Deputy Minister to comment on that.

**Mr. Klassen:** It is a joint project. My understanding is that the Canadian Wildlife Service, through the provision of some materials, has already fulfilled their portion of it, but I cannot say that with certainty. Since we do not show any line on the Recoveries there, I believe that they have already fulfilled their obligation under that agreement.

**Mr. Brewster:** I have a question on sale of wolf pelts. Where were these sold and how were they sold?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** My understanding is that they are sent out to auction.

**Mr. Klassen:** That is the case. They are sold at public auction. *Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$5,444,000 agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** This completes the Department of Renewable Resources. In view of the time, I move that you report progress on Bill No. 2.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair and the witness be excused.

*Motion agreed to*

*(Witness is excused)*

33

*Speaker resumes the Chair*

**Speaker:** I would now call the House to order.

May the House have a report from the Chairman of Committee of the Whole?

**Mr. Webster:** Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 2, *Second Appropriation Act, 1985-86*, and directed me to report progress on same.

**Speaker:** You have heard the report from the Chairman of Committee of the Whole. Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Speaker:** I declare the report carried.

May I have your further pleasure?

**Ms. Kassi:** I move that the House do now adjourn.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Member for Old Crow that the House do now adjourn.

*Motion agreed to*

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

*The House adjourned at 9:27 p.m.*

**The following Sessional Paper was tabled October 9, 1985:**

85-2-6

Yukon Housing Corporation 83-84 Annual Report (McDonald)